

John Jewel and the English National Church

The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer

Gary W. Jenkins

John Jewel and the English National Church

For my Mother, and the memory of my Father:
In memoria aeterna erit iustus, ab auditione mala non timebit.

John Jewel and the English National Church

The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer

GARY W. JENKINS

ASHGATE

© Gary W. Jenkins, 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopied, recorded or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Gary W. Jenkins has asserted his moral right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Gower House
Croft Road
Aldershot
Hants GU11 3HR
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington, VT 05401-4405
USA

Ashgate website: http://www.ashgate.com
--

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Jenkins, Gary W.

John Jewel and the English national church: the dilemmas of an Erastian reformer – (St Andrews studies in Reformation history)

1. Jewel, John, 1522–1571 2. Bishops – England – Biography
3. Reformation – England 4. England – Church history – 16th century

I. Title

283'.092

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jenkins, Gary W., 1961–

John Jewel and the English National Church: the dilemmas of an Erastian reformer / Gary W. Jenkins

p. cm. — (St Andrews studies in Reformation history)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0–7546–3585–6 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Jewel, John, 1522–1571. 2. Church of England – History – 16th century.
3. England – Church history – 16th century. I. Title. II. Series.

BX5199.J4J46 2005

283'.092—dc22

2005007479

ISBN 0 7546 3585 6

Printed on acid-free paper

Typeset in Sabon by Express Typesetters Ltd, Farnham

Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books, Bodmin, Cornwall

Table of Contents

Preface and acknowledgements	vi
Introduction	1
1 Oxford and exile, Jewel till 1558	6
2 Jewel and the struggle for the Elizabethan Church	51
3 The Catholic reaction to Jewel	115
4 A prelate public and private: Jewel caught between Puritans and princes	155
5 Life as a bishop in Salisbury	203
6 Jewel and the identity of the English national Church	225
Appendices	251
Bibliography	255
Index	287

Preface and acknowledgements

Among the great blessings of this mortal life, very near to family and friends, one must rank the aid, comfort, encouragement, and support rendered by the myriad people and institutions that make the production of a book a reality. This affinity becomes more true when the author finds many friends and family among those who have been abettors, comforters and cheerleaders in the enterprise. Honor of place in the academic arena must go to Professor William J. Tighe of Muhlenburg College, whose constant support, vast memory, familiarity with sources and grand companionship have never ceased to animate this work. He provided insight right up to the end, reading the manuscript both as it originally appeared as a dissertation, and now in its much altered and I hope improved version. Along with Bill I need to single out those who at various stages of its life also read the manuscript and provided both criticism and encouragement. Professor Frank James (president of Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, Florida) supplied bibliographic and correctives in my knowledge of Peter Martyr Vermigli, especially as regards his Eucharistic thought. Torrance Kirby (McGill University) graciously provided both insight and a copy of his forthcoming article 'Relics of the Amorites' for my perusal. John Craig (Simon Fraser University), kindly supplied me with his entry on Jewel to the new *DNB* as well as use of his paper 'Erasmus or Calvin? The Politics of Book Purchase in the English Parish, 1538–1640.' Professors Norm Jones (Utah State University) and Daniel Eppley (McMurray University) freely gave numerous criticisms and suggestions. Professors Donald Kelley, Phyllis Mack, and Maurice Lee, all of Rutgers University, read this when it was but a meager dissertation, and each helped me when I made the transition from the study of Medieval Europe to the disciplines of an Early Modern historian. Numerous others aided in other respects: Fr Keith Wyer, rector of St Peter's Church Berrynarbor and the churches of Berrynarbor parish was most kind with his insights about the topography and situation of Jewel's earliest years; Mr Joseph Sirotnak twice provided me free airfare to England for research; Dr Bob Schuettinger played my gracious host during my time in Oxford in 2003; Mr Mark Kelly, over numerous pints, allowed me to bounce my thoughts off him and was gracious with his insights; Professor Richard Rex whose comments over lunch led me to look into a certain item regarding Thomas Harding; Professor Tom Freeman provided insights on all things

related to that Salisbury prebend, John Foxe; and Tom Mayer who prodded me in the direction of Andrew Pettegree and St Andrews Studies in Reformation History, published under the auspices of Ashgate Publishing. I must thank as well, having mentioned them, all those at St Andrews and Ashgate, especially Ellen Keeling, for their patience and work on this text. All of the above have given me freely of their insights and aid, and I have frequently incorporated their judgments into the text. Any errors that persist, however, of both fact and interpretation, are mine alone.

Among the libraries and librarians I must first acknowledge the kindness, thoroughness and professionalism of Dr Christine Ferdinand of Magdalen College, Oxford, who was gracious on more than one occasion, and who sat with me through the heat of the summer of 2003 in Magdalen's old library as I poured over Jewel's personal library: even separated by an ocean, she never was more than a quickly answered email away with information. I must also acknowledge the librarians of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, especially those connected with the Duke Humphrey Library and reading room; the librarians of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC; the librarians of the Warner Memorial Library, Eastern University, notably Jim Sauer, Jonathan Beasley, and Susan Joseph, who freely gave their time in tracking down odd purchases and acquiring microfilm; the librarians of the Alexander Library of Rutgers University, especially the late Stan Nash who was invaluable in the initial heuristic stages of this work; the librarians of the Sage Library of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary, as the library proved a wealth of resources for the late medieval theological landscape, as well as that of the Reformation; the Warden and librarians of Pusey House, Oxford; and finally the librarians of the Ryan Memorial Library of St Charles Borromeo Seminary, who allowed me to keep numerous copies of works by various Recusants for an overly long time. Organizationally I must thank Eastern University, which provided a number of faculty development grants that allowed me to explore some of the ideas in the text, the Harold Howard Provost's Fellowship for the academic year 2003–04 which helped underwrite my sabbatical, and for the benefits of the Charles Van Gorden Professorship which helped with this book, and continues still to underwrite other areas of my research. At Eastern has come as well the support of my provost, Dr David Fraser, a real champion for faculty who wish to pursue scholarship. Also at Eastern I should note my grand colleagues in the history department, professors Price, Gatlin, Joseph and Boehlke.

On the personal level I must thank first of all my wife Carol, always patient beyond reason in the process, *tamquam et coheredibus gratiae vitae*, and a light at the end of the tunnel. Along with Carol I must thank

our daughter Kristen, who was always considerate of a father who needed quiet to think and write. Professors Gary and Marjorie Hafer (along with all the faculty irregulars) were free with their encouragement and hospitality, as were Cyril Quatrone, Professor Valerie Sajez, the late Fr Adrian Pollard, Fr Thomas Edwards, Fr Eugene Vansuch, Ed Bartholomew, Jesse O'Hare, Chris Butynskyi, Athanasia Ellmore, and the members of St Nicholas Parish. I must thank Professor Allen C. Guelzo of Gettysburg College, whose scholarly habits have inspired me, whose friendship has emboldened me, who has acted at times as the hound of heaven (and other places) in my completing this project, who first gave me the idea to write about Jewel, and who I believe could have done a much better job. Lastly I must thank my mother, who first taught me hard work, who no doubt is surprised that I of her sons wrote such a book, and who with my late father showed me what it took to put my hand to the plow and not to look back. I wish he could have seen it.

Gary W. Jenkins

22 June 2005

Feast of St Alban, protomartyr of Britain
Allentown, Pennsylvania

The Image of Jewel: an icon of a dice player

The debate about the English Reformation, what prompted it, how it was effected, how fast it spread and how thoroughly, assumes only an ancillary part of this study. The significance of this work's subject, namely John Jewel, the bishop of Salisbury from 1560 to 1571, capacious in his own day, reaches far beyond his time even to the present distress that afflicts the worldwide Anglican Communion. This study is not, however, an apologia for either side of that debate. Instead it is an attempt to see in Jewel more than merely a champion of some abortion of an agreement which allowed him to again live in England having spent four years in exile. Jewel in fact agreed with what occurred in 1559 just as much as he adhered to the theology of his Swiss Reformed hosts in the city of Zurich: to Jewel the Elizabethan Settlement made no virtue of a necessity. The real significance of Jewel then is not so much his impact upon the spread of the Protestant faith in his own day, however much he may have desired that and bent his energies toward it, but rather the legacy he bequeathed – an ambiguous one I shall argue – to the Church of England, an ecclesiastical entity he worked so hard to defend and did so much to define, however much this definition lacked specificity.

In his own day Jewel stood as an icon, and his death only enhanced the image. Intimate with the most prominent Reformers, both English and continental, and party to a number of the more pointed controversies of the Reformation, the peripeties of his life mirrored the course of the English Reformation, and were greatly influenced by the fortunes of the Reformation on the continent as well. Jewel also stands as a fulcrum between England's two reformations: present at the trial of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley,¹ his last written piece formed the very contours of the arguments between Whitgift and Cartwright about the proper polity of the church.² From the beginning of his academic career,

¹ John Strype, *Remains of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1840), I.483, named Jewel as the notary at Cranmer and Ridley's Oxford disputation with the Catholic doctors in 1554. In all probability it was Jewel who carried Cranmer's anonymous letter to Martyr in late 1554 or early 1555. Humphrey records that Jewel was known to the household of Latimer, Laurence Humphrey, *Ioannis Iuelli Angli, Episcopi Sarisburniensis vita & mors*. (London: John Day, 1573), p. 84.

² John Whitgift, *An Answer to a Certen Libell, intituled, An Admonition to the*

under the tutelage of a future bishop, to his last public acts, defending the Elizabethan Settlement from the Presbyterians, Jewel knew and consorted not only with the leaders of the English Reformation, but with those in Switzerland as well. Honored at his death by both foreign reformers and his fellow bishops, in his life notable Reformers from the continent whom he had not met would write him to praise his work,³ while the Council of Trent would damn it.⁴ In short, his life knew both misery and joy, success and setbacks; often the two were mixed. At the moment of Elizabeth's triumph in getting her Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity passed, returning England to the haven of Protestantism, he pined for Zurich.⁵ Having embraced Protestantism under Edward VI, Jewel recanted under Mary only to flee the country and apostatize again, only this time managing to run afoul of the Knoxians in Frankfurt. Yet while Jewel's life seems far from mundane, it was this he desired more than anything else, the uneventful otiose career of a scholar. As events turned out, he was the most prolific of Elizabeth's first bishops, and it can hardly be contraverted that in his day he was her chief apologist, undaunted by either Papist or Puritan, though it is with the former that almost all of his polemical work dealt. Consequently, this work shall be both theological and historical in character, akin to Jewel's method of polemics so tied to the history and the theology of the early Church.

Nonetheless, there is nothing of genius about Jewel; and despite his occasional cavalier use of sources, this is not to say he was disingenuous. While there is no cause to think him either a hypocrite or lacking in intellect, he was not always honest with his sources, and his scholarship showed more fervor than imagination. In this regard many things about the icon of Jewel need altering, for the original has been touched up and painted over many times. Within two years of his death his first biographer championed him as England's gallant against the beast of Rome, a model Reformed cleric given to the care of his flock and the equipping of a Protestant ministry, cutting a figure worthy of all emulation.⁶ But Laurence Humphrey's Reformed image of Jewel, essentially repeated in the brief biography Daniel Featly attached to the first collection of the bishop's works,⁷ did not survive a century. Barely 70

Parliament (London, 1573).

³ Jerome Zanchius to Jewel, 2 September 1571 in Hastings Robinson, ed. and trans., *The Zurich Letters*, in two volumes (Cambridge: Vol I, 1842; Vol II, 1845), pp. 185–88.

⁴ John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury*, ed., John Ayre (Cambridge, 1845–50) four volumes. III, pp. 186–87.

⁵ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1210.

⁶ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. xx–xxiii.

⁷ Daniel Featly, *A life of bishop Jewel*, in *The Works of John Jewell; and a brief discourse of his life* (London, 1609–11).

years after his encomium appeared, Archbishop William Laud, to the anger and consternation of England's Calvinist clergy, cited Jewel in his defense of prelacy. Having become a point of contention between Laud and his detractors, Jewel's exact legacy within the Church of England, more precisely, how Jewel used the Church Fathers and what this entailed for the Church of England's doctrine and organization, became part of the battle among England's various ecclesiastical factions. This ambivalence can be seen in the nineteenth-century publication of Jewel's works. The first attempted appropriation was by the high church cleric William Jelf, who saw in Jewel's use of the Fathers a foil to the evangelical party.⁸ The exact opposite intent and end animated the evangelical Parker Society with its more well known editions, seeing in Jewel a brake on Anglo-Catholic attempts to foist medieval piety on the English faithful. Despite Jelf's attempts, the Anglo-Catholics, most notably Froude, Pusey and Newman, saw correctly that Jewel was no friend to their enterprise; a view they held of all the English Reformers. In the mind of the Oxford Movement, Jewel was little better than Zwingli or Calvin; the Parker Society probably thought this happily true. Thus by the 1850s the Oxford Movement and the Anglo-Catholics saw Jewel as barely more than a shill for the continental Reformers, while the Evangelicals saw him as a defender of the Biblical faith of the Protestant Reformation.

By the second half of the twentieth century, this assessment of Jewel had largely been set aside as Jewel got caught up into the 'myth of the English Reformation', as historians and theologians coopted Jewel into that protean and malleable creature Anglicanism.⁹ In this scenario Jewel becomes one of the founders, arbiters, creators, patrons – take your choice – of a *via media*. Wyndham Southgate, the author most guilty of this charge, in his 1962 *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, cast Jewel as the forerunner of Hooker.¹⁰ The following year John Booty, though a bit more restrained, none the less moderately seconded Southgate, noting that a study of Jewel's life will reveal 'some of the ways by which Anglicanism came into being'.¹¹ Hylson-Smith sees in Jewel 'a theologian who had contributed to a nascent High Churchmanship despite his definite Protestant leanings'.¹² Even Anthony

⁸ *The Works of John Jewel D.D. bishop of Salisbury*, ed. Richard Wm. Jelf D.D. (Oxford, 1848).

⁹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The myth of the English reformation', *Journal of British Studies* 1991, 30 (1), pp. 1–19.

¹⁰ Wyndham Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Cambridge, MA, 1962), p. 99.

¹¹ John Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1963), p. ix.

¹² Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *The churches in England from Elizabeth I to Elizabeth II*, Vol 1, 1558–1688 (London, 1996), p. 135.

Milton, though hardly thinking Anglicanism an Elizabethan creature, credited Jewel with a legacy to the Church of England of Patristic authority, for

the appeal to the authority of the primitive church was, of course, the basic argument of Jewel's *Apology* of the Church of England and the 'Challenge' debate which it provoked (sic), in which the Church of England laid claim to the writers of the first six centuries of the church. Later divines continued to urge that the Church of England essentially preserved entire the true doctrine of the early church.¹³

Jewel certainly made an appeal to the early Church, and while he was happy to contend that certain aspects of the English church coincided with the Fathers' teachings, he was more concerned that England's doctrine was that of Peter Martyr Vermigli and Heinrich Bullinger.

This English/Swiss axis formed a substantial part of Jewel's intellectual and ecclesiological makeup, but for those seeking the roots of Anglicanism in the sixteenth century it has proven a major dissonance. How could someone who defended the prerogative of Her Majesty, episcopacy, and the use of vestments at the same time privately carp about these same vestments? This very question was asked in another vein by Charles Webb Le Bas, who wondered how it was that archbishop Parker and bishop Sandys could ask someone so contentious about vestments as Laurence Humphrey to write Jewel's biography, even though Jewel himself had little love for these 'relics of the Amorites'.¹⁴ Yet while Jewel possessed little affection for cope or surplice, he had an unending commitment to the notion that the magistrate held a paramount authority within the Church. Jewel knew no other polity. He came to Protestantism in the reign of Henry VIII, matured under Edward VI, and even when he took flight from Mary I, his ultimate destination was to that Erastian haven of Zurich, a city whose magistrates and pastors resided in equipoise. This image of what could be Jewel carried with him back to England at the beginning of 1559, for though Jewel loved Zurich, he was always English, and for him there was a great burden to defend its Protestantism.

Despite Jewel's intellectual and theological status among and even above the other members of Elizabeth's earliest bench, there is no Jewellian theology. Whatever theology Jewel possessed was entirely derivative, absorbed from that most notable of his mentors, Peter Martyr Vermigli. The Italian theologian's thoughts and arguments faintly echo

¹³ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 272.

¹⁴ Le Bas, Charles Webb, *The Life of Bishop Jewel* (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1835), pp. 241–42, 'reliquiae Amorrhæorum', Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1222.

throughout Jewel's works, but even these elements are faint, ephemeral, enervated and sometimes illusory. But in what then does Jewel's significance consist? It goes back to Jewel's use of the Church Fathers. In that Jewel approached his topics with zeal he was no different from any other controversialist of his day. In that he at times let his beliefs get the better of his judgment and discretion, damns him with everyone else in that age. But in his use of the Fathers he erected a new set of criteria, new canons, through which theology was filtered, canons negative and not positive. In short, Jewel attacked the very notion that there was a Catholic consensus among the Fathers, and ultimately there can be no doubt that Jewel found no Reformed consensus among them either. In this regard Jewel's ambivalent use of the Fathers, a via *negativarum canonum*, a minimalist patristic hereditament, seems more aleatory than purposeful, stochastic than precise. The dilemma is whether Jewel wished it this way.

Oxford and exile, Jewel till 1558

Jewel's early years and Oxford till the death of Henry VIII

Though meager when compared to the last 13 years of his life, the sparse evidence regarding Jewel before the accession of Elizabeth nonetheless reveals an individual whose Protestant outlook has already developed along lines peculiar to his life as an English bishop. The idiom he affected in his apologetics, the methods he embraced, the positions he endorsed, and the postures he assumed during Elizabeth's reign, had already obtained real clarity before Jewel had even set foot again in England following his years in exile. The few literary remains, amplified by his circle of friends, benefactors and teachers at Oxford and abroad, make Jewel's actions and associations over his last 13 years more easily understood. The three together – the writings he produced, the actions and pursuits he followed, and the associations he formed – present at times an enigmatic person, but one whose life and thought nonetheless follow a clear and consistent trajectory. The period from his arrival in Oxford till his return to England from exile in 1559 spans almost 24 years, nearly half of Jewel's life, informs the last 12 years of his life, and gives his thought roots heretofore overlooked. These years, so sparsely documented, nevertheless present an individual in which can already be discerned the nascent idioms which would produce the Challenge Sermon and the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.¹

The world of Jewel's youth is a little better known than John Jewel's youth itself. Born in March 1522 at Buden or Bowden farm in the parish Berrynarbor on the north coast of Devon, Jewel was one of ten children. Baptized in the Berrynarbor parish church of St Peters, about a mile from his home, all record of his baptism has been lost, torn from the parish record book at an unknown point some years ago. If it had the sad fate to have found its way to the cathedral in Exeter, then in almost all likelihood it was lost in the Blitz. Both Bowden farm and St Peter's church still stand, the church dating back to Anglo-Saxon England, with the arch of the western door dating to at least 1090, and many parts of

¹ The most recent edition of Jewel's *Apologia* is John Booty, ed., *An Apology of the Church of England* (Ithaca, NY: for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1963). The text is essentially that of Ayre's in Jewel, *Works*, Vol I pp. 49–108, but with a much better apparatus. The Parker Society edition of the Challenge Sermon is still the standard text.

the church predating that. The church itself was built over a spring, making for a rather damp sanctuary. As a number of burial mounds are near both the church and atop the hills of the Steridge Valley, the location of Bowden farm, it would seem safe to assume that before the church was built, the place was probably the site of pagan worship. Descendants of the Jewel family still live in nearby Combe Martin and Ilfracombe. Though Jewel's childhood predates the coming of the Reformation to the area, once it did arrive, the area itself proved slow in conforming or converting. Even the Bowden farm has evidence of a priesthole, the room being discovered just a few years ago during some renovations. Arlington Manor, some seven miles from Bowden farm, was the home of a notorious recusant family who willingly paid their yearly fine to Elizabeth to function as Recusants as opposed merely to being Church Papists.

Young Jewel's earliest education came at the hands of his maternal uncle, John Bellamie, rector of the parish church in Kentisbury,² just four miles from Berrynarbor. When he was seven, Jewel 'auunculo commendatur, ut statim principia bonarum artium disceret.'³ The place of Bellamie's education is not known, his name appearing among the graduates of neither Oxford nor Cambridge. Having given his nephew the rudiments of grammar, Bellamie then sponsored Jewel to the schools at Brampton, South Molton and lastly Barnstaple, all about ten miles distant from Berrynarbor. The school at Barnstaple – reputedly the oldest borough in England – where Jewel was educated 'sub auspiciis Walteri Bowen',⁴ still stands next to St Peter's church. It seems that his teachers at Barnstaple were the ones who got him into Oxford and the well-established and conservative institution of Merton College. Ironically, another Barnstaple student, also from Devonshire, would make his way to New College, Oxford the following year, namely Thomas Harding.

Jewel arrived at Merton College in 1535.⁵ Founded in 1264 by Walter de Merton, then Lord Chancellor and also bishop of Rochester, the college is located along the south wall of medieval Oxford, and was one

² Various of Jewel's lives give Hampton as the parish of Jewel's uncle (for example, Ayre in *Works*, IV, p. v).

³ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 17. 'He was commended to his uncle that he might learn the principles of the good arts.' Unless otherwise noted, all of the translations from Humphrey are my own, as the book has remained untranslated, though some writers on Jewel have translated the odd bit here and there, especially Le Bas.

⁴ From Thomas Tanner, quoted in Ayre, biographical memoir, in Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. xxvi.

⁵ Norman Jones, *English Reformation* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 114 ff., uses Merton as a case study in the spread of Protestantism among institutions, laying out the process by which the once strongly Catholic Merton slowly embraced Protestantism.

of the three oldest institutions in the university.⁶ In the first half of the sixteenth century some of the most renowned members of the university came from Merton, and Merton itself was highly inimical to the new learning of Renaissance humanism. Merton had, by conservative likes, the inauspicious honor of being John Wyclif's college. The century following Wyclif the college reacted with a strong orthodoxy, highlighted by the tenure of Richard Fitzjames as warden. Fitzjames became warden in 1501, having been the bishop of Rochester since 1497, was successively translated to Chichester in 1503 and then London in 1505, resigning his post as warden of Merton in 1507. Fitzjames had cultivated a medieval piety at Merton, and also had taken a hard line against the *studium humanitatis*. The latter is most clearly seen not only at Merton per se, but in his denunciations of John Colet, the dean of St Paul's cathedral. Fitzjames charged Colet with heresy before archbishop Warham, as Colet maintained some things that appeared drawn from Wyclif, and thus guilty of Lollardy. Further, per Erasmus's letter to Jonas Jeremiah, Colet was accused of opposing the worship of images. The strength of Colet's friends, who included Sir Thomas More and the Mercer Company of London, who had underwritten the costs of Colet's foundation of St Paul's school, certainly spared him any real difficulties.⁷ Fitzjames, as the Richard Hunne affair demonstrated (an affair about which Colet was highly critical), was unable always to control matters in London, but his conservative impression upon Merton was indelible. Despite the bishop's efforts, humanism did come to Merton in the person of Richard Rawlins, warden from 1509 to 1521. Although removed by Warham owing to complaints leveled against him by the fellows of the college, and succeeded first by Roland Philipps and then in 1525 by John Chambers, who remained at Merton till 1544, Rawlin's tenure, as shall be seen, was not without consequences.⁸

⁶ At first the college was in two locations, but in 1274 Merton unified the college at its present location. Most of the information for Merton College is drawn from G.H. Martin and J.R.L. Highfield, *A History of Merton College* (Oxford, 1997).

⁷ John B. Gleason, *John Colet* (Berkeley, 1989), pp. 235–60. Gleason sees Fitzjames confrontation with Colet as part of a bigger struggle, one connected to the prerogatives of Warham, and linked essentially to the rise of Thomas Wolsey, who became Colet's patron. Colet preached the sermon at Westminster Abbey on the occasion of Wolsey's receiving his cardinal's hat (18 November 1515); Fitzjames failed to show (pp. 244–47). Gleason sees the relationship between Colet and Fitzjames as amicable until 1515, that he was prominent in prosecuting Lollards, and that his struggles with Fitzjames were hardly over matters pertaining to the new learning. This also goes to the question of how attached Colet was to humanism at this stage of his life. Cf. *John Colet and Marsilio Ficino* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 38–55.

⁸ Martin, *Merton*, pp. 143–48.

Among Merton's fellows during Jewel's days at Oxford were Richard Smith and William Tresham, both of whom would figure in Jewel's later life at the university. In 1542 Henry VIII appointed Smith the initial Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, but under Edward VI, Archbishop Thomas Cranmer deprived Smith of his post, believing his conversion to the Protestant faith merely outward conformity.⁹ His position was given to the Protestant Italian émigré Peter Martyr Vermigli, who would play such an important role in Jewel's intellectual and theological formation. Smith was the instigator of the disputation on the Eucharist with Peter Martyr in 1549, with Jewel serving as Martyr's amanuensis for the affair.¹⁰ With the accession of Mary in 1553, Smith was restored to his chair as Regius Professor, and was one of the disputants with Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer at their trials in Oxford, and was also the preacher at Ridley and Latimer's burning in Oxford in 1555.¹¹ Tresham, one of the first canons of Christ Church Cathedral, was vice-chancellor of the university under Mary, and took Smith's place when the latter failed to turn up for the confrontation with Martyr.

Despite Merton's conservative bent, it was there that Jewel first encountered both humanism and Protestantism, though Jewel was hardly the first at Merton to be so influenced. John Huick, future physician to Henry VIII and a key member of Elizabeth's government, also became a Protestant while at Merton, sometime around 1530, having just completed his BA. By 1535 he was a fellow of the adjacent St Alban's Hall, which regularly drew its principals from Merton. Huick found himself expelled from St Alban's in 1536 for his heresy (though Huick confessed that it was his fellows at Merton who were infected, with Pelagianism).¹² Though discharged as principal, Huick still retained his fellowship at Merton, but left Oxford nonetheless for the less conservative Cambridge in 1536, and received his MD in 1538. But it was not from Huick that Jewel imbibed his heresy, but from a Merton fellow who had begun his education under the auspices of Magdalen College, John Parkhurst. Parkhurst entangled Jewel's life at Oxford in

⁹ Smith preached a sermon on the errors of his ways and publicly burned his offending publications on the same day. Apparently, ironically as it shall turn out for Jewel, this was not enough.

¹⁰ Joseph McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: A Study in the Theology of Peter Martyr: 1500–1562* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 18ff.

¹¹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1996), p. 582. The spot where they were burned is marked by a cross in the middle of Broad Street, with an engraved marker on the south wall of Balliol College, parallel to the marker in the street. To the north of Mary Magdalen church, just around the corner from the marker, is a huge memorial to all three bishops.

¹² Jones, *English Reformation*, p. 17.

the questions of the day pertaining both to humanism and, more specifically, to the Reformation. Initially Jewel's education had fallen under the aegis of the conservative Peter Burrey, later preferred to the vicarage of Croydon. Parkhurst did not scruple to argue with Burrey in front of their wards about the day's great questions. Burrey had ambitiously assumed to tutor both Jewel and a fellow Devonshire student but proved unequal to the task. (Humphrey opined of Burrey that he was 'hominem mediocri literatura praeditum'.)¹³ Eventually, with Burrey lacking the ability to tutor both, Jewel found himself as the ward of Parkhurst. Born in 1511, Parkhurst was educated at the grammar school attached to Magdalen College, at that time one of the more humanistically inclined schools at Oxford. He entered Merton probably about 1524, obtaining his BA in 1529 and MA sometime before 1533.¹⁴ Having obtained his MA, Parkhurst was also made a fellow of the college. Parkhurst gave Jewel assignments in reading Coverdale's and Tyndale's translations of the New Testament, ostensibly as an exercise in grammar and rhetoric, to compare them for their differences in translation and style. Despite this concession the assignment could not be considered less than provocative.¹⁵ Yet whatever advantages, academically and politically, Parkhurst enjoyed over Burrey, he also showed himself a scholar unequal to his ward, and in August 1539, apparently with Parkhurst's aid, Jewel moved to Corpus Christi College, where in October 1540 he received his bachelor's degree.

Corpus Christi, while created to advance philology in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, was certainly not a Protestant institution: Morwen its president, according to Humphrey, once remarked to Jewel: 'Amarem te Iuelle, si non esses Zvinglianus: et, Haereticus fide, vita certe videris Angelus, et, Honestus es, at Lutheranus.'¹⁶ Nonetheless, it was far more inclined to humanism than Merton or the rest of Oxford. Its foundation was in part made possible by Merton's former warden, Rawlins, who leased the lands and apparently some buildings owned by Merton to the new college. More than anything this is probably what brought about the complaints of the Merton Fellows against Rawlins and what led to his removal.¹⁷ Richard Foxe, bishop of Winchester, a close friend of Bishop John Fisher, Sir Thomas More and Erasmus founded Corpus in 1517. No doubt the college's foundation was a poke in the conservative

¹³ 'A man gifted with a mediocre literary style.' Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 18.

¹⁴ *Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1521-1567*, edited by John M. Fletcher. Oxford Historical Society, New Series Vol 23 (Oxford, 1974), pp. 42, 56.

¹⁵ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 21.

¹⁶ 'I would love you Jewel, were you not a Zwinglian and by faith a heretic. You certainly seem an angel by life, but you are a Lutheran.' Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁷ Martin, *Merton*, p. 146.

eye of Fitzjames, and that the college existed on lands it held in perpetual lease from Merton can only be thought to have added insult to any pedagogical injury.¹⁸ Foxe, a friend of the new learning, also certainly had no time for heresy, and while humanist enterprises such as Linacre's edition of Galen were dedicated to him, so too was Fisher's *De veritate Corporis et Sanguis Christi in Eucharistia adversus Johannem Oecolampadium*.¹⁹ Whatever Morwen's reservations about Jewel's theology, the president's affections seemed to have gotten the better of him, for Jewel prospered in his new home, and by 1542 he was made a probationary fellow. The continuance of his studies was underwritten by Parkhurst, suggesting that his original patrons had not been well pleased in his course of studies.

In 1544, though the precise date was not recorded, Jewel received his MA and was made a fellow of the college. Humphrey lists as his favorite authors Horace, Cicero (whose Latin style he sought to imitate), Suetonius, Livy, Polybius and his own near contemporary, Sabellico.²⁰ Many of the classical authors Foxe had himself prescribed for the members of the college, and even though he left two copies of Jewel's favorite author, Horace, to the library, Foxe had never commended him. Jewel tutored students in Greek and Latin, Humphrey relating how one student, who apparently was linked to the vicar of St Peter's Oxford, Robert Serlsus, was warned away from Jewel as the study of Greek was identified by many with heresy.²¹ Nonetheless, Jewel's university days during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI granted him more than a modicum of otiosity (inspired by Demosthenes, Jewel would walk through the woods, practicing his voice and facial mannerisms),²² but it was not till after Henry VIII's death that Jewel would gain a greater measure of notoriety and the advancement that an aspiring Oxford cleric sought. Parkhurst for his part sought preferment, and would eventually give up his post at Merton to assume the well-endowed living at Cleeve Episcopi in Gloucestershire, or as Jewel would later term it, his

¹⁸ Corpus Christi retained the use of the Merton facilities, it seems in perpetuity, for £4 a year. Martin, *Merton*, pp. 146–47.

¹⁹ Thomas Fowler, *The History of Corpus Christi College with lists of its members* (Oxford, 1893), pp. 23, 25.

²⁰ Jewel's copy of Sabellico's *Enneades*, is still at Magdalen College. Cf. Neil Ker, 'The Library of John Jewel', *The Bodleian Library Record*, IX no. 5 (1977), pp. 256–65, p. 261, shelf marks Q.18.4.5. He also had access to a copy at Merton College; see Ruth Chavasse, 'The reception of humanist historiography in northern Europe: M.A. Sabellico and John Jewel', *Renaissance Studies* 2.2 (1988), p. 332.

²¹ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 27.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 24–28.

kingdom.²³ Parkhurst, upon his return from exile wrote to Josiah Simler in Zurich:

Let others have their bishoprics; my Cleeve is enough for me
When I was lately in London ... Parker ... threatened me with I
know not what bishopric. But I hope for better things; for I cannot
be ambitious of so much misery. I am king here in my parish, and
for two years act as sole bishop.²⁴

Considered by some a poet,²⁵ in 1542, owing to one of his flattering epigrams, Parkhurst endeared himself to Catherine Parr during Henry VIII's visit to Oxford, and became her chaplain. Parkhurst was already the chaplain to the Duke and Duchess of Suffolk, Charles Brandon and his wife Mary, Henry VIII's sister. Parkhurst was granted the plumb of Bishop's Cleeve in 1549 by Lord Thomas Seymour, the brother of Edward Seymour, the duke of Somerset and the Lord Protector. Thomas Seymour had married the thrice-widowed queen Catherine Parr, shortly following Henry's demise. Parkhurst attended Catherine just before her death in 1548. Shortly thereafter, and not too much before Thomas Seymour's downfall, he was granted his living at Cleeve which was near Seymour's castle of Sudeley, about 30 miles west of Oxford. While Parkhurst quit his duties with Merton, he would still come to hear Jewel's lectures and to bless Jewel with his munificence.²⁶

Parkhurst's removal to Cleeve nearly coincided with the arrival from Strasbourg of Peter Martyr Vermigli. While Jewel never forgot his debt to Parkhurst,²⁷ without a doubt he now looked to Peter Martyr, both on a personal and an academic level. Though having formally been in the Protestant camp for only seven years, Martyr was easily one of the most learned men in the Protestant world: skilled in both Hebrew and Greek,

²³ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1228. Parkhurstus in regno suo.

²⁴ Robinson, ed., *Zurich Letters*, p. 61.

²⁵ Parkhurst's epigrams and poems are printed in Iohannis Parkhursti, *Ludicra sive Epigrammata Iuvenilia* (London: John Day, 1573). Short Title Catalog, 19299.

²⁶ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 29–30.

²⁷ At some point during Edward VI's reign Jewel reprimanded his mentor for seeking to hire him to tutor a student, when, Jewel said, there is nothing he could do that would ever be an equitable return for all that Parkhurst had done for him: Hoc solum in suavissimis literis mihi displicebat, quod cum tradis puerum, me abs te orari, neque vero orari solum, sed etiam pertio conduci video. Qua quidem hercle in re insignem ego mihi fieri injuriam arbitror. Nam et tu hoc, quidquid est, officii jam olim es promeritus, ut nulla tibi videatur posse a me par referri gratia: Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1194. The editor of Jewel's works, Ayre, dates this letter to Jewel's time in Strasbourg, but this hardly seems likely, especially with the reference to Jewel unable to get the boy admitted into Parkhurst's college, something that could only have been written by Jewel while still at Oxford. Also, Jewel's comments about the irresponsible letter carriers who had not delivered his previous letters to Parkhurst hardly seems to fit with the period of Jewel's stay in Strasbourg.

the *ars humanitatis*, theology and Aristotelian logic,²⁸ and coming to Oxford with a reputation already established from his time in Strasbourg, Martyr became the *magister* for Jewel that Parkhurst could never be. Though 25 when Martyr came to England, already a Master of Oxford and a College reader in Humanity and Rhetoric, and as well as soon to be ordained under Archbishop Cranmer's new ordinal, it is only with Martyr's arrival that Jewel assumed his public and polemical persona. Yet before looking at this development in Jewel, some things should be noted about Jewel's England that bear particularly upon the formation of his thought and his later polemical works, and things which the arrival of Martyr only accentuated.

Protestant fortunes during Henry VIII's reign seemed tied to the fluctuations of the king's amorous exploits. While Henry VIII neither formally nor materially sympathized with Protestantism, and while such things as the Statute of the Six (Bloody) Articles were to the detriment of the evangelical movement,²⁹ nonetheless to varying degrees and at different times Henry VIII countenanced certain Protestants: Cromwell within his council, Cranmer and Ridley in his church, and Anne Boleyn, Anne of Cleves (almost)³⁰ and Catherine Parr in his bedchamber. And while Protestantism alternately flourished and floundered, Catholic religion (not to say Catholicism), though also faced with shifting and unstable tides, survived well. Numerous individuals in high ecclesiastical

²⁸ John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden, 1976). Marvin Anderson, 'Peter Martyr: Protestant Humanist' in Joseph McLelland, ed. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1980), pp. 65–84, and Joseph McLelland, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist' in McLelland, *Italian Reform*, pp. 141–51. McLelland, though sympathetic to the concerns Anderson raised, nonetheless falls out more on the side of Donnelly, all the while warning against facile hard and fast distinctions between scholasticism and humanism. For more recent discussions see Frank A. James, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination* (Oxford, 1999); Carl Trueman, *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle, Cumbria, 1999); especially, Frank A. James III, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli: at the crossroads of late medieval scholasticism, Christian humanism and resurgent Augustinianism'. Also Bryan D. Spinks, *Two Faces of Elizabethan Anglican Theology: Sacraments and Salvation in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker*, Drew University Studies in Liturgy No 9 (Lanham, Maryland and London, 1999, pp. 27–34); and Brian Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison, 1969), pp. 32 ff.

²⁹ These acts enjoined belief in transubstantiation, that communion in one kind is as efficacious as communion under both elements, clerical celibacy, the use of private mass, and auricular confession. Cf. Henry Gee and William John Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London: Macmillan, 1921), pp. 303–20.

³⁰ Anne of Cleves was a Catholic, although the intended end of the arrangement of the marriage by Cromwell was a closer alliance to the German Lutheran princes. Technically Henry never married Anne as the marriage was never consummated.

office devoutly maintained a medieval outlook. Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, save for the final weeks of Henry's life when in disgrace he was kept off Edward VI's regency council, nonetheless thrived.³¹ Yet those who remained loyal to Rome, for example, Thomas More and the bishop of Rochester John Fisher, suffered the extremes of Henry's ire. Both Protestant and Catholic fortunes first turned on the 'king's great matter', the question of his divorce from Catherine of Aragon, but also on the several other 'lesser matters' that were its sequels. The particulars of Henry VIII's estrangement from Catherine of Aragon and their annulment enter this study only as ancillary matters;³² of greater importance are the intended and unintended consequences for the English church of how Henry effected his desires.

Henry VII (1485–1509) had done much to strip the nobility of their power, and had also strengthened certain aspects of his own household government. He had as well established prerogative courts, and the Star Chamber, which operated more under Roman and less under the common law.³³ But Henry VIII, never the hands-on monarch his father was – too involved with the *gloire* of his state and his life as a Renaissance prince – left many things to his administrators, and when one fell from grace, there was no lack of those who sought to fill the void. The significance of Thomas Cromwell – or rather the part Henry VIII allowed Cromwell to play – in the transformation of English government and religion in the 1530s, can hardly be over-stressed.³⁴ The events of this period, which Cromwell helped orchestrate, fundamentally changed England from one ruled as a feudal estate to that of a personal monarchy; and not ruled so much through the king's household, as through the Privy Council. Further, where Henry VII had curtailed the power of the nobility, Henry VIII would limit the Church; and this not

³¹ Lacy Baldwin Smith believes Gardiner's exclusion owed to his resistance to Henry VIII over the impending dissolution of the chantries. See, 'Henry VIII and the Triumph of Protestantism', *American Historical Review* (71) 1966, pp. 1237–64. However, this view has been greatly improved upon by E.W. Ives, 'Henry VIII's Will: the Protectorate Provisions of 1547', *The Historical Journal* 37.4 (1994), pp. 901–14, p. 912, which sees Gardiner the victim of Protestant factions surrounding Edward Seymour and Paget, who hoped to slander him about the land issue to Henry by not communicating Gardiner's desires on the matter. Ives then goes on to say, somewhat contradictory to this, that Henry had no intention of putting Gardiner on the Regency council anyway, as he did not trust him to support the royal supremacy, pp. 912–13.

³² Cf. Chapter Five on Jewel's life as bishop of Salisbury.

³³ M.M. Knappen, *Constitutional and Legal History of England* (Hampton, CN, 1964), pp. 316–18.

³⁴ I am following the interpretation of Sir Geoffrey Elton in his *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1972). Cf., also *Reform and Reformation. England, 1509–1558* (Harvard, MA, 1977), pp. 157–296.

merely through dint of monarchical will, or by the actions of Cromwell, but effected with Henry's willing accomplices in Parliament. While an Act restraining the payment of annates and so on, and the Act of Supremacy both abridged the English church's power, it was the Act in Restraint of Appeals which fully arrested any independence of the English church, for it took from her that right of appeal to Rome which had established her courts as insubordinate and unanswerable to the realm of England.³⁵ This limitation on the English church's authority, however, did not prompt Henry VIII to abet theological novelty, as he maintained his doctrinal ties with the medieval past. Yet prior to his dynastic worries, Henry VIII had already embraced a movement that for England, now stripped of any formal and institutional ties to the traditions of the Roman Church, could only portend further religious change: Henry fancied himself a Renaissance prince, a friend of Humanism and its desire for reform, and in this program many associated with his court, both men and women, joined him.³⁶

John Colet, dean of St Paul's cathedral, had in his travels to Italy fallen under the spell of the humanism of Pico della Mirandola, Lorenzo Valla and Marsiglius Ficino.³⁷ Colet, finding himself with numerous obligations, never acquired linguistic and philological gifts, yet upon his return to England began lecturing at Oxford on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, setting aside the *glossa ordinaria* for a simple treatment of the text.³⁸ Perhaps Colet's biggest influence came not upon the English, but upon a wandering scholar who never loved Colet's Oxford, the English climate, nor its beer, but was inspired by Colet to look *ad fontes*. Thus Erasmus, pressed by the urging of Colet, in 1500 traveled back to Paris to begin the study of Greek and Hebrew. He would later confess that he was too old to learn Hebrew and because of 'the insufficiency of the human mind to master a multitude of subjects', he set aside Hebrew and concentrated on Greek.³⁹ Erasmus, initially schooled at Deventer under the Brethren of the Common Life, and widely regarded as the preeminent scholar of his day, saw in Colet a model for his own vocation as a

³⁵ For the texts of these see G.R. Elton, ed., *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1960), pp. 344–51, 355–56.

³⁶ 'In all simple seriousness they were playing with ideas too strong for them, and in due course the fire was to burn most of them. But for the present, they gave ready support to views which called for active reform in Church and State.' G.R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 14.

³⁷ E. Harris Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* (New York, 1956), p. 48.

³⁸ A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1989), pp. 64–65.

³⁹ Harbison, *Christian Scholar*, p. 79.

priest.⁴⁰ And it was Colet, who in his well-known 1512 convocation sermon called for sweeping reforms along strict lines, as if animated by More's vision of the priesthood in *Utopia* (the priests are holy, so they are few). So humanism in the person of Erasmus, inspired by Colet, made its appearance at Oxford first, and all under the auspices of Henry VIII and his leading ecclesiastics. Yet Oxford seemed slow to embrace *bonas litteras*, for by Jewel's day Oxford had largely abandoned the humanism Cambridge then embraced, though as stated, this did not stop its influence at Jewel's university.⁴¹

Henry's reign had a second effect, of greater political significance for Jewel, one more closely aligned with the matter of the divorce: it bequeathed to Jewel and the later Protestant apologists the commonplaces of the political theology of royal supremacy. Various sources informed both Henry's notions and those of the polemicists and controversialists who championed his claims of supremacy over the English Church. Some of the Henrician assertions of ecclesiastical sovereignty had been adumbrated in the ecclesiastical and political wrangling over the episcopal city of Tournai in 1515.⁴² Henry VIII, drawn into war with France, found himself aligned with Ferdinand of Castile and the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian against Louis XII of France. The only notable thing Henry's huge war expenditure procured was Tournai, and seemingly the right to appoint his own episcopal nominee for the city. Henry chose Wolsey.⁴³ But the citizens of Tournai, hardly pleased with the whole affair, and making the most of equivocations from Leo X, sided with their French bishop-elect, Guillard. Henry's letters and communiques to Rome concerning his prerogatives over Tournai all sound startlingly like 1533–34. Henry claimed that 'We ... have never had any superior but God alone';⁴⁴ nor are Henry's claims of sovereignty couched in feudal, suzerainty language, but in language consonant with Henry's future concepts respecting the right of a monarch within his own realm, language often drawn from Gallican apologists.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ See Erasmus's 1521 letter to Jodocus Jonas; Cf. Germain Marc'hadour, 'Erasmus as a Priest' in Hilmar Pabel, ed., *Erasmus' Vision of the Church* (Kirksville, MO, 1995) Vol XXXIII, pp. 115–49, especially 123 ff.

⁴¹ Winthrop Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham, 1980), p. 47.

⁴² Thomas F. Mayer, 'On the Road to 1534: the Occupation of Tournai and Henry VIII's Theory of Sovereignty', in Dale Hoak, ed., *Tudor Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 11–30.

⁴³ It had been Wolsey who had organized the expedition, some 30,000 strong, and got them to Calais. The grant of the see came from Leo X. See Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, 38.

⁴⁴ Mayer, 'On the Road', p. 13.

⁴⁵ Mayer, 'On the Road', pp. 11–12, 15–16.

Whatever the sources of Henry's claims concerning the extent of his sovereignty over the English Church; however much of a debt for some of his views he owed to the pretensions of the French monarch; and while based, as Elton has pointed out, on the bold, if not revolutionary assertion, that the realm of England was an empire,⁴⁶ his aspirations enjoyed the added benefit of the religious propaganda flowing from Thomas Cromwell's circle of association following the formal split with Rome. The crucial matter here is not merely the endorsement of the royal supremacy, but the theology and rhetoric adopted to uphold it, which seems largely and ironically drawn from none other than Luther; and further ironically mediated by another of Henry VIII's theological nemeses, William Tyndale.⁴⁷ Luther had maintained, and Tyndale in his *The Obedience of a Christian Man* followed him in this, that the duties owed princes were religious obligations arising out of the duties enjoined by the fifth commandment, to 'honour thy father and thy mother'.⁴⁸ Though still giving obligation to parents its place, medieval exegesis had also made 'father and mother' into a religious obedience of a monastic quality.⁴⁹ To this the scholastics added, though with little emphasis or comment, the duty one owes to a prince as to a parent. Luther inverted

⁴⁶ 'Where by diverse sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and king having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality ... [the king] being also institute and furnished by the goodness and sufferance of Almighty God with plenary, whole and entire power, preeminence, authority, prerogative and jurisdiction, etc.' An Act in restraint of appeals, Elton, *Tudor Constitution*, p. 344.

⁴⁷ Richard Rex, 'The Crisis of Obedience: God's Word and Henry's Reformation', *The Historical Journal*, 39, 4, (1996), pp. 863–94. Rex contends that Luther's and Tyndale's obedience doctrines were not the basis of the shift in English political vocabulary, but that the shift in policy demanded a new politico-theological idiom, and Protestant controversialists associated with Cromwell were quick to appropriate Luther and Tyndale to this end. Rex writes responding to the contrary view of Stephen Haas that Tyndale had an 'immediate impact ... upon the political theology of the Henrician regime (p. 864)'. See Haas 'Henry VIII's *Glasse of Truthe*,' *History*, LXIV (1979), pp. 353–62; 'the *Disputatio inter clericum et militem*: was Berthelet's 1531 edition the first Henrician polemic of Thomas Cromwell?', *Moreana*, XIV, 55 (1977), 65–72; and 'Martin Luther's "divine right" kingship and the royal supremacy: two tracts from the 1531 parliament and convocation of the clergy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, pp. XXXI (1980), pp. 317–25.

⁴⁸ Both Tyndale and Luther would refer to this as the fourth commandment, following medieval usage. Protestantism eventually took what Catholics had included in the first commandment, the prohibition on making any likeness of the deity, and separated it into a commandment on its own, then combining the Catholic ninth and tenth commandments. Both are conventions, for while Deuteronomy 4:13 and 10:4 speak of the ten words, they do not delineate how they are arranged.

⁴⁹ Rex, 'Crisis', pp. 867–71.

the medieval reading of the text thereby making the prince the primary benefactor of the obligations the commandment enjoined. Tyndale coopted Luther's doctrine and gave it an English application.⁵⁰ This notion of religious obligation as enjoined by the 'law of God' became a Protestant response to the traditionalist demands of obedience to the Pope. It also became, as Richard Rex emphasizes, the basis of Protestant requests that the Word of God, which makes such demands upon the good Christian, be translated and distributed throughout the realm. The juxtaposition of the obedience demanded by the Word of God with the pretension and betrayal of evangelical law by Papal claims 'was a cornerstone of Henrician antipapal rhetoric'.⁵¹ The English monarchy was yet to receive all its desired prerogatives within the English Church, but even with the Protestant reliance upon the prince to be the new head of the Church – as far as the law of God would allow – a new formula had been established by which Parliament and convocation granted to the king so many of those properties coveted by his medieval predecessors.

This adulation should not be seen as a benefaction accorded Henry VIII by the Protestants alone, for the traditionalists as well took up the pen to justify the new situation in order to divorce the doctrine of obedience from the Protestant interpretations then circulating, which coupled obedience to adherence to the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith alone.⁵² Stephen Gardiner's *De vera obedientia*, taking as its premise St Paul's *obedientia fidei*, made faith and obedience works arising from charity, and thereby he far more closely identified them with medieval monastic virtues, sundering them from any Protestant associations. Furthermore, he drew extensively from Marsiglius of Padua,⁵³ ironically, one of the authors Luther was damned for citing. Cuthbert Tunstall as well tied obedience to the king to obedience to traditional ceremonies and rights, distancing obedience from the Protestant notion that saw submission built on faith.⁵⁴

The rift in Henry VIII's church which pitted traditionalists against Reformers still did not preclude both sides using the doctrine of the royal supremacy. For Gardiner and other traditionalists, the royal supremacy proved an effective weapon, when wielded by a traditionalist monarch, to check the spread of heresy, despite the archbishop of Canterbury. For

⁵⁰ David Daniell, ed., William Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2000). Cf. Rex, 'Crisis', pp. 866–67.

⁵¹ Rex, 'Crisis', p. 882.

⁵² Rex notes that Cromwell's pamphleteers linked obedience to the king to both the 'Word of God' and to the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, 'Crisis', pp. 880–91.

⁵³ Dickens, *English Reformation*, pp. 173–74.

⁵⁴ Rex, 'Crisis', pp. 887–88.

Protestants it had severed them from the Pope, yet this blessing was not unmixed, for Henry VIII proved little more than a new form of the old misery. But with the Pope gone, in the mind of the English Reformers, so many other evils that attended Rome had as well been removed: canon law, monasticism and, hopefully, even chantries. What both sides would soon enough come to learn was that death had no cardinal clergy, and the new supreme head may not abide by what they considered the truth.

Jewel and the Edwardian Reformation

John Jewel was 24 when Henry VIII died in January 1547, and he had been at Oxford for almost 12 years, four of them under Parkhurst at Merton, but the bulk at Corpus Christi. Yet Jewel may have labored on in relative obscurity were it not for the change of religion that came upon England under Edward VI. Even this, however, may have proved inadequate to bring Jewel to any public notice, despite having had the well-placed Parkhurst as a teacher. Parkhurst was a man of self-professed limited abilities, and, according to Humphrey, upon one of his returns to hear Jewel lecture, commented ‘Olim discipulus mihi, chare Iuelle, fuisti, Nunc ero discipulus, te renuente, tuus’.⁵⁵ It would remain for someone else to give Jewel direction, this direction coming with the change of political winds, both in England and in the Empire in 1547.

Henry VIII’s reign ended with the leading Catholics, nobility and clergy, outside of Henry VIII’s favor: the Duke of Norfolk was in the tower awaiting death, his son, the Earl of Surrey had already been executed and Stephen Gardiner, the bishop of Winchester, had been excluded from Edward VI’s regency council for his purported resistance to an exchange of lands.⁵⁶ Lacy B. Smith sees Henry VIII’s decisions concerning Edward’s regency prompted by politics, and not religion per se. Henry, according to Smith, feared that a council dominated by Catholics would play into the hands of Charles V, a situation that may prompt Francis I to attempt to take Calais from the English. Henry VIII, Smith writes, wanted a pacified, even a frightened Francis I, so that the French king, in fear of the emperor, would be happy to seal an alliance with England by a marriage between Edward and Mary of Scotland. But why a Protestant regency council would go through with this marital plan Smith does not make clear.⁵⁷ It seems far more obvious that Henry

⁵⁵ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 29.

⁵⁶ Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 330. Cf. fn. 33 and E.W. Ives, ‘Henry VIII’s Will’, p. 912.

⁵⁷ L.B. Smith, ‘Triumph of Protestantism’, pp. 1254 ff.

constructed the council as he did in light of making Edward's nearest blood kin, namely his uncles, his closest guardians and council.⁵⁸ For whatever reasons Henry VIII constructed Edward VI's regency council as he did, the religious result was the ascendancy of Protestantism as the dominant factor in the realm.

The regency council's plans for the religious makeup of England became clear from the outset, as in February 1547 it decided that the jurisdiction of all bishops had lapsed with the passing of Henry VIII. The royal injunctions of 1547 enjoined Cranmer's *Homilies*, and as this included the one on justification by faith, it clearly contradicted the *King's Book* and the Statute of the Six Articles, as Stephen Gardiner quickly pointed out. For his contumacy Gardiner found himself in the tower, but not without pen. By the end of the year Parliament had swept aside the *King's Book*, the Six Articles and as well any legal ground for Gardiner to stand on. Eventually Gardiner's catholic conscience got the best of him as he could not bind it by subscribing to the new liturgy, that it was 'good and godly'. He was duly deprived of his see, and so closely did he see royal supremacy tied to Protestantism that upon the accession of Mary in 1553 he even denounced his Henrician notions of supremacy.⁵⁹ Despite Gardiner's vacillation with the new regime, the notion of supremacy survived, and under the Protestants assumed new and more ecclesiastically arbitrary and irresponsible forms.

Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries established an economic interest in the royal supremacy, and unintentionally, at least on Henry VIII's part, the success of the Reformation as well. For the evangelicals, it also set a wonderful precedent. Edward VI's government continued the Henrician enterprise of putting church lands to crown use, but on a different theoretical foundation. Certainly the dissolution of the monasteries had served Protestant ends, but the justification employed had not been extracted from any Reformation premise, but was based solely on the goal of the correction of monastic vices, albeit all to the king's benefit.⁶⁰ The dissolution of the greater houses, carried out from

⁵⁸ David Loades, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. 1504–1553* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 86–89.

⁵⁹ Gardiner at first modified his assertions on supremacy, that its limits were constrained by traditional doctrine. He even employed the Protestant notion of adiaphora: that chantries, monasteries, episcopal appointment were indifferent in matters of salvation; transubstantiation and justification by faith were not. Loades, *Politics and the Nation*, 5th edn. (Oxford, 1999), pp. 166–68; Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, pp. 339 ff.

⁶⁰ 'Forasmuch as manifest sin, vicious, carnal, and abominable living is daily used ... to the high displeasure of Almighty God ... and to the great infamy of the King's highness ... [and in light of the fact that the visitations of the last two hundred years have effected no change] ... In consideration whereof ... that it is and shall be much more to the pleasure of

1536 to 1539, came without a repudiation of traditional, medieval doctrine, as Henry VIII maintained a robust medieval piety throughout his life. While the dissolution had hardly pleased the pious of England, Henry VIII was not throwing some bone to the Protestants, and this, at least, had suited the conservatives. Edward VI's government, however, suppressed chantries (chapels erected for prayers for the deceased) on the doctrinal ground that they had been superstitiously founded on the erroneous doctrine of purgatory:

The king's most loving subjects ... in this present Parliament assembled, considering that a great part of superstition and errors in Christian religion has been brought into the minds and estimation of men, by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ, and by devising and phantasizing vain opinions of purgatory and masses satisfactory ... the altering ... of the same ... cannot ... be provided ... other ... than {by} ... the king's highness.⁶¹

Aside from the changes Edward VI's council imposed upon the church in matters of the communion service, the content of the sermons, or ecclesiastical rite and order, they also sought to influence the English Church by changing the theological environment at Oxford and Cambridge, the source of its ministry, by the importation of continental Protestant Reformers. Following Charles V's triumph over the Schmalkaldic league at the battle of Muhlberg in April 1547, and with Strasbourg no longer a safe haven, many Protestants found sanctuary in England, for example, Martin Bucer, Bernardino Ochino and most importantly, Peter Martyr Vermigli.⁶²

Pietro Martire Vermigli was born in Florence in 1499, entering the Augustinian order in 1516. Educated in Padua (1518–26), he was, according to the letter Bucer wrote Calvin the day Martyr arrived in Strasbourg, 'learned in Latin, Greek and Hebrew'. His Greek he picked up in Padua, along with his Aristotelianism; he learned his Hebrew while serving as vicar to the prior in Bologna. From 1533–36 he was abbot in

Almighty God, and for the honour of this realm, that the possessions of such small religious houses ... his majesty shall have and enjoy to him and to his heirs for ever.' Act for the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries, 27 Henry VIII, cap. 28, in Gee and Hardy eds., *Documents Illustrative*, pp. 257–59.

⁶¹ Act Dissolving the Chantries, 1 Edward VI, cap. 14. in *Documents Illustrative*, pp. 328–29.

⁶² Others included the former Capuchin general Bernardino Ochino, John à Lasco from Poland via Zurich, and the Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer who went to Cambridge. Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 339. Though Elton gives the battle of Muhlberg a causal influence on the continental emigres, Dickens instead saw it as the presence of an opportunity to spread the Reformation in a realm given to its principles. *English Reformation*, pp. 231–32.

Spoleto, and from 1537–40 he was prior of San Piero ad Aram in Naples. His sojourn in Naples proved formative, for there he became part of the circle of Juan de Valdés and Marcantonio Flaminio.⁶³ If Martyr had never encountered Protestantism before, it is certain that he did in Naples. Not only was de Valdés a humanist, but it is clear that he embraced Luther's notion of justification by faith alone, although with some added, even Erasmian, overtones.⁶⁴ It was also in Naples while in de Valdés' circle that Martyr met Bernardino Ochino, the Master General of the Capuchins, who like Martyr also apostatized in 1542. In 1541 Martyr became prior of San Ferdinando in Lucca, establishing himself as a Reformer, creating an academy and beginning to lecture on St Paul's epistles and the Psalms. But having soon fallen under suspicion of heresy, when summoned by the Inquisition, Martyr fled Italy. Martyr first went to Zurich, but soon went to Strasbourg, where in October 1542 he took up teaching the Old Testament, establishing himself within the orbit of the Reformed side of Protestantism. With the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League in April 1547, Martyr's safe existence in the Empire, given his apostasy, at best was tenuous, so in October 1547, accompanied by his compatriot Bernardino Ochino, he again took flight, this time to England.⁶⁵

Cranmer conferred on Martyr the position at Oxford of the Regius Professor of Divinity, the post Henry VIII established; and whose sole previous appointment, the aforementioned Richard Smith, three years Martyr's junior, remained resident at Oxford while Martyr was there.⁶⁶ Martyr became for Jewel a spiritual father, as Jewel would address him in his later correspondence.⁶⁷ But Martyr was much more than that: his

⁶³ For Martyr's life in Italy see Philip J.M. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967). For Martyr's association with de Valdés see Frank A. James, 'Juan de Valdés before and after Peter Martyr Vermigli: The Reception of the *Gemina Praedestinatio* in Valdés' Later Thought', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*. 83 (1992), pp. 180–208.

⁶⁴ James, 'de Valdés', pp. 186–88.

⁶⁵ The last 30 years have seen an increase in interest in Martyr. His collected writings are now being translated by the Peter Martyr Society, in conjunction with Sixteenth Century Studies, and Truman State University Press, and much of the bibliography on Martyr is incorporated into the bibliography of this present volume. More importantly, Fr John Patrick Donnelly edited the *Bibliography of the Works of Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Kirkville, MO, 1999) in which Marvin Anderson included a fairly comprehensive bibliography of the secondary literature. Jason Zuidema's forthcoming dissertation (McGill University) on Martyr and Augustine shall also contain a more up-to-date bibliography on Martyr.

⁶⁶ For Martyr at Oxford see Philip M.J. McNair, 'Peter Martyr in England', in *Peter Martyr and Italian Reform*, ed. Joseph C. McLelland (Waterloo, ON, 1980), pp. 65–84.

⁶⁷ Humphrey notes that Parkhurst as well held Martyr in high regard, that 'he cared for Peter Martyr as a father, he loved Jewel as a son', *Vita Iuelli*, p. 31.

presence at conservative Oxford, where so few of either humanist or Reformer resided, touched off bitter controversy. Two matters stand out in particular: the Eucharistic debate of 28 May to 1 June 1549 and the events leading up to it,⁶⁸ and the conspicuous presence in Oxford of Martyr's spouse.⁶⁹ Martyr had the backing of both crown and convocation in both of these: with respect to the Eucharist, he explicated little other than Cranmer's doctrine; as to his wife, the marriages of priests were not formally validated by parliament till early 1549, albeit, convocation had earlier sanctioned clerical marriage in December of 1547.⁷⁰ Already under the influence and a known associate of Parkhurst, Jewel now became not only closely associated with Martyr, but clearly his leading protégé at Oxford. Written records of the time provide little about their relationship; information must be garnered from Jewel's post-exilic correspondence, where he wrote only in the most adulatory terms.⁷¹ Though certainly not the focus of controversy that Martyr was, nonetheless Jewel became a partaker of Martyr's sins; doubtless fraternization with so visible a Protestant led to his discomfiture upon Edward VI's death.

The evidence for Jewel's life during the reign of Edward VI presents a clear picture of what Jewel believed, and the direction in which his thought was taking him even then. This can be gathered not only from his associations with Peter Martyr, the nature and intentions of his several benefactors, including the ensconced Parkhurst, but also from those few written pieces surviving from this time. Under Henry VIII explicitly Protestant notions were often quite brutally discouraged by the king's conservative religious enactments. Even Cranmer, whom Henry admittedly knew was a heretic, kept his mouth shut, and was only preserved in his post by the king's good pleasure. Dickens relates how several Canterbury canons, apparently acting under the prompting of Stephen Gardiner, accused Cranmer of heresy. Henry, paying a visit to the archbishop at Lambeth palace, promptly took him on his barge and remarked 'Ah, my chaplain, I have news for you. I know who is the

⁶⁸ For the content and theology of the disputation, see Joseph McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library*, Vol 7, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation*, Vol LVI, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, trans. and ed. with introduction and notes by Joseph C. McLelland (Kirkville, 2000), and also his *Visible Words*, pp. 17–24. For dissent from McLelland's and most other Martyr scholars, see M.A. Overell, 'Peter Martyr in England 1547–1553: An Alternative View', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XV.1 (1984), pp. 87–104.

⁶⁹ McNair, 'Martyr in England', pp. 96–100, 104.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Documents Illustrative*, p. 366.

⁷¹ There are several lacunae in the catalog of Jewel's correspondence with Martyr, as some letters that Jewel alludes to, even by number, no longer exist. All the correspondence of 1561 is missing. See *Works*, IV, pp. 1196–256. By contrast, there are only ten extant letters of those Jewel wrote Bullinger over almost 13 years.

greatest heretic in Kent'. Yet Henry VIII then placed Cranmer in charge of the investigation into himself.⁷² But with Edward VI the open suppression of Protestantism and Protestant ideas not only ended, but patronage for Protestantism and Protestants flourished. Individuals began supporting Protestants at the universities, with Jewel among those who received stipends and benefactions. One such source was Curtop, a canon of Christ Church, Oxford and formerly a fellow of Magdalen College, who gave Jewel 40 shillings a year. Jewel as well received six pounds per annum apportioned to him by Richard Chambers, who was in charge of the distribution of funds collected by certain London merchants and nobility for the relief of indigent students who had embraced the Reformation.⁷³ It is upon an occasion of the dispersal of Chamber's munificence that Jewel delivered one of his few surviving Oxford orations. Humphrey relates a story of the liberality of Jewel's former mentor, Parkhurst. Upon one of Jewel's several journeys to Cleeve, 'Parkhurst entered their room, and while inspecting their purses, asked "Have these mendicant and wretched Oxonians any money at all?" Which, when he found their purses either empty or nearly empty, pouring and throwing money about liberally, he refilled them till they were a little plump'.⁷⁴

During the years of Edward VI's reign Jewel advanced perceptibly through the academic and clerical world of Oxford. His closest association was with Peter Martyr, whom he served as secretary (auditor) for his lectures on I Corinthians and Romans.⁷⁵ Jewel received his Bachelor of Divinity degree in 1550 and sometime in 1551 was ordained a priest (though it is likely he would not have used that word) under Cranmer's new ordinal. He was granted a preaching licence, and besides occasionally preaching at the University Church of St Mary the Virgin, took up the ministerial duties at the parish church of Sunningwell, near Abingdon, some three miles from Oxford. It offered only a modest stipend (*non magno salario*), but, writes Humphrey, Jewel undertook this for the feeding of the flock of the Lord.⁷⁶ The church dates from the fourteenth century. During his time there Jewel oversaw the addition of an heptagonal porch in the west side, still there to be seen. Jewel was appointed orator of Corpus Christi College in 1551, and also for a short time in June of 1552 interim president.⁷⁷

⁷² Dickens, *English Reformation*, pp. 183–84.

⁷³ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 31–32.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁷⁷ Le Bas, *Life of Jewel*, pp. 17–19.

Jewel's progress at Oxford paralleled that of Protestantism in England. Under the direction of Thomas Cranmer and Nicholas Ridley, the bishop of London, and attended by the constant oversight of first Somerset and then Northumberland, the Reformation made several material advances, in the implementation of the communion service, in the imposition of Cranmer's *Book of Homilies*, the publication in 1549 of the first Book of Common Prayer (to be followed in 1552 by a more radical one), the issuing of the XLII articles of religion, and especially in regard to the nature of those preferred for ecclesiastical advancement and appointment: the already mentioned placements of Bucer in Cambridge and Martyr in Oxford, but also Nicholas Ridley's advancement from Rochester to London, Miles Coverdale's appointment to Exeter, John Ponet's to Winchester, John Scory's to Chichester and John Hooper's to Worcester.⁷⁸ Furthermore, in 1548 the government made the former head of the Capuchin Order, Bernardino Ochino, who like Martyr needed to get out of the empire following the battle of Muhlberg, rector of a small Stranger church, largely ministering to Italians; in 1550 it made the Polish nobleman John à Lasco minister in charge of the large Stranger church in London.⁷⁹ John Knox, who had made a name for himself as a preacher in Scotland and had consequently found himself on a French galley, was turned over to the Edwardine government and became a chaplain to the king.⁸⁰ Knox was joined as chaplain by Edmund Grindal, Andrew Perne, Robert Horne, William Bill and John Harley.⁸¹ The importance of the liturgical changes, largely effected by Cranmer, have little bearing on Jewel's life under Edward VI, though they do affect him during Mary's reign. He was ordained under Cranmer's ordinal, and thus officiated as a priest with first the 1549 and then the 1552 editions of the Prayer Book. The matter of Jewel's relationship to the Edwardian Prayer Books shall be addressed in discussing the controversy at Frankfurt. There is no evidence for the extent that he used the *Book of Homilies*, and orator that he was, it may be wondered if he did.⁸² Jewel's hand in all of this reforming activity during Edward's reign was ephemeral at best, as none of the sermons he

⁷⁸ Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, pp. 339–40.

⁷⁹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley, 2002), p. 79.

⁸⁰ W. Stanford Reid, *Trumpeter of God* (New York, 1974), pp. 54–69. Reid confesses ignorance on how Knox obtained his release, while Dickens indicates that Edward's government intervened, *English Reformation*, p. 235.

⁸¹ Under Elizabeth, Grindal became bishop of London, Horne of Winchester, Perne the dean of Ely and Bill the dean of Westminster; Harley became bishop of Hereford under Mary. Cf. John Knox, *The Reformation in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1982), p. 99, where a facsimile of their signatures is reproduced.

⁸² It is postulated that Jewel had a hand in the writing of the Elizabethan Homilies, and

preached at Sunningwell have survived, though he left a record of his thoughts at this time apart from that implied by his association with Parkhurst and Martyr. Although slight in comparison with his later polemical treatises, sermons and letters, Jewel's written work from his time at Oxford – a sermon, three orations, three letters and a short poem – speak to the course of his life, and give insight into the events which occurred upon the accession of Mary. Most importantly, they demonstrate Jewel's theological and ideological bent as a student. In this regard, as their contents comprehend certain characteristics and methods to be found in Jewel's later polemical writings, they betray an emerging idiom.

Of the extant pieces the most important is a sermon delivered, in Latin, at the university Church of St Mary the Virgin, associated by Humphrey with Jewel's reception of his Bachelor of Divinity degree, given sometime in the reign of Edward VI, though the exact date is uncertain.⁸³ Jewel had the happy convenience that the Lectionary's appointed epistle for the day was I Peter 4.11, *Si quis loquitur, tanquam sermones Dei* (If any man speak, let him talk as the words of God). He used the occasion to accentuate certain Reformation emphases touching the place of the sermon in worship and preaching in the vocation of the minister (*pastor* and never *sacerdos*). Necessarily integral to this preaching is the Word of God, indeed foundational for Jewel. The sermon proceeds fairly tamely, never really transgressing decorum, as Jewel touches on themes that any reforming monastic may have employed, though his Protestantism seems always to hide just below the surface of his words: ministers should preach often, they should do so from Scripture, gravity and modesty should be their protocol. He then reaches a specific point, tacitly Protestant in its intent:

since he had preached at both Paul's Cross and before court, and as the content of some, especially the sermon on the Sacraments, is replete with arguments found elsewhere in Jewel, even employing the same quotations, this seems likely. Cf. Mary Ellen Rickey and Thomas B. Stroup, *Certain Sermons or Homilies*, facsimile reproduction (Gainesville, FL, 1968), pp. vii, and especially Sec. II. 123–42 'Of Common Prayer and the Sacraments'.

⁸³ 'A Learned and Godly Sermon, made in the Latin tongue, in St Mary's, in Oxford, upon the Sunday after the Ascension, in the reign of King Edward the Sixth.' *Works*, II, pp. 949–64. The date is either 1550, the date of his graduation with his BD as given by Anthony à Wood in *Athenae oxonienses: an exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the most ancient and famous university of Oxford, from the fifteenth year of King Henry the seventh, Dom. 1500, to the end of the year 1690 ... to which are added, the Fasti or annals, of the said university, for the same time* (London: Printed for Tho. Bennet, 1691–92), 1813–20, and *Fasti Oxoniensis*, Vol II, cols. 130–31, or, according to Humphrey, who while stating that this sermon was given upon the event of Jewel's graduation, places it in the fifth year of Edward VI's reign, 1551, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 49. The sermon as reprinted in *Works*, is taken from Humphrey, pp. 49–66.

if the sun is removed from the world, everything is left obscured, dispersed, and confused; and thus it is if the voice of the pastor is removed from the church: religion is left thoughtless, blind, and troubled, everything is mingled with error, superstition, and idolatry, so much it is to be a superintendent in the house of God. The Gospel, religion, and the health of the Church hang on us alone.⁸⁴

The last sentence is the telling one, though the first is fairly blatant in its own right. Jewel makes the health of the Church depend on the preaching of the Word, and not on the sacerdotal functions of the Christian ministry: the preached Word and not the sacraments are the emphasis. From that point the sermon progressed steadily in its use of more explicit Protestant motifs. Citing an argument which became a more elaborate theme in his Challenge Sermon, Jewel argued that the ignorance and stubbornness of the people cannot be deduced as reasons for not preaching, for God shall give an increase by His Spirit.⁸⁵ Jewel elaborates that in fact, God shall see to it that the ineffectual voice of the preacher shall be animated by grace, even of an irresistible quality: 'For as it belongs to us to instruct the people with words, so it is of God to join faith with his words and force.'⁸⁶ Jewel then further stresses that it is impossible for the Word of God not to be profitable: 'Indeed this is the strength of the Word of God, that it is impossible for it to effect nothing, and to benefit no one.'⁸⁷

Jewel then returns to the notion that preaching is what brings health and light to the church, equating Scripture with the flesh and blood of Christ (*Haec illa est carno, hic ille sanguis Jesu Christi*), and that Scripture alone – never in concurrence with the magisterial power of the Church – is the rule of faith: 'Unless it were for this, neither would religion flourish, nor faith be established, nor the church be maintained in her duty.'⁸⁸ Jewel's conclusion stressed the primacy of the preached Word as the essence of the Christian ministry, for 'Certainly Christ has not taught insincerity and hypocrisy. Rather he teaches this,

⁸⁴ 'Si sol de mundo sublatus esset, omnia obscura, dissipata, confusa relinquerentur; ita, sublata ex ecclesia pastoris voce, religio temeraria, caeca, turbata relinquitur, omnia errore, superstitione, idololatria permiscerentur: tanti est procuratorem esse domus Dei. Evangelium, religio, pietas, salus ecclesiae a nobis pendent solis.' Jewel, *Works*, II, p. 953.

⁸⁵ 'Proferamus nos lucem. Dominus aperiet oculos: pulsemus aures, Dominus dabit cor carnem: demus nos verbum, Dominus dabit Spiritum.' Ibid., p. 954.

⁸⁶ 'Nam ut nostrum est populum verbis instituere, ita Dei fidem dictis suis et robur adjungere.' Ibid., p. 954.

⁸⁷ 'Ea autem est vis verbi Dei, ut nihil efficere et nulli prodesse non possit.' Ibid, pp. 954–55.

⁸⁸ 'Hoc nisi esset, neque religio vigere, neque fides confirmari, neque ecclesia in officio contineri posset.' Ibid., p. 956.

that ministers keep in mind that they maintain the person of Christ'.⁸⁹

Having thrown down the gauntlet, Jewel now draws his rhetorical sword, though using it with feigned delicacy: 'I would rather mention these old things (the abominations of the Canaanites), than to use recent and fresh examples.'⁹⁰ He then proceeds to libel Rome directly, using the Protestant commonplaces of gross superstition, the blasphemy of the mass, the cult of the saints, the errors of sacerdotalism, and especially the presumptions of the bishop of Rome, and so on.⁹¹ Jewel knew the largely traditional opinions of his audience – 'I know that most of these things seem novel (*vestrum*) and implausible (*incredibilia*) to most of you', he says toward the end of the sermon – and he also knew the limits of propriety: to attack certain medieval abuses was dangerous, but in England in 1550 by linking them with Rome he probably hoped to mollify the more vitriolic of the assumed traditionalist responses.

Two final points about the sermon should be noted. The first item concerns two particular forms of argument, made with reference to the Church Fathers, both of which Jewel would later employ in his position as an Elizabethan apologist. In the sermon's text they are little more than passing allusions, hardly developed within the larger context of the sermon, yet when cultivated and employed in later years they would become axioms of his polemical discourse. The first, an argument growing out of his above discussed Eucharistic thought, is a negative appeal to the ancient church, here with regard to the reservation and adoration of the sacramental elements. 'By the immortal God I beseech you, consider in your minds, brethren, whoever – I do not say of the apostles – but of the holy fathers, either himself worshiped the Eucharist, or has shown it to others for adoration?'⁹² Jewel's aim is to build upon the silences and spaces that a sixteenth-century reading of the early church's liturgical practice offered, and to use these lacunae as an argument against the contemporary practice of Roman Catholics. The second polemical point is Jewel's assertion that 'Certainly, I could not say anything more of them (the fathers), than that they frequently disagreed among themselves on great and serious matters'.⁹³ Jewel's attempt to

⁸⁹ 'Verum simulationem et hypocrisin Christus non docuit. Id potius agit, ut pastores meminerint Christi personam sustinere.' Ibid., p. 961.

⁹⁰ 'Haec enim vetera commemorare malo, quam exemplis uti vivis et recentibus.' Ibid., p. 956.

⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 956–57.

⁹² 'Nam per Deum immortalem, cogitate cum animis vestris, fratres, quis unquam, non dico apostolorum, sed sanctorum, eucharistiam vel adoravit ipse, vel aliis proposuit adorandam?' Ibid., p. 959.

⁹³ 'Certe, ne quid dicam praeterea, maximis saepe et gravissimis de rebus parum inter sese convenerunt.' Ibid., p. 958.

undermine any sort of ancient Catholic consensus would be the negative foundation of his Challenge Sermon and a tool repeatedly used in both his *Replie to M. Harding's Answer* (Jewel's extended apology of the Challenge Sermon) and his *Defense of the Apology*. These two forms of argument, the silences of and dissonances within the Fathers, however embryonic circa 1551, Jewel made staples of his later apologetics.

The second point concerns the most radical element Jewel included in the sermon, an almost bald Zwinglian interpretation of the Lord's Supper. Jewel defends this Reformed doctrine (hardly the only Reformed view on the question) and used it as an illustration of how far removed he believed the traditional church was in its use of Scripture as regards the presence of Christ in the elements of the Eucharist. Jewel cited several passages concerning the presence of Christ in heaven, and since these verses referred to Christ's continued bodily presence with respect to his physical human form, and not to his Divine nature, ergo, he could not be physically, corporally or carnally present on, in, with, under, or *substantialiter* in the place of, the bread and the wine of the sacrament.⁹⁴ Jewel drew this Eucharistic doctrine almost definitely from Peter Martyr. What it was that he borrowed and why, call for some explanation, for in Jewel's confession we see one of the chief polemical matters that occupied the English Reformation.

When Martyr had come to England in 1547 he had professed a Eucharistic doctrine more akin to that of Bucer in Strasbourg than to either Zurich or Wittenburg,⁹⁵ and though this was not the view publicly espoused by both Cranmer and Ridley upon Henry VIII's death, it seems to be the one they held.⁹⁶ A Lutheran view had been tolerated by traditionalists late in Henry's reign, but by 1549 Martyr was not only teaching the more Reformed notion in his private quarters, but was also delivering the same in his lectures on I Corinthians.⁹⁷ In this Cranmer and Ridley were firmly behind him. Martyr's public lectures at Oxford's

⁹⁴ 'Hoc Christus non de numine suo, quo Patrem æquabat, aut cœlesti natura, sed de corpore suo loquebatur.' Ibid., p. 959.

⁹⁵ Jewel's Eucharistic doctrine, and those of Cranmer and Martyr, will be discussed fully in Chapter Three. The basic point to be made here is that Jewel, having been in an England that would seemingly allow the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation as the most radical doctrine it would embrace, at least up until 1547, is now identifying himself with Martyr and certain strains of Continental Protestant thought on the question of how Christ's physical body is present (if it is) in the Eucharist. Whether Jewel's theology follows Bucer is problematic, for he does a poor job of it, especially with the notion of 'Haec illa est carno, hic ille sanguis Jesu Christi'.

⁹⁶ MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 380ff. Cranmer may well have still embraced consubstantiation upon Henry VIII's death, but the rapidity with which he discarded it makes the question merely academic.

⁹⁷ McNair, 'Peter Martyr in England', pp. 101-105.

divinity school was the immediate cause of the 1549 disputations. Among those listening to Martyr's lectures (which McNair, citing John ab Ulmis dates to 2 March 1549, new style⁹⁸) was Richard Smith who immediately called for a disputation on the subject. The arrangements, however, were only made the next day when Richard Cox, the vice-chancellor of the university,⁹⁹ had to take Martyr by the arm, rescuing him from the uproar of the crowd agitating for the debate, leading the assailed Professor to his home where the arrangements were made. Smith, after being imprisoned for contempt but soon released, never took part in the debate, but fled the country for Louvain by way of Scotland.¹⁰⁰ When the disputation was finally held, Smith's place was taken by William Tresham, whom we already have met as a former fellow of Merton, but by then was a canon of Christ Church. Jewel, along with ab Ulmis, was one of the recorders of the debate. Martyr's public breach with the more conservative Lutheran position apparently received its impetus from Cranmer. The archbishop had garnered his new notions from several sources: most notably Ridley, who had provided the archbishop with the writings of Ratramnus of Corbie, a ninth-century monk whose *De Corpore et Sanguine* confessed that the sacrament was but a figure of Christ's body and blood.¹⁰¹ Cranmer as well had sought out Bucer for advice, receiving the Strasbourg Reformer's views in a letter delivered to him by Martyr and Ochino when they arrived in England in late 1547.¹⁰² Yet that is not all that Martyr brought with him, for he as well had brought a manuscript of John Chrysostom's *Ad Caesarium Monachum* that he had stopped and copied when he fled from Italy in 1542, in which the Constantinopolitan patriarch seemingly embraced a non-corporeal interpretation of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.¹⁰³ In 1550 Cranmer published his

⁹⁸ McNair, 'Martyr in England', p. 104.

⁹⁹ Cox was an evangelical, educated at Cambridge and ironically, had been plucked by Cardinal Wolsey from Cambridge to be an instructor at his new Cardinal College. He remained when Henry VIII reorganized the institution, and under Mary had to flee England. Under Elizabeth he would be the bishop of Ely.

¹⁰⁰ Smith would return following Mary's accession. He wrote at least two tracts on the question of clerical marriage, particularly in relation to those who had taken monastic vows (by whom he meant Luther and Martyr) and then broken them Cf. *Defensio coelibatus sacerdotum* (London, 1550).

¹⁰¹ Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534–1690* (first published in two volumes by Princeton University Press, Vol I. *From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534–1603*, 1970; Vol II, *From Andrews to Baxter and Fox, 1603–1690*, 1975. Combined volume, Grand Rapids, 1996), pp. 103–4.

¹⁰² MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 382–83.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 382. Stephen Gardiner, certainly to his great glee, pointed out that this manuscript was the only one which contained the words which Cranmer would eventually employ.

*Defence of the True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament*¹⁰⁴ in which the English archbishop clearly denied the real or corporeal presence of Christ in the elements of the Eucharist, openly espoused a theology akin to that professed in the *Consensus Tigurinus*, and made full use of the Chrysostom text supplied by Martyr.¹⁰⁵ The arguments Jewel used about the Incarnate Christ's human body being in heaven became the central point of a dialogue composed by Martyr against the Lutheran doctrine of Ubiquitarianism. As we shall see, Jewel was happy to appropriate Martyr's arguments, however inapplicable they might be for the questions he would address.

In the span of some four years following the death of Henry VIII, England had moved from a strongly traditional Catholic theology, with most of its prelates of the same opinion, to one in which the traditionalists found themselves threatened and even deposed,¹⁰⁶ the Reformers advanced and protected.¹⁰⁷ What the Reformers had only hoped during Henry's reign, had under Somerset and Northumberland become a reality, as the first set of Edwardian injunctions, modeled on those of Thomas Cromwell,¹⁰⁸ obligated parish priests to read from Cranmer's *Book of Homilies*.¹⁰⁹ This was followed by the allowance of clerical marriage, the introduction of a Protestant liturgy and its imposition as the only legal form of service in 1549, a new ordinal and finally, a revised and far more Reformed Book of Common Prayer in 1552, complete with a quasi-Zwinglian Eucharistic service. Jewel's

¹⁰⁴ *A Defence of the True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concerning the same grounded and stablished upon God's holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient Doctors of the Church*. (London, 1550. Reprint, East Sussex, 1987).

¹⁰⁵ The distinctions between the several Reformed theologians, notably Calvin and Bullinger, and the theology of the *Consensus* are discussed in Paul Rorem, 'Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Part I: The Impasse', *Lutheran Quarterly* II.2 Summer (1988), pp. 155–84, and 'Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Part II: The Agreement', *Lutheran Quarterly* II.2 (1988), pp. 357–90. Rorem's discussion is pertinent to the English situation, as shall be addressed below when treating Jewel's own Eucharistic thought as it relates to Peter Martyr Vermigli.

¹⁰⁶ Gardiner of Winchester and Edmund Bonner of London were both deprived and imprisoned, though Gardiner hardly was muzzled. Day of Chichester, Heath of Worcester, Rugg of Norwich, Wakeman of Gloucester and Tunstall of Durham, resigned. MacCulloch, *Edward VI*, p. 96; Loades, *Politics and the Nation*, p. 168.

¹⁰⁷ Knox, called the Duke's (Northumberland's) Preacher, had been taken to task by the Council of the North for his vehement preaching, only to find himself promoted to a larger living in Newcastle. His homiletical skills and outspoken manner eventually brought him to Northumberland's attention, and gained him the royal chaplaincy. Reid, *God's Trumpeter*, pp. 74–84.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative*, pp. 269–74.

¹⁰⁹ Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 339.

thought and creed, as delineated in his sermon, were commensurate with this shift.

Prompted by circumstances already cited, the dispersal of funds by Richard Chambers, the *Exhortatio ad Oxonienses* presents a picture similar to the one given in Jewel's sermon at St Mary's, of both the reality and the expectations of Oxford Protestants. Jewel fills the first section with platitudes for the two men who had brought the money from Chambers to Oxford.¹¹⁰ Jewel then turns to matters of religion (*Jam vero de religione*) in which he paints a desperate picture, in which the Gospel is set upon by individuals who 'cultivate error for religion, custom for truth, and opinion for piety'.¹¹¹ Besides these deceivers, those who forget what the fathers really taught are 'these other inimical enemies of the Gospel, who for a long time profess the truth with the mouth, but deny it with their deeds, and deter others from religion by their accursed manners and flagrant life'.¹¹² Jewel's tone in this demarcation of Reformer from traditionalist gives a clear view of what Jewel believed were now the prospects for Protestantism both at Oxford and in England. These horizons, made clear by his near acquaintance with the leading Reformers in Oxford, Martyr and Cox, demonstrate little hesitancy on Jewel's part in so speaking. And while they also show that a thorough Reformation had yet to be accomplished, its agenda could still be pursued openly.

But theological formation and the foundation for later doctrinal disputes were not all that occupied Jewel at Oxford. As was mentioned, Jewel was the Orator at Corpus Christi College, and aside from the oration treated above, three others are extant. The first, an encomium on Richard Foxe, the founder of Corpus Christi College, has little more insight to offer than Jewel's familiarity with what were the common rhetorical topoi of Renaissance writers: the mention of the deeds, actions and accomplishments of classical authors (Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Pliny, *inter alios*), mythical and tragic figures (the Muses, Neptune), and ancient personages (Priscus, Cato), all for inspiration and emulation.¹¹³ Jewel, according to Humphrey, did use a text from the psalter as his theme for his oration, Psalm 112:6, that the memory of the righteous

¹¹⁰ Humphrey mentions two men, Thomas Sampson and Thomas Horton, who had been Chambers agents, but it is not clear that they were the two meant in this oration. *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 34, 36.

¹¹¹ 'Ita errorem pro religione, consuetudinem pro veritate, opinionem pro pietate colunt.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1302.

¹¹² 'Sunt alii longe his infestiores hostes evangelii, qui veritatem ore quidem profitentur, factis autem negant, et perditis moribus et flagitiosa vita alios a religione deterrent.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1302–03.

¹¹³ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1304–05.

shall endure forever, and also notes that it was delivered in December 1552.¹¹⁴ As such it was one of the last orations he would give at Oxford.

The best example of Jewel's rhetorical and oratorical abilities comes in the extended *Oratio Contra Rhetoricam*, which exists in three manuscripts, one in the British Library and two in Corpus Christi library.¹¹⁵ A Latin oration, it ostensibly targets rhetoricians, for example, Cicero, while defending the theological method of the scholastics, for example, Duns Scotus; and as such poses a difficulty if it should be taken at face value, for after all, humanism and rhetoric is the implicit *raison d'être* of Corpus Christi's existence, the unexpressed reason that Jewel made his way there from the conservative halls of Merton. The denunciation of rhetoric and oratory as a facet of the *ars humanistica* had been a commonplace for some Roman Catholics, especially among some monastics, but also in the universities. It had been this tension between the humanists and conservatives at the beginning of the century, centered on the Hebrew scholarship of Johann Reuchlin that had elicited the letters of support for Reuchlin that became the book *Letters of Famous Men*, printed as an apology for Reuchlin in particular and humanism in general.¹¹⁶ Ulrich von Hutten and Crotus Rubeanus, in sarcastic imitation of the *Letters of Famous Men*, but in defense of Reuchlin, published their *Letters of Obscure Men* aimed at lampooning one of Reuchlin's antagonists, Ortvinus Gratius, a theologian of Cologne, and supposedly written by his supporters. The wretched prose conveyed the message that Gratius was both immoral and an ignoramus:

When I was in your study at Cologne I could see well enough that you had a multitude of volumes, great and small. And there you sat, with a whisk in your hand to flap away the dust from the bindings. 'Pardy!' said I, 'Magister Ortwin, you have full many a fair volume, and you hold them in high esteem.' Then you replied that in this we might know whether a man were learned or not; for he that honoureth books honoureth knowledge.¹¹⁷

To some extent von Hutten and Rubeanus had followed the lead provided by Erasmus, who in 1507 had published his *Moriae encomium*, *The Praise of Folly*. That Jewel did not intend his work as a serious libel

¹¹⁴ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 45 ff.

¹¹⁵ Jewel, *Oratio Contra Rhetoricam, habitu in aula ejusdam collegii coram omnibus ejusdem collegii alumnis*, in Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1283–91. Translated by Hoyt Hudson with an Introduction in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* XIV (June 1928), pp. 374–92.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Erika Rummel, *The Case against Johann Reuchlin. Religious and Social Controversy in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Toronto, 2002).

¹¹⁷ Ulrich von Hutten, et al., *On the Eve of the Reformation, Letters of Obscure Men*, translated by Francis G. Stokes with an introduction by Hajo Holbron. (New York, 1964), p. 210.

against rhetoric may be seen in his adopting – and in some cases virtual plagiarizing – of some of the arguments and phrases of Erasmus's *Encomium*. While not alluding to them all, Hoyt Hudson notes several passages where, in reference to Cicero and Demosthenes, Jewel lifts whole phrases and ideas from Erasmus's text.¹¹⁸ Coupled with this, in a passage dealing specifically with matters of education and religion, Jewel, having already berated orators for use of the public square in their destruction of ancient commonwealths, turns his attention to the recent halcyon days of traditionalism, the age of Scholasticism,

when Cicero, neglected and scorned, lay in mould and darkness; when Scotus held the ports (*aditus*: approach or admission) of the schools and the paths of literary study; when they did not know so much that by others, who had not learned the mysteries, they were thought to be mad and to rave. Yet how beautifully learned they seem, what acute philosophers, what estimable theologians! Then how great an admiration there was for sound literature! What a throng of studious youths! There were the seats, these the shrines of letters, here was the fountain, the source, of all humanities.¹¹⁹

It would seem that Jewel's medium was his message, that his oratory against oratory put the lie to the content of his message; and that, far more an exercise in irony than in conservative obscurantism, Jewel wished to defend that which he calumniated. This interpretation of Jewel's *oratio* is embraced by C.S. Lewis:

What can this be but an insinuation that none could seriously attack (as Jewel has been ostensibly attacking) the new Ciceronianism, unless he were a Papist and a scholastic? The whole *Oratio* is a laboured academic joke of the kind not then uncommon. Jewel was no more seriously condemning rhetoric than Erasmus was seriously praising folly.¹²⁰

Another option does present itself. When he delivered this *oratio*, Jewel had already been at Oxford for some time, and apparently had a reputation for his defense of the new learning: 'I know that many of you marvel when you hear these very things from me – especially from me.'¹²¹ Such a provision hardly seems the province of irony. Jewel had written the university's congratulatory letter to Mary upon her accession,¹²² and he would subsequently also recant his Protestantism, probably as late as

¹¹⁸ Hudson, 'Jewel's Oration', pp. 380–81, 383, 384–85, 386, 387, 389.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 389–90.

¹²⁰ C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford, 1944), p. 307.

¹²¹ 'Mirari scio plerosque vestrum, cum ista ipsa ex me, de me praesertim ipso, audiat.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1284.

¹²² Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 79–80.

the end of 1554.¹²³ Such circumstances may have provided the environment in which Jewel would have, exercising all candor and seriousness, delivered such an address. His last known oration given at Corpus Christi, upon the occasion of his dismissal, the *Ultima Iuelli Ejecti e Collegio Oratio*, implies that his lectures had been somewhat lacking in the substance his students had been accustomed to hear, or he to deliver: 'For when once I resolved to put an end to my lectures, and perceived that this venue of speaking would be taken away ... I did not blush, in spite of custom, to lay before you many unpleasant and crude things. For I saw that I had incurred the offense and gaze of others.'¹²⁴ Yet some chronology, difficult in this period as our only source of information is Humphrey, is a bit confused if this tack is taken.

But the resolution to whether Jewel delivered the *Oratio contra Rhetoricam* as ironically or sincerely comes from two factors. The first is Jewel's patent use of Erasmus, whose *Moriae encomium* must have been common in Oxford, and the bald borrowing from it would certainly not have sat well with any traditionalists whom Jewel either feared or was trying to please. Further, his words quoted from his last oration lend themselves more to an unprepared state, which the *Oratio Contra Rhetoricam* does not match. The second element supports the idea that Jewel delivered this oration as irony is that he gave his last oration at Corpus Christi upon the occasion of his ejection from the college in 1553. The manuscripts of the *Oratio contra Rhetoricam* have no date, though the title stated that he was the praelector of the college. If he did deliver this after Edward's death then the titles would be wrong and the circumstances surrounding his giving it would be hard to establish, for when did he have wards after being expelled from Corpus Christi? It is the *Ultima Juelli ejecti e collegio oratio* that gives us Jewel's last oration at Corpus, and, only if the titles are correct on both pieces, which for the latter seems likely, as it is corroborated by Humphrey,¹²⁵ can we then with reasonable certainty affirm that the *Oratio contra Rhetoricam* was delivered at Jewel's leisure. As it gives every indication of being so prepared, it would then be what Lewis and Hudson assert, an oratorical exercise in irony, the subject of the barb being scholasticism.

The delivery of the *Ultima Iuelli Ejecti e Collegio Oratio*, a speech with little value in determining anything substantial in Jewel's opinions,

¹²³ Southgate, *Problem of Authority*, pp. 12–13.

¹²⁴ 'Cum enim hunc mihi legendi finem statuerem, et has dicendi mensas jamjam tolli intelligerem, non dubitavi praeter consuetudinem nostram vobis et mutla, et insuavia, et semicruda proponere. Video enim me in aliquorum offensionem et oculos incurrrere.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1292.

¹²⁵ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 74–75, and Jewel, *Works*, p. 1292.

signaled that Jewel's busy but happy Oxford life had drastically changed, along with that of every other Protestant in England. On 6 July 1553 Edward VI died of tuberculosis, and whatever Northumberland might do, the Catholic daughter of Catherine of Aragon, Mary, was to take the throne.¹²⁶ Neither Jewel nor England would ever be the same, though at the time none could perceive the full implications of Mary's reign. The course that Jewel had set for himself, his attachment to Peter Martyr, and the content of his teaching and orations, would now all have profound consequences, ones that like his time at Oxford during Edward VI's reign, would adumbrate his life as an Elizabethan apologist.

Exile: Mary Tudor and the gestation of an Elizabethan Protestant

Edward VI's later government under Northumberland had not elicited a happy response from the people of England. While the duke held all the resources, and while even the foreign ambassadors believed that Mary could not succeed against him, very few of the nobility, regardless of religion, were willing to stand against her: Protestants were the ones who informed her of Edward's death, nobility more concerned about the law than Mary's religion.¹²⁷ Certainly those nobles who Northumberland could coerce, those nobles and clerics who had been most vociferously behind the Reformation – Nicholas Ridley denounced her from Paul's cross on 9 July, and the London Council sent out letters to dissuade any from supporting Mary – would stand for Lady Jane Grey. But Northumberland was his own worst enemy: he let Mary escape from his watch; to most of the nation he was highly unpopular. By the end of July Mary held the throne, and did so with the aid and consent of such Protestants as Sir Thomas Wyatt, Sir Peter Carew and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton.¹²⁸

Jewel's life during Mary's reign falls into two parts: the first entails the difficulties endured while remaining in England, the second the journeys, controversies and relationships formed while exiled on the continent. Most of what Jewel has to say about this period of his life is from retrospection, though some letters do exist. Most of the events he never mentioned at all, as though the significance of them had never dawned on

¹²⁶ David Loades, *Mary Tudor, A Life* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 171–90; Dudley, pp. 230–73.

¹²⁷ Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, pp. 374–75.

¹²⁸ Loades, *Dudley*, pp. 261–65; *Mary Tudor*, pp. 171–81; *Politics and the Nation*, pp. 240–41. It should be noted that Carew, Throckmorton and Wyatt all joined in the debacle that was the attempted armed resistance against the Spanish match, cf. Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 211–15.

him. Consequently, much of what occurred during Mary's reign may have had less of an obviously formative influence on Jewel than the events may otherwise convey, yet this would be a facile reading of the evidence, for indeed this period more than his days at Oxford determined the course of his life. Jewel's expulsion from Corpus Christi was predicated on several items, all linked to associations and activities already noted: his association with Peter Martyr, his preaching of heresy at St Mary's, his failure to attend Mass and lastly his ordination under Cranmer's rite.¹²⁹ Jewel took up residence at Broadgates hall, now Pembroke College, just opposite Christ Church.¹³⁰ The principal there, Thomas Randolph, would also become an exile, traveling in both the Empire and in France, and would later serve as Elizabeth's envoy to Scotland. The relationship between Jewel and Randolph continued into Elizabeth's reign, as Randolph would write Jewel from Scotland, sending him information and news about the state of the Reformation there, news which Jewel would in turn incorporate into his letters to Martyr.¹³¹

Though this period appears as one of anxiety for Jewel, initially his status as a colleague of Martyr, or as one with essentially Protestant sympathies, did not seem to pose any immediate threat. Having found refuge with Randolph, at some point he attempted to go to Cleeve to see Parkhurst, but not finding him there (Parkhurst had left Cleeve for the continent soon after Edward's death) Jewel returned to Oxford in a distressed state. Apparently hoping that they would be forwarded to him, Jewel wrote Parkhurst two letters, dated October of 1553.¹³² The letters sound a clear note of despair, as Jewel was quite worried about his former mentor: 'O my Parkhurst, my Parkhurst, what may I think you are now doing? that you are dead, or alive? that you are weeping (*fletu*), or in the Fleet prison.'¹³³ But by the time that Jewel wrote the third letter, 24 January 1554, he wrote knowing where Parkhurst was, and with

¹²⁹ 'Quod Pet. Martyre diligenter audivisset, quod Dei sermonem religiose et recte secuisset, quod Christi sacris, non Papae ceremoniis initiatus fuisset.' Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 74.

¹³⁰ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 77.

¹³¹ 'There was brought me yesterday from Scotland a letter from Pamphilus [Jewel uses this pseudonym drawn from Terence's *Girl from Andros*, Crito is the Earl of Arran, also from Terence's *Girl from Andros*], the presiding angel and companion of our friend Crito, respecting the whole state of affairs in that kingdom ... all which he entrusted me to communicate to you.' Letter to Martyr, 1 December 1559. Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1227. See also *Works*, IV, *Letters* 1 August 1559, p. 1215; 16 November 1559, pp. 1225–26; 1 December 1559, pp. 1227–28; 4 February 1560, pp. 1229–30; 5 March 1560, pp. 1231–32; 1 June 1559, pp. 1236–38; 17 July 1560, pp. 1239–40.

¹³² Jewel, *Works*, pp. 1190–91.

¹³³ Letter to Parkhurst, 15 October 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1190.

every expectation of seeing him again soon.¹³⁴ No years are listed on these letters, only the calender dates of 15 and 22 October for the first two, and St Paul's Eve on the third (24 January). A specific fact mentioned in the 15 October letter, the deprivation of Judge Hales, makes evident that this was written in 1553.

Though believing himself an outcast, in the third letter Jewel stated that he and Randolph live 'miserably enough, but better perhaps than they like who are vexed that we still live at all'.¹³⁵ But even this modicum of comfort changed by the end of the year. Jewel, according to Strype, served as the notary for Cranmer and Ridley at their Oxford disputation in April 1554,¹³⁶ and it was at some point after this that the Dean of Christ Church, Richard Marshall, forced Jewel to subscribe to the traditional faith in writing.¹³⁷ The date of Jewel's recanting is probably October 1554, as there was a visitation at Oxford then, and numerous persons were deprived.¹³⁸ The visitation, acting upon the first Marian injunctions, issued 4 March 1554, reset the ecclesiastical clock to the reign of Henry VIII, and repealed any notion that bishops acted by the authority of the queen (*regia auctoritate fulcitus*). Most importantly for Jewel, 'that no person be admitted or received to any ecclesiastical function, benefice, or office, being a sacramentary, infected or defamed with any notable kind of heresy or other great crime'.¹³⁹ According to Humphrey, Jewel soon thereafter took flight, fleeing to London on foot, though by an alternative route that he might not be detected. Hobbled from an earlier illness, Jewel collapsed beside the road and was found by Augustine Bernherus, Hugh Latimer's Swiss servant, who took Jewel to Anne Warcup; and so Jewel, according to Humphrey, was delivered from the enemies of God, even as Daniel had been delivered from the mouths of the lions, frustrating them as the Magi had Herod.¹⁴⁰ Though nothing Jewel wrote during this time concerning his flight remains, the Marian persecutions and the Marian church became emblematic in his thought. Humphrey's account, however, raises a huge question: why was Jewel imperiled if he had subscribed and if, as seems the case from the *A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford*, he had attended Mass. Apart from Cranmer, no one who subscribed and even did the minimum,

¹³⁴ That Parkhurst got all three of these letters seems a safe assumption since they were housed at Parkhurst's cathedral in Norwich till transferred at some point to Cambridge.

¹³⁵ Jewel, *Works*, p. 1192.

¹³⁶ John Strype, *Remains of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1840) I.483. See also John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (London, 1877), Vol VI, p. 471.

¹³⁷ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 81–82.

¹³⁸ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III, xvi,

¹³⁹ Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative*, pp. 380–81.

¹⁴⁰ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 82.

faced any reprisals, and it is difficult to think that Jewel was singled out in this regard. Edmund Guest, who played a far more prominent part in Edward's reformation, as well as Matthew Parker, both remained in England, and largely untroubled in their lives. Barlow and Scory, both bishops, though deprived, were as well, once having subscribed, left free; so free in fact that they both fled England. This would seem a bald piece of hagiography on Humphrey's part.

Humphrey never mentions Jewel's relationship with Cranmer or Ridley, or even Latimer (he does mention Cranmer's condemnation in relation to Jewel's subscription), though Latimer's servant Bernherus, however, knew Jewel, so there is little doubt but that Latimer must have also. As already noted, Jewel had served as the notary for Ridley and Cranmer's Oxford disputations, and it was perhaps this that triggered his forced subscription, and that upon the threat of severe penalty for non-compliance.¹⁴¹ Years later Jewel himself would reflect on the events and persons surrounding the Oxford martyrs, and especially their accusers.

Your friend [Richard] Smith ... has been taken in adultery, and on that account ... was ordered to retire from the theological chair.¹⁴² Bruerne, too, has been compelled for a similar offence, only far more flagitious, to relinquish his professorship of Hebrew. I write nothing about Marshal for fear of defiling my paper.¹⁴³ You have before heard respecting Weston.¹⁴⁴ But why, say you, do you make mention of such persons? Simply, that you may learn by what kind of judges it was fitting that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer should be condemned.¹⁴⁵

Jewel would take up the discussion of Richard Smith again a year later, with a rather biting invective, though where he got his information from is uncertain, and as it was generally known that Smith had fled England for Louvain in 1558, the recriminations are virtually slanderous, though perhaps not by sixteenth-century standards:

Smith is gone to Wales where ... he has taken a wife, with the view I suppose, of refuting all your arguments. However this is, he boasts

¹⁴¹ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 84.

¹⁴² Smith had preached the sermon that accompanied the executions of Latimer and Ridley. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 582.

¹⁴³ The same Richard Marshall who had gotten Jewel's recantation, was dean of Christ Church, and now Vice-Chancellor of the university, was Cranmer's jailor for the two months of December and January, 1555–56. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 585–87. He also is the man who ordered the body of Martyr's wife dug up and thrown onto a refuse pile.

¹⁴⁴ Hugh Weston was the prolocutor of the House of Commons, and a member of Convocation, wherein he had withstood the 42 articles. He headed the delegation from convocation against Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 562–68.

¹⁴⁵ Jewel, *Works*, Letter to Martyr, 20 March 1559, Ayre's translation, p. 1201.

of his grey hairs and empty head.¹⁴⁶ [Smith] now keeps a victualling house and gains his living by a hired tavern, despised by our friends and his own.¹⁴⁷

Jewel's words, not so much about the three bishops as about their accusers, jailors and executioners, frames one of several contexts in Jewel's later writings, a context that originated in his experience and apprehension of the Marian years: Mary's reign, and with it the activities of her cousin, Reginald Cardinal Pole, represented not only the nadir of Protestant fortunes, but the imposition of immorality and ignorance parading as true religion: 'O Mary and Marian times! How much more tenderly and moderately is truth now defended, than lies were defended long since! Our adversaries acted always hastily, without precedent, without justice, without law.'¹⁴⁸ Jewel's life in England now imperiled, he takes flight, probably sometime in late 1554, before Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer met their fate. Jewel was aided in his flight by Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, a known Protestant, but one of the men who had rallied to Mary's cause at Edward VI's death. Jewel went first to Strasbourg, where was the largest and probably also the most influential of several exile groups to flee England. Jewel did not stay there long, for by 13 March he was with the group that accompanied Richard Cox to Frankfurt.

The Frankfurt congregation had joined themselves to the French Church there, which had itself come to Frankfurt from London upon Mary's accession. The syndics of Frankfurt had granted the English congregation only a modicum of autonomy, allowing them to use only those forms commensurate with those used by the French congregation. Thus prompted, the English congregation assumed a form which had only been used by the Stranger Churches in England, one more in line with Geneva.¹⁴⁹ The leaders of the English congregation then wrote to the other exile communities, inviting them to join them in worship 'wherein they might heare God's worde truly preached, the sacraments rightly ministred, and discipline used which in their owne countrie coulede never

¹⁴⁶ Smith, the day following a lecture on justification given before Hugh Latimer, recanted his assertions, blaming his youth for the non-traditional content of his lecture, while taking off his cap to reveal his grey hair, cf. McClelland, *Visible Words*, p. 20, n. 44.

¹⁴⁷ Jewel to Martyr, 1 June 1560, *Works*, IV, p. 1237. Where Jewel got this information from is not known, since none of it is true. Smith fled England for Louvain in 1558.

¹⁴⁸ 'O Maria et Mariana tempora! Quanto nunc mollius et remissius veritas propugnatur, quam pridem defendebantur mendacia! Adversarii nostri omnia praecipites, sine exemplo, sine jure illo, sine lege.' Jewel, *Works*, Letter to Martyr, 14 April 1559, p. 1204.

¹⁴⁹ Edward VI had granted John à Lasco the privilege of ordering the London Stranger Church along Genevan lines.

be obtained',¹⁵⁰ and that the church in Frankfurt now had the privilege of worshipping God 'in puritie off faithe'.¹⁵¹ Hardly happy with the course of events, the English congregations in both Zurich and Strasbourg wrote replies. The church in Strasbourg informed the Frankfurt congregation that they were going to send them a minister, or they might have their pick of either of the two of a list contained in the letter: Ponet, formerly bishop of Winchester, master Scory, John Bale, or Richard Cox. In reply, the Frankfurt congregation called Edward VI's former chaplain John Knox, then at Geneva, who on several points and notorious occasions was an avowed critic of the Book of Common Prayer; Thomas Lever at Zurich; and James Haddon who was at Strasbourg, to come and be their ministers.¹⁵² Lever and Knox accepted.

Following the exchange of some correspondence, the Frankfurt church, with Knox now as their minister, Haddon having declined, and Lever not yet arrived, and seeing the need for some form of worship until the other exile communities could meet with them, adopted the Genevan service book as a temporary liturgy, 'whiche then was already printed in Englishe and some copies there amonge them ... shoulde take place as an order moste godly and farthest off from superstition'.¹⁵³ Shortly after the adoption of the Genevan order, Thomas Lever arrived from Zurich. Lever, formerly master of St Johns College, Cambridge, had been a supporter of Lady Jane Grey upon Edward's death, and when he fled to the continent, took a number of Oxford and Cambridge students with him.¹⁵⁴ He arrived in Strasbourg sometime in February 1554, for he wrote a letter from there dated 24 February.¹⁵⁵ Having been closely associated with the court of Edward VI, Lever not surprisingly was hardly satisfied with the Genevan order, and wished to implement a

¹⁵⁰ Calvin's notion of the three marks of the true church clearly present themselves here: the preached Word, the sacraments duly administered, and of course, discipline.

¹⁵¹ *A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford in Germany anno domini 1554 Aboute the Booke off off [sic] Common Prayer and Ceremonies and Continued by the Englishe Men Theyre to the Ende off Q. Maries Raigne* (Heidelberg: Schirat, 1574, 1575), Reprinted by Edward Arberas Vol I of 'A Christian Library', 1908, pp. VII–VIII. None of the spellings are modernized. The authorship of this work, traditionally attributed to William Wittingham, has been called into question by Patrick Collinson, 'The Authorship of *A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford*', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, IX (1958) 188–208, who attributes it to Thomas Wood, another exile.

¹⁵² *Brieff Discours*, p. XIII.

¹⁵³ *Brieff Discours*, p. XXVII.

¹⁵⁴ Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 219.

¹⁵⁵ Hastings Robinson, ed. & trans. *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation, written during the Reigns of King Henry VIII., King Edward VI., and Queen Mary: Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1847), II, p. 514.

temporary liturgy. It is this development that incited Knox and Wittingham to draw up a version of services of the Book of Common Prayer, in Latin, and send them to Geneva for Calvin's judgment.¹⁵⁶ Given how Knox and Wittingham framed the letter, casting the services in a most unfavorable light, Calvin's appraisal that the book contained 'manye tollerable foolishe thinges by theis wordes I meane that there was not that puritie whiche was to be desired',¹⁵⁷ seems expected. With this reply, Knox, Wittingham and Gilby imposed the Genevan book on the Frankfurt congregation, although not without resistance. Eventually, on 6 February 1555, another trial liturgy was established to be used until the last of April, with the whole matter set before the tribunal of several continental Protestant theologians, namely, Musculus, Calvin, Martyr, Bullinger and Viret. The author of *The Brieff Discours* then notes

To that all gave their consentes. This daie was joyful. Thanckes were given to God, brotherly reconciliation followed, great familiaritie used, the former grudges seemed to be forgotten ... And this frinshipp continued till the 13 of March folowing at which tyme D. Coxe and others with him came to Frankford.¹⁵⁸

Cox and his followers had come to Frankfurt from Strasbourg and their intentions were quite clear. In the revised litany the congregational response to the versicles had been omitted, but Cox and those with him decided to fill in the lacunae by saying the responses at the appropriate time. When, admonished by the congregation's Seniors, Cox and those with him replied 'that they woulde do as they had donne in England, and that they would have the face off an English church'.¹⁵⁹ Many in the congregation were loathe to admit the new party into the church, and hoped that the matter of the service's order would first be resolved. Besides that, there were with the newcomers certain individuals 'greatly suspected that they had byn (some off them) at masse in Englande, and others had subscribed to wicked articles as one of them shortly after even in the pulpit sorrowfully confessed'. The most eminent of these Nicodemists, the penitent in the pulpit, was Jewel.¹⁶⁰ Humphrey records that Richard Chambers – apparently the same Chambers who had supported the impoverished Protestant students at Oxford – urged Jewel

¹⁵⁶ The substance of the letter, in English, is in *Brieff Discours*, pp. XXVIII–XXXIII.

¹⁵⁷ *Brieff Discours*, p. 35. For the entire Calvin letter, pp. 34–36. For a more current translation from the Latin, cf., *Selected Works of John Calvin, Tracts and Letters*, Vol VI, 1554–58. trans Marcus Robert Gilchrist (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982. Original translation, 1858), pp. 117–19.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. XXXVIII.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. XXXVIII.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. XXXIX. Jewel's name is not given in the text, but it is in the marginalia that was part of the original 1574 edition of the book.

to take the pulpit and repent his subscription, which Jewel did with tears.¹⁶¹ Humphrey's description of this elaborates not only on Jewel's confession, but as well on that of Cranmer, certain soldiers under Julian the Apostate and Origen: all who had renounced the faith, yet with contrition took it back again.

The author of the *Brieffe Discours* would later write, noting the compromise reached before Cox arrived, that 'within fewe daies after, this determination was broken. A stranger craftily brought in to preache who had bothe byn at masse and also subscribed to blasphemous Articles, many taunting bitter sermons were made (as they thought) to oure defacing'.¹⁶² That Jewel is the same stranger who both repented his apostasy with tears and who preached a taunting sermon would seem probable. In the first instance of his tearful repentance in the pulpit, when cited as one of them who had subscribed to wicked articles, the author of the *Brieffe Discours* notes that it is Jewel in the margin. If the second were other than Jewel the question is why did the author not distinguish him from Jewel, even if only again in the margin? What the author's state of mind was toward Cox's party when he penned these words cannot be said, whether of libelous disposition or not; but that bitter feelings had emerged dividing the two groups need hardly be stated.¹⁶³ Jewel could well be the 'stranger' mentioned in the letter, but whether he is or not, the author of the *Brieffe Discours* shows the level of animus between the two parties this occasion produced, and by extension, the level of animus during the Puritan controversy of Elizabeth's reign when the *Brieffe Discours* was published.¹⁶⁴

Cox, Jewel and the others were admitted into the Frankfurt church, under the protests of some, but largely due to the intercession of Knox who, ironically, pleaded for them. This immediately altered the course of

¹⁶¹ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 84–87.

¹⁶² *Brieffe Discours*, p. XLVIII.

¹⁶³ Christina Garrett maintains that Wittingham is here referring to Jewel, and the letter Jewel wrote to Goodman and Wittingham from Zurich seems to be that of the man Wittingham described. Though we have no direct evidence that Jewel attended Mass, the sermon he preached as a penitent fits the description given by Wittingham, and it seems to be the same person that is mentioned earlier in the *Brieffe Discours*. Cf. Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, pp. 17–18. Southgate's contention that Jewel parted on good terms, and that the letter to Wittingham and Goodman attests to it is all on the supposition that Wittingham and Goodman had played the interlopers at Frankfurt. But why would Jewel ask forgiveness of them if that were the case? Jewel may well be him to whom Wittingham was referring in his letter, but neither Garrett nor Southgate seem conclusive or persuasive.

¹⁶⁴ Why Jewel's name may not be mentioned could easily stem from his sympathies to Puritan concerns, and the fact that the Puritans held him in high regard. Laurence Humphrey having been his biographer, it may not have served Puritan interest to defame him.

events as, also ironically, the Coxians now ordered Knox not to preach anymore.¹⁶⁵ The next day a supplication was presented to the Senate of the city, which set up the French minister Valeran as an arbiter to work out a compromise. Eventually another compromise liturgy (in actuality the liturgy of the French congregation) was erected, much to the satisfaction of the more precise among the English. It was then that the Coxian party showed to the Senate a copy of Knox's *An Admonition to Christians*, a work rather slanderous of not only Mary, but also against her husband Philip and Philip's father, the Emperor Charles V. The magistrates accused Knox of 'Laesae Maiestatis Imperatoriae, that is, off high treason', and by 26 March 1555 Knox was off to Geneva, banished from the city.¹⁶⁶

In a subsequent, undated letter to Wittingham and Goodman,¹⁶⁷ both now at Geneva, Jewel asked their forgiveness if he had caused any offense to either of them at Frankfurt.¹⁶⁸ The letter, little more than an apology by Jewel on the face of it, actually delineates two strains of thought among the exiles, the one 'Genevan' or Puritan, the other Erastian: while these terms are certainly anachronistic for the missive, the point of contention is central. The notion, propounded by Garrett *Marian Exiles* (1938), that the seeds of the Puritan opposition to the Elizabethan Settlement were planted and nurtured during the Marian exile, and that the exiles as a group formed a party at the 1559 Parliament which opposed Elizabeth and backed her into a corner, a notion embraced and given its best exposition in Sir John Neale's *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559–1581*,¹⁶⁹ might draw some credence from what occurred in Frankfurt, as the arguments and lines drawn seemingly reoccur in the 1560s and beyond.¹⁷⁰ But whatever happened there, this is a far cry from the orchestrated conspiracy Garrett

¹⁶⁵ *Briefff Discours*, pp. XXXIX–XL.

¹⁶⁶ *Briefff Discours*, pp. XLIII–XLV.

¹⁶⁷ Goodman had actually been a part of Cox's party, though he had been more disposed to compromise and conciliation than Cox or the others had been. *Briefff Discours*, p. XLVII.

¹⁶⁸ Jewel to Wittingham and Goodman, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1192–93.

¹⁶⁹ J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559–1581* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1953).

¹⁷⁰ 'It was, apparently Garrett who engendered the vigorous myth that the exiles, both in and out of Parliament constituted a radical, or Puritan opposition group, though neither leadership, organization nor activity has ever been established.' 'Although he did not actually say so, J.E. Neale's perverse interpretation of the making of the Elizabethan church settlement was evidently an attempt to account for Garrett's "Puritan" opposition.' N.M. Sutherland, 'The Marian Exiles and the Establishment of the Elizabethan Regime,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 78 (1987), pp. 253–84, pp. 253, 254. Another corrective, of course, is Norman Jones, *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion, 1559* (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1982).

and Neale assume, especially as the greatest number of exiles involved at Frankfurt would largely embrace what the 1559 Elizabethan Settlement later established.¹⁷¹

Two implications of the Frankfurt incident stand out for Jewel. The first pertains to the thoughts attributed to Cox's party, spoken upon that first Sunday of the confrontation, 'that they woulde do as they had donne in England, and that they would have the face off an English churche'.¹⁷² This theme would later reverberate throughout Jewel's writings, the right of a regional church to establish and espouse its own order and liturgy. This prerogative, inherent in the very concept of the royal supremacy, became integral to Jewel's espousal of the Protestant commonwealth under the godly prince. 'The prince is the keeper of the law of God, and that of both tables, as well as of the first, that pertaineth to religion, as of the second that pertaineth to good order. For he is the head of the people, not only of the commons and laity, but also of the ministers and clergy'.¹⁷³ For Cox, as well as Jewel and the other exiles, they did not cease to be English merely because they had fled their homeland. Perhaps for Knox the perspective was different. As strangers, the English exiles hoped for the same privileges granted to other Stranger Churches. Indeed, the very French congregation to which they were united at Frankfurt had enjoyed liberties in England that the particular parishes of the Church of England did not. For Cox and the English of Strasbourg and other cities, it was not a matter of aping the French, but of retaining their identity as an English Church, an identity distinguished by the Edwardian Prayer Book.

The second point touches on the first in that it pertains to the very notion of order itself. The most godly or the most Reformed order, abstractly or ideally considered, was not the question for Cox. For most of the other Reformers, an attempt to implement a formal service that pleased God was essential, but this was not the *sine qua non* of Reform. In John Calvin's reply to the initial inquiries made by Knox and Wittingham, though not enthusiastic in any sense about the Book of Common Prayer, the biggest concern for Calvin was not merely proper order, but the preservation of unity and peace.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ For the ideological divisions at Frankfurt which reoccur under Elizabeth, see Ronald J. Vander Molen, 'Anglican against Puritan: Ideological Origins during the Marian Exile', *Church History* 42 (March 1973), pp. 45–57.

¹⁷² *Brieffe Discours*, p. XXXVIII.

¹⁷³ Jewel. Sermon in Haggai 1:2–4, *Works*, II, 997.

¹⁷⁴ For Calvin, while desiring the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper for the Genevan Church, even seeing it as vital, that it never was effected, though many of his forms of discipline were, betrays a hierarchy in Calvin's mind of what could and could not

This indeed grievously afflicts me and is highly absurd, that discord is springing up among brethren who are for the same faith exiles and fugitives from their own country; and for a cause indeed which in your dispersion should like a sacred bond have held you closely united.¹⁷⁵

Jewel as well sought a pure church, the definition of which, as will be shown, was very Swiss in origin. But certain matters were more important to him, they assumed a higher place in the hierarchy that constituted his notion of the godly commonwealth than purity abstractly considered. Here again is the presence of the godly prince, the one who orders the Christian commonwealth and sustains the Christian religion. Perhaps the biggest antinomy in Jewel's theological index rests in his persistent carping to his Zurich friends about the state of English religion on the one hand and his public proclamation of England's and Elizabeth's respective Protestant fervor on the other. But however much the state of his church may dismay him, Jewel always insisted that the way to reform was through the order imposed on the Church by the prince. In this he was very much of a piece with his Erastian friends in Zurich.

By spring of 1555 Jewel had left Frankfurt and had traveled again to Strasbourg to join his mentor, Peter Martyr. Martyr had previously turned down an invitation proffered by the elders of Geneva's Italian church, even though in a letter to Calvin he expressed his own personal gratification for having received such a honor.¹⁷⁶ But by the late spring of 1556 Martyr, embroiled in controversy with Strasbourg's Lutheran authorities over the Eucharist, accepted a call to Zurich, and in July 1556 departed Strasbourg for Zurich with Jewel accompanying him. The three years spent between Strasbourg and Zurich proved formative for Jewel for several reasons, but most importantly for the expanding circle of associations in which Jewel now moved. To this point, though certainly affiliated with persons who had shaped the English Reformation – Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Cox – Jewel's life had largely been consigned to the immediate Oxford circle of Parkhurst and Martyr. Now Jewel came into full contact with what Winthrop Hudson has termed the 'Cambridge connection'.¹⁷⁷ Cambridge University, beginning in the 1520s had come under the increasing dominance of Protestants and humanists. If Oxford had been the first of the universities to embrace humanism, Cambridge's later endorsement proved more

be accepted in a Reformed Church.

¹⁷⁵ Calvin, *Letters*, p. 117.

¹⁷⁶ McLelland, *Visible Words*, p. 51.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. fn. 41. Richard Cox, of course is Jewel's first introduction to this circle, but in Zurich his entrance is complete.

durable, more vehement: when humanism was falling into disrepute at Oxford, it had only begun to flourish at Cambridge. In its wake came Protestantism. Initially identified with the few who met at the White Horse Inn, the group eventually expanded to take in some of the most prestigious posts and influential positions in the university. Most notable among these was Richard Cheke of St John's College. It did not hurt that the group was supported at court first by Thomas Cromwell and subsequently by Henry VIII's more permanent friends, Anthony Denny and William Butts, the latter one of Henry VIII's personal physicians.¹⁷⁸

Jewel's initial contact with Cambridge Protestantism came through Richard Cox when he served as vice-chancellor of Oxford; but then at Strasbourg and then again at Zurich, he fell in with those who had influenced and been influenced by Cambridge, and who in turn made up the dominant group of those who would fill the higher posts of Elizabeth's church: John Aylmer, Edmund Grindal, Robert Horne, Alexander Nowell, Edwin Sandys and James Pilkington, *inter alios*.¹⁷⁹ Yet while Jewel remained in exile his identity largely came from Peter Martyr, whom he served as a secretary, not from his fellow English religionists. Zurich also proved a hospitable city for the refugees, for when Stephen Gardiner found out that London merchants had been underwriting the expenses of the exiles, he had the flow of money stopped. Under the prompting of Bullinger, the Senate of Zurich, along with Christopher, the prince of Württemberg, came to the exiles' financial aid.¹⁸⁰

At some point during his time at Zurich Jewel it seems traveled across the Alps to Padua. Though Humphrey never mentions it, as travel to Italy, Padua in particular, was undertaken by other students from England, such a trip by Jewel seems plausible. The supposition is based on the *Epistola ad Scipionem*, a work attributed to Jewel, addressed to a gentleman of Venice whom the author met and resided with while a student in Padua, and included in the Parker Society edition of Jewel's works.¹⁸¹ The work first appeared in an appendix to a 1629 translation of the history of the Council of Trent by Fr Paolo Sarpi.¹⁸² Where the

¹⁷⁸ Hudson, *Cambridge Connection*, pp. 40, 50–53.

¹⁷⁹ These names are all listed by Humphrey, who was himself in residence at Zurich, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 87–88. Information about the relationships of these and others can be found in Hudson, *Cambridge Connection*. Of interest also are two of the most prominent individuals in Elizabeth's early reign who were also from Cambridge, but not exiles, Matthew Parker and William Cecil.

¹⁸⁰ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 90.

¹⁸¹ Jewel, *Epistola ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1092–126.

¹⁸² Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623) was a Servite monk, a scientist and a native of Venice. He frequently was in trouble with the Inquisition. See John L. Lievsay, *Venetian Phoenix*:

translator, a gentleman named Brent, obtained it, is not known, but as Ayre notes, 'there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt that Jewel was the author'.¹⁸³ The work follows the main lines of Jewel's arguments (though not marred by the pedestrian and pedantic addition of one source upon another), quotes most of the same sources, uses the books that were in Jewel's library, employs phrases found in a letter to Martyr in which Jewel had proposed such a work¹⁸⁴ and even makes the identical mistakes in his attribution of authors and historical facts.¹⁸⁵ Booty in his work on Jewel does not even mention the letter.¹⁸⁶ Southgate says that it can only be studied in conjunction with Jewel's other writings, as he doubts that he ever went to Padua, although he confesses that the work probably is his.¹⁸⁷ Regardless of Jewel's other travels, in one sense he had merely picked up his Oxford studies in another setting. At Strasbourg he had heard Martyr lecture on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and the Book of Judges; at Zurich he would also hear him lecture on St Augustine.¹⁸⁸ Jewel's life in Zurich, despite being an exile, was nonetheless, upon recollection, one he cherished and later greatly missed, even when his own fortunes would seem to be at their highest: 'O Zurich! Zurich! how much more often do I now think of you than ever I thought of England when I was in Zurich!'¹⁸⁹

At the end of the 1550s Christian Europe was, given the century, relatively at rest. The long struggle that had pitted first Spain against France in Italy, begun in 1494 and inherited by Charles V and Francis I, and that devolved into the struggles following Francis's death in 1547 between Henri II and Charles V, and then after 1555, between Henri II and Philip II (and with Philip, his wife's England), were now coming to

Paolo Sarpi and some of his English Friends: 1606–1700 (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1972).

¹⁸³ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1094, fn.1.

¹⁸⁴ *Ad Scipionem*, p. 1097, Letter to Martyr, 7 February 1562, *Works*, pp. 1245–48.

¹⁸⁵ See Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1098, fn. 2; and fn. 2 p. 1100.

¹⁸⁶ Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist*. This lacuna begs the question of Booty's view of the work's authorship.

¹⁸⁷ See Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, pp. 22–23, 129. Southgate explains the initial part of the letter addressed to Scipio as perhaps a commonplace of a mythical address, though this seems strained. Southgate also notes that Jewel's name does not appear with the English students at Padua, and Humphrey does not mention him going there. Humphrey gives merely a page to the year Jewel spent in Strasbourg and only a few pages to the time he spent in Zurich, so the omission of a journey to Padua should hardly rule out the possibility. Besides, Humphrey never gives dates and is chronically imprecise with the arrangement of his facts. And that Jewel's name does not appear in the student lists is possible of numerous explanations. It would seem, based on the literary evidence, the harder explanation would be who other than Jewel could have written it.

¹⁸⁸ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 88.

¹⁸⁹ Jewel, undated letter to Martyr, *Works*, IV, pp. 1210–11.

a close with effective negotiations taking place at Cateau-Cambrésis even as Mary Tudor lay dying. Charles V in 1555 had concluded a bitter peace with Lutheranism, granting to heretics the right to exist, and giving to heretical princes the option of favoring heresy in their own domains. Following his initial success at Muhlberg in 1547, and the death of his most bitter rival Francis I in that year, the future must have then seemed happy to Charles V: only the Turk and the reform of the Church to be troubled with. But with the victory of Maurice of Saxony at Innsbruck, and the subsequent 1555 Peace of Augsburg legalizing Lutheranism in the Empire, Charles retired to prepare to meet God, leaving his brother Ferdinand the empire, and his son Philip Spain and the Netherlands. Already in 1549 the Swiss Protestants, in a rapprochement effected between Calvin and Bullinger, had also come to a Consensus on the Lord's supper, allowing them to form a military league, and also giving their creed a coherent definition in contradistinction to Lutheranism. 1558 also brought the death of the unhappy Mary Tudor, and with it the end of exile for many of the English, Jewel among them. But the end of the decade also saw several other beginnings besides that of Elizabeth's reign. By early 1559 the unlooked for death of Henri II during the tournament to celebrate the new peace brought to the throne of France the first of the succession of his three sons. The death proved a portent to France, which would soon be driven by the passions of religion and the ambition of its nobles into 30 years of civil war. The same fate awaited the Netherlands. Elizabeth all too happily exacerbated both situations by her interventions. The end of the decade also saw the full flowering of the Catholic or Counter Reformation.¹⁹⁰

As for our subject, having survived Mary's reign, having seen how the Reformation operated in other cities and principalities and as well having the luxury of living in domains that enjoyed their Protestantism in peace – both peace in its lack of threats from without and peace in the relations of its ministers to the civil magistrates within, consonant with what the little evidence of his life and thought allows, we see that Jewel had already clearly arranged his ecclesio-political system around a Zurich/Elizabethan axis. What Jewel already embraced and professed in 1558 and 1559 could easily be inferred from the facts and details of the first part of his life. As a bishop and apologist, Jewel would attempt to hold in equipoise conflicts left over from his earlier years, but now writ large in his later. His resolutions, though often never explicitly reflecting his past controversies and writings, nonetheless tacitly retain elements

¹⁹⁰ Chapter Three treats the Catholic reaction to Jewel. While I think the term Counter Reformation still valuable in describing such affairs as the Recusant response to Jewel, it hardly suffices in describing the Catholic Church's renewal in the sixteenth century.

found in them. Jewel, now almost 36, reentered his former world of ecclesiastical and religious controversy, one for which the idiom of his own history, discipline and temperament had well suited him. Despite his humble, West Country origins, despite the loss of his life at Oxford,¹⁹¹ despite having weakened and subscribed to 'papistical' articles, his past associations and theological disposition now became the door through which lay advancement and opportunity, however much he might have longed to go back through it to return to Zurich. Others had also endured these circumstances, but Jewel had maintained the life of a scholar throughout his exile, he had never strayed either from furthering his education or far from his teacher; and unlike so many of his fellow English clerics, and certainly to the delight of Elizabeth who preferred her clergy celibate, he had never married.

John Jewel's life prior to 1559 reappears throughout his later years, in his views of what constituted a Christian commonwealth, his ideas on what basis a church ought to be reformed, in the place granted the primacy of the prince in the life of the Church and in his attachment to the person, views, and ideas of Peter Martyr. That repeated Frankfurt refrain of worshiping as had been done in England also often recurs. Jewel emerges after 1558 as a committed Protestant, but one who never lost his English identity within the larger world of Protestantism. His allegiance to his monarch, however, is tempered by the constraints of what Jewel repeatedly termed *vera religio*. For Jewel, Mary Tudor and her ministers, both civil and ecclesiastical, had shown how they would treat this religion; they had as well shown of what sort they were morally and spiritually. That the true faith needed the protection of a godly prince became a dominant motif in Jewel's thought, though there was the small problem of what to do when your prince was not as godly as you wished her to be?

¹⁹¹ In his 1558–59 correspondence Jewel never mentions the possibility of returning to Oxford, or going back to a scholar's life.

Jewel and the struggle for the Elizabethan Church

The prospects and duties of an Elizabethan Protestant

Mary Tudor's death on 17 November 1558 brought a formal end to the expatriation of Jewel and the other exiles. Her death had been rumored, Humphrey noted, on several occasions, but with the confirmation of the news, the exiles began their pilgrimage back to England.¹ Jewel and most of the other exiles returned to England at the end of 1558 and the beginning of 1559.² The first exiles to set out were those in Strasbourg, chiefly Sir Anthony Cooke, Edmund Grindal (who had taken Bucer's English writings with him to his former home, giving them to Conrad Hubert), Thomas Sampson and Edwin Sandys. Cooke, according to Sandys, left the day after Mary's death had been established, 20 December; Sandys left on the 21st. News had come even before the confirmation had arrived on 19 December, for on 17 December Sampson had already been inquiring of Peter Martyr whether he should take up a post under Elizabeth's new polity. Jewel and others set out from Zurich on 7 January, reaching Strasbourg by the month's end, England at the beginning of March 1559. Jewel wrote Martyr of his 57-day journey: 'What a life it was, with water, and earth, and even heaven itself enraged at us, and by every means impeding our return.'³ Jewel's winter trek, and the sad plight of Parkhurst who was robbed of most of his belongings en route, demonstrates the undaunted expectations that flourished within the exile community of an imminent change in English religion. Nonetheless, many of the English exiles who had attached themselves to Geneva delayed their return, some for political reasons, for example, Christopher Goodman, some due to their work on the Geneva Bible, for example, John Foxe, and some because their expectations were not as high as those of exiles associated with other cities.⁴

¹ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 97.

² Jewel wrote Peter Martyr from Strasbourg 26 January 1559 and then wrote again subsequent to his arrival in England, 20 March 1559, *Works*, IV, pp. 1196–201.

³ 'Quae illa vita fuit, cum et aqua, et terra, et coelum ipsum nobis indignaretur, et omnibus modis reditum nostrum impediret!' Letter to Martyr, 20 March 1559, IV, p. 1198.

⁴ See Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967; reprint, Oxford, Clarendon Paperbacks, 1991), pp. 45–46.

When stopping in Strasbourg on his return, Jewel wrote Martyr that the religious situation in England was proving no less turbulent than the weather. Elizabeth had already forbidden anyone to preach, 'either papist or gospeller'. Some thought, according to Jewel, that this was because there was merely one Protestant minister in all of London, Thomas Bentham, a former exile who had taken part in the troubles at Frankfurt and who had since then been smuggled back into England to minister to the clandestine Protestant church in London.⁵ Yet others, again, according to Jewel, thought the decree was issued because the only time Bentham had given a public sermon, a religious riot had broken out, with people arguing whether the English Protestant church should look like Frankfurt or Geneva?⁶ As the situation unfolded, Frankfurt may well have been a happy alternative for even the more precise. But it was not merely a matter of muzzling the godly M. Bentham; bishop White of Winchester, in his sermon upon Mary's funeral urged the faithful of England to resist all change, and that it would be a pious act if one were to kill the returning exiles.⁷ The Marquis of Winchester duly charged White with sedition and arrested him.⁸ The news of White's discomfiture probably encouraged Jewel, but as he would find, to his exasperation if not consternation, the sovereign was more quick to silence extremes than eager to effect religious change.

That England would be a Protestant country seemed a surety to the exiles, even though moderation in the speed of change, and discretion in how it was done, was on all sides the caution repeated to Elizabeth.⁹ Even in the first days of his return Jewel had this same impression:

The queen meanwhile, though she openly supports our cause, yet partly by her own councillors who consider everything, and partly by the Spaniard count Feria, Philip's legate, she is wonderfully enjoined not to allow anything to be restored. Nevertheless, she is prudently, firmly, and piously pursuing her intentions, though less swiftly than desired. And although the beginning seems so far a little difficult, nevertheless there is hope that sometime a right conclusion shall occur.¹⁰

⁵ See Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, pp. 86–87.

⁶ Jewel, Letter to Martyr, 26 January 1559, *Works*, II, p. 1198.

⁷ 'Bonum factum, si quis exules reduces interfecerit.' *Ibid.*, p. 1197.

⁸ White must have soon been released, as he played a crucial role in the affairs of Elizabeth's first parliament, though he soon enough found himself again in the Tower.

⁹ See Dickens, *English Reformation*, pp. 294–96, and especially Jones, *Faith by Statute*, who argues that the intentions of Elizabeth were sweeping, but conservatively implemented.

¹⁰ 'Regina interea, etsi aperte faveat nostrae causae, tamen partim a suis, quorum consilio omnia geruntur, partim a legato Philippi comite Ferio, homine Hispano, ne quid patiat innovari mirific deterretur. Illa tamen, quamvis lentius aliquanto quam nos

Yet ironically Mary and her cohorts had already largely opened the door, if not to the triumph of Protestantism, at least to a mollification of resistance to it. Though the ruthless and at times cruel suppression of heretics had bolstered sympathy for evangelicals in England, and had engendered animus for Mary's and Philip's regime abroad, it was more their inability to read the mood of England that aided in yet another change of religion. Stephen Gardiner had wanted Mary to be able by an Act of Parliament to disinherit Elizabeth and bequeath the crown by will. But the whole idea was doomed, as no one in the lower house could abide the thought of Philip of Spain as the English monarch. Mary had paid a dear price by her marriage to Philip II, and with the loss of Calais, many in England believed it an unreasonable fee. To Dickens, it was the Spanish match that made the succession of a Protestant Elizabeth inevitable.¹¹ David Loades echoes the cool antipathy of the political nation to Mary's Spanish attachments, which as well made the change of religion more easily effected; yet this does not entail on Loades' part an acceptance of the idea that Mary's reconciliation of England with Rome was a fool's gambit, or that given more time the English would not have reverted back to the old religion.¹² Elton also noted that political entanglements with the Spanish had cost Mary the support of her subjects, especially after the loss of Calais to the duke de Guise in 1558.¹³ Indeed, aside from awaiting the finalization of peace with France, few things in either the international or the domestic realm inhibited Elizabeth in effecting a religious change.¹⁴

That is not to say that it was forgone that England would become Protestant on Elizabeth's accession. England was still by law a Catholic country, with close ties to Spain, the strongest Catholic power in Europe; and with Spain, its Habsburg cousins in the Empire. If Elizabeth hoped to effect a change of religion it would come in the teeth of opposition from both the upper house of Parliament and from convocation. Philip II certainly held out hope otherwise, even though among the English traditionalists and Catholics the fear was pervasive that change was

velimus, tamen et prudenter et foriter et pie persequitur insitutum. Et quam vis hactenus principia paulo visa sunt duriora, tamen spes est aliquando recte fore.' Jewel, letter to Peter Martyr, 20 March 1559, in *Works*, p. 1199.

¹¹ Dickens, *English Reformation*, pp. 212–13.

¹² Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 338–42.

¹³ Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, pp. 394–95.

¹⁴ Although to the Catholic powers Elizabeth was a bastard, her relationship with Philip II kept Paul IV, had he been inclined, from acting on the implications of this fact. David Loades points out that Rome was poorly informed about the state of English religious affairs, though the excommunication did finally come in 1570. Loades, *Politics and the Nation*, pp. 274–75.

coming. Few doubted this, least of all the exiles. Even the traditionalist Catholic clergy were anticipating an attempt at a change in religion, as the incident of bishop White at Mary's funeral makes plain. It is not that Elizabeth had not made known her mind; rather, she had made known two of them. Just before her death Mary had sent Jane Dormer, the wife to be of Philip's envoy, Feria, to lay on Elizabeth the conditions of Mary's recognizing her as her heir. According to Jane in her autobiography the stipulations were that Elizabeth would pay Mary's debts, and that she would not seek to alter England's religion. According to Dormer Elizabeth prayed that the earth might swallow her were she not a true Catholic.¹⁵ As this was undoubtedly conveyed to Mary's council, which included the Archbishop of York, Nicholas Heath, who upon Mary's death and that of her cousin Cardinal Pole some hours later, became the leading ecclesiastic in the realm, the Catholics must have had at least some hope that Elizabeth would keep the realm under the Roman obedience. Yet Protestants were not without their hope either, as the narrative of Elizabeth's confrontation with Mary's emissary (now emissaries) had a completely different ending. Elizabeth, though willing enough to pay her sister's debts, is said to have responded that 'to religion, I promise thus much, that I will not change it, provided only it can be proved by the word of God, which shall be the only foundation and rule of my religion'. This account had made its way into a document that was then sent to the exile community in Strasbourg, and was reproduced by Edwin Sandys in a letter to Bullinger.¹⁶ No need arises to wonder which account is true, for undoubtedly Elizabeth told Dormer just what Dormer relates, but also most definitely she had sent information otherwise to the exile communities in order to hasten their returns.¹⁷

But Jewel soon learned that other impediments to the spread of reform existed, those who should have endeavored for a better state of English religion, indeed those who should have desired it the most: 'It has happened that the mass in many places has of itself ceased, without any laws for its eradication. If the queen would herself rid her chapel of it the whole matter might be disposed of easily.' The blame did not only devolve to her Majesty, but also extended to those who should have happily seen to the spread of the truth.

We manage everything with so much deliberation, and prudence and wariness, and circumspection, as if God himself could scarce retain

¹⁵ In David Starkey, *Elizabeth, The Struggle for the Throne* (New York: Harper Collins, 2001), pp. 225–26.

¹⁶ *Zurich Letters*, I, p. 4.

¹⁷ Starkey, *Elizabeth*, p. 226.

his authority without our ordinances and precautions; so that it is idly and scurrilously said, by way of joke, that, as heretofore Christ was cast out by his enemies, so he is now kept out by his friends.¹⁸

That England's religious situation did not even possess the promise of Edward's church, or that it could only be imperfectly realized, Jewel had originally blamed upon those traditionalists – primarily the bishops – who had in 1559 retained the ability to impede reform. The bishops, however, though formidable because of the positions they occupied in the House of Lords, were not the only problem, as they only impeded reform on the formal level of keeping it from being effected by statute. Yet whatever the resistance or obstacles offered by either Catholics or the temporizers, Jewel was of the mind that where it concerned the laity, ignorance would evaporate before the Gospel, and informed Martyr in August 1559 that this was not merely a desired end, but indeed was an unfolding reality, for 'We found everywhere the minds of the masses rather bent to religion; indeed, even there in all those places where we thought there would be the most difficulty'.¹⁹ By the following March he would write how after a sermon at Paul's Cross up to 6,000 people would stay afterwards to sing; all, Jewel adds, to the great annoyance of the devil and the 'mass-priests' (*sacrificios*).²⁰ Nonetheless, in April he likened the speed of the change of religion to the pace of the delivery of his letters to Martyr, for 'they [the letters] are either stuck somewhere or other, and imitating our religion are in laziness and leisure, or are lost along the way'.²¹

Jewel explicitly linked the political considerations which accompanied religious change to any hope of a welcome for Martyr and his return to Oxford, even if only in spirit if not also in reality. In a subsequent letter, little more than a month later, Jewel assured Martyr that Elizabeth is possessed with the best intentions towards him, and that not only she, but others (archbishop Parker, *inter alios*) desired his return to England. Jewel, however, can only acquiesce to Martyr's return if the invitation took an earnest, serious and honorable form. Martyr's theology carried political baggage, as members of Elizabeth's government as well as representatives from Wurttemberg saw in his Eucharistic doctrines an impediment to negotiations with the German Lutheran principalities.²² Despite these misgivings Jewel entertained hope of a thorough reformation, as both his hasty return and early letters disclose. But with

¹⁸ Jewel, letter to Peter Martyr, 14 April 1559, in *Works*, IV, p. 1205.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 1216.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 1230.

²¹ 'Et fieri potest, ut saepe fit, ut aut haereant uspiam, et ignavae atque otiosae imitentur religionem nostram, aut etiam perierint in itinere.' *Ibid.*, IV, p. 1206.

²² McClelland, *Visible Words*, p. 45.

the growing realization that matters would neither resolve themselves with the thoroughness of reformed zeal, nor with the rapidity that he would have liked, Jewel's tone became somber, even cynical, speaking of not a golden mean, but a leaden mediocrity. The stagnating pace of reform becomes a recurrent lament in his letters, as Jewel increasingly grasped how political considerations impinged upon the questions of English religion. Writing to Martyr sometime in late April or early May of 1559, just after Parliament had established the Elizabethan Settlement, Jewel noted that even this action, a return of religion to the days of Edward VI, came in a manner insufficient for those who hoped for a bright future: 'Concerning religion, it has been enacted (would that it were accompanied by good portents), that it should be in the same situation as it was when you were here last under Edward.'²³ Jewel's proviso was occasioned by the Ornaments rubric of the Act of Uniformity that retained the surplice and cope.

Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as was in the Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of her commissioners appointed and authorized, under the great seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realm.²⁴

Jewel's disconsolate attitude regarding the breadth of the reform accomplished by the Elizabethan Settlement waned over time. And though still manifestly present, his discontent appeared only rarely after he assumed his episcopal duties in June 1560,²⁵ and even that in a furtive letter to Bullinger.²⁶ Despite his disaffection with those he believed should be his allies in matters of such great importance, he kept his opinions private, confined to his letters to Peter Martyr, Heinrich Bullinger and the other Zurich ministers. Publicly, Jewel was always the dutiful English bishop.²⁷ In the end, whoever those may be who by their lack of zeal retarded reform, they did not pose the greatest threat to the English Church. The real peril came from those who would overthrow Elizabeth, who sought to circumvent her laws, and who fled the country to foment

²³ 'De religione transactum est (utinam bonis auspiciis!) ut esset eo loco, quo fuit ultimis tuis temporibus sub Edouardo.' Jewel, undated Letter to Martyr, in *Works*, IV, p. 1211.

²⁴ Hardy and Gee, *Documents Illustrative*, p. 466.

²⁵ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1235–36.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1270–71.

²⁷ This dissonance between Jewel's public and private writings shall be addressed subsequently in Chapter Four.

both political and religious dissent from abroad. Against their assertions Jewel would exert the greater part of his intellectual and academic activities over the next years of his life. On seven separate occasions Jewel, both by public sermons and in print, defended the Elizabethan Settlement: at the 1559 Westminster Disputation; in his Challenge Sermon, preached in the fall of 1559 and the spring of 1560, and as well in its subsequent literary, polemical aftermath; in the composition of the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* and the running debate which it engendered; in his anonymous *Epistola*, written at the behest of William Cecil and ostensibly disseminated in France; in his epistle to the Venetian Scipio, defending England's absence from the Council of Trent;²⁸ in his *A View of a Seditious Bull*, written upon the occasion of Elizabeth's excommunication by Pius V; and in his short tract 'An Answer to Certain Frivolous Objections against the Government of the Church of England', which he composed in response to the views and actions of the Presbyterians in the 1571 Parliament, defending the threefold order of the ministry of the Church of England. All these controversies, the last excepted, involved Jewel in disputes with Roman Catholics over the nature of what is a properly constituted ecclesiastical order; and even the dispute with the Presbyterians concerned this matter as well. As will be seen, in his debates with the more precise of his Protestant acquaintances,²⁹ Jewel adopted the same posture concerning the duties of the individual to the prince, and employed basically the same arguments against them as he had done in his quarrels with Rome.

Jewel's polemic revolved around several themes recurring throughout his writings. First among these is the supremacy of the godly prince within his domain to effect ecclesiastical reform and to order the Church, provided this exercise of authority by the prince has the limitation of the Word of God. Next and correlative to the first, though subordinate to it, is the authority and autonomy of regional churches to order their own rites and polity. This is a necessary extension of the first, for in England, though the monarch is the supreme head, and in Elizabeth's case the supreme governor – whatever this change of wording entailed – of the Church of England, the clergy drew their authority directly from the ordinance of God (though always at Elizabeth's pleasure), and they in conjunction with their sovereign ordered the life of the Church.³⁰ As

²⁸ The Epistle to Scipio was seemingly unknown in England, and was culled from a set of documents printed in connection with the Council of Trent.

²⁹ This would include the Vesterian controversy of the mid 1560s as well as the 1571 Admonition Controversy.

³⁰ Richard Hooker in the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (VIII.4) saw no real distinction, speaking of the supremacy as a necessary attribute of any polity: 'Now besides them ... is required a universal power, which reacheth over all importing supreme authority of

neither the clergy nor the prince owed allegiance to any foreign potentate (that is, the Pope), it is both their prerogative and duty to arrange their local Christian commonwealth. The third of Jewel's themes pertains to his embracing only a modicum of essential doctrines that form the *sine quo non* of true religion. In the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* Jewel's profession of Faith includes little more than an amplified version of the Nicene Creed, which at times bears a striking resemblance to the language of the Athanasian formula. The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion are not treated directly, but the minimum of doctrine that they profess is.³¹ In comparison with other Protestant confessions and formulas, the Church of England's articles, and Jewel's enumeration of them, are slight. For Jewel, this lowest common denominator approach to Protestant doctrine entails ancillary aspects of the final two themes. The first of these two is Jewel's minimalist reading of the church Fathers, which also calls for a necessary lessening of Patristic authority and a consequent deprecation for what may be termed the Catholic faith as found in the early Church. Jewel's stratagem cut out from under his opponents any ground from which they could assail the English Church, and to do this he sought to erode the early Church's status as the unified, Catholic domain from which traditionalists could conveniently draw sustenance. The minimalist doctrinal base was a natural corollary. Finally, and a consequent to the last point, Jewel asserted that the Church of England's Protestant apprehension of Christianity, however minimal it may be, does not make it the purveyor of novelty, but instead that Rome is the one guilty of innovation.³² In each of the controversies that engulfed Jewel, he would build his apologetic around one or more of these notions, and in such a work as his *Apologia* and his *Defense of the Apology*, they all appear.

government Courts all Judges all Causes ... This power being sometime in the *Bishop of Rome* ... was ... annexed unto the *King's* royal seat and crown ... [O]ur laws have provided that he *King's* supereminent authority and power shall serve, as namely when the whole Ecclesiastical state ... do need visitation and reformation.'

³¹ The Thirty-Nine Articles had omitted the Edwardian article on the Pope as Antichrist, and interestingly enough, Jewel also refrains from so labeling the Pope, though he is quick to employ the testimony of others to this end, and thus keeps himself one step removed from deed. Cf. Jewel's comments on II Thessalonians 2:4 in his *Commentary upon the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, in *Works*, II, pp. 902–07, where Jewel culls from numerous writers the necessary evidence that the Pope is the Antichrist of whom St Paul wrote, although, since the Antichrist will style himself as God, who fits this bill? 'You look that I should name the bishop of Rome, that it is he which hath suffered himself to be called by the name of God. I will not tell you in mine own words.' p. 906. These same sentiments and arguments Jewel employs in a sermon on Luke 10: 23–24, *Works*, II, p. 1080.

³² Jewel, *Works*, III, p. 89.

Polemics with Catholic authors, most notably with the Louvain professor and former Salisbury canon and treasurer Thomas Harding,³³ who was also a frequent suppliant with Jewel of Peter Martyr while all were in Oxford, consume the bulk of Jewel's writing and scholarship. Of the 2,452 pages comprising the four volumes of the Parker Society edition of Jewel's works, those that treat specifically with Harding encompass some 1,700 pages, though the reproduction of Harding's treatises for the purpose of argumentation encompass many of these pages. Harding and Jewel crossed polemical pens throughout the decade of the 1560s over two formally different matters and circumstances. Materially though, the confrontations were very much the same, for both addressed the question of the legitimacy of the disputants' respective communions, that is, whose was the innovator or whose had a claim to the Faith professed by the ancient Church. In viewing Jewel's arguments in the debates with Harding and in his several other polemics that involved Catholic claims, it should be remembered that these were not merely dogmatic, but also rhetorical and oratorical controversies, for Jewel a public aspect of his duties as an English bishop. Consequently, the audience addressed by Jewel's writings was not so much Harding *per se*, as the faithful of England.

The first apologies for Elizabethan religion: Jewel in 1559 and 1560

Jewel had only ever known an Erastian ecclesiastical and political order, in which the civil government – in Jewel's case the monarch – exercised judicial and, in many ways at least, a tacit magisterial authority over the church.³⁴ This had been the case with the Church of England at least since the early 1530s when Henry VIII assumed the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England. Henry's assumption of the supremacy coincided with Jewel's earliest days as a student at Oxford. The civil magistrate exercising authority within and over the Church was as well the case in the Zurich where Jewel lived during his exile from 1556 to

³³ Harding had been Stephen Gardiner of Winchester's confessor, and it was by Gardiner's request that Harding was first made treasurer of Salisbury, 17 July 1555, and then later canon-residentiary. He was formally deprived of both on 6 November 1559, though he had as early as August 1559 refused to swear the oath to Elizabeth as governor of the Church.

³⁴ Tacit, in that the prince retained the right to materially silence, suspend and depose recalcitrant bishops. The most notable example is Elizabeth's 1577 suspension of Edmund Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury from 1576–82. See Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal, 1519–1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (London and Berkeley, 1979), pp. 233–52.

1559. In fact, except for the Anabaptists, Erastianism was the order embraced by all the Reformers, though all to a relatively greater or lesser degree. Of the major Reformers, either Lutheran or Reformed, the first to break thoroughly with this tradition was Calvin's successor at Geneva, Theodore Beza, who backed George Withers in his debate with the Heidelberg physician Thomas Erastus, from whom the doctrine took its name.³⁵ The Zurich Reformers Rudolph Gualter, Josiah Simler and especially Heinrich Bullinger, all aligned themselves with Erastus. Though Jewel never commented on the debate, it is abundantly clear that he sided with Erastus as well.³⁶

Protestantism, from the movement's earliest beginnings in Germany under Luther, had looked to the princes and nobility to protect itself against both the Papacy and those powers whose allegiance was to Rome. Jewel by bitter experience had apprehended the expediency and need of the godly prince as the governor and protector of the Protestant church: initially, the death of the Protestant Edward made Jewel a pariah in both Oxford and England because of his own Protestant inclinations; and even before his exile his religious proclivities had brought him into intimate familiarity with the Oxford martyrs Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer, put to death at the hands of a Catholic hierarchy acting under the aegis of Mary. Jewel would never shrink from employing the concept of the necessity of the godly prince, as it became one of the chief articles that he both defended against traditionalist invectives, and as well used as a defense of the English Church. In this regard, Jewel's defense of the English polity was never, to use the happy phrase, making a virtue of a necessity. For Jewel, that the godly prince held some form of power for the good of the Church within his realm, was axiomatic.

Although Jewel had spent the previous 23 years prior to 1558, both by education and by experience, in a manner that would prepare him for the role he would play in the early Elizabethan Church, nevertheless before his return to England nothing in either his academic life or clerical career, however well prepared he was, commended him for the role he subsequently played in the Elizabethan Church's first decade. Further, though having attained the post of orator for Corpus Christi college, having written the congratulatory epistle to Mary on behalf of Oxford

³⁵ McNeill, *History and Character of Calvinism*, pp. 273–74. For Beza and his influence on England see Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, Ch. VI. 'Godly Magistracy and the Godly Prince' (Cambridge, 1960); and Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 110–12.

³⁶ Patrick Collinson, 'Episcopacy and Reform in England in the Later Sixteenth Century', *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), pp. 161–62. Originally published in *Studies in Church History*, Vol 3, ed. G.J. Cuming (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), 91–125.

University upon the occasion of her accession, and having for a brief time been an interim president of Corpus Christi, none of these hardly merit an episcopal appointment. He had but one clerical charge prior to 1558, the modest parish of Sunningwell, whose religious needs he attended to every other week while still a student at Oxford.³⁷ Patrick Collinson has noted that the path to preferment generally ran through the universities, and that one who governed their hall or college well would merit advance.³⁸ The real reason for Jewel's preferment rests probably with Elizabeth herself, who plucked her bishops mainly from the returning exiles, and who set them up as the foils to Marian Catholicism. Had Elizabeth wished a Henrician church it is possible that she could have possessed it. Such individuals existed who could more than adequately have made up her bench, for example, Andrew Perne, but she chose not to go that route.³⁹ The controversy fostered by the government in 1559 had a clear aim, and its intents and ends could hardly be said to be driven by anyone but Elizabeth.

Within weeks of his return to England he found himself in the thick of the religious controversy then consuming Parliament regarding the alteration of religion: he had been chosen along with seven other former exiles and also Edmund Guest, the future bishop of Rochester, to defend three peculiarly Protestant propositions in a disputation with a similar number of traditionalist Marian clergy. The attempts to change by statute the religion of England had run into the obstacle of the House of Lords, dominated still by the conservatives led by the bishops, despite the episcopal depletion at the end of Mary's reign.

The bishops greatly impede us, since they are, as you know, among the chief individuals and nobility in the upper house, and none of our men there are able by open speech to refute their deceit and arrogance; they reign alone among unlearned and ignorant men, and they easily hem in our enfeebled lords (*paterculos*) by either their numbers or the reputation of their learning.⁴⁰

On the Catholic side were five bishops, White of Winchester, Watson of Lincoln, Oglethorpe of Carlisle, Scott of Chester and Bayne of Coventry;

³⁷ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 45.

³⁸ Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants. The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 60–61.

³⁹ Patrick Collinson, 'Andrew Perne and his Times', in *Cambridge Monograph Series* no. 11, *Andrew Perne. Quatercentenary Studies* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 2.

⁴⁰ 'Magno nobis impedimento sunt episcopi: qui cum sint, ut scis, in superiori conclavi inter primores et proceres, et nemo ibi sit nostrorum hominum, qui illorum fucos et mendacia possit coram dicendo refutare, inter homines literarum et rerum imperitos soli regnant, et paterculos nostros facile vel numero vel opinione doctrinae circumscribunt.' Jewel, letter to Peter Martyr, 20 March 1559, in *Works*, IV, p. 1199.

the Abbot of Westminster Feckenham, also a member of the House of Lords, is listed by Jewel, but was not one of the formal debaters. Besides these was the Dean of St Paul's cathedral, Henry Cole; and two other clerics, William Chedsey D.D., the archdeacon of Middlesex and John Harpsfield (brother of Nicholas), the archdeacon of London.⁴¹ Chedsey, Harpsfield, Cole, Feckenham, Watson, Oglethorpe and Scott had all taken part in the 1554 Oxford disputations against Cranmer and Ridley and Chedsey had also been part of the 1549 disputation at Oxford with Peter Martyr. The disputation was to be held the Friday following Easter, of 1559, and the subsequent Monday. It was Jewel's activity in this controversy that may have commended him to Elizabeth's government as suitable material for a diocesan appointment. Doubtless his connection with Richard Cox did not hurt either.

The Disputation, Jewel's first public defense of Protestantism, was conducted primarily for the members of Parliament (though Jewel notes that a crowd larger than the peoples' expectations was present), the disputation taking place in the choir of Westminster Abbey. The three propositions on which the debate focused are contained in both Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* and in Holinshed's *Chronicle*. Though seemingly of little moment when compared with the other questions debated between Catholic and Protestant in the sixteenth century, the Protestants composed the questions for both their political and religious consequences: First, it is against the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in common prayers and the administration of the sacraments.⁴² Secondly, every particular church has authority to institute, change and abrogate ceremonies and rites in the church, so that to edify.⁴³ And lastly, 'that the propitiatory sacrifice, which the papists pretend to be in the mass, cannot be proved by the holy scriptures'.⁴⁴ The basic ground rules of the

⁴¹ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1200. Jewel lists the eight other Protestants as Scory, Cox, Whitehead, Sandys, Grindal, Horn, Aylmer and 'a Cambridge man of the name of Guest.' Apparently Sandys, later archbishop of York, did not participate in the disputation, as his name is not among the signatories of the sole article that was debated, whether the service of worship is to be in any but the vulgar tongue. See Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 62.

⁴² Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 56.

⁴³ Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 72. Cardwell reproduces the complete texts of the disputation, Horne's preface, the Protestant divines' written defense of the first proposition, Dean Cole's response and the Protestant defense of the second proposition. This is followed by letters of both Richard Cox and Jewel treating the matter, pp. 55-98. He does not list the third proposition.

⁴⁴ Jewel listed all three to Martyr. Jewel's take on the second one reveals the Protestant strategy for the debate of the second point some days before the Catholics even knew of the debate. *Works*, Letter to Martyr, 20 March 1559, IV, p. 1200.

debate called for written responses to the truth or nullity of the propositions, and then (perhaps) extempore comments following their reading. The first proposition was a standard criticism leveled by Protestantism against the Catholic practice of the Mass and the liturgy being said by the priest in Latin. For many Protestant apologists, the service said in Latin touched the theological question of the Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, but the Protestant disputants at Westminster never treated it from this vantage. Instead they handled the proposition as an exegetical matter, drawing almost the whole of their argument from St Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians:

The first part is most manifestly proved by the 14th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, almost throughout the whole chapter; in which chapter St Paul intreateth of this matter, *ex professo*, purposely: and although some do cavil, that St Paul speaketh not in that chapter of praying, but of preaching; yet it is most evident, to any indifferent reader of understanding ... that he plainly there speaketh ... of all other public actions which require any speech in the church.⁴⁵

Some patristic quotes are proffered, but that the whole priesthood should be participants in worship is never treated.⁴⁶ Conversely, the traditionalists, whose response to the point was presented by Dean Cole,⁴⁷ addressed the matter, on the one hand, on the basis of authority: did the Church possess the authority to order the worship of the faithful? And, on the other, on the grounds of unity: is not Latin the tongue of the mother church of Rome? Cole had presented first and was then followed by Horne, though only after Horne had taken the provocatively Protestant liberty of praying with his back to the altar, facing the people. Friday's part of the disputation ended after the reading of the Protestant answer,⁴⁸ and it was determined that the following Monday, 3 April, the respective sides would give an answer to the first day's assertions. But at the opening of the next session, Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon ordered the disputants to move to the second point and present their written treatises on it, treatises the Catholics said they did not have. When the traditionalists refused to treat the second point without addressing themselves to the first, the disputation ended.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 57. These mirror the arguments used by St Cyril the apostle to the Slavs in arguing for a Slavic liturgy.

⁴⁶ Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, pp. 56–62.

⁴⁷ Jewel contends that Cole spoke extempore, noting that the traditionalists had no written arguments prepared. Richard Cox merely states that Cole spoke in his own name (*Zurich Letters*, I, p. 27); Jewel that he was persuaded by the others (*Works*, IV, p. 1203). Cardwell does have the written text of Cole's remarks, *History of Conferences*, pp. 63–72.

⁴⁸ Cardwell has the order reversed.

⁴⁹ *Acts of the Privy Council*, VII, pp. 78–79. The cause of their interment is not listed,

Jewel, contradicting himself in the letter of 6 April, maintained, on the one hand, that the disputation was to pick up where it had left off the previous Friday and, on the other, that the rebuttals of the first day's proceedings were to be given on the third day, and that it had already been determined that the disputants would treat the second point touching the authority of regional churches on the second day. Jewel is echoed in his initial assessment by the account of the Recusant Nicholas Sander.⁵⁰ The altered record of the privy council also bears out that the Catholics' claim of fraud and deceit (this voiced also both by Il Schifanoya and Feria) at the least seems justified, especially as the format of the disputation had already been changed twice previously. Dickens argues that whichever side may have been justified, the second point, touching the authority of local churches, likely would never have been touched by the traditionalists, for to have affirmed it would have meant denouncing Rome, and to deny it would have involved them in treason.⁵¹ Yet this did not stop them from so arguing after the debate. Both A.G. Dickens and Norman Jones point out that the disputation served to contravene any assertion by the bishops that they had not been given a hearing, as well as to curtail their power within the House of Lords where they had thus far stymied any attempt at restoring Protestantism.⁵² This is clearly Jewel's sentiments in his 20 March letter to Martyr. Whether the bishops and the other traditional clerics hoped to avoid the Tower by avoiding a denial of the second proposition became academic, as both White and Watson were arrested for contumacy on 6 April. The bishops having been cowed, the Elizabethan Settlement subsequently passed through Parliament.⁵³

With regard to Jewel, the matter of the second point on the prerogative of regional councils demands some further thought. In his letter to Martyr on 20 March 1559, prior to the disputation, Jewel sets out the three points for debate, but the substance of the second as he related it to Martyr differs from that recorded by Foxe, Burnett, Holinshed and Cardwell. Jewel's version, 'that every provincial church, even without the bidding of a general council, has power either to establish, or change, or abrogate ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites,

though both Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, V, VIII (1563), pp. 692–93, and Holinshed, *Chronicles* IV (1587), p. 182, list it as contempt.

⁵⁰ Nicholas Sander, *Report to Cardinal Moroni*, in *Catholic Record Society Miscellanea*. I. London, 1905, p. 30.

⁵¹ Dickens, *English Reformation*, p. 301.

⁵² Norman L. Jones, *Faith by Statute*, pp. 123–29; Jones, 'Elizabeth's First Year: the Conception and Birth of the Elizabethan Political World', in Christopher Haigh, *The Reign of Elizabeth* (Athens, GA, 1987), pp. 42–43.

⁵³ Jones, *Faith by Statute*, pp. 129–37.

wherever it may seem to make for edification',⁵⁴ is certainly an expansion on 'Every particular church hath authority to institute, change, and abrogate ceremonies and rites in the church, so that to edify'. For Jewel, the added proviso 'even without the bidding of a general council,' qualifies even further the extent to which the larger church can exercise jurisdiction over a regional church. This motif recurs in Jewel's controversies with Harding, wherein Jewel *de facto* denied the power of general councils both by playing their decrees off those of local and regional councils, which contradicted them, and by citing the acts of certain councils which discredit specific dogmas which the traditionalist Harding avowed.⁵⁵ Jewel's granting regional churches such autonomy, an independent sovereignty largely deposited and realized in the prince, recurs in almost all of his writings and controversies.

By July of 1559 Jewel had been selected to be the bishop of Salisbury. Echoing such worthies as St Augustine and St Anselm, Jewel found the appointment a bother, telling Martyr that 'I have positively decided to shake off this burden'.⁵⁶ But the matter could hardly have been avoided, even though to Jewel and to many of the other new bishops, a number of whom had also been exiles, the office had been tainted. Martyr had counseled the former exile Thomas Sampson that it were better that the godly take the offices than that others – wolves and antichrists – should possess them:

In the first place I exhort you, by reason of the great want of ministers in your country, not to withdraw yourself from the function offered you: for if you who are as it were pillars, shall decline taking upon yourselves the performance of ecclesiastical offices, not only will the churches be destitute of pastors, but you will give place to wolves and antichrists. By remaining without any office you will be so far from amending those things which you dislike, that you will hardly retain what is now conceded.⁵⁷

Sampson did not heed Martyr's advice, turned down the bishopric of Norwich, and it subsequently was given to Jewel's former mentor

⁵⁴ 'Quamvis ecclesiam provincialem, etiam injussu generalis concilii, posse vel instituere, vel mutare, vel abrogare ceremonias et ritus ecclesiasticos, sicubi id videatur facere ad aedificationem.' *Works*, IV, p. 1199.

⁵⁵ In the first instance Jewel cites the Council of Nicaea as maintaining the propriety of clerical marriage over against Carthage which denied it; in the second instance he names the Councils of Basle and Constance as being opposed to the authority of the bishop of Rome in that both deposed popes. Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1053. This will be further discussed below.

⁵⁶ Jewel, letter to Martyr, 1 August 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1214.

⁵⁷ 1 February 1560, in the *Zurich Letters*, pp. 38–39. Given Martyr's letter to Hooper, one wonders why Sampson wrote to him at all.

Parkhurst. Sampson also never consented to other matters on which Martyr told him to bend, namely vestments.

For his part, Jewel manifested few qualms about the episcopal office;⁵⁸ his hesitancy relates to his belief that the office would curtail his studies. As to its pollution by past bishops, Jewel professed that so much of what had corrupted and diverted the old episcopal order had been corrected, including the matter of their lordly status.⁵⁹ Unlike Catholics who attached a sacramental role to the episcopate, for Jewel and the rest of the English Church, while there were three orders in the ministry, the order of bishop was nothing more than an office for order and administration. There was nothing a bishop possessed through his consecration that a minister did not have in ordination.⁶⁰ Whatever scruples Jewel may have had, he was now thoroughly a public servant of Her Majesty, a bishop to the people of England, and with perhaps one proviso, he always presented himself as the dutiful and faithful bishop. His first duty, before even being enthroned at Salisbury, was the execution of the visitations to the diocese in the southwest of England at the end of summer, 1559. Jewel, along with three other visitors, made their way across the south of England to enforce the Acts of Uniformity and to have clerics subscribe to the Supremacy. Armed with the Royal Injunctions, largely based on those of Edward VI of 1549, Jewel got his first taste of the life of a bishop. He was to find that London hardly was emblematic of the rest of the nation when it came to religion. The day Jewel returned from the Visitation, 2 November 1559, he recounted to Martyr the inventory of relics, witches and sorceresses, along with the corruption of all the cathedral chapters they visited, which he said were worse than a den of thieves, or even worse than that, if something that foul could be thought. He also told Martyr that Harding, who was then the treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral chapter, preferred to change his conditions rather than his opinions. According to Jewel he was not alone, as the biggest obstacle to true religion had been the priests, especially those who had at one time professed Protestantism. All in all, Jewel gave a depressing picture of his visitation, although he notes that the people were ‘satis propensos ad religionem’.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Though distressed about vestments (Letter to Martyr, 5 November 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1222) and the crucifix in Elizabeth’s chapel royal, the office per se never gave Jewel pause.

⁵⁹ ‘Opes episcoporum imminuntur, et ad mediocritatem quandam rediguntur; ut, semoti ab illa regia pompa et strepitu aulico, possint tranquillius et attentius vacare gregi Christi.’ Jewel, 2 November 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1220.

⁶⁰ Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 379. He is commenting on a passage from St Jerome.

⁶¹ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1216.

Whatever the private misgivings Jewel entertained about the state of English religion, in the fall of 1559, following his duties as a royal visitor, in the seven months he spent in London between the end of the Royal visitations and his departure for Salisbury, he emerged in his own right as a controversialist and apologist for the Elizabethan Settlement in the preaching of the Challenge Sermon. Although he publicly defended the material substance of the Elizabethan Church, he also expressed grave concerns about what may be termed formal or ceremonial religious matters. Two specific difficulties emerge in the aftermath of the Settlement of Religion, both touching ritual and worship, though only one assumed material importance for Jewel. In the first instance, the use of particular vestments became a tension in Jewel's mind that betrayed itself recurrently in his personal correspondence. Though a practice he believed best deserted, Jewel never felt constrained by his conscience to make an issue of the matter by a public dissent; indeed, on this issue he publicly always acted in concert with both his queen and his archbishop.

The second concern, that Elizabeth retained a crucifix in her chapel, differed from vestments, for it involved what Jewel believed was idolatry.⁶² Jewel had no sooner returned from his visitations than he found himself embroiled in controversy with his own coreligionists, primarily archbishop Parker and Richard Cox. Jewel had distinct notions about what it was appropriate for the monarch to practice, in that the monarch's practice could indeed become a precedent, the very thing he feared would become the end of Elizabeth's infatuation. He had already confessed to Martyr that Elizabeth's affectations could set policy with respect to her retention of even an expurgated Mass in her chapel:

Itaque factum est, ut multis jam in locis missae etiam invitis edictis sua sponte ceciderint. Quod si regina ipsa eam abigeret e suo larario, res omnis facillime posset confici. Tanti sunt apud nos exempla principum: quod enim regis exemplo fit, id vulgus, ut scis non dubitat recte fieri.⁶³

⁶² 'That little silver cross, of ill-omened origin, still maintains its place in the queen's chapel.' Letter of 16 November 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1225.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 1205. 14 April 1559 to Martyr. 'Thus it is that the mass has stopped of itself, even with such unhelpful laws. Now if the queen herself would remove it from her chapel, the whole matter might easily be resolved. Such are the examples of princes, since what is done by the example of the prince, as you know, the people consider it to be done correctly.' However, he does concede 'Nonetheless she has so tempered her mass, which she keeps but for present considerations, that, even though there is much in it that should not be tolerated, one is able to listen to it without great peril.' 'Quamquam illa ita missam illam suam, quam adhuc temporis tantum causa retinet, temperavit, ut, quamvis in ea multa gerantur quae ferri vix possint, tamen non ita magno cum periculo audiri possint.' p. 1205.

This is exactly what he feared about the crucifix, that ‘Me miserum! res ea facile trahetur in exemplum’.⁶⁴ The arguments and controversy extend from at least November to February, 1559–60. Thomas Sampson wrote Martyr that the very thing Jewel feared was coming to pass:

what can I hope for when the ministry of the word is banished from court? while the crucifix is allowed, with lights burning before it? The altars indeed are removed, and images also throughout the kingdom; the crucifix and candles are retained at court alone. And the wretched multitude are not only rejoicing at this, but will imitate it of their own accord.⁶⁵

Sampson, who had previously leaned on Martyr for advice on whether he should accept preferment, now addressed the big question:

whether the image of the crucifix, placed on the table of the Lord with lighted candles, is to be regarded as a thing indifferent; and if it is not to be so considered, but as an unlawful and wicked practice, then, I ask, suppose the queen should enjoin all the bishops and clergy, either to admit this image together with candles, into their churches, or to retire from the ministry of the word, what should be our conduct in this case?⁶⁶

Sampson’s sentiments were echoed by Richard Cox, who wrote Martyr sometime before February 1560:

Respecting our affairs, what shall I write? by the blessing of God, all those heads of religion are restored to us which we maintained in the time of King Edward. We are only constrained to our great distress of mind, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and him who was crucified: the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling-block may at length be removed.⁶⁷

Subsequent to this Cox refused to serve in Elizabeth’s chapel, and gave Elizabeth a letter stating his conscience. The letter, preserved by Strype, lays out the basic Protestant notions about images equalling idols.⁶⁸ The sequel of Cox’s action shall be rehearsed anon. So bitter did the contention become that Jewel feared not only for his own, but for the episcopal offices of others, the very choice that Sampson feared. Jewel’s fear no doubt included Edmund Grindal, the bishop of London, who along with Jewel were to debate before the council and some judges picked by the council. They debated Matthew Parker and Richard Cox. Whether Cox lost his nerve, or somehow was illuminated to a different position is not known. Jewel certainly seemed to lose all regard for him:

⁶⁴ Ibid., 1224. ‘Have mercy! this thing shall easily turn into an precedent!’

⁶⁵ *Zurich Letters*, II, p. 63.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 64.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 66. The letter is undated.

⁶⁸ Strype, *Annals*, I, i, p. 260.

Vix credas in re fatua quantum homines, qui aliquid sapere videbantur, insaniant. Ex illis, quos quidem tu noris, praeter Coxum nullus est ... Rideo tamen, cum cogito, quibus illi et quam gravibus et solidis rationibus defensuri sint suam cruculam.⁶⁹ In the event, though the crucifix, intermittently, remained in the chapel royal, neither Sampson's nor Jewel's fears were realized, and no consciences were constrained, nor were any bishops deprived.

As for Cox, it appears that his attitude took an Erasmian bent, for a month after the debate he wrote to his acquaintance George Cassander of Cologne, then leader of the Erasmian party among the Catholics. Cox, a bit disingenuous, wrote Cassander that there 'is no open quarrel, but yet there does not exist an entire agreement among us with respect to setting up the crucifix in the churches, as had heretofore been the practice'. He continues that some will countenance them if they are neither worshiped nor venerated, but others assert that all images are forbidden. He then sets forth that 'no crucifix is now-a-days to be seen in any of our churches'.

Cassander writes back at length, though under the assumption that Cox is referring to a bare cross, without a *corpus* upon it. Cassander takes Cox along a rather Carolingian trek, even citing the *Liber Carolini* to the effect that having the form of a cross was a venerable thing. Cassander valorizes the making of the sign of the cross, or blessing oneself (which, ironically Calvin saw as an ancient and sound act⁷⁰), and that the ancient church (Cassander cites Irenaeus and Gregory of Tours) certainly used and venerated the cross. Cassander, oddly, seems to embrace the use of an eight-pointed cross commonly associated with Slavonic Churches. Cassander also asserts the assumption many Protestants (Jewel among them) refused to recognize, that there is a fundamental distinction between *veneratio* and *adoratio*, and Cassander maintained this not by an overt declaration of the argument, but by using the arguments employed by iconophiles of the Greek Church in the eighth and ninth centuries, that veneration given to images is analogous to that which a subject pays to the emperor when the image of the emperor is venerated in coins and seals. This argument the iconophiles took directly from St Basil of Caesarea, and Cassander reproduces the same to Cox. It should be wondered how surprising this response was to what Cox asked.⁷¹

⁶⁹ 'You would hardly believe to what degree men (archbishop Parker and bishop Cox), who once seemed to be wise, are mad in regard to this silly matter.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1228.

⁷⁰ Calvin's *Ecclesiastical Advice*, trans. Mary Beatty and Benjamin Farley (Louisville, 1991), p. 74. In a letter to Mme de Beze, and dated 1562.

⁷¹ For both letters see *Zurich Letters*, II, pp. 42–47.

Simultaneous with Jewel's consternation over the crucifix and his carping about the use of vestments,⁷² Jewel prepared and delivered his Challenge Sermon, an address given three separate times in the course of the fall and spring, 1559–60. Jewel first preached his sermon 26 November 1559 at Paul's Cross. The merchant Henry Machyn noted that the sermon was witnessed by as 'grett audyense as [has] bene at Powelles crosse', and that it was attended as well by a number from court.⁷³ Jewel preached the sermon the second time before Elizabeth's court on 17 March 1560. He would preach it for a third time on the second Sunday before Easter, 31 March 1560, and this time it was again delivered before a prominent crowd at Paul's Cross.⁷⁴ In isolation, the initial sermon could have been viewed as merely another among many of the Protestant diatribes against Rome, as Southgate points out; but that it was preached before court, and then given a third hearing, once again at Paul's Cross, marked it as a public, official challenge to traditional religionists.⁷⁵ Jewel proffered 27 propositions, which,

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 ... if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles ... I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe.⁷⁶

In the first delivery of the sermon Jewel had used 15 propositions, and with the subsequent sermons added the additional 12.⁷⁷ Most of the propositions, 22 to be exact, revolve around the niceties and complexities of Catholic sacramental theology and liturgical traditions of the Eucharist. The other five challenges touch on issues substantial enough in themselves (the use of icons or images, the use of the vernacular in both common prayer and the reading of Scripture, papal jurisdiction and whether ignorance led to piety),⁷⁸ but the preponderance of Jewel's challenge focused on points pertaining to the Mass.

⁷² '(that scenic dress ... these trifles) are indeed as you very properly observe, the relics of the Amorites.' Jewel, Letter to Martyr, 5 November 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1223.

⁷³ Henry Machyn, *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550–1563* (London: Camden Society, 1848), p. 218.

⁷⁴ The text of the third sermon, amplified from the original November 1559, is reproduced in the Parker Society edition of Jewel, *Works*, I, pp. 3–25.

⁷⁵ Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, p. 49.

⁷⁶ Jewel, 'The Challenge Sermon', *Works*, I, pp. 20–21.

⁷⁷ See Appendix I (pp. 251–2) for the 27 challenges.

⁷⁸ That the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue; that the bishop of Rome was then called a universal bishop, or the head of the universal church; that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people might worship them; that

Many of the arguments Jewel used in treating the Mass apply to seeming minutiae, matters probably too arcane for the vast majority of the faithful in England to have contemplated, let alone considered at any length. But with such matters Jewel felt he retained the upper hand in debate, to the exclusion of matters with which he could not hope to flourish given the terms and parameters he had adduced: justification by faith alone, the Protestant doctrine of *sola scriptura*, the invocation of saints, *inter alia*. It is on just such matters and points that Jewel's challenge was initially answered. Two of the previously mentioned traditionalists, the Dean of St Paul's Cathedral Henry Cole, and the former Salisbury treasurer Thomas Harding, both of whom were educated at Oxford, were quick to point this out. Cole, in a letter to Jewel following his second delivery of the Sermon, inquired about the parameters of Jewel's Challenge:

why ye rather offer both in your sermon yesterday in the court, and at all times and at all other times at Paul's Cross, to dispute in these four points, than in the chief matters that lie in question betwixt the church of Rome and the protestants. It seemeth to me far the nearer way to compass that you would so fain win, if ye began not with such matters, which we deny not but a general council might take order that they should be practised as ye would have it.⁷⁹

Cole then listed several articles which he considered more germane to the present debate than those offered by Jewel; among them the value of a Christian's good works, whether the Mass is at all tolerable, whether it is in any way a sacrifice and whether there is any Scripture denying the use of saints as intercessors. Cole then concludes, 'I ween, if ye had the upper hand but in one of these questions, the world might well think we were smally to be trusted in all the rest.'⁸⁰ Cole then breaks Jewel's challenges down to four issues: whether the substance of bread and wine remain after consecration, whether the people can tolerably receive under one kind, whether it is offensive to God that a common service be performed in Latin and whether it is offensive to God for a priest to say Mass without someone else to communicate with him. Jewel responded by reiterating his challenge, accusing Cole of being a poor listener (or rather a non-listener, as he must have obtained his information from someone who attended the sermon and then poorly reported it to him). Cole, says Jewel in his response, 'misliketh all sermons, and yet will not

the laity were then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue; that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience. Numbers 3, 4, 14, 15 and 27 respectively. Jewel, *Works*, I, pp. 20–21. For many of these it is evident that Jewel is erecting straw adversaries, imputing meanings beyond his antagonists' words.

⁷⁹ Henry Cole, an open letter to Jewel, 18 March 1560, in Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 26.

⁸⁰ Cole, 18 March 1560, in Jewel, *Works*, I, pp. 26–27.

vouchsafe to hear one'. Jewel emphasized again the parameters of his challenge, limiting the number of councils to which appeal can be made and the time frame in which the disputants may garner evidence.⁸¹

Cole's second response takes up the basic nature of Jewel's negative argument: that these certain items as listed are nowhere found within the constraints given. Cole objected that Jewel as a bishop should 'first approve it (Protestant doctrine) unto such as doubt' and that 'I stand in place and case to learn, and you a man appointed to teach', that is, Jewel had asserted nothing positive and had only set about to tear down: the criteria advanced by Jewel are insufficient for a real debate of the matters. In Cole's third response he lays out the foundational issues as he sees them, noting that the primitive church was not the full measure of what the Church should be:

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

This concept, says Cole, he has drawn from St Ambrose.⁸²

After a brief response to several of Cole's items, Jewel took up his challenge in a more substantial manner, returning to the several points Cole raised, but never moving from the position he had maintained in the various Challenge Sermons, calling merely for the traditionalists to proffer one authority to show that on these points he was mistaken. To Cole's point about the Church having a life which passes through stages of maturity, Jewel merely responded that 'I never heard before now that Christ and his apostles were called infants; or that every man before now took it upon him to set them to school'. He further answered that how was the Church in its infancy if it were the time of the Fathers? Cole's seeking to address what Catholics considered Protestant novelties, not being part of Jewel's Challenge, was never addressed.

Jewel's answering Cole by an obfuscation of metaphors – a commonplace in his writings – betrays either a poor grasp of his opponents' implications, a poor ability to see the extent to which their arguments can be pushed, or a panoply of arguments built more around rhetorical gamesmanship than theological explication. Jewel's usual manner of answering arguments entails listing one authority after another;⁸³ he seldom treated the assertions of his antagonists on either

⁸¹ Jewel, letter to Cole, 20 March 1560, in *Ibid.*, pp. 27–28.

⁸² Cole, letter to Jewel, 8 April 1560, *Ibid.*, pp. 36–40. The argument sounds like an incipient Cardinal Newman.

⁸³ In commenting on Dean Colet, Harbison notes that this is what distinguished a

theological or dialectical grounds. Jewel developed a *via negativi canonis*, a set of parameters devised to assert what was not held by the ancient church, never a canon to divine what the Fathers positively held. This basic negative approach served more as a means to eradicate the whole edifice of traditionalism by embracing a minimum of fundamental dogmas, than as any positive platform on which to construct a purely Protestant theology.

Jewel's polemical method: the Challenge Sermon, Henry Cole and Thomas Harding

The Challenge Sermon made Jewel a controversialist in his own right. Though it never directly addressed the powers of national churches, both the substance of the Challenge Sermon and the circumstances in which it originated, reveal fundamental methodological aspects of Jewel's apologetic, particularly when aimed at Rome. For Jewel, it was Rome that was the innovator, not only in that it had abandoned the early Church on certain matters, but that it as well claimed the early Church as an authority on certain points on which the Fathers had in fact been silent. Ironically, Jewel himself finds little positive content in the Fathers for his own creed. Jewel's response to Cole merely adumbrated the more extended rebuttal he would give to Thomas Harding. Jewel's written disputes with Cole lasted but two months (18 March to 18 May); his exchange with Harding would consume the largest part of the rest of his polemical life. Jewel's tedious and pedantic response, following the commonplace of his day, virtually reproduces Harding's almost equally tedious and pedantic *Rejoindre* in his own *Replie unto M. Hardings Answer*. Paragraph by paragraph, section by section, Jewel seeks to contravene Harding's assertions and responses to the Challenge Sermon. Why Jewel did not eventually answer Harding's 1567 *Rejoindre*, which specifically addressed the matter of the real presence in the sacramental elements, and the propitiatory nature of the Eucharist, is not known, though he did answer Harding's later attacks on the *Apologia*. The answer may be that Jewel became consumed in his *Defense of the Apology*, first published in 1567 in response to Harding's 1565 *Confutation of a Booke intituled an Apologie*. Jewel then expanded and republished his *Defense* in 1570 and 1571, following Harding's 1568 *Detection of sundry foul errors uttered by M Jewel in his Defence of the*

humanist from a scholastic, that scholastics merely piled one proof text on top of another. Cf. Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation*, pp. 59–61.

Apology.⁸⁴ But whatever the reason for his lack of further response beyond his *Replie unto M. Hardings Answer*, in what Jewel did write he asserted little by way of a positive creed or dogma, and is instead wholly consumed by delineating what the ancient Church did not teach. Though never overtly saying so, his main task is clearly not a defense of English Protestant religion, but the denial that Roman dogma had any claim on antiquity. Jewel's failure to treat such topics as prayers for the dead, the treasury of merit, the meritorious nature of good works and the sacerdotal nature of the Christian ministry, betrays a tacit admission that these traditionalist doctrines existed and were well defined within the period he had marked, and that those several things he had slighted were those things he could easily enough dismiss. Both Cole and Harding made this point. That this did not stop them from playing by Jewel's rules does not say, however, that they believed that all that Jewel attacked was either material or integral to traditionalist doctrine. What it does say is that they were not going to allow Jewel to go unchallenged in his assertions. Some have slighted Cole, Harding and others, who responded to Jewel,⁸⁵ but it seems that given the nature of Reformation polemics and the absolute claims proffered by either side, that to have left anything uncontested would have been seen as conceding your protagonist's point.⁸⁶

Jewel produced not a single assertion of how the Fathers could be used in a normative way, for the whole goal of his enterprise was to rid the Fathers of any normative, authoritative consensus. He seldom commented upon the Scriptures he proffered in light of Patristic authority, and he never gave any precise interpretations to the writers and points Harding made. Instead Jewel responded by way of confutation, either to slight what Harding's quotations asserted, or by the use of syllogism and logic – and that at times shoddily employed – to rob Harding's authorities of the weight that he asserted they bore. Jewel seemed less interested in argument and more interested in scoring rhetorical points. In his very first letter in response to Jewel's Challenge Sermon, when Henry Cole maintained that the debate Jewel proffered must proceed *dialectice*, and that learning and not words should govern

⁸⁴ See the biographical memoir in the Parker Society edition of Jewel's *Works*, IV, pp. xxvi–xxviii for a catalogue of Jewel's works, extant and lost, and as well for a chronology of the printed disputations between Jewel and Harding. This chronology is reproduced in Appendix II.

⁸⁵ F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, 1967) pp. 107–9.

⁸⁶ Jewel had put it 'Now therefore, if it be leefull for these folks to be eloquent and fine-tongued in speaking evil, surely it becometh not us in our cause, being so very good, to be dumb in answering truly'. *Apologia*, in *Works*, III, p. 55.

debate, he addressed the perception that rhetoric and oratory drove Jewel's arguments more than scholastic methods and syllogistic logic.⁸⁷ Cole, who spent the next several months in the Tower before being transferred to the Fleet prison (his residence for the next 19 years), must have thought of this often in reading Jewel's responses to Harding. Jewel's slighting of dialectic, theology, and the disciplines of humanism abound in his works.

In commenting upon the sixth proposition of the Challenge Sermon in his *Answer to Ivell*, that Christ's body is, or may be, in a thousand places or more at one time, Harding had argued that

although the body of Christ be naturall and humane in dede, yet through the vnion and coniunction, many thinges be possible to the same now, that to all other bodies be impossible; as to walke vpon waters, to vanishe awaye out of sight, to be transfigured and made bright as the sunne, to ascende vp through clowdes: and after it became immortall, death being conquered, to ryse vp againe out of the graue, and to entre through doores fast shutte.⁸⁸

Harding predicated his response upon the doctrine of *communicatio idiomatum*, that those attributes that belonged to either nature of the Incarnate Christ, divine or human, could be properly attributed, through the unity of the Person, to the other nature. This would seem the same line of argument followed by certain Lutherans in maintaining their peculiar Eucharistic doctrine of consubstantiation, a line of argument known as ubiquitarianism, that Christ's resurrected body is everywhere present, and thus can be physically present in elements of the Communion. Only this is not what Harding is defending here, but merely that the body of Christ, even before his resurrection, had done things other bodies were incapable of, and now after his exaltation limits cannot be set to the capabilities of Christ's human nature. In response, Jewel writes,

Now let us consider Harding's arguments: Christ's body walked upon waters: It entered through the doors being shut: it Ascended through the clouds: *Ergo*, it may be at one time in sundry places. Although this argument may soon be espied, having utterly no manner sequel in reason, yet the folly thereof may the better appear by the like: St Peter walked upon the water: Elias was taken up into the clouds: St Bartholomew entered through the doors being shut; *Ergo*, St Peter, Elias, and St Bartholomew may be at one time in sundry places.⁸⁹

To belabor the many places of Jewel's illogic or his misapplication of

⁸⁷ Henry Cole to John Jewel, 18 March 1560, in Jewel, *Works*, Vol I, p. 26.

⁸⁸ Harding, *Answer to Ivell*, p. 136.

⁸⁹ Jewel, *Replie to Harding*, in *Works*, I, p. 483.

theology goes beyond the scope of the chapter, but it should be noted that here Jewel's argument rests upon Peter, Elijah and Bartholomew having by nature physical properties similarly empowered to supernatural ends in the same manner as Christ's body was also supernaturally empowered in his Incarnation; a point Jewel could not have admitted to. Jewel here follows, however, a line against the traditionalist doctrine of the real presence that had been set out for him by Peter Martyr in his *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*.⁹⁰ Martyr had written the dialogue against the peculiar Eucharistic views of Johannes Brenz and Brenz's doctrine of ubiquitarianism, the means whereby Brenz chose to defend the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. This was not the official Lutheran explanation of the doctrine, for indeed such an argument had already been repudiated by both the Lutheran theologian Chemnitz and the Formula of Concord (although it did not deny that Christ according to his human nature could be everywhere). Martyr had dedicated the work to Jewel, and had cast Jewel as Palaemon, one of the characters, and the judge of the dialogue. In his letter thanking Martyr for the honor, Jewel referred to this work as *Orothetes* (Greek: ὀροθέτης, one who sets boundaries).⁹¹ Martyr's argument basically affirms the temporal presence of Christ's body in heaven, and denies that it possessed supra- or trans-temporal qualities that would make it more than a human body.

Jewel's tacit dismissal of Harding's major premise – the supernatural effect that both the divine nature and the divine person of Christ had upon the human body of the Incarnation – is apparent in his making the major premise of his argument the identity of Christ's incarnate body with the merely temporal and defined nature of the human bodies of Peter and Thomas, *inter alia*. Jewel's syllogism would run: Peter performed miracles as Christ performed miracles, Peter as to his humanity is limited, ergo Christ as to his humanity is limited. This is a four-term syllogism, thus an equivocal one, stemming from the equivocal 'middle term' of the first term of the syllogism, that Christ's and Peter's bodies (*inter alia*) are supernaturally effected in the same way. Jewel does not make this clear, and had this been his point he would have transgressed orthodoxy to have done so.⁹² Jewel in his polemical works

⁹⁰ Peter Martyr Vermigli, *The Peter Martyr Library*, Vol II, *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, Vol XXXI of *Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies*, trans. and ed., with introduction by John Patrick Donnelly, S.J. (Kirksville, MO, 1995).

⁹¹ See Jewel, Letter to Martyr, 7 February 1562, *Works*, IV, 1245–46. See also McClelland, *Visible Words*, pp. 65–67. The antagonist is the personification of Brenz, dubbed Pantachus (Greek, everywhere).

⁹² It is not clear whether Jewel's equivocation on this point was a willful tactic employed merely for the rhetorical points to be had with his assumed audience, or his own

never detailed a full and explicit doctrine of the Eucharist in contrast to the traditionalist one. That was neither his method nor his goal: it was not his goal, for that was to deprive traditionalist recourse to the ancient Church, not the proffering of any formal creed; it was not his method, for to articulate a Eucharistic dogma would ultimately open him up to the same tactics as he had used on the Catholics.⁹³ The arguments Jewel used mirror ones Martyr used in the *Dialogue*, but actually twisted them. Martyr's syllogism works for it seeks to show that the power that produced the miracles that accompanied Peter, et al., had no bearing upon the question of Christ's presence and his human nature.⁹⁴ As John Rastell pointed out in his *Confutation*, Jewel's argument about the ascension of Christ (Martyr's point against Brenz) is without effect in addressing Catholic Eucharistic thought, as substance does not have place, a property that only obtains of accidents.⁹⁵ As a consequence, the substance of Christ's body may be anywhere and everywhere.

Jewel's arguments with Harding in the context of the Challenge Sermon, and as Harding would emphasize in his later writings, primarily revolved around not merely Jewel's denial of the traditional Catholic understanding of the Eucharist, but how this denial was effected. For all the energy that Jewel must have put into the controversy, there is little that commends itself to a student wondering just what Jewel would have asserted were his own beliefs, not merely about the Eucharist, but about the authority of the ancient Church. At times he would use the Church Fathers approvingly; at other times he would cite them, admitting that he did not necessarily believe what they had said, but used them nonetheless because they bolstered his arguments.⁹⁶

Harding saw that many of Jewel's categories in the Challenge Sermon were so many deflections that dealt with few substantial issues; they instead focused on matters which, according to the Catholics, having found their origins in Patristic understandings, only fully developed in the medieval period. One of these was the use of the canopy. The canopy, or baldachin, was a covering or 'veil' widely used in English churches for the

theological and personal assumptions led him astray on this point.

⁹³ For Jewel's Eucharistic theology see Chapter Three and the discussion regarding both the question of consecration in Cranmer's Prayer Book Communion service, and how union is effected in Communion.

⁹⁴ Donnelly, *Dialogue*, pp. 140–42.

⁹⁵ Rastell, *Confutation*, f. 101a.

⁹⁶ This can be seen in the above use of the story that St Bartholomew walked through a door, as reported by one Abdias, bishop of Babylon (*Works*, I, p. 483). Jewel on the one hand calls it 'but a vain fable' and then writes 'and yet it may not easily be denied. For ... Abdias ... as Master Harding supposeth, saw Christ in the flesh'.

reservation of the host. Canopies were erected over altars and from them a pyx would be suspended, often in the shape of a dove, as the one alluded to by Harding in a quote from St Basil, in which the consecrated host was kept for the purpose of adoration. Harding had little to say about the matter for he happily contended that the canopy was not an issue of any great moment, but rather the reservation of the elements, for which the canopy served.⁹⁷ Jewel sought by calling into question the accidents surrounding the practice of reservation to call into question the practice itself, and from thence to attack the notion of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements. By this approach Jewel laid the groundwork for his notion of worthy reception, that is, Christ was present spiritually to those who in faith received him. To maintain this stance Jewel not only had to vitiate the dogma of the real presence and all its forms medieval or otherwise,⁹⁸ but the Patristic antecedents of it as well.

The canopy provided an easy target, for since it was a means later developed for the veneration of the consecrated, reserved elements, Jewel could attack it as an aberration, and thereby call into question the doctrine on which it was predicated. But even within the eight pages of arguments that comprise Jewel's chapter on the Canopy (following the commonplace of controversial literature, Jewel reprints the text from Harding which he wished to refute), Harding still demonstrated that the Fathers were not so Protestant as the bishop of Salisbury might have hoped.⁹⁹ But in whatever respect they were not caused Jewel no real alarm, for if they were not Protestant, neither were they popish. This is the message of Jewel's citing the liturgies of the Greek Church by way of example, played out in both the Challenge Sermon, and in Jewel's *Defense of the Apology*, where Jewel cited the liturgies of St James, St John Chrysostom, St Basil and the Armenian liturgy, all of which testify that the Latin rite is not the sole claimant to antiquity and

⁹⁷ 'If Jewel would in plain terms deny the reservation and keeping of the blessed sacrament, for which purpose the pix and canopy served in the churches of England ...' quoted in Jewel, *Works*, II, p. 553.

⁹⁸ Jewel in his letters, sermons and treatises virulently attacked both transubstantiation and the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, that the presence of Christ existed in, under, and through the sacramental elements. Cf. *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, Jewel, *Works*, II, pp. 1098–139, and the varied and often weak response to Harding, noted above, 'Of Real Presence', *Works*, I, 445–79.

⁹⁹ Harding readily admits that there is no mention of the canopy in the early Church, but does not admit what Jewel hoped thereby to deny, the reservation of the sacrament in a visible place at the altar. Jewel for his part cannot deny the quotation from Amphilochius's biography of Basil. For Harding's quote of St Basil, in Jewel, *Works*, II, pp. 559–60. Also Harding, *An Answer to Maister Ivelles Challenge* (Antwerpe, 1565. Reprint, Scolar Press, 1975) pp. 155 verso–158 recto. The Scolar Press edition of Harding is part of a larger collection of English recusant literature.

apostolicity.¹⁰⁰ Since this is so, why cannot Cranmer or the English Church produce their own rite?

Jewel's proffering the question of *individuum vagum*, a logical distinction dealing with indifferent individuals and second intentions, but applied by some late medieval theologians (Jewel cited the nominalist Robert Holcot) to *hoc* of *hoc est corpus meum*, can be seen in the same light. Harding spent little time on the matter, for how did scholastic meanderings substantially touch the Faith? Harding asserted against Jewel's point that Catholic piety had always professed that 'in this sacrament, after consecration, is the very body of Christ, and that upon credit of his own words, *Hoc est corpus meum*'.¹⁰¹ Harding denounced what he took for the unlearned musings of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Cranmer and Martyr. In response Jewel then provided a whole litany of Catholic theologians who had made differing comments on the words under question, *individuum vagum* being only one of their various explanations. Jewel lays out the cacophony to attack the notion that Rome had a unified teaching on the question of the real presence, even though the whole matter was in fact whether the concept of *individuum vagum* was Patristic in its origin. Harding thought the point not worth treating; Jewel used it to attack the notion of the unity of the Catholic Faith.¹⁰²

Likewise when Jewel condemned and attacked monasticism he sought to eradicate certain things (manners of devotion and piety) that had been asserted as canon (*ut legem, credendi statuat lex orandi*). But, it is not simply a manner of arguing against monasticism based on the redefinition of the term 'religious', or of condemning the piety built around monasticism. The Reformation agenda as a whole called for more than a correction of abuses, but a wholesale reconstruction of piety and dogma, liturgy and structure. A Reformed monasticism would not be a cure, as monasticism at bottom was part of the problem. Late medieval piety had assumed an ubiquitous presence in the life of the laity, not merely on institutional levels, but in a reification of the sacred in all sectors of the mundane.¹⁰³ There was as well a commensurate saturation of all areas of the transmundane, that is, the cult of the saints. Facile

¹⁰⁰ Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 154, and IV, p. 887.

¹⁰¹ Quoted in Jewel, *Works*, II, p. 787.

¹⁰² John Henry Newman treats at length Jewel's arguments that the seeming breadth of theological opinion in the Catholic Church dwarfed the differences among the Protestants. *Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*. Vol I. Lecture 10. (London, 1850).

¹⁰³ Johann Huizinga gives the illustration of the mystic Henry Suso. 'At table Suso eats three-quarters of an apple in the name of the Trinity and the remaining quarter in commemoration of "the love with which the heavenly Mother gave her tender child Jesus

assumptions about relics dominated the life of both great and small; Luther's own prince, Duke Frederick the Wise of Saxony, had an enormous collection of relics.¹⁰⁴ The banality of the sacred, the selling of forgiveness, the diffuse character of redemption,¹⁰⁵ in the minds of the Reformers, all arose from the sacramental, sacerdotal system of the medieval Church.

Basic then to Reformation assumptions was that the Renaissance Church stood in desperate need of correction in piety and devotion. In this they were not original, as the late medieval church had been littered with reform movements, and the elusive goal of purity in devotion animated most of the monastic reform movements in the medieval world. This ambition for purity was so universally held, and so numerous, abundant and widespread were new monastic orders and institutions – almost all established either for the purpose of reform, or in response to the perceived decline in existing monastic institutions – that the fourth Lateran Council in 1215 banned the introduction of any new orders. Yet this did not daunt the reform-minded. By the fifteenth century, the expedient of adopting as a rule the flexible and more open *regula* of St Augustine (a better pedigree than Benedict) had circumvented this attempted institutional brake on reforming monastic activities. The Augustinian rule served for two of the more popular and strict of the fifteenth-century orders: The Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life; and the Austin Friars, that Order which embraced the Observant movement of which Luther himself was a part.¹⁰⁶ The *devotio moderna*, often narrowly identified with the Brethren of the Common Life, exercising a vast influence over numerous and influential individuals,¹⁰⁷ sought to alter the very notion of communal life. Its piety, stripped of the usual conventions of the monastic disciplines, still exhibited a strong austerity and moral rigorism, all witnessed to by à Kempis's *De imitatio Christi*.¹⁰⁸

an apple to eat"; and for this reason he eats the last quarter with the paring, as little boys do not peel their apples.' *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (London, 1924), p. 137. But see especially all of Chapter XII, 'Religious Thought Crystallizing into Images', pp. 136–59.

¹⁰⁴ Martin Treu gives the figure of 19,033 relics housed within 12 galleries in the nave of the Wittenberg castle church. *Martin Luther in Wittenberg* (Wittenberg, 2000), p. 15.

¹⁰⁵ 'It was an irresistible tendency to reduce the infinite to the finite, to disintegrate all mystery.' Huizinga, *Waning*, p. 139.

¹⁰⁶ That Observantism and the *devotio moderna* were not the same see Heiko Oberman *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Durham, 1983), pp. 343–46.

¹⁰⁷ Including Jean Gerson, Thomas à Kempis, Gabriel Biel, Nicholas of Cusa, Luther, and of course, Erasmus.

¹⁰⁸ See Francis Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1979), pp. 100–12.

However austere or ascetic the new orders may have been, the very notion that 'religious' was a noun applicable to professed clergy, monks, or nuns, flew in the face of the basic implications of the Reformation principle of justification by faith alone: 'Therefore, those now called "the religious", i.e., priests, bishops and popes, possess no further or greater dignity than other Christians, except that their duty is to expound the word and administer the sacraments.'¹⁰⁹ No institution or priest mediated the grace of salvation, such attempted mediation was rendered not only unnecessary, but an affront to the divine economy of redemption and the efficacy of the atoning death of Christ. Justification by faith alone cast devotion in a new form, one removed from the sacramental system in which the suppliant is dependent on a priest. Instead the Church becomes an effect of salvation, an institution where the believer resides as a consequence of grace.¹¹⁰

This redefinition of devotion Jewel happily employed. In both personal correspondence and polemical tract Jewel attacked the fundamental medieval notion that largely identified the cleric and monastic with the religious.

As to your expressing your hopes that our bishops will be consecrated without any superstitions and offensive ceremonies, you mean, I suppose, without oil, without the chrism, without tonsure. And you are not mistaken; for the sink would indeed have been emptied to no purpose, if we had suffered those dregs to settle at the bottom. Those oily shaven hypocrites we have sent back to Rome from whence we first imported them.¹¹¹

Here Jewel hits upon two points, the first that the whole order of the Catholic clergy, in and of themselves, constituted one of the chief problems with the Church, a clergy characterized by superstition in ceremony and rite; and second, that this problem arose as a usurpation of each regional church's liberties, and thus the remedy of packing them

¹⁰⁹ Martin Luther, *An Appeal to the German Nobility*, in Dillenberger, *Luther: Selections*, pp. 409–10.

¹¹⁰ *Luther's Small Catechism*, q. 175. 'What is the holy Christian Church? The holy Christian Church is the communion of saints, that is, the *whole number of believers in Christ*; for all believers, and *only* believers are members of this Church.' (St Louis, 1943). Cf. Luther's Smalcald Articles, III.12. 'Thank God, a child seven years old knows what the church is, namely, the holy believers and the lambs that hear their Shepherd's voice. For the children pray thus: I believe in a holy Christian Church. This holiness does not consist in surplices, tonsures, long clerical gowns, and other ceremonies of theirs, fabricated by them without the warrant of Holy Writ, but in God's Word and in true faith.' Quoted in Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther's World of Thought*, trans. Martin Bertram (St Louis, 1958), p. 134.

¹¹¹ To Josiah Simler, 2 November 1559, Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1221.

'back to Rome from whence we first imported them'. Concerning superstition in rites and practice, Jewel and the other Reformers were capitalizing on ideas and rhetoric ready made.¹¹² But the Reformers went further than any of the Renaissance criticism. For Jewel, the criticisms of monasticism he happily retained, though in his case as with other Reformers, as shall so often be seen, *abusus tollit usum*.¹¹³

The Reformers slighted much of late-medieval devotion as merely another expansion of a corrupt system, a new form of the old misery. As with Jewel, many reformers gladly pilfered Erasmus and others for arguments against monasticism; but in the case of the other Reformers, as in Jewel's, they were all apprehended not to effect the reform of monasticism, but for its removal. In a short section of *The Defence of the Apology*, Jewel proceeds against monasticism, using for his assault not Protestant notions of the Christian vocation and the priesthood of all believers, but a litany of citations drawn from patristic and medieval sources. Following a *modus operandi* usual to him, Jewel piles citation on top of citation, often without critical comment, all aimed at his assumed audience and reader, the faithful of the Church of England. Among those Jewel coopted for his assault on monasticism were St Augustine of Hippo, St Bernard of Clairvaux, Erasmus and St Jerome; each in his turn adopted to attack some element of monasticism – sloth, impiety, worldliness – and all used not merely to discredit monasticism, but to bolster such matters as Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries for the benefit of the crown.¹¹⁴ Yet in a glaring omission that would certainly not have been lost on his polemical nemesis Harding (though perhaps Jewel hoped it would be on his audience in the Church of England), Jewel never bothers to point out that Augustine, Jerome, Erasmus and Bernard were all monks. The others that he cites, Nicholas of Cusa and St Hilary of Poitiers, were extremely sympathetic to monasticism.¹¹⁵ All wrote to correct monastic abuses, none to bring

¹¹² For the nominalist and papalist champion, the mystic Gabriel Biel see the note on Oberman above, for Erasmus's statement in his *Enchiridion*, 'Monachatus non est pietas', see Erika Rummel 'Monachatus non est pietas: Interpretations and Misinterpretations of a Dictum', in Hilmar M. Pabel, ed. *Erasmus' Vision of the Church* (Kirksville, MO, Vol. XXXIII 1995), pp. 41–56.

¹¹³ This is Jewel's basic argument to Harding in defending those in the Church of England who refused to wear the surplice: it had been befouled by Roman superstition (*Works*, III, pp. 614–18). The implications of this shall be discussed at the end of this chapter and in Chapter Four. This dictum would hardly apply to Luther.

¹¹⁴ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 798–801.

¹¹⁵ Nicholas of Cusa had been influenced by the Brethren of the Common Life, and one of his better known works, *De visione Dei*, was written as a spiritual exercise for monks. See John Patrick Dolan, ed., *Unity and Reform: Selected Writings of Nicholas de Cusa*

about its demise. Jewel's polemical duplicity is apparent; but it would be wrong to think that he does not believe himself justified in his use of these authors this way. For Jewel and for many of the other English Reformers, *abusus tollit usum*. This method is part and parcel of his making the prince the guardian of England's conscience, the keeper of both tables of the law, for by the prince's decree, abused things could be made licit. The prince had become that unilateral, irresponsible definition of tradition that Jewel would damn the papacy for assuming.

The matter of the Donation of Constantine serves as an excellent example of how Jewel employed and misused humanism, and also provides a sidelight on Jewel's reading and use of criticism, illuminating Jewel's apologetic and polemical method. Though he knew and even quoted Lorenzo Valla's *On the Forgery of the Alleged Donation of Constantine* when criticizing the morals of the Popes, citing Valla's status as a canon of the Church in Rome, and thus one who could, with a first-hand authority, address his subject,¹¹⁶ he never employed him when he attacked Harding's assertion of papal claims as contained in the Donation. Harding indeed had tried to skirt and fend off any criticisms by avoiding the text of the Donation altogether. He instead quoted a Greek, Matthaëus the Hieromonk, as his authority on the question of Constantine's bequest to Sylvester I. This did not deter Jewel, who launched an attack on the veracity of monk Matthew's testimony (Jewel added as an aside that Matthew had never even seen Rome and thus had no authority in the matter). Moreover, Jewel pursued the whole question of the Donation of Constantine and its authenticity, not on the grounds of humanist arguments as utilized by Valla, concentrating on philology and syntax, but rather on grounds of authority, and thus his abuse of the Greek Matthew. Valla may be a canon, but Nicholas of Cusa was a Cardinal bishop, and to Cusanus Jewel turned to garner arguments: not to proof and reason as characterized by Valla's humanism, but to an authority even Harding must recognize, one ensured to produce an *ad majorem* effect on his English audience. Valla did make it to a list of some dozen authors who had written against the document – again, Jewel's version of an intellectual inundation, but the particulars of his argument which treat with syntax and philology Jewel never touched.¹¹⁷

(South Bend, 1962), p. 9. For *De visione Dei*, see also Dolan, pp. 129–84 and L. Bond, *Nicholas of Cusa* (New York, 1997).

¹¹⁶ Jewel, *Works*, III, p. 127 in *A Preface to the Reader*, in defending himself against the charge of lying, Jewel quotes Valla that Pope Celestine was a Nestorian. IV, p. 916. Jewel cites Valla on the simony of the bishop of Rome, IV, p. 972, quotes Valla that the devils make it great sport to dress as do Romish priests, and in IV, p. 1081 notes Valla's observations about the greed of the Church.

¹¹⁷ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 839.

This same stratagem spills over into Jewel's equivocal use of sources. When Jewel maintained that councils have greater authority than do popes, and that the initial councils were all convened by the emperor, he was quick to cite the most well-known of the conciliarists' treatises, Nicholas of Cusa's *De Concordantia Catholica* and with it his smaller tract *De presidentia*.¹¹⁸ Besides Cusanus, Jewel also quoted Pius II's *Dialogues*. With both of these, Jewel cited not only their works, but also oddly their titles, Cardinal and Pope respectively: 'Here specially to be noted, that cardinal Cusanus saith [et cetera].' Jewel somehow flagrantly failed to mention that both of them when they wrote the respectively quoted works, were Conciliarists looking for arguments for a conciliar supremacy over the popes, at that time estranged from the papacy, and that neither had yet the title by which Jewel would address them, titles only obtained following their repudiation of Conciliarism.

Jewel's use of tradition in his polemics surrounding the Challenge Sermon, as either an authoritative norm or an heuristic prolegomenon, follows no fixed pattern; he had no consistent canon in treating ancient authorities. The patristic writings become a negative florilegium for Jewel, a vast set of topoi and commonplaces whose only real, consistent advantage is not as an authority, unless Jewel already agreed with them, but as a hermeneutical *via negativa*: a means by which he can remove any appeal to a uniform antiquity or ancient tradition that was itself a canon for Christian dogmatics. The Catholic reaction and response to Jewel's Challenge will be treated in the next chapter, though two points should be noted here, if only briefly. As can be seen, since Jewel demanded evidence for Catholic theology he had no need to elaborate any of his own, though what Jewel believed can be garnered, seemingly, from what he wished his sources not to assert. But something more occurred with Jewel. In his assertions about the 'private mass' and the worship of images, Harding immediately replied that what Jewel damned the Catholics for in fact did not obtain. Jewel refused to admit certain distinctions fundamental to Catholic piety and theology; the one on images shall stand here as exemplary. Harding quickly agreed with Jewel that nowhere in the first 600 years of the history of the Church will one find images set up in churches for worship, for images are not for worship, but for veneration. Thus, since images were set up but not for worship, Jewel's point is irrelevant. Harding, instead of letting the point end there does go on to argue the question (rather poorly as shall be

¹¹⁸ Jewel, *Works*, IV, from *De concordantia*, pp. 922–23; and also from *De presidentiae*, p. 1018, another of Cusanus's conciliarist tracts. The editors of Jewel's works have confused the footnotes at this place, as they have a footnote 13, but no such footnote appears in the text.

shown). Jewel would never admit to Harding's or the Catholic (and indeed Orthodox) distinction between *veneratio* and *adoratio*. In this regard Jewel, and virtually the whole of Protestantism went beyond even the error of the Council of Frankfurt in 794, which working from a poor translation of the *Acta* of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, confused the Greek words λατρεία and προσκύνησις (the former owed to God alone) and translated them both *adoratio*.¹¹⁹ In this regard Jewel, who by his later epistle to Bullinger showed himself quite ignorant of what occurred in 794, was practicing little more than theological demagoguery or ecclesio-political grandstanding.

Jewel's *Epistola* and the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*

Jewel's next plunge into the pool of controversy involved his most well-known work, the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. This work should not be considered without reference to a lesser-known, much shorter work of Jewel's, which shall simply be called the *Epistola*.¹²⁰ The year 1561 saw the appearance of this concise treatise, which may only have been published in England, though intended ultimately for France, via Paris. In content and strategy it is much like the *Apologia* that Jewel would produce by January 1562. The *Apologia*, published first in Latin, but immediately translated into English, probably by archbishop Parker, was accorded the English title *An Apologie or aunswer in defence of the Church of England*.¹²¹ The work was again translated in 1564 by Lady Anne Bacon, wife of the Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon, the mother of Sir Francis Bacon,¹²² and her translation subsequently would always be

¹¹⁹ Most discussions on the lacking distinction are brief (cf. George Ostrogorsky, *The History of the Byzantine State*, 3rd ed. (New Brunswick, NJ, 1963), pp. 183–85. Hadrian I's letter which caused the confusion is in Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence, 1769–), 12, pp. 1055–75.

¹²⁰ *Epistola cuiusdam Angli, qua asseritur consensus verae religionis doctrinae & caeremoniarum in Anglia, contra vanissimos quorundam cavillos, quibus eandem suis ad plebeculam contionibus impugnare conantur*. N.p., M.LXVI [1561]. This appears as the Appendix, with translation, in Booty's *Jewel as Apologist*, pp. 209–25.

¹²¹ Patrick Collinson points out the ambiguity in the Latin title, but also points out that Jewel saw no essentially distinct English cause to his writings as opposed to that of the larger Protestant community. Jewel had no idea that 'God is English'. 'Calvinism with an Anglican Face: The Stranger Churches in Early Elizabethan London and their Superintendent', in *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c. 1500–1750. Studies in Church History*, Subsidia 2, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1979), p. 71. Reprinted in *Godly People*, p. 213.

¹²² 'Anne Lady Bacon deserves more praise than I have space to give her ... Again and again she finds the phrase which, once she has found it, we feel to be inevitable. *Sacrificuli* become "massing priests," *ineptum* "a verie toy," *quidam ex asseclis et parasitis* "one of

used both in English parish churches and by Jewel in his replies to Harding.

These works, similar in both their material content and the circumstances of their appearance, give an ample insight into Jewel's own theology and also his positive assessment of the nature of the Church of England. As to the circumstances of their composition, both were written at the behest of Sir William Cecil; both were anonymous. Indeed, so anonymous was the *Epistola*, that the first three editions of Jewel's collected works did not contain it, including the nearly exhaustive Parker Society Edition. There is a printed edition of the *Epistola* in the British Library and also a manuscript copy in the Public Record Office.¹²³ John Booty, in the course of research for his doctoral work and the publication of his *Jewel as Apologist for the Church of England*, made the identification of this text with the work alluded to by Sir Nicholas Bacon in a letter to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton: 'I have caused the Bishop of Sarum to fayne an epistle sent from hince thither, and have printed it secretly, and send you herwith certen copyes, if more be printed there, the matter shall have more probabilitie.'¹²⁴ Booty is of the opinion that the British Library edition was printed in Paris, though why this is he does not say, though it was indeed intended for the French. Since there were some copies already printed in England, it may never have appeared in Paris. The pseudonymous *Epistola* was to feign appearance of being written by laity in response to questions from a friend in France, and seems to have been commissioned by Cecil as an answer to libels about the English Church then current in France following the Colloquy of Poissy. As this work made not even a ripple upon the surface of the English ecclesiastical lake, its use for the inquiring historian is limited to the insights garnered from its contents respecting both the mind of its author and the mind of the English establishment in handling criticisms of the Elizabethan Settlement.

Jewel's main argument in the *Epistola* revolves around the libels that England's is a fractured ecclesiastical state, one in which some defend, while some defame, the use of vestments; one at odds with itself both doctrinally and ceremonially; one which saw the faithful in contention with their crown and convocation.¹²⁵ Jewel's response is not only to

his soothing pages and clawebuckles," *lege sodes* "in goode fellowshipe I pray thee reade," *operae pretium est videre* "it is a world to see," and *magnum silentium* "all mum, not a word." If quality without bulk were enough, Lady Bacon might be put forward as the best of all sixteenth-century translators.' C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 307.

¹²³ Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, p. 209.

¹²⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, 1561–1562*, p. 104.

¹²⁵ 'Nos omnes, studiis et contentionibus, in factiones et sectas distractos esse: nihil

embrace these accusations, but to throw them back at the critics; in this case supposed French monks. Jewel noted that the liberality of liturgical expression within the Church of England had been something of long standing, as 'indeed always our particular churches – Salisbury, York, Hereford and Bangor – have offered public prayers to God different from one another'.¹²⁶ Jewel then shows that this diversity of practice was not an English idiom, but that divergences of practice occurred among the ancient Syrian, Egyptian, Roman and African Churches.¹²⁷ As for England and vestments, says Jewel, we are all agreed, from the prince down, that such things are neither holy nor polluted in and of themselves; such things are adiaphora. And beyond this, the English Church now adheres to one form of the administration of the sacrament, and one form of common prayer.¹²⁸ Paradoxically, these divergences which Jewel trumpets, by which English diversity should be countenanced, these adiaphora, have all been proscribed by the uniformity which Jewel himself sought to impose.

Pertaining to matters theological, Jewel insisted that the English Church had a greater unity than the traditionalists. In fact, concerning matters that dealt with the truth of the gospel, there was no dissent.¹²⁹ Jewel rebukes Rome, for he says, there are vast rents in its fabric: Occamists against Scotists, Dominicans with the Franciscans, bishop Fisher's dissent on the eating of the body of Christ by mice, Thomas's disagreements with Lombard.¹³⁰ This assertion by Jewel of factions and parties in the traditionalist camp had already appeared in his previous writings and will appear again in his controversies with Harding. The several themes that made up the essential content of Jewel's *Epistola*, the unanimity of the English Church on essential matters (*de re vero ipsa*), the indifferent character of liturgies and vestments, the reality that the English Church was well ordered, all recur in his *Apologia* and form part of the justification for the English polity being centered on the will of its prince.

apud nos esse certi: non Episcopos inter se, non Concionatores, non Ecclesiarum ministros, non homines singulos, vel de doctrina, vel de Ceremoniis convenire: quoniam sibi pro sua libidine Ecclesiam suam fabricari.' *Epistola* in Booty Appendix, *Jewel as Apologist*, p. 210.

¹²⁶ 'Semper enim Ecclesiae nostrae particulares ut sunt Sarisburiensis, Eboracensis, Herfordensis, Bangoriensis, aliter atque aliter publicas Deo preces persolverunt.' *Ibid.*, p. 220.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 220–22. In his Challenge Sermon, Jewel had already used this diversity and seeming lack of uniformity in liturgical practice against those who would argue for the necessity of the unity brought by the Roman rite. Cf. Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 23.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

¹²⁹ 'De re (Euangelii) vero ipsa, nihil inter nos est dissidii.' *Ibid.*, p. 218.

¹³⁰ This same line of argument appears in almost identical form in the *Apologia*, in *Works*, III, pp. 68–69.

Like the *Epistola*, the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* also came at the request of the Elizabethan establishment, this time Lord Keeper Bacon as well as archbishop Parker.¹³¹ Though like the *Epistola* anonymously written, that Jewel played the primary role in this work none ever questioned, and it was often asserted even in his own lifetime.¹³² Yet unlike the *Epistola*, which though probably published in England was sent to France, and from France to obscurity, the *Apologia*, published in a Protestant country with the support of the establishment, enjoyed notoriety from the time of its first publication. Jewel's Challenge Sermon was probably conceptualized and constructed during his months on Visitation in the late summer and early fall of 1559, then preached in the fall and spring, 1559–60. Jewel had just finished the last of his replies to Cole three days before he left for Salisbury in May of 1560, sending the whole correspondence off to John Day on 18 May. On 21 May he dined with Cecil and several others, including the Lord Keeper Bacon, Robert Horne and Thomas Young, just appointed to York. It seems that the *Apologia* was given its conceptual birth at this meeting.¹³³ By April 1561 upon his return to London Jewel had completed the *Apologia*. Again citing, but more fully, what Cecil on 8 May 1561 wrote to Throckmorton in Paris:

I have caused the Bishop of Sarum to fayne an epistle [the *Epistola*] sent from hence thither, and have printed it secretly, and send you herwith certen copyes, if more be printed there, the matter shall have more probabilitie. I have caused an apology to be wrytten but not prynted in the name of the whole clergy, which surely is wisly lernedly eloquently and gravely wrytten, but I staye the publishing of it untill it may be furder pondered, for so is it requisite.¹³⁴

At some point after this the sixth section on the Council of Trent was added, a chapter dissonant with the rest of the work.

In the *Apologia* Jewel bends his primary energies against the traditionalist accusations that the English Church is guilty of novelty, that it has no claim to either catholicity or antiquity, and much like the themes touched on in the *Epistola*, that it is a Church sundered within itself, not just from other Protestants. Jewel's text is further animated by his defense of the English refusal to take part in the reconvened council at Trent. To answer such accusations, Jewel again takes up the questions

¹³¹ Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, pp. 45–55. Cf. Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (Oxford, 1821), I, p. 197.

¹³² Cf. the letter of Peter Martyr to Jewel, 24 August 1562, in *The Zurich Letters*, I, pp. 339–41, in which Martyr commends his protégé for his work.

¹³³ *Calendar of State Papers Spanish*, Elizabeth, I, p. 201.

¹³⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, 1561–1562*, p. 104. This letter is quoted in both Southgate (pp. 56–57) and Booty (p. 40).

surrounding the various prolegomena and canon of dogmatics and polity. His argument begins by asserting that truth has never enjoyed wide acclaim, indeed has itself been an émigré and despised by those who claim a love of verity and true religion; ironically truth sounds very much like Jewel and many of the other English Protestants. Jewel's language fit with other well known descriptions, if not of truth, than still of the Church. Petrarch at the beginning of his *Liber sine nomine* describes the Church as a ship with no one at the helm. Erasmus in his *Naufraugium* gives a similar picture to Petrarch's, only by now the ship is breaking apart. Regardless, for Jewel the Roman Church was bereft of sure guidance, in that truth was treated as a beggar and a vagabond, without which the ship would surely wreck.¹³⁵

The work in brief is divided into six sections, presenting little by way of formal argumentation for the Protestant Settlement. The whole first section is largely taken with delineating traditionalist accusations that the Protestants were heretics, apostates whose new learning had carried them to schism, revivers of old heresies, schismatics, deniers of the authority of councils and fathers, novel and seditious. The only substantive point Jewel makes in the first section concerns the ground of the debate: 'Wherefore, if we be heretics, and they (as they would fain be called) be catholics, why do they not as they see the fathers, which were catholic men, have always done? Why do they not convince and master us by the divine scriptures?'¹³⁶ Jewel's stated reliance on Scripture alone becomes the one new, formal canon by which both regional synods and princes were guided. Jewel defined the English faith in section two, employing a somewhat amplified version of the Athanasian Formula and a prolonged Protestant explication of the power of the Christian ministry (which for Jewel resided in deacons and priests, bishops only existing for the good order of the Church). The *Apologia* embraced only two sacraments, with its Eucharistic doctrine relying heavily on Martyr and Zurich that the Eucharist signified and sealed grace, and that it held before the eyes of the faithful the mysteries of salvation.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ The opening words of the *Apologia* read, 'It hath been an old complaint, even from the first time of the patriarchs and prophets, and confirmed by the writings and testimonies of every age, that the truth wandereth here and there as a stranger in the world, and doth readily find enemies and slanderers amongst those that know her not'. *Works*, III, p. 54.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, III, p. 58.

¹³⁷ Jewel, *Works*, III, p. 63. That Jewel embraced Martyr's views on the Eucharist, views strongly akin to Bullinger's, and not those of Bucer or Calvin, is betrayed by his use of certain words and phrases such as 'by faith, by understanding and by (the) spirit', III, p. 64 [the definite article is an addition of Lady Anne Bacon's and is not contained in Jewel's subsequent *Defense of the Apology*]. For Martyr's Eucharistic doctrine see Joseph McClelland, Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr: A.D. 1500–1562* (Edinburgh, 1957). For Calvin

In the third section Jewel takes up the particular accusations laid against the Protestants, most especially that they are heretics, they foster those who hold to old heresies and that not only are they schismatic from Rome, but that they do not even agree among themselves. To the charges of fostering heresy, Jewel merely retorts that although these heresies did arise 'ever since the gospel did first [again] spring (i.e., from the time of Luther)', nonetheless, 'Anabaptists, Libertines, Menonians, and Zuenckfeldians ... we have neither bred, nor taught, nor kept up with these monsters ... What hath there ever been written by any of our company, which might plainly bear with the madness of any of those heretics?'¹³⁸ In section IV Jewel takes up the question of sedition. Who was first a rebel Jewel asks? It was none other than the pope himself, for:

Falsely and traitorously also did he release the Romans and the Italians, and himself too of the oath whereby they and he were straitly bound to be true to the emperor of Grecia, and stirred up the emperor's subjects to forsake him; and calling Carolus Martellus out of France into Italy, made him emperor [sic], such a thing as never was seen before.¹³⁹

Jewel also brings up several historical incidents, such as the Pope's dealings with several monarchs, including John I of England and the emperor Henry IV. He also takes pains to poison the waters of the term 'catholic' by calling on several of the Middle Age's leading lights and using their terms to cast aspersions on Rome. Part V treats the accusation of novelty, in which Jewel resorted to one of the basic premises maintained throughout his writings, that the ancient Church could not be a dogmatic standard, for even among themselves the Fathers disagreed. Further, even what they univocally affirmed, even this his traditionalist opponents do not possess. Ultimately, Jewel's Catholic opponents lack any claim to the ancient Christian Tradition: 'They have not, good Lord, they have not (I say) those things which they boast they have: they have not that antiquity, they have not that universality, they have not that consent of all places nor of all times.'¹⁴⁰ In the sixth and

and Bullinger, see Paul Rorem, 'Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Part I: The Impasse', *Lutheran Quarterly*, II. 2 Summer (1988), pp. 155–84 and 'Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Part II: The Agreement', *Lutheran Quarterly*, II.2 (1988), pp. 357–90.

¹³⁸ Jewel, *Apologia*, Works, III, p. 67.

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 75. He does correct the historical gaff, found in both Lady Bacon's translation and in the original Latin of the *Apologia* (Works, III, p. 22) to Carolus Magnus in the *Defense*. In the subsequent editions of the *Apologia*, 1581, 1591 and 1599, the mistake was amended to read Carolum Magnum Martellum.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 89. Jewel's anti-formula echoes Vincent of Laurens canon of what was tradition.

final section, Jewel turns at last to the question of why the English would not attend the Council of Trent.

That the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* was published anonymously makes it no less the work of Jewel.¹⁴¹ What emerges from its pages is a claim that England (and Protestantism in general) is the true possessor of the early Church, for they possess that which was itself the ground of all the Patristic argumentation, the ancient canon of the Scriptures. To Jewel, the divisions within Protestantism he portrayed as trifles, mere disagreements, which paled in comparison with those divisions that characterized Rome.

But good God! What manner of fellow be these which blame us for disagreeing? And do all they themselves, ween you, agree well together ... Hath there been no strifes ... ? Why then do the Scotists and Thomists, about that they call *meritum congrui* and *meritum condigni*, no better agree together? Why agree they not better among themselves concerning original sin in the Blessed Virgin; concerning solemn vow and single vow? Why say the canonists that auricular confession is appointed by the positive law of man; and their schoolmen contrariwise, that it is appointed by the law of God? Why doth Albert Pighius dissent from Cajetan?

Jewel then moves to a host of Catholic divergences on the Eucharist:

some of their own company which say that the body of Christ is in this supper naturally; contrary, other some of the selfsame company deny it to be so: again, that there be other of them which say the body of Christ in the Holy Communion is rent and torn with teeth; and some again that deny the same ... some ... which say Christ did consecrate with a certain divine power; some that he did the same with his blessing; some again that say he did it with uttering five solemn chosen words; and some with rehearsing the same words afterward again. Some will have it that when Christ did speak those five words, the material wheaten bread was pointed unto by this demonstrative pronoun *hoc*: some had rather have that a certain *vagum individuum*, as they term it, was meant thereby. Again others there be that say dogs and mice may truly and in very deed eat the body of Christ; and others again there be that steadfastly deny it.¹⁴²

Jewel turns next to the question of Protestant unity and unity's relationship to truth. He first maintains that unity is not an accurate gauge of true religion, for were not they unified who made the golden calf, and was it not also a unified voice which yelled 'Crucify him. Crucify him?' In fact Peter and Paul were in conflict, so then, was there no Church when these two were sundered? Thus, since Jewel has

¹⁴¹ John Booty covers the incidentals surrounding the work's publication, the various influences in its creation and its anonymous nature. He concurs with the traditional appellation of Jewel as largely the genius behind it. *Jewel as Apologist*, pp. 36–58.

¹⁴² Jewel, *Apologia*, in *Works*, I, pp. 68–69.

obliterated – at least to his own mind – unity as a prerequisite of true religion, he then proceeds to defend the divisions that do exist among the Protestants:

And as for those persons, whom they upon spite call Zuinglians and Lutherians, in very deed they of both sides be Christians, good friends, and brethren. They vary not betwixt themselves upon the principles and foundations of our religion, nor as touching God, nor Christ, nor the Holy Ghost, nor of the means to justification, nor yet everlasting life, but upon one only question, which is neither weighty nor great; neither mistrust we, or make doubt at al, but they will shortly be agreed.¹⁴³

Jewel has essentially moved from decrying unity as necessary to true religion, to saying that regardless Protestants possess it, that the only division among them is one touching a minor point, for in reality Protestants were charitably living in the greatest of unity. Jewel's persistent refrain that unity and charity existed among Protestants as a whole, that it was also a reality in England, centered on his belief that what they affirmed univocally was a core of faith, his *de re vero ipsa*.

The palpable flaws in Jewel's assertions, both respecting his theological logic and his opaque appraisal of Protestant unanimity, begs a question: why does Jewel slight unity as a mark of the Church and then proffer this ironic apparition of Protestant charity with respect to their various understandings of the sacrament of communion? Jewel had been in Strasbourg when Martyr was forced to leave because of his disagreement with the city council on this matter (they had now affirmed, in light of the Peace of Augsburg, a Lutheran understanding of the Eucharist). He also knew that any hope of a rapprochement between England and the German princes depended on a trivializing of English ties with Martyr.¹⁴⁴ He himself was violently opposed to any Lutheran Eucharistic notions – he always termed them by the phrase ubiquitarians – being given a theological place in England, much less allowing them the epithet of friend: 'That volatile ubiquitarian doctrine is unable in anyway to establish itself among us, though not for lacking initiative by those who had this matter greatly to heart.'¹⁴⁵ In one sense, it is a question that pertains to Jewel's audience: to whom was he making his appeal? Though the *Apologia* was published initially in Latin, thus connoting an educated audience, it was quickly followed by two translations into English. That Jewel addressed a theological audience – the various

¹⁴³ Jewel, *Apologia*, Works, III, pp. 69–70.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr 28 April 1559, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1206–9.

¹⁴⁵ 'Volatica illa doctrina ubiquitaria non potest apud nos consistere ullo modo: etsi non deerant ab initio, quibus ea res magnopere curae fuerit.' Jewel's letter to Martyr, 6 Nov. 1560, *Works*, IV, p. 1240.

divines of Europe, both Protestant and Catholic – seems certain: it was read by both Protestants in Zurich and Catholics in France, with readers in both dominions citing its moderation in tone.¹⁴⁶ But that the *Apologia* targeted also the faithful of England, either as confirmation of the Protestant faith, or as a means to dissuade those who were still traditional in their leanings, should be assumed as evident by its overly rhetorical nature, its lack of theological and logical precision and its rather brazen use of hyperbole in setting the context of the arguments: each point assumes a popular and not a strictly theologically educated audience. But the identity of Jewel's audience does not explain everything. Jewel could not avoid the question of unity, for this had been the assumption underlying his use of *de re vero ipsa*. Jewel knew well enough that to Protestants communion was never insignificant, and its diverse formulations played almost as crucial a role in their divisions from each other as it did in their divisions from Rome. Yet Jewel's skirting the issue of the Eucharist aside, he still needed to maintain unity; indeed on the question of *sola fide* and *sola scriptura* the Protestants were united. Jewel needed this unity in order to rebut the claims of Rome's pretended universality as opposed to the unity of Protestantism, a unity that gave them the title of universal.

Yet however he sought to counter Roman claims and whomever Jewel's audience was, the historical parameters remained the point on which so many other things turned; here Jewel gave with the one hand what he took away with the other. 'Surely we have ever judged the primitive church of Christ's time, of the apostles, and of the holy fathers, to be the catholic church; neither make we doubt to name it Noe's ark, Christ's spouse, the pillar and upholder of all truth, nor yet to fix therein the whole mean of our salvation.'¹⁴⁷ Yet this expansive declaration suddenly retracts when the 'holy fathers' come into focus. In a series of sermons, later collated and made into a *Treatise of the Holy Scriptures*, Jewel elaborated on the ancillary authority of the Fathers: 'We may not build upon them: we may not make them the foundation and warrant of our conscience: we may not put our trust in them.'¹⁴⁸ Jewel's parameters in the debates engendered by his Challenge Sermon and by the *Apologia* necessarily must be negative by definition and in any definition it offers, that what the traditionalists practiced and maintained, at least those things cited by Jewel, could not be found in the ancient Church, and this absence vitiated all their other claims. Yet Jewel could not make the

¹⁴⁶ See Peter Martyr's letter to Jewel, 24 August 1562, in *ZL*, I. pp. 339–41; and Jewel's letter to Martyr, 14 August 1562, treating the response to the *Apologia* of the French civil lawyer Baudouin in Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1254–56.

¹⁴⁷ Jewel, *Apologia*, *Works*, III, p. 77.

¹⁴⁸ Jewel, *A Treatise of the Holy Scriptures*, *Works*, IV, p. 1173.

Patristic era a canon, for the 'they have not' could in like manner be applied to Jewel and the Church of England. William Fulke was quick to realize Jewel's disavowals of the normative nature of the fathers:

For although the bishop of Sarum made challenge of many articles now holden of the Papists, not to be found within the compass of the first six hundred years, and therefore to be new and false doctrines: yet neither he nor any Protestant living or dead, did ever agree to receive what doctrine soever was taught within the first six hundred years. But this I dare avow, that what article of doctrine soever we do affirm, the same hath been affirmed of the godly Fathers ... whatsoever we deny, the same cannot be proved to have been universally affirmed or received of all the godly Fathers by the space of the six hundred years together.¹⁴⁹

When Jewel proffered his 27 items he so closely scripted them that it was almost impossible by definition for his opponents to answer him. That did not stop them, nor is it to say that Jewel wisely chose what he did, for he was ignorant of much about which he spoke. One illustration shall here suffice. Jewel wrote to Heinrich Bullinger in March 1566, seeking information on three matters: what can he tell him about the Carolingian Council of Frankfurt, what does he know about one John Camotensis, and, especially crucial for the argument here, a point that touches the Greek Churches, whether the Greeks practice any form of 'private mass (that the priest alone communicated irrespective of who else was present)?'¹⁵⁰ Jewel had written on the matter of the Greeks not practicing private Masses in 1565 against Harding, asserting that the Greeks had never used the private Mass.¹⁵¹ Having now made his boast, Jewel had been called to account and needed Bullinger's help in authenticating his claims. The great danger for Jewel, despite his faith that he would not be proven wrong and that Rome was truly aberrant, was that someone might find something which he could not explain. The Greek Church proved a wonderful mine of anti-Roman information in that they belied the antiquity of the strict uniformity professed by Rome. But if in this (the private Mass), they agreed with Jewel's protagonists, then catholicity would speak against him. The narrow constraints of Jewel's challenge addressed what errors Jewel thought could be excluded from the Fathers; but it also proclaimed that many of the doctrines he had adopted he was unwilling to assert that the Fathers professed them.

¹⁴⁹ William Fulke, *Stapleton's Fortress overthrown. A rejoinder to Martiall's Reply. A discovery of the dangerous rock of the popish church commended by Sanders* (Cambridge, 1848), pp. 28–29.

¹⁵⁰ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1247. Jewel believed the Carolingians were iconoclasts and thus his question on the Council of Frankfurt. He never found out that Camotensis was John of Salisbury.

¹⁵¹ Jewel, *Works*, II, p. 637.

Yet if the ancient Church failed as a dogmatic authority for Jewel, they did give him a club by which he could assault traditionalists, albeit always within the snug and narrow confines of the Challenge Sermon. These restrictions Jewel used again in the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. Though the *Apologia* was not a polemical tract in the same vein that the Challenge Sermon was, nonetheless, in Part V Jewel rehearses a litany of matters in which some practices, real or perceived – at times Jewel would broach a common abuse as though it were a universal practice – were contradicted either by ancient imperial edict,¹⁵² regional councils,¹⁵³ or the pronouncements of particular bishops. He did use statements by several popes to prove these assertions, though in the sequels to the *Apologia* – the three editions of the *Defence of the Apology* – less can be made of these statements from the respective Popes than Jewel had initially intended. One statement, which apparently Jewel had hoped was drawn from Clement I, was actually a conflation of words from St Bernard. Another citation, drawn from Leo the Great, in which Jewel hoped to prove that only one Mass in one church per day alone was permissible, he had to revise, merely having to draw some conclusions from Leo's statements, as they were not pregnant with the meaning Jewel thought they were. In fact, in the *Defence of the Apology* Jewel did not even answer Harding's response to his erring use of Leo; and in his *Answer to Harding* (pertaining to the Challenge Sermon), Jewel had to admit that the use of more than one service of the Mass, in any one day, is not forbidden, though of course Jewel never considered that this qualified as having rightly answered his Challenge, for it could not be shown that it had obtained practice or positive sanction.¹⁵⁴

From Conciliarism to Erastianism: two short treatises

Jewel's anonymous writings were not limited to his *Epistola* and *Apologia*. He also wrote a letter to a certain Venetian named Scipio, by

¹⁵² Jewel cited an edict of Justinian that the liturgy should be said in a clear, loud and 'treatable' voice. By this Jewel makes a formal abuse into a material, traditional, liturgical practice wherein 'these men mumble up all their service, not only with a drowned and hollow voice, but also in a strange and barbarous tongue (Latin)'. Jewel, *Apologia*, Works, III, p. 87.

¹⁵³ Jewel references the Council of Gangra (see *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, Oxford, 1992, p. 337) a regional council that met in Asia Minor probably around AD 340, attended by 14 bishops, at which was condemned the eccentrically ascetic teachings of one Eustathius, which included abstaining from Eucharists celebrated by married priests (a decree Jewel especially played upon). Jewel, *Apologia*, Works, III, p. 87.

¹⁵⁴ Jewel, *Apologia*, Works, III, p. 87; and *Defence of the Apology*, Works, IV, pp. 819–21. Cf. *Answer to Harding* in Jewel, Works, II, pp. 629–33.

which he took the occasion of the letter to inform Scipio, whose acquaintance Jewel had made when he had studied in Padua,¹⁵⁵ precisely why the English would not take part in the Council of Trent. There is some obscurity surrounding the letter, for little is known of its official or polemical purpose. Jewel had made comment in a letter to Martyr that just such a tract (he does not say it will be in the form of a letter) was being considered, and one that specifically responded to why England would not be represented at Trent.¹⁵⁶ As Jewel had in the letter to Martyr specifically referenced the *Apologia*, he is evidently alluding to some other text, and one for which the *Epistola ad Scipionem* perfectly fits the bill. Further, the date of the *ad Scipionem* is 1562,¹⁵⁷ and while largely contemporaneous with the *Apologia* and the *Epistola*, still places it a year after them. The themes, however, which treat specifically about the authority of councils, and particularly Trent, are far more consonant with Jewel's 1570 *View of a Seditious Bull*, published in response to Pius V's bull excommunicating Elizabeth, *Regnans in Excelsis*.¹⁵⁸ Whereas Jewel's Challenge Sermon, *Epistola* and *Apologia* treated issues more heuristic and in the nature of prolegomena, these two works rest upon his former treatises, and as such expand on Jewel's other academic enterprises. Both the *Ad Scipionem* and the *View of a Seditious Bull* treat of the peculiar polity of the English Christian commonwealth and the question of sovereignty: who has it and for what end is it to be exercised? In this respect they are Jewel's fullest statements defining the royal supremacy.

¹⁵⁵ Apart from this reference, no evidence exists in any of Jewel's letters or his writings that he ever was in Padua, and some have thus wondered whether this tract may not be by Jewel. But the possibility seems readily at hand for him to have studied in Italy, as following the Peace of Augsburg, Padua, then under the Venetians, gladly welcomed German students. Cf. "They Urinate in the Holy Water": German Protestant Students in Italian Universities'. Paper delivered at the 1998 Sixteenth Century Studies Conference, by Professor Paul Grendler, University of Toronto, 24 October 1998. Beyond this, the tract is too replete with matter so peculiar to Jewel that it begs the question, if not him, then whom? Even had Jewel never been to Padua, the notion of a fictive Scipio seems hardly beyond the probable, as this would simply be the same type of feigned letter as the *epistola*.

¹⁵⁶ 'Our queen has fully made up her mind not to send any representative to the council ... We are now thinking about publishing the reasons which have induced us to decline attendance.' Letter to Martyr, 7 February 1562, in *Works*, pp. 1245–48, quote from p. 1247, editor's translation.

¹⁵⁷ Jewel comments that it had been ten years since the Lutheran bishops and princes had been excluded from Trent, an event which occurred in 1552.

¹⁵⁸ *A View of a Seditious Bull sent into England from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome*, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1133–60, with a dedicatory Epistle to the godly reader, by John Garbrand, London, 1582, in which is included *A Short Treatise of the Holy Scriptures*. This same pair was again published, with some alterations, in 1611, by John Norton.

Such matters Jewel treated in his other works, especially in the *Apologia*, and many of the arguments that Jewel employs in the *Epistola ad Scipionem* and the *View of a Seditious Bull* come largely from some of the concerns already expressed in the *Apologia*. But where the *Apologia* addressed affairs from the historical perspective of the early Church (who was the innovator, who really had catholicity), these two works treat their respective questions from their immediate historical context. This is more the case for the *View of a Seditious Bull* than for the *ad Scipionem*. In the latter Jewel's argumentation often arises from Patristic and ancient sources, since the questions concerning the authority of councils can only make some reference to those earliest ecumenical councils. Yet ultimately Jewel builds his case with arguments drawn more from the Conciliarists. But whereas the Conciliarists faced the perplexity of first two and then three popes, each of whom stood tangentially as orthodox, for Jewel the question was rather why the English should submit themselves to a council convened by such a one as the Pope in the first place. Or perhaps more succinctly put, the *Ad Scipionem* asks what sovereignty has the Pope over the universal Church in general and the English Church in particular? In *A View of a Seditious Bull*, Jewel treats Pius V's writ of excommunication line by line; and while the *Ad Scipionem* deals with the Pope's place in the Church, the *View of a Seditious Bull* addressed the question of papal prerogatives over the civil affairs of kingdoms.

Jewel was not navigating new territory in his thoughts on councils, for the other Reformers had followed this trail before. The Reformation *modus operandi*, which slighted the new devotion on account of its embracing the medieval sacramental system – à Kempis and Erasmus remained dutiful sons of the Church – replayed itself in the procurement of late medieval conciliar arguments respecting institutional reform. Luther had briefly maintained a conciliar authority,¹⁵⁹ but for Luther Conciliarism proved an ineffectual appeal; not simply because the movement had failed to offer a real alternative to the abuses of the papal monarchy, but because even by 1519 Luther had backed himself into a corner on the question of Jan Hus and whether any of his propositions condemned at the Council of Constance (1414–17) could be understood in a Christian sense. Luther's admission that Hus's condemned faith could have a Christian sense contradicted Constance, and thus comprehended the notion that a general council could err. Therefore, as

¹⁵⁹ *Cambridge Modern History* Vol. II, 78. Luther had drawn up an appeal to a future general council, and had briefly in 1518 maintained the absolute authority of councils over popes and all the Church.

councils could not be an ultimate court of authority, they became ancillary in the questions of dogma.¹⁶⁰

But the question of the authority of councils the Reformers could not so easily set aside. Councils had proven themselves tremendous vehicles of reform, and none of the Reformers would have questioned the first four Ecumenical councils.¹⁶¹ But like so many other issues, diverse opinions on the relative utility and authority of councils existed among all the Reformers. The equivocal opinions on councils can best be illustrated by comparing the opinion of Calvin with that of Luther. For Calvin, councils could err, and the decision of a council was no guarantee of the truth. But the determination of the meaning of Holy Scripture Calvin believed should be left in the hands of a council.

We willingly concede, if any discussion arises over doctrine, that the best and surest remedy is for a synod of true bishops to be convened, where the doctrine at issue may be examined. Such a definition, upon which the pastors of the church in common, invoking Christ's Spirit, agree, will have much more weight than if each one, having conceived it separately at home, should teach it to the people, or if a few private individuals should compose it And the very feeling of piety so instruct us that, if anyone disturb the church with a strange doctrine, and the matter reach the point that there is danger of greater dissension, the churches should first assemble, examine the question put, and finally after due discussion, bring forth a definition derived from Scripture which would remove all doubt from the people and stop the mouths of wicked and greedy men from daring to go any further.

Thus, when Arius rose up, the Council of Nicaea was summoned. By its authority it both crushed the wicked efforts of that ungodly man, restoring peace to those churches which he had troubled, and asserted the eternal deity of Christ against his sacrilegious teaching.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ On the Leipzig Disputation, see Daniel Oliver, *The Trial of Luther*, trans. John Tonkin (St Louis, 1971, 1978), pp. 93–103. Luther's ill-formed defense of one of Hus's propositions by which Eck trapped him, that there was but one, holy, Catholic Church and that it was identified solely with the elect – a notion Hus garnered from Wyclif – Luther subsequently denied.

¹⁶¹ Beginning with Nicaea in 325 and ending with Chalcedon in 451. Jewel himself openly defended the first four, and even asserted the necessary validity of the fifth, though he never really comments upon it. Jewel asserts an un-Romanized Church in the first 600 years of its history, and this is the parameter in which his debates with Harding occur, and thus the fifth council, during the reign of the Emperor Justinian, would fall within these parameters. Doctrinally the fifth Ecumenical council forms largely an appendix to the fourth.

¹⁶² John T. McNeill, ed., *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, translated by Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia, 1950), pp. 1176–77. 'Nos certe libenter concedimus, siquo de dogmate incidat disceptatio, nullum esse nec melius nec certius remedium, quam si verorum Episcoporum synodus conveniat, ubi controversum dogma excutiat. Multo

Calvin's view, hardly traditional as shall be shown, nonetheless contrasts sharply with Luther's, who coupled his own opinions about the authority of Scripture with the priesthood of all believers. Together these underpinned Luther's doctrine of the right of private interpretation.¹⁶³ Yet even this doctrine had a prerequisite, the tacit perspicuity of Scripture; that the Scriptures possessed a clarity that anyone using the Scriptures (a shepherd or a plowboy were usual examples),¹⁶⁴ could know as much as any bishop. On this point the Reformers were not univocal in definition, for example, the above quote by Calvin, and Luther's later fears about popular Bible reading. But the necessity of this doctrine alone preserved them from dependence on a magisterial institution which dictated what the Bible taught. Calvin's conciliar authority must be seen as merely pedagogical in nature, possessing a magisterial authority, but not a judicial one. This distinction is fundamental. Had both been wedded in a council, then of necessity the reforms sought and the doctrines preached by the Reformers could not be maintained, all not only lacking conciliar authority as to the veracity of their content, but also any jurisdiction of constraint upon the conscience. In the end, Calvin's view on councils becomes tautological, thus casting the matter back to the individual: 'Such a definition, upon which the pastors of the church ... agree, will have *much more* weight than if each one, having conceived it separately ... should teach it to the people, or if a few private individuals should compose it.'¹⁶⁵ Consequently the source of authority then devolved to the Scriptures.

In the *Ad Scipionem* Jewel returns to the question of the authority of regional councils, even over general councils. He touches on it quickly though, for his real aim is to show that the papacy had never had

enim plus ponderis habebit eiusmodi definitio in quam communiter Ecclesiarum Pastores, invocato Christi Spiritu, consenserint, quam si quisque seorsum domi conceptam populo traderet, vel pauci homines privati eam conficerent ... Atque ita nos ipse pietatis sensus instituit, ut siquis turbet Ecclesiam domate inusitato, atque eo res perveniat, ut sit periculum a graviore dissidio, convenient primum Ecclesiae: quaestionem propositam examinent: demum, iusta discussione habita, definitionem ex Scriptura sumptam proferant, quae et dubitationem in plebe tollat, et os obstruat improbis et cupidus hominibus, ne pergere amplius audeant. Sic exorto Arrio coacta est Nicaena Synodus, quae sua autoritate et sceleratos impii hominis conatus fregit, et pacem restituit Ecclesiis quas vexaverat, et aeternam Christi divinitatem contra sacrilegum eius dogma asservit.' Joannis Calvini, *Opera Selecta* ed. Petrus Barth. Guilelmus Niesel, 1559. Lib IV. Cap IX.13, p. 161.

¹⁶³ Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation, Past and Present* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996), p. 189 ff. Though dated, see also Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (E.P. Dutton, 1886, *Grand Rapids*, 1961), pp. 322–41.

¹⁶⁴ 'And as for the understanding of it, doubt not, for God will give knowledge to whom he will give knowledge of the Scriptures, as soon to a shepherd as a priest'. Robert Plumpton, in Dickens, *English Reformation*, p. 72.

¹⁶⁵ Calvin, *Institutes*, p. 1176. [Emphasis added.]

authority over councils, either to convene or guide. For Jewel, it was the ancient emperors who sat over the earliest councils, citing the precedents of Constantine the Great and the Council of Nicaea, Theodosius and the first Council of Constantinople and Maurice I and the Council of Chalcedon. Jewel then moves from these examples of imperial prerogative and explains why the English had authority to change their religion. For Jewel, it was always the power of imperium which presided over councils, and that is why what Constantine and the other emperors did were pious acts. Such sovereignty, however, no longer pertains to the emperor, at this time Ferdinand I Habsburg, for 'since the powers of the empire are weakened (*imminutiae sunt vires imperii*), and kingdoms have succeed to the imperial power, that right is [now] common to Christian kings and princes'.¹⁶⁶ Jewel had taken the Conciliarist argument, that contrary to canon law the Pope is not needed to convene a general council, as one can be called at the behest of the emperor,¹⁶⁷ and moved it a step further: since the power of the empire is so diminished – in fact since it has devolved to the several kingdoms – the councils of particular realms can act with just as much authority as any council that meets at Trent. Indeed, the English convocation had more of a right. It is not the Pope who has the jurisdiction and duty to order the affairs of the Church, but the monarch. In a twist of phrase that adumbrated the famous tract of Richard Montagu, Jewel wrote that the 'Apostle Paul did not wish to give himself over to the council in Jerusalem, but rather he appealed to Caesar (*sed potius appellavit ad Caesarem*)'.¹⁶⁸

For Jewel the regal power stands out more clearly in *View of a Seditious Bull* in which he defines a monarch's responsibility to convene a council, but notes that the prince must then turn all matters divine over to the bishops, who would dispose of reform, led by the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures.¹⁶⁹ As far as Jewel was concerned, this element of the

¹⁶⁶ Jewel, *ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1098.

¹⁶⁷ Sigismund convened the council of Constance, though he did so also with Pisan Pope, John XXIII, I guess just to be sure.

¹⁶⁸ Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1100. Montagu's tract, written against the seventeenth-century Puritans as *Appello Caesarem*.

¹⁶⁹ Jewel read the Bull from the Cathedral pulpit in Salisbury. Henry Parry to Sir John Thynne, xi June 1570. 'Thys day in the plupti at Sarum my Lord dyd uppon good considerations shoue furthe a Bull from Rome, in the whyche the Pope dyd declare the quene an heretique and therefore no lowfull Quene of thys realme. By the sme bull all her leage subjects discharged of theyre obedience, and that yt maye be lawfull unto all that do receave the same Bull to burne, robbe, spoyle and kyll the Quene's frynds as the Pope's enemies. thus day solelymly it was shewyd. uppon Sundaye next my L. will read yt and expounde the same. I would spend a fatt ox that my L. the Earle were present at the same: undto whom I praye you do me into hys crue, good reason wolde so, for bycause of hym I am not nombyrd of any other crue', in Longleat Papers No. 3, pp. 9–48. from *WA&NHM* 18, 1879, p. 21.

freedom of the clergy, that the clergy could come or go, were free to discuss and free to act, was entirely absent at Trent. For Jewel, councils were to be free of coercion and not governed by some predetermined oath to the Pope that was the prerequisite of attendance. This, also, Trent did not possess.¹⁷⁰

Jewel did not confine his use of Conciliarist arguments merely to the calling of the council. It extends to two other important points, both of which touched the question of the council's convening, but in particular addressed canonical and conciliar issues. The one concerns the superiority of a council over a pope, and the other concerns the licitness of a council called in abeyance of both the whole body of the clergy, and the pope in particular. The Conciliarists used two concepts by which they hoped to circumvent canon law: ἐπιε ἱκεῖα, or moderation; and the Aristotelian concept of equity. Jewel, while pure of the Conciliarists' specific language, nonetheless expanded on their thought by which he justified English action.

Prior to the convening of the Council of Constance, Jean Gerson, the Chancellor of the University of Paris, wrote his *Tractatus De Unitate Ecclesiae*.¹⁷¹ In it he countered the papalist objections raised to the calling of the council at Pisa in the abeyance of papal authority, namely, whether an orthodox pontiff could be questioned and whether a council could be held without papal authority? Gerson, like the other Conciliarists, and as the canonists before them, built his theories upon the Roman, legal dictum, *quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet* (What touches [concerns] all, ought to be approved by all).¹⁷² Gerson appealed to natural law in establishing that every part should be willing to disown its own place and prestige for the sake of the salvation of the whole.¹⁷³ He

¹⁷⁰ Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1100, 1122. The question of the oath seems a bit disingenuous on Jewel's part, since an oath was required of the English clergy before they could be ordained, let alone sit in either convocation or Parliament, that Elizabeth was supreme in all matters and causes whether temporal or spiritual.

¹⁷¹ Jean Gerson, *Oeuvres Complètes*, introduction, text and notes by Mgr Glorieux, Vol VI, *L'Oeuvre Ecclésiologique* (Paris, 1965). There is a translation in Matthew Spinka, *Advocates of Reform: Wyclif to Erasmus*. Vol XIV, The Library of Christian Classics, Philadelphia, 1953.

¹⁷² This phrase had been employed by Marsiglius of Padua, and had been one of the reasons that some at one time saw Conciliarism as arising out of his, William of Ockham's and John of Paris's writings. However, see Brian Tierney, *Foundation of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge, 1955). The place Marsiglius of Padua had in the thought of Henry VIII's apologists, especially Thomas Starkey, at one time was taken as a given, though this has been called into question specifically in Thomas F. Mayer, *Thomas Starkey and the Commonweal. Humanist politics and religion in the reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 139–46.

¹⁷³ 'Hoc nimirum dictat naturae lex ut pars quaelibet pro suo toto salvando sedet et exponat.' Gerson, *Tractatus*, p. 138.

later quoted Cicero as saying that he only loved Caesar when Caesar sought the good of the republic.¹⁷⁴ This of course was a reflection on the contending Popes who were then presiding over the schism in the Church. From this axiom Gerson addressed the use of positive law, that is, the canon law. Gerson noted that the council had employed the principles of equity and necessity to overcome the canonical difficulties that faced it, calling upon the principle of *ἐπιεῖκε* in acting for the good of the whole Church. Positive law, that is canon law, should be employed for the use and benefit of the Church, and if that law now harmed the Church, then it could and should be contravened. The law to which he referred, the one harming the Church, concerned the need for the Pope to call a general council; and it was this law that now must be set aside.¹⁷⁵ He also noted that the council, more so than the obstinate popes, would be free of schism. Yet Gerson moved beyond even the dictates of necessity, for he also posited that a council may sit over and judge a Pope:

It would be right to hold a general council against his will; finally, it would be right to compel him to abdicate, or should he resist, to defrock him of all honor and place, and indeed even to deprive him of life. Thus, all these and any like actions are able to be performed in accord with the immutable law, divine and natural, because against this truth no law or constitution of a mere man ought to be made without the new authority of God, unless it is condemned as an intolerable error.¹⁷⁶

Though the circumstances of Gerson's day had elicited this statement, revolutionary for a late-medieval, Latin mind, the canonists had already spoken of a way in which a Pope may be judged.¹⁷⁷ Yet Gerson had said that if a Pope were a notorious heretic, he may be removed, not based on any necessary item in the canon law, but because a law stood above positive law, governing the exceptions to the rule. This concept Aristotle in his *Ethics* termed equity. These two concepts, moderation and equity, justified the methods of the Conciliarists in seeking an extraordinary means to handle the schism. And likewise both equity and *ἐπιεῖκε*

¹⁷⁴ 'Caesarem, ait, nunquam dilexi nisi pro quanto visus est diligere rempublicam.' Ibid., p. 139.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 137–38. The Glorieux text uses a Latin form 'epikeia,' whereas Spinka's edition renders it in Greek.

¹⁷⁶ 'Liceret concilium generale eo invitio celebrare; liceret tandem ipsum ad cessionem compellere, vel renitentem dejicere ab omni honore et gradu, immo et vita privare. Haec omnia denique taliter licere possunt stabili jure divino et naturali quod adversus hanc veritatem nulla lex vel constitutio puri hominis cujuscumque sine nova autorizatione Dei fieri debet quin erroris intolerabilis damnanda sit.' Gerson, *Tractatus*, pp. 140–41.

¹⁷⁷ See Tierney, *Foundations*.

provided extraordinary means by which the Conciliarists could circumvent former canonical categories.

Jewel knew both his recent history and his Conciliarists, often quoting them when it suited him. Like the Conciliarists, he happily sought a means to circumvent older norms. But in the *Ad Scipionem* he even exceeded Conciliarists views of the extraordinary. Like the Conciliarists he saw the papacy as the key obstacle to reform, but for Jewel, the papacy would never countenance a truly free council. How then was reform to be effected? In what form would equity and moderation bypass the use of canon law and procedure? For Jewel it was found in two places. The first is the charismatic leader, most notably, the godly prince: 'So in times past, when bishops did sleep, or were attending to by matters, or did defile and pollute the Lord's temple, God did always extraordinarily raise up some men of great spirit and courage, to make all well and sound again.'¹⁷⁸ A similar argument Jewel had already employed in the *Ad Scipionem*: 'For he the godly man [t.g.m.] understands that he is not bound to give ear to the pope, or the council, but to the will of God, whose voice is to be obeyed, though all men say nay.'¹⁷⁹ The second is the authority vested in local councils: 'Wherefore we called a full synod of bishops, and, by common consent of all sorts, purged our church This it was properly in our power to do, and, because we could do it, we did it boldly.'¹⁸⁰ Jewel's twin resolution to the dilemma of how to reform the Church lay with the prince as a unilateral agent of reform, the one who for the good of the Church acted in the Church; and the prince's and the bishop's authority in each particular region to dictate and establish rites and ceremonies. The regional assembly of bishops could also act unilaterally to circumvent the corruption inherent in the larger Church, authority having devolved to them through that devolved from the now impotent emperor to the several monarchies and principalities. This equity stood above the law of any foreign jurisdiction's claim in England, be it papal or conciliar.

The other concept, that of the Roman legal dictum *Quod omnes tangit*, which addressed the question of interest, Jewel also employed, though never quoting or using the phrase. The Conciliarists had used it to argue both for the supremacy of the council over the pope – in that it

¹⁷⁸ 'Sic olim cum episcopi dormirent, atque aliud agerent, aut etiam contaminarent et polluerent templum Dei, semper Deus extraordinaria ratione alios quosdam excitavit, magno viros spiritu atque animo, qui omnia in integrum restituerent.' Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, p. 1123.

¹⁷⁹ Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1122. Editor's translation.

¹⁸⁰ 'Itaque convocatis episcopis frequenti synodo, communi consensu omnium ordinum ... Idque et potuimus recte facere, et quia potuimus fidneter fecimus.' Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, p. 1123. Editor's translation.

was representative of all (*omnes*), as well as for the necessity of a council convening when matters of the gravest urgency necessitated it (*omnes tangit*). Jewel took the concept of interest on a rather different path, though one having been employed in many ways by other Protestants, that is, that of the equality of orders within the Christian ministry. Jewel noted in the *Defense of the Apology* that the ministry of the Church of England had bishops, and that, though of ancient custom, they were used merely for good order.¹⁸¹ Having denied any special suzerainty to either the bishop of Rome, or even to a general council, Jewel posits prerogative in the national ecclesiastical bodies, since, 'we judged it appropriate to provide for our churches by a national council'.¹⁸² Specifically, Jewel saw the local synod as self-governing, and that only if they were good, could foreign customs be imposed on local regions. Jewel cites pope Gregory the Great to Augustine of Canterbury to support his contention.

You know my brother the custom of the Roman church, in which you have been brought up. But my judgment is, that whatever you have found either in the Roman church, or that of France, or any other, which may be more pleasing to Almighty God, you should introduce the chief of such things into the English church, which is as yet but new in faith, and, as it were, but now to be framed. For things are not to be valued because of the place where they are found; but places are to be valued for the things that are in them.¹⁸³

However much emphasis Jewel reserved for local councils, they were ultimately of little moment, even ineffectual, without the aid and support of the godly prince. Whereas in the *Ad Scipionem* Jewel had been concerned with papal abuses in relation to the rest of the Church as an ecclesiastical body, in *A View of a Seditious Bull* he treats the misappropriation of papal prerogatives over realms, especially over the realm of England. Reference has already been made to Pius V's 1570 *Regnans in Excelsis*, the Bull of excommunication by which he had anathematized Elizabeth and all who either defended her or obeyed her laws.¹⁸⁴ Jewel's treatise against this bull is also an apology for Elizabeth's

¹⁸¹ Jewel quotes Jerome to this effect, that bishops are but for order and custom and that no priest is above another, all in the context of denying papal sovereignty over any other priests. *Defense of the Apology*, in *Works*, I, p. 379.

¹⁸² 'Proprium esse judicavimus, ut municipali concilio ecclesiis nostris prospiceremus.' Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1122.

¹⁸³ Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1123–24. Editor's translation.

¹⁸⁴ 'Praecipimusque et interdicimus universis et singulis proceribus, subditis populis, et aliis praedictis, ne illi ejusve monitis, mandatis et legibus audeant obedire. Qui secus egerint, eos simli anathematis sententia innodamus.' Pius V, *Regnans in Excelsis*, reproduced in *View of a Seditious Bull*, in Jewel, *Works*, p. 1132. Jewel quotes and translates in p. 1154.

peculiar role in English ecclesiastical polity. The *Apologia* of necessity had made reference to the place of the godly prince, but all within the greater sphere of the English Church as a whole. In *A View of a Seditious Bull* Jewel lays out in detail the exact nature of the godly prince's duties, specifically the necessity of the godly prince for the *bene esse* of a godly commonwealth and its Church.

Jewel had, in his previous writings, refrained from openly labeling the pope Antichrist; instead he had allowed the invectives of others this place in his work, while he himself demurred. But in his response to Pius V he candidly applies the title, and some of its Biblical equivalents, that is, son of perdition, man of sin, to the pontiff. The raising of the tenor of Jewel's rhetoric matches the heightened political situation that the papal bull both entered and elicited.¹⁸⁵ To Jewel, as the title of the treatise proclaims, the action of the Pope was seditious. The traditionalist accusations that Protestants were seditious Jewel had rebuffed in his previous writings, but here it is manifestly the Pope who was the fomenter of sedition. Whereas Pius claimed Elizabeth had usurped the throne, Jewel contends that she had the throne by right of inheritance, as she was descended from both the house of York and of Lancaster. Furthermore, her right of inheritance was granted by the assent of the council in the days of Henry VIII. In opposition to the sedition that came from Rome and Pius V personally, Elizabeth embodies the essence of what it was to exercise the oversight of the spiritual estate of her people. This duty she discharged more perfectly and piously than the Pope in his duties, even if she were guilty of the abuses of her position that Pius claimed:

He imagineth that her majesty preacheth in the pulpits, that she adminstereth the sacraments, that she sitteth in the consistories and heareth all spiritual causes. Which if she do, she doth more than the pope doth. It were monstrous to see the pope in a pulpit, and it is monstrous to see antichrist sit in the temple of God, to see a bishop girded with the swords, to see a priest take upon him the rule of heaven and earth, the servant of servants advanced above all the princes of the world.¹⁸⁶

Jewel is not merely concerned with showing Elizabeth as pious, even in the hypothetical context of the papal slanders; instead he defines what he does see as her role. Hers is not a position novelly assumed, but was also that of 'Moses, Joshua, David, Salomon, Josias, Jehosaphat, as

¹⁸⁵ Jewel makes reference to the Northern rebellion of 1569, blaming the whole event upon Pius V. *Seditious Bull*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1146. Jewel had earlier noted that Pius 'hath conference with traitors in England, with traitors in Ireland, with traitors in Germany', p. 1138.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1144.

Constantine, Valentinian, Gratian, Theodosius, Arcadius, Honorius, and other godly emperors have done'. Further, 'God hath given charge to her of both tables. In the first she hath charge of religion, in the other of civil causes'.¹⁸⁷ Yet Jewel does understate the spiritual prerogatives that Elizabeth believed she possessed, for:

She doth nothing but which she may lawfully do, nothing but whereunto the Lord God hath given her especial warrant. Her majesty is supreme governor over her subjects. The bishops within her realm are subject to her. She governeth; they yield obedience. When occasion is offered to dispose of any thing specially appertained to the service of God, or to judge of a controversy arising in spiritual causes, she commendeth and giveth to her learned divines the due consideration thereof.¹⁸⁸

Jewel did not live long enough to witness her majesty's 'due consideration' to archbishop Grindal.

As Jewel's encomium progresses, Elizabeth's status expands from her delineated authority to her status among the hearts of the English, that Elizabeth is 'our sovereign and most gracious lady, a virgin full of wisdom, virtue, grace, and compassion: she is unto us as a comfortable water in a dry place, as a refuge for the tempest, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land'.¹⁸⁹ That Jewel's allusions, drawn from Scripture, had been initially used either of the Virgin Mary or of Christ, caused him no qualms, for to Jewel, the godly prince stood over the people even as God did over the creation.

The greatest blessing which God giveth to any people is a godly prince to rule over them. The greatest misery that can fall upon a people is to have a godly prince taken from them. For by a godly prince he doth so rule the people as if God himself were with them in visible appearance. The prince walketh in the ways of the Lord: the nobles follow the steps of the prince; and the people fashion themselves to the example of the nobles. The face of a godly prince shineth as the sun-beams and bringeth joy and comfort to his subjects.¹⁹⁰

And,

When it pleased God to send a blessing upon us, he gave us his servant Elizabeth to be our queen, and to be the instrument of his

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 1145.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 1145.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 1153. For these allusions Cf. Isaiah 32:2 for the water in a dry place, a refuge from tempest and a rock in a weary land; the *Angelus* for a virgin full of Grace (*Ave Maria*); I Corinthians 3:17 and Proverbs 8:12–14 for wisdom; Compassion was a commonplace in Marian devotion.

¹⁹⁰ The language Jewel used here is probably drawn from Eusebius of Caesarea's *Encomium* of Constantine the Great. Ibid., p. 1153.

glory in the sight of all the world ... our noble and renowned queen,
whom God hath mercifully appointed to rule over us in place of her
noble progenitors.¹⁹¹

Jewel's language about the Lord's anointed now proceeds along the twin lines delineated above: the blessings of a Godly prince, the curse of having one removed. Undoubtedly that '[t]he greatest misery ... is to have a godly prince taken from them', is an allusion to Edward VI, for Jewel's next several pages compare the times of Mary with those of Elizabeth, but more poignantly, Catholic versus Protestant times. Jewel makes several comparisons, but the key one is when he applies traditionalist sacral, sacerdotal imagery and language, language peculiar to traditionalist views of the Mass, to Elizabeth. Jewel first recounts, in superlative terms, the abysmal years of Mary's reign, in which 'what hunger was in this land ... What cruel executions ... there were few streets where was not set up a gallows or a gibbet. In Oxford two and fifty were executed ... What diseases fell upon us ... Calais was lost. A stranger [Philip II] and foreign people had the rule over us'.¹⁹²

The language of Jewel's personal correspondence often sounded the note of the poor estate into which England had fallen, both spiritual and civil, during the reign of Mary: 'As touching religion, let us think of that time of ignorances wherein we were before ... such deadly dumbness in the Church of God.'¹⁹³ Jewel contrasted this with the purported blessings that accompanied Elizabeth's reign as examples of God's blessings; the evils of Mary's as God's curse. This sets up nicely the comparisons made between 'our most gracious lady' and the enormities of papacy and those who followed it. Jewel's language now takes its sacerdotal turn, a twist guided both by his previous comparison of Elizabeth's peaceful reign with Mary's cruel one, and by his other comparison of the piety of Elizabeth with the irreligion of Pius V: 'They talk much of an unbloody sacrifice.'¹⁹⁴ It is not theirs to offer it. Queen Elizabeth shall offer it up unto God; even her unbloody hands, an unbloody sword, an unbloody people, and an unbloody government. This is an unbloody sacrifice. This sacrifice is acceptable to God.'¹⁹⁵ That Jewel's allusions do not explicitly ascribe priestly powers to Elizabeth is clear; but it does nonetheless grant her more of a right to priestly powers than those exercised by the Catholic priesthood: they do not possess an unbloody sacrifice, Elizabeth does; they have a feigned religion, Elizabeth the true. Jewel's purpose

¹⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 1133, 1145, 1154

¹⁹² Ibid., IV, p. 1155.

¹⁹³ Ibid., IV, p. 1154.

¹⁹⁴ The Mass was so termed, since the blood of Christ was only there substantially, but not as to its accidents.

¹⁹⁵ Jewel, *Seditious Bull*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1155.

was to strip the papal claims to sovereignty from the pope, and having done this, to enfeoff them to Elizabeth.¹⁹⁶

Jewel's main arguments in these two tracts focused on a set of pretenses and a set of verities: the contrived council in Trent, convened and mastered by an abomination as its head; these two, head and members, stand in opposition to the godly synod of English bishops who truly and rightly reformed religion, and that under the aegis of their godly sovereign, Elizabeth. Jewel responded to traditionalist inquiries by the use of Conciliarist arguments, both unalloyed and transformed. But Jewel and the other Reformers drew not only from the Church's recent past, they also looked to other controversies for inspiration in the defense of their actions and in their attack of papal claims, most notably, the Gregorian Reforms and the Investiture Contest.¹⁹⁷

The Gregorian Reforms and the subsequent Investiture Contest on the one hand pitted a tradition of internal piety against a longstanding tradition of imperial action, such notions arising from two different views of the Christian commonwealth.¹⁹⁸ On the other hand, they opposed the established tradition of the imperial oversight in the life of the Church by a belief that the spiritual power stands above the temporal power, both of the Empire and of the various European monarchs.¹⁹⁹ Both of these motifs appeared in the writings of Jewel and the other Reformers, whose respective stances had aspects both of Gregorians and of imperial controversialists.

With both in mind, the Investiture Contest embraces a twofold application in the study of Jewel's thought and agenda. First, the controversy becomes a motif for Reformation apologists, and especially for Jewel, as their controversial literature draws both language and argument from the royal and imperial apologists of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This occurs in their own arguments about the right of magistrates, and in Jewel's case, the English monarch's royal supremacy, expressly as it pertains to the right of the monarch to maintain spiritual order.²⁰⁰ Jewel gave to monarchs the right to convene councils, something canon law only granted to popes.

¹⁹⁶ Jewel had used this explicitly legal and feudal term when noting the pope's usurpation of powers from other bishops. *Ibid.*, p. 1136.

¹⁹⁷ Jewel, *Works*, III, pp. 345–47.

¹⁹⁸ Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Christian Society at the time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. with introduction by R.F. Bennett (Oxford, 1959). But see also Tellenbach, *The Church in western Europe from the tenth to the early twelfth century* (Cambridge, 1993), trans. Timothy Reuter.

¹⁹⁹ Morrison, *Tradition and Authority*, pp. 265–360.

²⁰⁰ Jewel used numerous Old Testament analogies in establishing the monarch as the keeper of both tables of the law, and for the monarch as over the spiritual estate. Cf. *Works*, IV, pp. 987–89; and see IV, pp. 703–7 that the pope is inferior to temporal rulers.

We now therefore marvel the more at the unreasonable dealing of the bishop of Rome, who, knowing what was the emperor's right, when the church was well ordered, knowing also that it is now a common right to all princes, forso much as kings are now fully possessed in the several parts of the whole empire, doth so without consideration assign that office alone to himself, and take it sufficient, in summoning a general council.²⁰¹

Second, the Investiture Contest provided significance from a historiographical perspective. In Gerd Tellenbach's treatment of the Investiture Contest, the eleventh century saw the confluence of three distinct views of the Christian society, of which only two could exist compatibly: the imperially ordered society, and the secular, parochially ordered society. For the Empire and the various other nations and independent principalities, the Emperor or monarch, the duke or the count, had a divine prerogative in the affairs of the Church. For the secular parish clergy, the mission of the Church was one primarily of conversion, and consequently the dispensing of the means of grace in the sacraments. In these two views the question of the necessary piety of the parish priest was largely indifferent, as the dispensing of grace did not necessarily depend on the spiritual status of the priest.²⁰² As a result, questions of simony and lay investiture were never the concerns that they would assume for the Gregorians. With the enthronement of the reformer bishop Bruno of Toul as pope Leo IX – an act initiated, overseen and effected by the German Emperor Henry III – a third world view entered: that which embraced a morality apposite of monks.²⁰³ The contrast between the monastic and the secular model of the Christian society can be simply drawn: while it may not be morally acceptable for the local priest to retain a concubine or a common law wife, the administration of the sacraments was not materially affected by this vice; in the case of the duties of monks, such actions would be fatal, for a

²⁰¹ Jewel, *Works*, III, pp. 98–99. Cf. Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1952), pp. 51–52. fn. 20. Kantorowicz notes Jewel's affinity with the Norman Anonymous.

²⁰² The question of whether purity of life and conduct is required of the celebrant of the sacrament for the sacrament's efficacy goes back to the Donatist controversy, in which Augustine gave the definitive answer that the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend on the one administering it, but on the words of institution and the Spirit of God in the Church.

²⁰³ Bruno himself was not a monk, but the scion of Alsatian nobility, related to the imperial house. Though having received his episcopal see at the nomination of Conrad II, and the papacy at the instigation of Henry III, he was a violent critic of simony, a practice at that time not yet identified with lay investiture. Most of the men Bruno surrounded himself with in Rome were monks, dominated by Cluniac notions of reform. Cf. Tellenbach *Church in western Europe*, pp. 144–47.

monk's sole vocation is prayer, the *opus Dei*. Should the monk fail in piety of what avail were his prayers? The Gregorian Reformers, operating under this monastic temperament, sought to impose a new, morally stringent ideal on the Church: one without common law wives for priests; and one without the practice of simony, the buying of an ecclesiastical office. As simony was so closely related to the practice of lay investiture, the latter must go as well. The Church needed its independence from the state that the prerequisite purity of morals may be realized in the clergy. Not surprisingly, some of the Gregorians were Donatists.²⁰⁴

In an ironic twist of categories and players, the Reformers also saw the need to purify the morals of the clergy, separating them from corrupting institutions, but now, far from the Gregorian idea of integrating monasticism into the life of the Church and separating it from any ties to the temporal powers,²⁰⁵ the Reformers, in an almost direct inversion of the Investiture contest, allied their enterprise with the state. To Luther, the Church needed to be delivered from the church, a church whose spirituality and sacramental system leaned heavily on the centrality of monasticism and its bifurcation of the temporal and the spiritual domains.²⁰⁶ Thomas Cranmer, in responding to the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, believed that the clergy as a body were the greatest hindrance to the cause of reform.²⁰⁷ The Gregorians focused on morality and the necessity of guarding the purity of the Church against the corruption inherent in the world, as well as the source of pollution, that is, lay investiture. This promptly elicited the basic monastic motif of retreat from society and the emphasis on personal morality. Likewise the Reformers saw a need not only to correct abuses, but to guard against the source of these abuses, namely, the whole Catholic sacramental system, predicated upon a sacerdotal priesthood, the corollary system of the magisterial Church, and the medieval system of merit tied closely to both monasticism and the priesthood.

The Reformers replayed the Investiture Contest, though with the necessary inverting of the means to attain reform. Jewel was keenly aware of this antinomy, as in his defense of the English Settlement he took especial aim at Hildebrand, generally remembered as pope St

²⁰⁴ Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Christian Society*, pp. 108–11.

²⁰⁵ Although the Reformers violently opposed even a purified notion of monasticism (Cf. Jewel, *Works*, IV, 798–801), they themselves inculcated numerous monastic notions of piety, transforming a communal asceticism for an individualistic one. In Calvinist circles, the abbot was replaced with the authority of lay elders.

²⁰⁶ Martin Luther, *The Pagan Servitude of the Church*, in John Dillenberger, ed. *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings* (New York, 1961), pp. 310–12.

²⁰⁷ MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 173–81.

Gregory VII.²⁰⁸ Jewel quotes extensively from all the contemporaries who treat the life of Gregory, both those whose *ad hominem* arguments labeled the pope a sorcerer and murderer, such as the cardinal Beno, and others whose pro-Gregorian stance in reporting Jewel still uses in an anti-Gregorian sense.²⁰⁹ Jewel employs accusations labeling Hildebrand a simoniac and a heretic. He quotes the Council of Brixen, called by the German emperor Henry IV, which avowed Hildebrand as not the pope, but a false monk.²¹⁰ By siding with the imperial advocates, Jewel in his role as an English apologist, strikes at Rome in three distinctly calculated ways. First, he attacks papal claims of universal jurisdiction of ecclesiastical oversight. With this denial he bolsters the 1559 Elizabethan Settlement by his assertions of the right of local polities to establish the forms of religion for their own country. Second, and as a corollary to the first blow, he also undercuts those, like Harding, who would fault the right of Parliament to establish England's religion, and thereby marks the Recusants as being as seditious as the Gregorians. Third, Jewel's revision of canonical norms necessitates a doctrinal standard for the Church other than the magisterium or the papacy: having denied to the papacy its universal magisterial prerogative, he has begged the question – the canonical question – whether this magisterial authority is found in any permanent, universal, ecclesiastical institution. For Jewel, the answer is no. It instead lies in the Scripture, but is administered by the regional Church.²¹¹

While the other Reformers embraced the civil magistrates as their protectors and integrated them in various ways into their schemes of the godly society, Jewel made the place of the prince paramount in that the prince, as supreme governor, did not only stand as moral guardian of the temporal realm, but of the spiritual also. Like the imperial and royal antagonists of the Gregorians, Jewel established a Church dependent on the crown; paradoxically, like the monks who were the protagonists of the Gregorian Reforms, Jewel retained a piety which though not overtly Donatist,²¹² still divorced Christian piety from the sacerdotal, sacramental system integral to the existence of the medieval concept of

²⁰⁸ Following Jewel's normal *modus operandi*, he spends several pages in his *Defense of the Apology* viciously attacking Hildebrand, yet this does not stop him from quoting Gregory VII that truth takes precedence over custom. *Works*, I, 49.

²⁰⁹ Beno was the most prominent member of the Roman cardinalate who sympathized with Henry IV. See Morrison, *Tradition and Authority*, pp. 319 ff.

²¹⁰ Jewel, *Works*, III, pp. 345–48.

²¹¹ Cf. the following discussion on Jewel's use of the Greek liturgies.

²¹² This accusation could have been leveled at Jewel by the Recusants. Jewel's assertion that when the pope fails to act like a bishop he is no longer one certainly embraces that heresy.

the institutional Church. While Jewel embraced the central aspects of Luther's theology, he found only a passing need to defend them, as his goal was not the positive affirmation of any of the particulars of Protestantism in and of themselves; sporadically, however, he did do this. Rather, it was to establish that Rome had no claim to the Patristic Church, while England in some sense did, especially as adumbrated in the Elizabethan Settlement of religion and Jewel's notion of the Christian Commonwealth. Jewel constrained the conscience of the English Christian to the political realities of the 1559 Settlement. As shall be seen, Jewel's idea of the English National Church assumed a Protestant visage, yet one commensurate with certain 'Genevan' sentiments. But most importantly for Jewel, the conscience of English piety ended where Her Majesty's began. Given that the prince's decree can make the polluted licit, could it enforce that which was contrary to God's Word? Jewel would never have said 'Yes' to this, but none of the Catholics with whom Jewel fell into controversy would have said it of the pope either.

Neither Precisian nor Papist: ecclesiastical reductionism in rochet and chimere

In his *Apologia* Jewel had reduced the content of the faith to a slight minimum of dogmas, and thereby created a whole new set of categories into which could be shoved adiaphora. To effect this, Jewel had taken certain matters once integral to the life and practice of the Church – rite, ceremony, numerous devotional practices – and had made them practical nullities, matters left to the discretion of Her Majesty and convocation. Jewel's polemical method reduced these categories, once employed as canonical norms among the Catholics, to ineffectual courts of appeal. It is sufficient here to note that during Jewel's tenure as bishop of Salisbury his intellectual activities were largely consumed by his controversies with Recusant antagonists, and almost wholly with Thomas Harding. In his Challenge Sermon, and in the *Apologia* as well, Jewel had chosen the parameters of his arguments to suit his polemical needs, giving himself the advantage. But in doing so he had argued for what the Church Fathers had not said, not so much for what they had. The onus for dogmatic assertions in this debate he laid on his opponents. For Jewel, the obligation of any specific doctrinal formula is immense.

In his *Epistla ad Scipionem* and his *A View of a Seditious Bull* Jewel likewise goes over some familiar territory, though now directed at more specific ends: a repudiation of both Trent and Papal sovereignty, and the valorizing of the prince as the true guardian of religion and piety. In all his writings Jewel is expansive in his eager assertions of the primacy of

the godly prince and the right of regional churches, while little can be drawn from his writings that will give us the shape of his theology. He had no long explications on the sacraments as did Luther, Calvin, Martyr and Cranmer; no running dialogues on the bondage of the will; nor did he have any positive program for the reform of the Church. Jewel's was a church beholden to its monarch, centered more around rite and order, than around any finely articulated set of doctrines: Jewel died before the united front of both Commons and clergy were able to force the question of even something so minimally doctrinal as the Thirty-nine Articles as normative for the faith of England. Both its critics and its apologists saw in England's polity a doctrinally bereft church.

Whether this was his intent, Jewel, by rearranging canonical norms as regards piety, rite, authority and polity, had made the prince a new standard of doctrine largely commensurate with St Vincent of Lerin's canon *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*. By destroying the notion of a unity among the Fathers, and valorizing a creed of the lowest common denominator, he has made what is believed by all rather narrowly circumscribed, but not so limited a parameter that he cannot get other things in, such as justification by faith alone. So what he denies to the papists with one hand he gives to the Church of England with the other. Yet he does this by how he had effected for England the first of Vincent's two canons, for the authority of *quod ubique* he has stripped from the emperor who had held it as a universal prerogative and given it to the prince. Though this necessarily raises the question of how the emperors held the imperium in the first place if it was the authority of the pope, acting as the mediator of heaven, that had been given to them? Nonetheless, the prince now held this imperium and as such possessed *quod ubique*. This goes hand-in-glove with *quod semper*, for according to Jewel, it had always been the emperor, and not the Apostolic See that, while perhaps not the definer of doctrine, was still its guardian. Jewel's prince, as shall be seen in Chapter Four, had lordship over the subjects' consciences, for by *fiat* the prince had the power to make the corrupt clean and the befouled pure. Jewel does limit all of the prince's prerogatives to the Word of God, but even then, the prince possessed the final guardianship, if indeed not magisterial authority over what Scripture proclaimed.

Jewel spent his career as an Elizabethan cleric largely arguing for the merits of his communion against the edifice of traditional Catholicism. Jewel's Church hardly possessed the historical doctrinal pedigree his antagonists did, and his most effective weapon was to cut this out of the debate, thereby making tradition not a positive tool in the formulation of dogma, but a negative one. The extant works he left of his 11 years as Elizabeth's dutiful servant attest to this. What is not there is any well-

articulated dogma. Though he left an exposition of the creed among his unpublished papers, neither his first literary executor the printer Garbrand (nee Hircks), nor the later president of Corpus Christi John Rainolds, to whom Garbrand left everything, ever thought enough of it to print it; now it is lost. Despite his affinities with continental Reformers, who all produced precise and articulate theologies in abundance, Jewel and the other English bishops who had spent their Marian years abroad, never left any formal and detailed creed: this had been the province of those other exiles, those excluded from the higher offices of Elizabeth's Church. Leonard Trinterud notes that 'The "English Zurichers" became *ex officio* the administrators of a deliberately non-ideological national religious establishment based on compromise',²¹³ that is, they made a theological virtue out of a political necessity. As will be argued in Chapter Four, this is an unjust judgment, an assessment that misses the mark in that the polity they embraced was exactly what they had hoped for. It is just that Elizabeth never equaled the Protestantly Erastian rhetoric Jewel used about her.

²¹³ Leonard J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (Oxford, 1971), p. 23.

The Catholic reaction to Jewel

English Catholics and the Counter Reformation

Previous studies on Jewel noted the varied, articulate and voluminous Catholic reaction to the bishop's polemical works, and then largely ignored it. The Recusant polemic suffers the disadvantage that their authors were traitors, expatriates and that they lacked, at least in the English speaking world, a strong confessional interest in their work. With the exception only of Harding – since Jewel in responding to him in both his *Answer* and the *Defense of the Apology* preserved a good bit of what Harding wrote – none of the Catholics garner more than passing allusions in works treating either Jewel or Elizabethan religion. Yet each of the men who answered Jewel's Challenge Sermon and the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* eventually became prominent in their own right apart from any relation they enjoyed with the bishop of Salisbury. Together they formed an integral part, not only of the history of Elizabethan Catholicism, but also of the Counter Reformation and the renewal of the Catholic Church in the second half of the sixteenth century. Yet aside from Southern's treatment of the prose of the several Recusants, and some biographies of such as Allen and Stapleton, little has been recently done on this group.¹

Not all Catholics who sought to maintain their faith got to leave England; indeed, many who would have sought this life were prevented

¹ For the Recusants, see A.C. Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant Prose, 1559–1582* (London, 1950); Marvin O'Connell, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (New Haven, 1964); for the English mission Thomas Parsons and Edmund Campion; Michael L. Carrafiello, *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580–1610* (Selinsgrove and London, 1998); Francis Edwards, SJ, *Robert Parsons. The Biography of an Elizabethan Jesuit, 1546–1610* (St. Louis, 1995); John Edward Parish, *Robert Parsons: English Jesuit* (New York, 1951); and Parish, *Robert Parsons and the English Counter-Reformation* (Houston, 1966); Ernest Edwin Reynolds, *Campion and Parsons: the Jesuit mission of 1580–81* (London, 1980); Malcolm H. South, *Jesuits and the joint mission to England during 1580–1581* (Lewiston, NY, c1999). There are also older monographs on English Catholicism: Thomas McNevin Veech, *Dr. Nicholas Sanders [sic] and the English reformation, 1530–1581* (Louvain, 1935); J.H. Pollen, *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (New York, 1920). For Recusant political thought see Peter Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise: the Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics*, (Cambridge, 1982), and Arnold Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalty in Elizabethan England*, (Chapel Hill, 1979).

from doing so by Her Majesty. These included most of the bishops and also such clerics as John Feckenham, the erstwhile abbot of Westminster. For most of these life continued in the confines of Elizabeth's several prisons; Feckenham himself, however, was actually turned over to the custody of Robert Horne, the bishop of Winchester, for several months beginning in October 1563. Feckenham's tenure at Winchester was an attempt by Horne to get him to recant his recusancy, or at least to embarrass him during their daily disputations at Winchester, but Feckenham would have none of it. After a number of progressively heated dialogues, Horne sent the former abbot back to the Tower. In 1574 he was released on bail and allowed to go to Bath, though in 1577 was placed in the custody of Richard Cox, bishop of Ely and eventually imprisoned in Wisbech Castle, where was also the former bishop of Lincoln, Watson. Feckenham died there in 1584. Nicholas Heath fared better. Bishop of Worcester under Henry VIII, he was deprived under Edward VI for his refusal to recognize Cranmer's ordinal, and spent the remainder of Edward's reign as the guest of Nicholas Ridley in London. Following his restoration to Worcester after Edward's death, he became the archbishop of York and Mary's chancellor. Acting as Mary's chancellor Heath had proclaimed Elizabeth's accession in 1558, and had also in 1559 helped arrange the Westminster Disputation. Yet when he withstood the Royal Supremacy he was deprived of everything.² After a short sojourn in the Tower, he was allowed to retire to his estates at Chobham, so long as he refrained from interfering in questions of religion. Heath stayed on good terms with his monarch, and was even visited by her; but he never attended Protestant services, probably secretly had Mass at his home, and died there in 1578. Most of the other bishops who survived 1559, like Watson, had been imprisoned, though a few made it to the continent (for example, Scot and Goldwell). For the vast majority of England's Catholics conformity became the option, though for some only on the most bare of terms, giving rise eventually to the protean epitaph 'church papist'. This moniker was largely Puritan shorthand for those who did not quite measure up to precisian zeal, and who as such were a threat to the godly commonwealth.³

More important was the throng of Oxford and Cambridge faculty and students who quit the universities for the Low Countries and the north of France. A number of Catholics did remain in England, for example, the Regius Professors of Divinity and Greek at Cambridge, George Etheridge and Thomas Sedgwick respectively. But it is the first group, the émigrés which became the concern for Jewel. Some were

² Jones, *Birth of Elizabethan Age*, p. 20.

³ Cf. Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists* (Woodbridge, 1999).

people already part of Jewel's life, most notably Richard Smith and Thomas Harding; but also Thomas Heskyns, who with Harding had been deprived by Jewel of his living as the chancellor of the diocese of Salisbury in 1559. These were but the tip of the iceberg. As Catholics, those who departed fell from the grace of the subsequent Protestant and national histories of England, yet it may plausibly be argued that they were a far more substantial group, both ecclesiastically and academically, than their more celebrated Protestant expatriates who endured exile during Mary's reign. Most of the Marian exiles who left the universities were fellows of their respective colleges, though there were notable exceptions, such as the former vice-chancellor of Oxford, Richard Cox; the list is bolstered in adding to it the foreign divines such as Peter Martyr Vermigli. Among those Marian exiles that enjoyed ecclesiastical preferment were both William Barlow, bishop first of St Davids and then of Bath and Wells and John Scory, the bishop of Chichester, who with Cranmer administered the burial rites to Edward VI, and after conforming, fled. Coverdale of Exeter was cited by the council, but was allowed to leave for Denmark in February 1555. The Marian bishops that survived into Elizabeth's reign were never allowed that much liberty.

The largest exodus under Elizabeth largely occurred from 1559 to 1563: from the time when the oath of Supremacy was first promulgated to when it was enjoined upon all those who held any public office. The Elizabethan government especially denuded the universities: 25 fellows were ejected from New College Oxford alone, many of whom figure largely in Jewel's polemical life.⁴ Aside from them, Oxford's first reader in Greek, its Regius Professor in Greek, its vice-chancellor, its proctor and several doctors in theology and civil and canon law, as well as several rectors were expelled; Cambridge's Regius Professors in civil law and divinity, and the Masters of St John's College and Clare Hall, *inter alios*, were all ejected. The individuals concerned here almost all made their way either to the established university town of Louvain to the east of Brussels, or to Philip II's new university at Douai, some 20 miles to the north of Cambrai. Paul IV had issued the bull for the university's establishment in 1559, Pius V confirming this in January 1560. The university's *raison d'être* was the combating of Protestantism and the strengthening of the Catholic faith, though its immediate cause was that the Farnese had denied their subjects any privileges to attend foreign universities. In 1559 the Netherlands was at peace, and being close to England, and having already a history of English Catholic émigrés

⁴ Southern, *Recusant Prose*, pp. 43–57, gives an abbreviated calendar of the men who fled England upon Elizabeth's accession. Though incomplete, it gives evidence of why Elizabethan Protestants would lament the failure of the arts and sciences at the universities.

(More's circle had resorted to Louvain), it was the logical alternative. Further, the Englishman John Fowler would set up his press in Louvain, where, as shall be seen, he would print most of the Recusants' tomes after 1566. At the University of Louvain two houses were established within the university's precincts, aptly dubbed Oxford and Cambridge. There also were founded Franciscan and Dominican houses for the exiled English friars.

Among the first to leave England were Richard Smith and Thomas Harding. Smith had been placed in Parker's custody, but fled for Douai in 1559 and soon was appointed by Philip II as chancellor of the university and professor of theology once the university formally began in November 1562. Initially, however, Louvain, with its well established university, proved the preference of English Catholics. Harding resorted there, taking a secular living. Harding came from Combe Martin, but five miles from Jewel's birthplace in Berrynarbor. Like Jewel he had attended Barnstaple, but obtained a scholarship to the school in Winchester in 1528, and from there entered New College, Oxford in 1534. In 1554 he obtained his DD and became a prebendary at Winchester and subsequently the treasurer of Salisbury. He was the first to respond to Jewel, in 1564. Closely associated with Harding was Thomas Dorman. Harding sponsored Dorman to Winchester, from whence Dorman came to New College where he eventually proceeded to a probationary fellowship. At some point in Edward's reign he resigned from New College, but in 1554 became a fellow at All Souls. Prominent among the others who made their way to Louvain was Nicholas Sander. Sander, also a fellow of New College, and like Harding and Dorman a Wykehamist, arrived in Louvain in 1559, but soon went to Rome where he was ordained a priest by the exiled bishop of St Asaph, Goldwell, and made DD. He attended the third session of the Council of Trent, and afterwards traveled in Lithuania and Prussia implementing its reforms. By 1565 he was back in Louvain where he became professor of divinity. Sander published three treatises against Jewel, most notably his *The Supper of the Lord* (1565) and *A Treatise of the Images of Christ* (1567). Sander was best known to the theologians of the period for his *De visibili monarchia ecclesiae*. Sander came to a tragic end in 1581 while accompanying an ill-fated expedition to Ireland in the hope of raising Catholics against Elizabeth.

Probably the most gifted of those who opposed Jewel was Thomas Stapleton.⁵ Stapleton, like Harding, Dorman and Sander, was educated

⁵ Stapleton's life and work is covered in O'Connell, *Thomas Stapleton*. It is one of the few biographies of any of the Recusants, and treats at length Stapleton's activity as a controversialist, which extended far beyond his part in the debate with Jewel.

at Winchester before going to New College in 1553, receiving his BA, in 1556. In 1558 he was ordained and made a prebend of Chichester. He left England for Louvain shortly after Elizabeth's accession and remained absent for four years. Due to the urging of his father, he returned to England in 1563. William Barlow, then bishop of Chichester, duly summoned him to take the oath to Elizabeth. Stapleton willingly subscribed to the part of the oath obligating him to Elizabeth as his sole sovereign 'in al temporal causes and things', but because he could not 'renounce every forain Prelate,' as he later wrote, 'he deprived me (as much as laie in him) of my prebend'.⁶ Following his confrontation with Barlow Stapleton left England, along with the rest of his family, and spent virtually the rest of his life in the Netherlands, first at Louvain, but then at Douai.

The John Laet or Latius press in Antwerp printed the initial Recusant polemics beginning in 1564 until the middle of 1566, when due to circumstances the operation fell to the English printer John Fowler in Louvain. The conflicts over religion then gripping France moved north, and with them came not only civil war, but brigandage. Stapleton happened to be in Antwerp on the night of 19 August 1566 when the first iconoclasm broke out in Antwerp, marking in Stapleton's mind the arrival of the Reformation. His recollection of the night was prefaced by a question to bishop Horne of Winchester: 'How thinke you M. Horne? Doe there men acknowledge their Prince Supream Governour in all Spirituall causes?' Stapleton then proceeds:

To let passe the continuance of their preachings without the walles, which dured aboute six or seven wekes, the Prince of Orange governor of the towne, labouring in the meane season a greate while but in vaine, to cause them to surcease from their assemblies, untill the Kinges pleasure with the accorde of the Generall States were knownen, they not admitting any suche delaie or expectation (as them selves in a frenche Pamphlet by them published in printe, without the name of the Author or place of the printing, doe confesse, foreseeing (as thei said) that no good would come therof, and therefore obeying the Magistrat as much as them listed) found the meanes to bring their assemblies into the town it self, so farre without the Kings or the Regents authoritye, as if they had had no King at al out of the land, nor Regent in the land. But the meanes which they found to bring this feate to passe, was singular and notable.

Wheras the 19 August the Prince of Orange departed from Antwerp to Brussels to the court, that being then in the Octaves of the Assumption of our Lady, a special solemnitie in the chief Church of Antwerp town, the brethren both for the Governors absence

⁶ Stapleton, *A Counterblaste to M. Hornes Vayne Blastte Against M. Fekenham* (Lovain: Joannem Foulerum [John Fowler], 1567), f.424a.

emboldened, and in despite of that solemnity more enkenneled, the 20 of August being Tuesday toward evening, at the Antemne [anthem] time betwene 5 and 6 of the clock, began first by certain boyes to play their Pageant, mocking and striking by way of derision, the Image of our Lady then especially visited and honored for the honorable memorial of her glorious Assumption. At this light behaviour the boies some stirre being made, as wel by the Catholiks then in the Church, as by the faction of the Calvinists there also then assembled, the Catholikes fearing a greater inconvenience, began to depart the Churche, and the brethren at the rumour therof incresed very much.

With this the Margrave arrived and ordered the Protestants to disperse, but this they were quite unwilling to do. Failing of this, the Margrave ordered them not to disrupt divine service, to which they answered, 'thei came also to do God service, and to sing a few Psalmes in his honor, that being a place most convenient therfore'. But by this time the crowd had grown so large that the Margrave could achieve nothing and left.

The Magistrate being thus rejected the holy brotherhode went to their druggery. First they song Psalmes, pretending that only to be the cause of their meeting there at that time. At their Psalmodies rushed in great numbers of people, some to see and be gone againe, some to remaine and accompanie them From that time forward, their melodie sone ended, they proceeded to sacrilege, to breaking of Images, to throwing downe of Aulters, of Organes, and of all kind of Tabernacles, as well in that Churche, as in all other Churches Monasteries and Chappelles of Antwerpe, to stealing of Chalices, so spoiling of Copes, to breaking uppe of seates, to robbing of the Churche Wardens boxes as well for the church as for the poore.

Stapleton ends his account of the evening's activities with a synopsis of the more moderate spoilation of St James church, the rapine being 'not so outragious, as in other churches'. There 'were divers little scobbes and boxes of gatherings for the poore. These scobbes lo, onlye, were broken up, and the contents visited: for to them was their chiefe devotion: Al the reste remained whole'. Finally:

To be shorte, al that night ... the Zelous brotherhood so folowed the chase, that they lefte not one Churche in Antwerpe greate or smal, where they hunted not up good game Chalices, patens and cruets of golde and of siver, copes and vestiments of silke and velvet, fine linnen and course, none came amisse: they tooke al in good parte and tooke no more than they founde. What shal I speak of the very libraries spoiled and burned, namely of the grey fryers, and of the Abbye of S. Michael? To describe particularly the horrible and outrageous sacrileges of that night, an eternal document of the ghospelike zeale. of this sacred brotherhood, woulde require a ful treatise of it selfe.⁷

⁷ Stapleton, *A Counterblaste*, ff. 17b–19a.

For Stapleton, the point of the whole story was to demonstrate to Horne that the bishop should preach obedience to his own creed's adherents, for such brigandage had never been the way of Catholic subjects with their Protestant princes. With regard to the literary fortunes of the Recusants, since from that time Antwerp became an unsuitable place for the production of their books, the printing end of the operation moved to Louvain. Yet the Catholic enterprise fared little better in Louvain, as by 1568 they were forced again to move as war pushed most of them to Douai. Harding remained in Louvain where he died in 1572. But 1568 marked the end of the Recusant English literary endeavor for another reason. As most of the English Catholics now saw themselves as involved in a conflict greater than that between themselves and Protestant England, they turned their attention to continental concerns. Consequently, the controversial treatises after 1568 were almost entirely in Latin.⁸ There was also the problem of an ever increasing diligence on the part of the Elizabethan government at its ports.⁹

One of the Recusants who did not enter into the polemical fray with Jewel was William Allen. With Stapleton, Allen led the English Catholics for most of the second half of the sixteenth century. But while Stapleton was the contemplative scholar, Allen was a man of action. Stapleton avoided church preferments, and though he did make one trip to Rome, he spent the last years of his life putting off the papacy's requests that he return, ostensibly for a cardinal's hat. Allen on the other hand had the foresight to see that Catholicism in England needed help from the outside, and thus with Jean Vendeville, the Regius Professor of Canon Law at Douai, traveled to Rome in 1567 to petition for the beginning of the English College at Douai. The English College became the fount from which flowed the Catholic mission back to England, and would produce some 450 priests, over 100 of whom would be executed by the English government for treason. Stapleton, though certainly of one mind with the English College, was a professor at the University of Douai. When Douai's political fortunes changed in 1578 with a pro-Calvinist city council in place, the English College was expelled. Stapleton, however, as a university professor was allowed to remain. The situation was not a calamity, though, for Allen, again showing prescience, had already made arrangements to move the college to Rheims, where it would stay.

Jewel's Catholic detractors confronted him on several fronts. Though the main thrust of their arguments centered on only a few of Jewel's challenges, in essence they answered all of them, for their contentions

⁸ Southern, *Recusant Prose*, p. 31; O'Connell, *Stapleton* p. 61. Southern notes that with the coming of the Jesuits in 1581 the number of English Catholic books rises.

⁹ Southern, *Recusant Prose*, pp. 33-43.

focused not merely upon certain points of controversy, for example, papal supremacy, transubstantiation, the use of images, *inter alia*; but upon particular heuristic matters, prolegomena of theological debate in which they showed Jewel deficient. Jewel had defined the parameters of the debate in such a way that he thought himself within a safe arena in which to confront the Catholics, and that the weapons of the contest, chosen by him, were all to his advantage. The Catholic response hardly accommodated Jewel, for while they certainly accepted several terms of his challenge such as limiting debate to the first 600 years of the Church's existence, in the end they chose also to show that how Jewel cast the debate itself was defective, and that what Jewel sought to denounce could not be so easily slighted, even given Jewel's own assumptions. It must be stated that this survey can hardly do justice to the weight of the Catholic response to Jewel, as 13 different writers produced 34 separate volumes, a number of them running over 800 pages, and none of them mere cursory replies.¹⁰ Some of the texts, such as Heskins' *The Parliament of Christ*, Sander's *The Supper of the Lord* and Stapleton's *The Images of Christ and his Saintes*, each ostensibly addressed but one issue of Jewel's Challenge, though numerous of Jewel's specifics could be answered whenever the topic of the Eucharist was addressed, for Jewel sought to capitalize on the vast field of Catholic Eucharistic theology to paint it as riddled with novelties and thus unfaithful to the Patristic tradition. Regardless of the number of challenges Jewel proffered, and aside from the answers to the particulars of each challenge and the general assertion that Jewel suffered from defects in his theology, the Catholic responses largely fall into several distinct categories: that Jewel had overreached with his rhetoric and that he had thus based his responses on equivocal arguments and wrongly used texts, that he had abused logic, that he had proceeded from a faulty sacramental theology, that he lacked a Catholic and Patristic ecclesiology and that he had wrongly apprehended the axioms and presuppositions of the Fathers and had thus fallen from the right path. Indeed, apart from Harding's first response to Jewel, dominated by his consideration of the several initial assertions of Jewel's Challenge Sermon, none of the subsequent Catholic works treated each of Jewel's 27 challenges. This was consciously done.

To confute any parte of the Replie, it is easy. By due examination to stay at euery Untruth, it is paineful. He doth not so much wring vs with heape of loose sayinges. He presseth not with weighte, but

¹⁰ Southern, *Recusant Prose*, pp. 61–66, lists all the works from both sides, 64 in number, though he includes each piece of correspondence between Jewel and Cole as separate items, as well as each of Jewel's sermons in 1565 against Harding's *Confutation*, given just prior to the publication of his *Replie unto M. Hardinges Answere*.

troubleth with number. His blowes come thicke, but his weapons lacke edge. some in olde time likened Logique to the hand closed togehter, Rhetorique to the hand stretched abroad. Thereof it may be conceived, how much we feare this Rhetorician. wel may he swepe duste from of our coates with flap of hand: he cannot hurte our boanes with stroke of fiste. The onset of such an enemy cannot fray us, the chasing of him may put us to some labour.¹¹

A work that sought to answer, part-by-part and line-by-line, Jewel's 1565 response to Harding would necessarily be too long, and thus it was decided that each of the Catholic contestants would answer Jewel 'as zeal pricked forward'.

The Recusants and Jewel's overextended rhetoric

When Henry Cole first responded to Jewel that the debate he proposed must proceed *dialectice* and that arguments not be based upon words and definitions, but upon logic and dialectic, he set the tone for the whole of the Catholic answer to Jewel. The Catholic polemicists certainly noted that the truth of theology was not based merely on words, that is, whether the truth of Christ's corporeal, substantial, physical presence depended on the Fathers using these exact words in so describing it, likewise whether the universal jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome depended on these specific words for its reality. And while how they approached Jewel extended far beyond the content of terms, the Catholics also argued that Jewel's challenges hardly presented the matter as it should have been, for many things that are licitly done may have no testimony in the early Church. In this they were thinking of communion under one kind, though they were still more than happy to answer Jewel on this item given the original terms of the Challenge Sermon. They argued further that how Jewel sought to use the testimony of the ancient Church would also leave no room for his own theological assertions. In answering Jewel that Christ spoke not one word about the Mass, Thomas Stapleton noted that Christ never uttered a word about sacraments or *mysterium* when instituting the Eucharist either. Even more pertinent, Stapleton maintained, if Jewel wished to quibble about the term sacrifice, he would not find it in the New Testament, for it had been given to the Church by the holy Fathers, for from none of the Evangelists could it be learned that Christ's death on the cross was a sacrifice, though of them it is learned that Christ was so sacrificed.¹²

¹¹ Thomas Harding, *A Rejoindre to M. Jewels Replie* (Louvain: John Fowler, 1566), in the 'Addres to Reader'.

¹² Thomas Stapleton, *A return of Untruthes upon M. Jewelles Replie* (Louvain, John

Rastell challenged Jewel along the same lines concerning both the veneration of the Virgin and what the ancient liturgies reveal about the Faith of the Church in its first centuries. Rastell addressed the aspersions Jewel cast on the Mass, and then turned from them to his own libel of Cranmer's Communion service and the English Prayer Book. Jewel had condemned the ordinary of the Mass by a comparison of the Mass with the Liturgy of St James, concluding that nothing of Christ's institution resided in the Mass, since clearly, Jewel argued, the Liturgy of St James is of apostolic provenance, and what is in the Mass is absent from the Liturgy of St James. This was too easy for Rastell, who pointed out that what had been added to Christ's institution in the ordinary of the Mass, namely *Kyrie*, *Sanctus*, *Agnus Dei*, *Credo in Deum* and *Gloria in Excelsis*, along with the reading of Scripture, while not 'of Christ's institution', were nonetheless perfectly acceptable. But this is hardly Rastell's damning point: after all, he queried, what was the Communion service but a ragtag rearranging of the Mass according to Thomas Cranmer's wishes? And if the Jacobean liturgy were of apostolic appointment, indeed, if not of Christ's own appointment, why did Cranmer not translate that into English? Yet what is replete in St James's Liturgy, the genuflecting, incense, commemorations of the Blessed Virgin Mary and prayers for the dead, along with silent prayers, curtains, communion in the chalice, and so on, never appear in the English Communion service.¹³ Thus, if Jewel would appeal to St James's Liturgy, then to St James he shall go.

Rastell employed the same argument as regards the use of the Latin in the Liturgy. Jewel had maintained that nowhere in the Fathers was it ever commanded that the Latin tongue be used in the service. Rastell's retort showed the weakness of Jewel's arguments from silence (what each of his 27 challenges in some way entailed) in that they would open Jewel up to similar countercharges. Rastell wanted to know when exactly were other languages used, and where is the record of Spanish, English or French ever used in the first 600 years?

And it should be a demonstration to all reasonable men, that undoubtedly the publike Service here in the west was in Latin from the beginning, because, no other beginning thereof can be shewed, nor the ceasing of those vulgar tongues, which (as M. Jewel gesseth) were once used, can anywhere be found, or espied.

Rastell, beating the same horse, then asked Jewel whether he can show

Fowler, 1566), f. 2a–2b.

¹³ Ibid., ff. 155a–58b. Rastell was mistaken about the bread being in the Chalice for the Liturgy of St James. While this is how the elements are distributed in the Liturgies of St Basil and St John Chrysostom, by use of a spoon, in the Liturgy of St James the bread is distributed to the hands of the communicants.

that the Liturgy was said in any other tongue in the ancient Church other than the Latin or Greek, for while it can be shown that hymns were sung in other tongues (though this is only witnessed to with respect to the Syriac language), yet was the Liturgy ever said in another language?¹⁴

Later in his text Rastell defended Harding who had tentatively begun this line of questioning with Jewel, by asking Jewel where were the English service books from ancient times and that if the English service were of ancient constitution, why had none of its remains survived? Jewel turned Harding's question back on him and replied that by this logic the Druids of France, who have no record of their Gallic prayer books, must have prayed in Latin. Rastell came to Harding's defense. He noted that Jewel used Harding's logic to its wrong end, indeed twisting what Harding had said. He then counters:

But that you may not escape so, I will not aske you for Bookes, nor Monuments, nor reliques, nor tokens of the English service: But in this one, and reasonable, and easy question to be answered, I would faine perceive, what sense you have or understanding. When you were borne, and long before that, the Service in England was in the Latine tonge: If therefore it had not ben so, from the beginning: when began the Latine? when ceaseth the English?¹⁵

According to the Catholic polemicists, Jewel's imprecise theological language and loose rhetoric had also failed him in regard to the matter of images. Jewel raised the issue of the worship of images in his Challenge Sermon with a completely poisoned point: 'that [at no time before AD 600] images were set up in the churches to the intent the people might worship them.'¹⁶ Harding was quite happy to agree with Jewel, that he would find no worship of images before the year AD 600 in the church; for, maintained Harding, as with the faithful after 600, Christians venerated and did not worship images. Jewel conceded Harding's point that images existed, but not the point that they were not worshiped. As with other Protestant polemicists, Jewel was quite unwilling to accept the distinction between the worship and the veneration of images, instead shifting the question from the use of images to their abuse. In doing this, he took up the position of both the Henrician and the Edwardian polities regarding images. Initially, England's was a disinterested, if not to say, an irreligious iconoclasm. Though certainly Protestant, its impetus arose not from religion per se, but from royal directives: for example, under Henry VIII, the goal of the dissolution of the monasteries was royal enrichment, not a reformation

¹⁴ John Rastell, *A treatise entitled, Beware of M. Iewel* (Antwerp: John Fowler, 1566), ff. 20b–21a, 22b–23a.

¹⁵ Ibid., f. 39b.

¹⁶ Point 14. Cf. *Defense of the Challenge Sermon* in *Works*, II, pp. 644–68.

born on Henrician principles nor least of all on evangelical ones.¹⁷ Likewise under Edward VI, though certainly Protestant, as with the question of vestments, so with the matter of images, the alacrity of reform did not satisfy the program or agenda of some. Officially, Edward's policy was that of his father, that images 'unabused' (not used idolatrously) were to be condoned.¹⁸

Stephen Gardiner addressed the matter of icons in his February 1547 letter to Nicholas Ridley, quite aware of the drift of the new government, and realizing the place the alteration of religious policy had in it. Gardiner understood there could never be a separation of religion from national interests, and saw religion as one of the constitutional elements of the English nation.¹⁹ For Gardiner, Edward's minority demanded peace and stability, but the changes sought by some (he cites Barlow of St Davids) embraced only peril for the state. In a letter to the military governor of Portsmouth, Edward Vaughan, Gardiner noted that attacks on religious images presaged political upheaval, even as it had done in Germany during the Peasants revolt.²⁰ While he annexed political and national considerations in his letters to Somerset and Vaughan, Gardiner in his letter to Ridley, addressed matters from both the theological and historical vantage point. He cites Eusebius in favor of the antiquity of images, noted that the transitory nature of the Mosaic code makes it a poor prop for iconoclasm, and further noted that unlike pagan idols, which were vanities and nonexistent things, the images in the Church were of Christ and his saints. He also noted that not even Luther, who had 'pulled away al other regard to them, strove stoutly and obtained, as I have seene in divers of the churches in Germany of his reformation, that they shuld (as they do) stand stil'.²¹ Gardiner further argued that if learning and devotion by the sense of sight were to be removed, should not preaching then, using the auricular sense, also be removed? For Gardiner the political ramifications of iconoclasm were never out of sight, especially when denouncing it to Somerset, but he always kept the considerations that such actions had for devotion paramount.

¹⁷ Cf. Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars. Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven, 1992); and John Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535–1660* (Berkeley, 1973).

¹⁸ This same type of abuse argument is used by the Protestant establishment regarding Eucharistic adoration, and is a main feature of Jewel's own polemic.

¹⁹ Along with laws, land and decrees. To Somerset, 28 February [1457]. James Arthur Muller, ed. *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 265. These sentiments are expanded in a letter of June 1547, Muller, pp. 286–95, cf. 288–90.

²⁰ Muller, *Letters*, pp. 273–74. In a later letter to Somerset Gardiner points out that evidently it was a rood screen that was pulled down.

²¹ Muller, *Letters*, p. 256.

Jewel would also link images with the good of the commonwealth, but the Catholic distinction between image and prototype, and between worship and veneration as regards images and saints, he would not admit. Nonetheless, this distinction Jewel happily embraced when paying homage to the image of the prince. For Jewel, Elizabeth exercised the spiritual oversight of her people and became an image worthy of veneration: for 'she doth nothing but which she may lawfully do, nothing but whereunto the Lord God hath given her especial warrant. Her majesty is supreme governor over her subjects. The bishops within her realm are subject to her. She governeth; they yield obedience'.²² As noted in the last chapter, Jewel made sweeping, hagiographical allusions to Elizabeth, drawn from Scripture, and initially used of either the Virgin or Christ.

The greatest blessing which God giveth to any people is a godly prince The greatest misery ... to have a godly prince taken from them. For by a godly prince he doth so rule the people as if God himself were with them in visible appearance. The prince walketh in the ways of the Lord: the nobles follow ... and the people fashion themselves to the example of the nobles. The face of a godly prince shineth as the sun-beams and bringeth joy and comfort to his subjects.²³

The venerated icon now was no longer a saint, but her majesty.

When Harding first responded to Jewel perhaps he took the bishop aback by his response, for Harding was quite willing to agree with Jewel that in the first 600 years of the Church's existence there had never been put up any images for the purpose of the people to worship. This would have been idolatry, for after all, worship is due to God alone. Instead, Harding maintained, images had been set up for veneration, for what Catholics termed *dulia* or mere reverence. Worship, or *Latreia* was due to God alone, and thus Catholics venerated images, they did not worship them; and this, Harding asserted, was the attitude of the first 600 years. Jewel would not permit this distinction, and in this he was little different than other Protestants. Calvin had both denied that this distinction was clear, or that any religious adoration could be given to creatures. The Greek term προσκυνέω, Calvin asserted, could only have God as its object, and turned to Cornelius's prostration before Peter in the book of Acts and John's prostration before the angel in the Apocalypse as evidence of this. Calvin did not, however, address why this is the word

²² Jewel, *Seditious Bull*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1145. Jewel did not live long enough to witness her majesty's 'due consideration' to archbishop Grindal. Cf. Patrick Collinson, *Grindal*, pp. 233–52.

²³ Jewel, *Seditious Bull*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1153.

used of honor due to parents.²⁴ In fact the second Nicaean Council (787) had linked προσκυνῶ with τιμώτης to guard against any confusion of terms. Up to and including Jewel's and Harding's confrontation, the debate over images in the English Church had made no use of the central point on which the debate over images had turned in the eighth and ninth centuries, the Incarnation. At this very point Nicholas Sander took up the question with Jewel.

Sander reproduced segments from both Harding's and Jewel's works in treating the question of images, and went directly to the question of whether Catholic images were by definition idols, showing that Jewel's identification of the two takes liberties with what the Fathers had said. He quotes Jewel: 'M Harding douteth not to derive the first invention of his Images from God his selfe (and afterward) but learned and wise men thinke, that the invention hereof came first from the Heathens and Infidels, that knew not God.' Jewel quoted St Athanasius to bolster his point, to which Sander replied that Jewel had twisted the saint's words, for Athanasius had written that all idols, not all images, were the invention of the heathen. He then pressed his point:

Is every image an idol? If you thinke so, then sith *the Son of God is the Image of God, and the figure of his Fathers substance*, the Sonne of God is with you an Idol. Or is every idol, an image? then the pictures of those who are made with Dogs faces, are Images, and consequently there are such men in dede. For every Image, if it be properly an Image, is the likenes of some truth. Otherwise it is an Idol, and no Image, as I shewed before out of Origen and Theodorete. But know you not the difference betwene an Idol and an Image? Then you are very simple, in good faith, and to(o) meanly learned, or if you do know the difference (because doutles you are no sote) why then turn the greek word εἰδώλων *Idolorum*, by this english word Images? but onely because you must maintein your cause by falshod? But let us come to speak of the state of the new testament.²⁵

Sander also took up the question of the relation between images of Christ and the images of kings and princes. None would deny that the smashing of the image of the king is nothing less than treason; what then of smashing the image of Christ? Is not Christ in his manhood worthy at least of the honor given to kings? If it is correct to break the image of Christ, is it not also warranted to break the image of the king and magistrate?²⁶ Sander here introduced, but did not pursue, the link between proper reverence of God as a prerequisite for proper obedience

²⁴ Calvin, *Institutes*, I.xi–xii. Cf. McNeil ed., pp. 99–120.

²⁵ Nicholas Sander, *A Treatise of the Images of Christ; and his saints* (Louvain, John Fowler, 1567), ff. 76a, 77b–78a. Italics Sander's.

²⁶ Ibid., ff. 109b–11a.

to the king, and though he does not spell it out specifically, those who would honor images of the king, but not of Christ, have created a god of the king. During the iconoclastic controversy images of the emperor were allowed, those of Christ were not. Sander knew this, for unlike Harding and Gardiner, he knew and employed the same arguments the eighth- and ninth-century Church had used in its defense of images, a defense based on the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ.

Surely if we wil goe no further, but to the only nature of flesh, as flesh, it may not be worshipped with Gods owne honour. But because the flesh of Christ must be respected, as a thing united to the Godhead in one person, for the respect and truth also of this union, we ought to give the same honour to Christes flesh, which we give to God. For it is made the flesh of the natural Sonn of God.²⁷

The Recusants also denounced Jewel for altering the terms of the debate when his demands for evidence concerning the reception of communion under one kind and the reality of the private Mass were met. In the Challenge Sermon Jewel had made absolute that no contrary example could be produced. The Catholic replies, however, came seemingly a bit faster than Jewel had thought they would. Rastell in his *A treatise entitled, Beware of M. Iewel* first noted that Jewel divided his assertions into a host of questions, focusing on the supposed invention of private Mass. Yet, noted Rastell, instead of considering all of these questions as a piece, Jewel had shifted his ground from one argument to another, all the while appearing as if he were arguing one point.²⁸ What had been Jewel's *modus operandi* for private Mass had held true for communion under one kind. When Harding gave the example of communion received by bishops visiting Rome which had been sent to them by the pope, Jewel's response, that there was no mention of the Mass in the text, only obfuscated the point for:

'Which of the three said masse? He that sent the Sacrament, or he that receaved it, or els the messenger that brought it? It were a straunge matter to see a Masse and yet no man to say Masse.' Lo how closely M. Jewel kepeth his wittes together. He is opposed with single communion, and he demandeth of the Masse: the objection goeth upon the receaving the Communion, and he asketh (without answer making) who saied the Masse.²⁹

Jewel's response had also not addressed Harding's real contention:

To this effect then cometh the first article. M Jewel dalieyth stil, ye D. Harding sheeweth not any private masse, that is (by his

²⁷ Ibid., ff. 124a.

²⁸ John Rastell, *A treatise entitled, Beware of M. Iewel* (Antwerp: John Fowler, 1566), ff. 6a–7a.

²⁹ Ibid., f. 7b.

interpretation) where any priest SAID masse, ORDINARILI, in OPEN CHURCH and received alone: D. Harding proveth Priavate masse, that is to say, single communion, or Sole receaving.³⁰

Rastell also took Jewel to task for how he changed the parameters of his second proposition, for he seemingly altered the point every time his most recent iteration was shown deficient. Initially Jewel, in the third instance of his preaching the Challenge Sermon had stated that,

Touching the second abuse of the communion under one kind, it would be long to say so much as the place would seem to require. For, besides the institution of Christ, and the words of St Paul, which to a christian man may seem sufficient, it was used throughout the whole catholic church six hundred years afer Christ's ascension, under both kinds, without exception.

Further on Jewel denied 'that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind'.³¹ The words 'without exception' and 'any communion' would prove too large for Jewel's argument.

Necessity forced Jewel's hand once the Recusants produced examples that the laity, St Basil the Great, St Ambrose and even Christ to the disciples on the road to Emmaus, had administered and partaken of communion only under the form of bread. Once these items were brought forward as evidence, Jewel altered his Challenge to demand that this practice be shown in the first 600 years to have ever been openly performed in the church and as a public usage. Lastly Jewel added the proviso 'as it is practiced in the Church of Rome'. Numerous examples came out that showed Jewel's initial sermon's point – 'without exception' – faced numerous exceptions, and thus Jewel in the course of his controversy with Harding had to shift his ground. From his vantage point in Louvain in 1566 Rastell saw Jewel's maneuvers and rightly pounced on the shift. Paramount for Rastell, Jewel's Challenge needed to be reformed, that 'the first question should have bene: Whether Christes Institution doth stand with receaving under one kinde', and 'whether it were an abuse in the primitive church to receve under one kind'.³² This echoed a point Rastell had made the previous year against Thomas Cooper, bishop of Lincoln, concerning the minister communicating alone or privately.

[Cooper's defence] *But you should bring such places as might prove that the common minister in place of the Lorde his supper, did celebrate and receyve alone, other being present, and not partakyng.* No Syr, you must rule us in the manner of our reasoning, and appoint us to prove that, which we take not upon us. This is it,

³⁰ Ibid., f. 10b. Emphasis Rastell's.

³¹ Jewel, *Works*, I, pp. 9, 20.

³² Rastell, *Beware*, 17b–18a.

which I have wysshed before to be well remembered, that our question is not, whether any priest then did receive alone, but whether he might doe it lafullie, or no, that is our question.³³

Rastell also faulted Jewel for his poor use of words in his assertions that nowhere in the first 600 years could be found in any old doctor or church council that ‘Christes bodye ys reallye, substaniallie, corporallie, carnaillie, or naturallie in the Sacrament’. Rastell could offer his own challenge with little fear of what it would mean for his theology, for likewise

I think it would be very hard to find, in any writering, of old and holy doctor within vjC yeares of Christ, all these wordes, that he toke *reall, substantiall, corporall, carnall, et naturall flesh*, of the virgin marie, and yet they were instructed perfectlie, to beleve that Christ toke ovr verve flesh, and not a figure onely therof, as the Maniches did evill report.³⁴

Closely aligned with Jewel’s tergiversation on the precise limits of his challenges was his equivocal use and misquoting of texts. Thomas Dorman, Harding’s protégé, presented a clear case of this in which Jewel had cited the Acta of a council at Carthage to the effect that only Scripture could be read in the churches. Yet having made his point Jewel completely ignored what immediately followed.

You know you have alleaged it, aswel in your sermon and privately, as in your Apologie togeather with others to prove, *that nothing may be read in the Churche but Scriptures*. And yet you could not be ignorant, if ever you sawe the place in the original, that there foloweth, immediatly, *sub nomine divinarum Scriptarum*, under the name of divine scriptures: whiche wordes you cut of cleane, as you concealed also the latter parte of the canon, where is an other exception, directlie making against that for the which you alleaged it, that is, *that besides the scriptures, the Legendes of Passions of martyrs may also be read, when their yearely Feastes are kept*: which thing you denie.³⁵

Rastell also censured Jewel in regard to his seeming careless use of passages for his Protestant ends. For Rastell it was hardly a question of Jewel being haphazard, as in his mind Jewel had deliberately twisted the passage in question. Drawing on a particular passage in Jerome’s *Adversus Iovianium*, Jewel had hoped to demonstrate that people ought not to take the elements of the Eucharist and communicate at home, that

³³ John Rastell, *A Replie against and Answere* (Antwerp: Aegidius Diest, 1565), ff. 125b–26a.

³⁴ John Rastell, *Confutation of a Sermon* (Antwerp: Aegidius Diest, 1564) ff. 139a–39b.

³⁵ Thomas Dorman, B.D. *A Request to M. Iewell* (Louvian: John Fowler, 1567), ff. 3a–3b. Emphasis is Dorman’s.

is, that communion was to be public and in church. For Jewel, communion was something obtained by the people when they participated together; an act of the people, not a union with Christ effected through the presence of the human nature of Christ in the elements. Jerome's denunciation of receiving at home was seen as a denunciation of the 'private Mass': *'that in his tyme some used to receyve in their houses, but he [Jerome] earnestly inveigheth against that maner. Why (sayeth he) doe they not come into the church? Is Christ sometyme abrode in the commonplace, sometyme at home in the howset?'*³⁶

Rastell reproduced the entirety of the passage from Jerome to show that this had nothing to do with some abuse of not communicating in the Church, but dealt rather with the ancient Christian customs of fasting and abstaining from conjugal relations prior to partaking of the Eucharist. Thus Jerome's condemnation was leveled against those who would have had sexual relations with their wives and then received the sacrament at home, even though they dared not go to the church for the Martyrs' feasts or for any other Eucharist celebrated in the local parish after having had intercourse with their spouse. Rastell then cited the unexpurgated Jerome:

I know that this custome is in Rome, that the faythfull doe at all tymes receyve the bodye of Christ which thing I doe neither reprove, neither allow, for every man abundeth in his owne sense. But I aske of theyr consciencies, which doe communicate the same day, after they have had carnall knowledge of theyr wyves, et iuxta Persium, noctem flumine purgant, wherefore they dare not goe unto the Martyrs? wherfor they go not unto the church? ys Christ one abrode, and another at home? that which ys not lawfull in the church, ys not lawfull at home etc.³⁷

Jewel managed to mangle texts even when they were drawn from Protestants, namely Luther. In Luther's audience before Cajetan in Augsburg in October 1518 he and the Dominican cardinal had argued over the nature of faith required for the sacraments to be efficacious. Jewel drew from Luther's response to argue that the Catholic Church taught that the Eucharist was efficacious unto redemption regardless of the state of faith of the communicant. Not only did Jewel not present correctly Cajetan's sentiments, but in quoting him he deletes part of Cajetan's assertion, one which Luther did not. 'Accessuro ad sacramentum necessarium est ut credat sese gratiam consequi, et in hoc non dubitare sed certissima fiducia confidere, alioquin in iudicium accedit.' First, Jewel substituted 'eucharistiam' for 'sacramentum', a necessity since what he was arguing concerning the Eucharist was not in

³⁶ Jewel, quoted in Rastell, *Confutation*, f. 129a. Italics are Rastell's.

³⁷ John Rastell, *A Replie against an Answer* (Antwerp: Aegidius Diest, 1565), f. 130a.

question at Augsburg (Jewel altered the quote both in the *Defence of the Apology* and in his *Reply unto Harding*), but more importantly, everything that Cajetan said following 'ut credat' Jewel edited out, changing the entire context and meaning of what Cajetan was arguing.³⁸

One of Jewel's more blatant abuses of a text was when he asserted in the *Apologia* that papal canonists had declared that fornication was not a sin. As was the case with the question of images, Jewel would not allow the Catholics a distinction which they made in regard to certain matters relating to sexual morality: whether it were better for a priest to fall into sexual sin, or to take a concubine, than to break their vows of celibacy and oaths as priests, and to marry. To Jewel this distinction was nothing short but a rejection of the institution of marriage, and cited St Paul's warning against apostates who refused people to marry. For Catholics the distinction arose over which was the greater sin, to fall into fornication, which was never not considered a sin, or the breaking of a religious oath or vow. The question was personal for Jewel. Peter Martyr had been a Augustinian monk, and upon repudiating the papacy and embracing Protestantism had also renounced his vows of celibacy, along with monasticism, had married, and this not only once. Martyr's presence in Oxford with his wife had evoked not merely consternation, but public denunciations. Richard Smith, Martyr's nemesis, had written two tracts against Martyr and the whole question of clerical marriage and the breaking of monastic vows. By the 1560s it was a given that Protestants would do this, since Martin Luther himself had repudiated his vows and had married a nun. Jewel never addressed per se the question of vows, he simply accepted that Martyr had the right to break his, all the while damning Catholic contentions that they would rather countenance fornication than allow their priests to marry. His citation of canonists on this was proof enough.

The only problems were that those he cited were not canonists, and that fornication was never countenanced by Rome. Jewel would not yield on the question that this was a problem of greater or lesser sins. Harding hit back. 'In my Confutation I saie that this is a grevous offence, and worthy to be pounished.' But Harding's claims are not merely personal pieties professed in opposition to other Roman Catholics: Jewel had misrepresented the facts. First, the author he cited as a canonist,

³⁸ Jewel cites the passage as 'Fides non est necessaria accessuro ad eucharistiam' which appears in both *Reply to M. Hardings Answer*, *Works*, II, p. 751, and in *Defence of the Apology*, *Works*, III, p. 556. For Luther see *Werke*, Weimar edition, II, p. 13. Jewel's use of the text has an afterlife appearing in the Anglo-Catholic writings of B.J. Kidd and Eric Mascall. The matter is treated at length by Francis Clark in *The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Westminster, MD, 1960), pp. 365–79. Clark confused Jewel's *Defence* for the *Apologia*.

Iohn de Magistris, did not exist; there is a Martin de Magistris, but he was not a canonist, but a Doctor of Divinity. It is true, Harding maintained, that de Magistris did write at one point that simple fornication was no mortal sin, yet in its context this did not mean that he did not believe that it was not mortal sin. At the place where Martin de Magistris so argued that fornication was not a sin, he was but merely giving the *non* equation of the *sic et non* of scholastic writing, that is, 'but only wrote of the matter after the Scholastical manner' as Harding put it.³⁹ Martin de Magistris had argued, Harding added, that to deny that fornication was not mortal sin was not heresy per se, but he never asserted that fornication itself was not mortal sin, only that a denial of the point was not heresy.

In the *Defense of the Apology* Jewel cited Gratian (who was himself citing the first Council of Toledo) that 'Is qui non habet Vxorem, et pro Vxore Concubinam habet, a Communionem non repellatur [He who does not have a wife, and has a concubine in place of a wife, let him not be thrown out of the communion.].' But Jewel had not quoted all of Gratian, who was citing the canons of the Council of Toledo with respect to the having of common law wives, of people who had married without consent of parents and thus without dowry, but who nonetheless lived with each other as husband and wife. 'Concubina autem hic intelligitur, quae cessantibus legalibus instrumentis unita est, et coniugalia affectu asciscitur. Hanc coniugem facit affectus, concubinam vero lex nominat.'⁴⁰ Such arrangements were to be solemnized by the church, and when this was done, the couple was to be considered married from their first union, their children to be considered as lawfully born. In this sense, concubines were wives, for affection had made them so, and thus the civil law in this sense considered concubines wives. Otherwise, having a concubine was adjudged a sin. Harding, to drive the point home, noted that St Augustine was quoted in the Decrees to the very effect that having concubines without the intent of affection was sin. Harding treats of several other passages cited by Jewel to damn Rome with asserting that fornication was not a sin, and probably the most twisted of these is Jewel's citation of St Augustine that he did not know whether fornication was forbidden for single men to commit with single women. Harding responded that Jewel had given the wrong citation for the place he alleged, but then went on to quote the putative offending passage from St Augustine. The saint's point had been that it seemed that fornication

³⁹ Thomas Harding, *A Detection of Sundrie Foule Errours, Lies, Slanders, Corruptions, and other false dealings* (Louvain: John Fowler, 1568), f. 394b.

⁴⁰ 'This, however, is understood as regards the concubine, who is wed by the laws faltering instrumentality, and is accepted as married on account of due affection. Affection makes this union, the law certainly calling her a concubine.' Ibid., ff. 396b–97a.

was not the same as adultery, though the words of Christ with respect to the causes for divorce closely linked them. If fornication differed from adultery, then Augustine confessed that he was unable to tell whether it was forbidden in the decalogue, but not whether it was not forbidden altogether.⁴¹ Oddly, Jewel never cited the passages from St Augustine and St Thomas which countenanced the existence of brothels, allowable on the assumption that if they did not exist greater harm could occur to society, even though Peter Martyr cited them both (only to reject them), the passages present in the *Loci communes*.⁴²

The Recusants and Jewel's use of logic

Jewel's *oratio* had hobbled his *theologica*, and consequently, the scholastic in Jewel, something he had little place for, must fill the breach. But as Jewel's rhetoric faltered, his logic proved unequal to the challenge, unable to save him, at least not according to Harding and the other Recusants. While it may be unfair to say that Jewel purposefully abused logic, the Recusants believed themselves justified in drawing this conclusion, and probably the more so since Jewel's rhetoric had so poorly served his theology. The Recusants throughout their writings repeatedly slighted Jewel's theological logic and acumen, and one of the most basic accusations against Jewel's dialectic was that his conclusions did not proceed from his assumptions and first principles. Harding had attacked both Jewel's rhetoric and logic, and found them wanting.

Item, [according to Jewel] 'The Fathers speak muche of the spiritual Aulters of our harte, and of mere spirtual sacrifices: *Ergo*, they denie, that there be any material "Aulters, and that thereon the real and external Sacrifice of Christes body and bloude is offered"'. Logique is good cheape, where these Argumentes be allowed. But he that lacketh a Recorder, may yet pype with an oten reede. If Logique can not handsomly be applyed, to mainteine M. Iewels glorious Chalenge, yet Rhetorique wil do good service. And yet in Rhetorique it selfe these Arguments be but childish.⁴³

Thomas Dorman amplified Harding's sentiment, though he is far more specific and acerbic on how it was that Jewel's conclusions did not

⁴¹ Ibid., ff. 403a–05a.

⁴² For Martyr, *Loci*, 2.11.8–11; for St Augustine, *De ordine*, 2.4.12; and for St Thomas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2-II, Q. 10, a. 11. All cited in John Patrick Donnelly, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli's Political Ethics', in Emidio Campi et al, *Vermigli, Humanism, Republicanism* (Geneva, 2002), pp. 65–66.

⁴³ Harding, *A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie* (Louvain: John Fowler, 1567), sig NNNi b. His citation from Jewel is *Works*, II, p. 723.

proceed from his premises, especially in regard to the red herring of the 'private Mass'.⁴⁴

But let this be graunted to your spirite of arroganceie, that you maie saie frelie that yow have sene all the writers, which no man elles alive hath done: let it be a figure of rethorick that yowe have ransacked every corner in their worckes, who have not reade the twentieth parte thereof, and of that little which you have reade, have not borne awaie perhapps the hundreth. Yet all this I saie being graunted, what logike is this of youres to reason after this sort? All these holy doctours have geven us perfect evidence of a communion, without mencion making of any private masse, *Ergo* there was in Christes church within the first six hundred no private masse. If apon your witnesse yow bring not in this conclusion yow saie nothing against us. If this be your conclusion, in effect yow saie as little: forasmuch as every childe is in a manner able to teache yow, that this consequent is nought: he speaketh no of such a thinge, *ergo* there is no such thing. Or as yowe reason, they did not, *Ergo*, though coulde not.

I would alleage your auctorities of *Clemens, Dionisius, Iustinus martir, Ambrose, Hierom, Austen, Leo*, saving that we finde in them that which we denie not, that is to saie, that with the priest, the people did use to communicate: but that if (as yow saie) the people would not, the priest should not, thereof we finde not one worde, which till yow rove us, Chrisostome his yea will be taken for better then youre naie That as the catholices forbidde no man to receive with the priest that will: but hartelie wisshe that all men would so dispose themselves, that at every Masse with the priest there might be some to communicate: so neither can they constreine them to receive whose devotion thereto serveth them not, nor maie them selves absteyne from the sacrifice whereunto Christes institution bindeth them.⁴⁵

Stapleton also slighted Jewel's *argumentum ad consequentiam*, and illustrated his contentions by employing the *Pater Noster*, that not one example could be found that any private person said this to himself in the first 600 years, and likewise, you could find no written record in

⁴⁴ Dorman was quite pointed in defending his mentor, in his 1567 *A Request to M. Jewell* (Louvain: John Fowler) he wished to show Jewel in some few instances his 'evident corruption', 'execrable lye (5b)', and to point out that 'if you had as good a stomacke to digest your meate that you receive, as you have a liberal and large conscience in uttering of falsehood, you might eate horseshewes and take no harm (6a)', 'when you prove falshood in other, have made so lowde and impudent a lye your selfe', for example, 'Is your conscience, say you, free and cleane from all falsehoode that every you uttred? Nowe surely then have you as strange and as large a conscience, as ever I hearde of, or rather no conscience at all. For of al manie hundreds of untruthes, wherewith by diverse men you remain charged in printe to chose one, the rather because your selfe have chosen it in this Sermon of yours, I praie you Syr tell us, howe youre Protestation, and the evident corruption of the Councel of Carthage agree together?'

⁴⁵ Dorman, *A proufe of Certeyne Articles* (Antwerp: Johann Latius, 1564), ff. 98a–99a.

Spain of 'private Masses' in the last 50 years, yet did this mean that neither of these were true?⁴⁶

With respect to the question of the adoration of the consecrated elements, Rastell, who certainly employed logic and dialectic more than his compeers (and thus makes for less engrossing reading), beats Jewel with the same stick. He noted that according to Jewel, since Christ or Paul did not command adoration of the elements to be done, it should not be done. Here Jewel had employed the same form of argumentation as had Hooper when balking at the wearing of episcopal garb, that is, that a regulative principle drawn from the Scriptures, negative in construction, should limit theological activity. Yet, retorted Rastell, Christ nowhere gave commandment that he be worshiped either, even though it was done. And St Paul gave no command in regard to the posture to be taken when receiving the elements, yet the English Prayer Book prescribed one.⁴⁷

For the Catholics, Jewel's conclusions, based on the putative silences of the Fathers, were not merely non sequiturs, but indeed were dangerous to the Faith. Jewel had done what the Puritans themselves did, that is to affirm that the want of any positive commandment was the same as a prohibition. Jewel may not have been consciously arguing this, but the coincidence of his thought with that of the Puritan and later Presbyterian notion of a regulative principle in doctrine, worship and Church order, here applied to the Church Fathers, essentially left no room for theology itself. For after all, Rastell would argue, what was the assertion of the Arians against ὁμοούσιος, but that it was not in the scriptures, and that it had no antiquity. Similarly Rastell had proffered that doctrines now professed by the Catholics, though perhaps not explicit, nonetheless were clearly contained in the Fathers, noting in his *Confutation* that 'whereas owt of one principle a hundred conclusions may be deducted, it is not necessary, that every conclusion be expresselie written in the auncient fathers workes, or ells that we make doubte of the principle, which afterwarde I will make more playne and probable.'⁴⁸

Jewel himself had been defended by the bishop Thomas Cooper, in his *An Answere in Defence of the Truth*, which itself had been penned

⁴⁶ Stapleton, *A return of untruthes*, f. 34a.

⁴⁷ Rastell, *Confutation* 70a–73a.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 144a. The principle he was going to make plain was the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the point he was there arguing. Rastell leaned heavily upon both St Cyril of Alexandria and St Ambrose of Milan in his arguments. For Cyril the arguments had actually run the other way, in that he sought to guard the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and thus sought in his defence of the hypostatic union of the Incarnation a guarantor of Christ's physical presence in the Eucharist. Rastell was arguing the other way round.

against an anonymous apology for private Mass. Rastell, assailed bishop Cooper for more than just coming to wrong conclusions, but also cited him for equivocal reasoning. Rastell had responded by defending the *Apologia* when it had argued that as no prayer is merely a private prayer, so no communion is merely a private communion, and that Sir Thomas communicating in Paris and Sir Ambrose communicating in Venice were also communicating with each other, for communion with other Christians was predicated upon and effected through communion with Christ.

[Cooper's Defence] *Sir I deny your argument, and say, that neyther thone, nor thother doth communicate with any Christian man, because neyther of both receiveth according to Christ his institution.* [Rastell] You be allwaies lyke your selfe, in forgetting your selfe. For here you deny the argument, and the cause of your denyall is the fault which you fynde with the major and minor propositions of it. But if the faulte be only in the propositions, why deny you the argument? And if the argument be faultie, how uncunningly do you prove that, by denying of the propositions? But go to, let the first proposition be interpreted as you would have it, and lett us then repete the argument, saying, *Thei which receive in divers places, according to the institution of Christ do communicate together. But Syr Thomas etc.* (as before [Thomas celebrateth Masse and receyveth alone in Parys, and Syr Ambrose doth the lyke in Venyce: Ergo Thomas and Ambrose doe communicate together]) *doe so: Ergo thei communicate together.* How saye you? doth this argument please you? yea truly I thinke it doth. why then dyd you deny the former argument, which was altegether of the same forme and making with this? But such disputors they be, with whom the church hath to doe. Now againe, if you admitt the argument as concerning the forme of it, what saie you to any of the propositions, and say that none of those two priestes, whom I named, do worke according to the institution of Christ. And why so? Forsooth (saie you) because thei receive alone by them selves. Yea but herein you say falsely, because the one of them at the least, receiveth with the other, and so thei have a communion, and observe the institution of Christ.⁴⁹

Rastell's arguments responded not merely to Cooper, but also Jewel who had made the identical argument against Harding in *A Replie to M. Harding's Answer*. Treating of the question of 'private Mass', Harding had maintained that St Jerome in Bethlehem and St Augustine in Carthage were in communion with one another – Jerome had written that Augustine was *episcopum communionis meae* – despite the miles that sundered them. Jewel attacked Harding for equivocating on the term *communio*, that it had two senses, communion of doctrine and communion of shared action in corporate reception, and that Harding

⁴⁹ John Rastell, *A Replie against and Answer* (Antwerp: Aegidius Diest, 1565), f. 118b.

had conflated them.⁵⁰ Harding, of course, would have explicitly denied this division, for the unity of faith, which Jewel said was all that Augustine and Jerome shared, was effected by Christ, and without it, union with Christ was impossible.

Harding and Rastell, as well as Dorman and Sander, were rather pointed in their denials that communion was something effected by the people or by their faith, the opinion which Jewel embraced and which certainly was an outgrowth of his Eucharistic receptionism which he had imbibed of Martyr and Cranmer. For the Catholics, rather, communion was something accomplished by Christ, through the union of the Christian with Christ through the Eucharist, that is, with the body and blood of Christ. Jewel denied that Sir Thomas and Sir Ambrose communicated with each for he refused to recognize the union accomplished in them through the Eucharist by their union with Christ. For Jewel the Eucharist had become little more than it had been for Zwingli, a communion effected, at best, by faith, but a communion with other Christians, visibly and locally present in the parish. In this sense Jewel was far from even Calvin who maintained that Christ was the main actor in the Eucharist, who spiritually fed the Christian, albeit still through faith. Harding, Rastell, Sander and Dorman would not have denied that the spiritual benefits derived from the supper depended on Christian faith for their realization, but at the same time it was not faith that effected communion, nor was it faith that effected the presence of Christ in the elements, but rather the action of God. Thus, as regards the Eucharist, for Catholics, grace preceded faith, and here ironically the Catholics were better Calvinists than Jewel; or better put, Calvin showed himself more of a Catholic than did Jewel and most of the English Protestants.

The Recusants and Jewel's sacramentology

In the mind of the Recusants, Jewel departed from the faith of the early Church in regard to the sacraments, and as a consequence he embraced a deficient ecclesiology. Though spending a good bit of time on the question of the papal supremacy, the question of the Mass and how Christ is present in the elements of the Eucharist consumed most of the Recusant's energy. For Dorman the matter was too simple, for what could be less unambiguous than *Hoc est corpus meum*, 'then which wordes if all the worlde would lay their heades together, to devise howe he might have spoken more plaineleie, theie shall never finde the

⁵⁰ Jewel, *Works*, I, pp. 131–35.

waie'.⁵¹ Rastell wanted to know 'where find you not onelye within. vjC yeares of Christ, but wihtin vj and vj hundred and take three more unto them, that the people were taught to beleve, that the body of Christ is onlye figuratiue, sacramentalile, significantelye, tropicallie, imaginiatiuelie, in the Sacrament, to the denyall of all preference and realitie?'⁵² In Rastell's mind, Jewel was trying to divert attention from the most important matters separating the rivals so that he could score polemical points over trifles:

Lett one sentence, example, authoritye, worde, or sillable, be browght furth, of a bodye, onelye figurative and significative: and he shall have the victorye. *yea but* (sayeth he) *the reall, corporall, carnall, naturall presence, was not preached or taught, at those dayes, ergo a figurative bodye onelye was beleved.* And thus whiles we stryve upon termes onely, we spend the time in a question not necessarie, and he will not consider the truth, in it self, and it is. Christ sayd, *this is my bodey which shalbe delyvered for you.* Saye the truth, Is not this, playne enough?⁵³

The Catholic polemic against Jewel touching the Eucharist focused on several items: the meaning of the words of institution, the significance of consecration and oblation, how Christ is present in the Supper, whether communion is a divine act or a human one, and how the Eucharist effected the communion of the saints.

The Recusants pillaged the Church Fathers for numerous quotations that the flesh which was present on earth in the Incarnation was none other than that which was present on the altar, and while Jewel certainly parried many of these polemical thrusts, the great weight of them certainly accumulated beyond what Jewel answered. With the sole exception of some of the arguments of Thomas Harding, Jewel never addressed any of the other works that responded to his Challenge, some of them far more refined and articulate than Harding's. The relish with which the Catholics took up the Challenge seemingly excelled the normal commonplaces of Reformation controversy, as shown by the volume of their replies. For Jewel, the influence of Peter Martyr, and perhaps the specter of Thomas Cranmer, propelled the direction of his Eucharistic thought. For the Catholics the basic question of the sacraments was the basic question of redemption itself: how does the Christian participate in the life of Christ and thus overcome the curse of sin and death. For the Catholics the answer was obvious: through the life-giving sacraments of the Church that united the Christian to life itself. Rastell built upon the patristic tropes of salvation as union with

⁵¹ Dorman, *Certain Articles*, f. 68a.

⁵² Rastell, *Confutation*, f. 140a.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, f. 140b. Italics are Rastell's.

the divine (he cited both Hilary of Poitiers and Gregory of Nyssa at length on this point), a union effected by participation in the glorified life of Christ, coming to the conclusion that

except this bodye of owrs, had a lyvelie bodye, by participation of which, it should be payred: it were impossible, that it should ryse agayne, when it were once by death cast downe. Not bycause, God of his absolute power, were not able to have done it, which without the incarnation of his blessed soun myght have saved the world, but the order most wyse and agreable once beyng sett owt, by almighty God, that owr sowle by his spirite, owr body by his flesh, should be properlye preserved: now, in this ordre and wisdom, he, which taketh away from Christians a bodely reall presence, he taketh away the proper and chiefest hope of the resurrection of bodyes.⁵⁴

For the Catholics the Christian's participation in the sacramental life of the Church brought about this union with Christ. Thus, to remove the physical presence of Christ's deified human nature from the sacraments was to remove Christ from salvation. In his reply to Harding concerning the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Jewel listed four ways in which Christ is corporally, really and substantially present in the believer: by his nativity (that is, the Incarnation), by faith, by baptism and by the Eucharist.⁵⁵ To explain how Christ and the Christian are united Jewel employed the language of instrumentality, that Christ is in the Christian naturally by means of the sacraments, but that does not entail 'that Christ is naturally in the sacrament'.⁵⁶ Jewel meanders into truncated disquisitions on the Incarnation in which he posits Christ as some form of ideal or archetype in his human nature, and that by the Incarnation he has brought all of human nature into a union with the divine nature, even noting at one point that Christ effected this union by the one person of the Incarnation:

that wonderful conjunction and knitting that is between Christ and us, whereby either is in other, he in us, and we in him; and that even in one person in such sort as he is neither in angels, nor in the archangels, nor in any other power in the heaven.⁵⁷

Jewel then treated several quotations from the Fathers and came to a rather bold conclusion on what it means that Christ 'dwelleth in our bodies; and not by way of imagination, or by figure or fantasy; but really, naturally, substantially, fleshly, and indeed':

⁵⁴ Rastell, *Confutation*, ff. 143b–44a. Doubtless Rastell's nominalism would take both Hilary and Gregory aback.

⁵⁵ Jewel, *Works*, I, pp. 472 ff.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 473.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 474.

Thus much of these words corporally, naturally, &c.: whereby is meant a full perfect spiritual conjunction, excluding all manner of imagination or fantasy; not a gross and fleshly being of Christ's body in our bodies, according to the appearance of the letter. Otherwise there must needs follow this great inconvenience, that our bodies must be in like manner corporally, naturally, and fleshly in Christ's body.⁵⁸

What Jewel had admitted with the right hand, that Christ is fleshly, really and substantially present in the Christian, he now takes away with the left, by arguing, as had been done in Cranmer and Zwingli as regards the presence of the body of Christ in the elements, that union with Christ was effected only on a spiritual plane. Jewel's use of instrumental language is merely an omnium-gatherum of words that has only an accidental relationship with Calvin's use.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 476.

⁵⁹ Jewel's Eucharistic theology cannot be understood apart from his relationship with Peter Martyr. Martyr's cannot be apprehended without some recourse to his relationship and interaction with archbishop Thomas Cranmer. Substantial work has been done on this topic in the last thirty years, beginning with Salvatore Corda's *Veritas Sacramenti. A study in Vermigli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Zurich, 1975), including Joseph McLelland's translation of Martyr's Eucharistic treatise and the Oxford disputation [*The Peter Martyr Library Volume* volume 7, *The Oxford Disputation, and Treatise on the Eucharist, 1549*. Translated and edited with introduction and notes by J.C. McLelland, volume LVI *Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies* (Kirksville, Missouri, 2000).], John Patrick Donnelly's translation of the *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, the renowned biography of MacCulloch on Cranmer and his later article on the relation of Martyr and Cranmer in Campi, *Vermigli. Humanism, Republicanism*, pp. 173–201, and also Paul Rorem's seminal articles on the epistolary debates between Calvin and Bullinger leading up to the *Consensus Tigurinus*. Not to be excluded in all of this is McLelland's older work on Martyr's Eucharistic thought, *Visible Words*. Where McLelland in *Visible Words* saw an essential unity between Bucer, Martyr, Cranmer and Calvin, owing largely to the praises they heaped on one another, Rorem has taken a far different view, seeing the gulf that separated Geneva and Zurich, a gulf bridged by pulling Geneva to Zurich. My own thoughts on this are largely guided by arguments some years older that involved an exchange between dom Gregory Dix and one G.B. Timms. Dix in his often cited work *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945) had accused Cranmer of holding a doctrine of 'real absence' (pp. 640–56) that left him indistinguishable from Zwingli. This incited Timms to defend Cranmer's doctrine in his pamphlet *Dixit Cranmer. A reply to Dom Gregory* (Accluin Club Papers, May 1946). Rising to the challenge Dix responded with 'Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit' (*Church Quarterly Review*, March 1948, Vol CXLV, p. 145 sqq), in which Dix cited passages about the spiritual eating of Christ and the nourishment faith gained from the Eucharist, only to reveal that he had garnered them all indeed from Cranmer, but Cranmer was citing Hooper, Bullinger and Zwingli. The exchange was consummated by Cyril Richardson's *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist – Cranmer dixit et Contradixit* (Evanston, IL, 1949). Richardson took a bit more nuanced approach to the archbishop, but nonetheless essentially agrees in distinguishing Cranmer, Bullinger and Zwingli on the one side of the Reformed divide, Bucer and Calvin on the other. Jewel's own 'A Treatise on the Sacraments' is only a posthumous reworking of some of his sermon material by his

Jewel had already accomplished in this section some of his best exegesis/eisegesis of the Fathers in ridding them of any notion of the real presence. Harding brought quotes from Cyril of Alexandria and Hilary of Poitiers, that, contra the Arian heretics, the Christian is joined substantially and corporally to the body of Christ, as Christ has joined his corporal humanity to the sacrament, and in this sacrament the Christian partakes of Christ. As Harding quoted Hilary:

If indeed the Word is truly made flesh, and we assume the incarnate Word in the appointed feast, how is it to be considered not to be in us naturally, who, born a man, has now both assumed the inseparable nature of our flesh to himself, and has mixed his corporal nature to his eternal nature under the sacrament of his flesh which is communicated to us.⁶⁰

Jewel's response? That St Hilary merely meant that Christ dwells naturally in us, and not in the sacrament, for Christ is not truly under the sacrament of his flesh, but, *vere sub mysterio ... carnis*. Jewel here translated Hilary's *sacramento* by his latter use of the word *mysterio*, and thus rendered Hilary's *sacramento* as merely 'under a mystery', that is, that Christ dwells in the believer by a mystery. Here Jewel chose to

executor John Garbrand, and as such really gives no systematic, but rather a hortatory approach to the sacraments. His views such as they were, emerge in his contentions in defending the English rite. In this, Jewel's views, at least as regards the accidents of his theology of communion and Eucharistic presence, unsurprisingly, approach the theology of Peter Martyr. Corda shows that Martyr believed in three types of communion with Christ (pp. 170–8). The first, a static ideal, arises from Christ being universally united with all humanity by virtue of the Incarnation, and in this union there is no hope for the damned. The next type of communion, an eschatological one, is a union of likeness realized in the final state, but daily appropriated to the elect in regeneration by the power of the Spirit, even though the faithful undergo no change of nature. Another communion that exists to the benefit of the elect is logically prior to this second eschatological one (though not necessarily chronologically) namely the mystical union of all the elect in that they are united to Christ their head. Regeneration is tied to the first, justification to the second, and thus logically anterior to the communion of eschatological likeness realized in regeneration. Vermigli termed this mystical union a middle communion, whose benefits come by faith, but also working in the sacraments and preaching. As such, Corda notes, it is of necessity non-spatial, making such notions as the presence of the Incarnate flesh of Christ in the Eucharist superfluous. Jewel's theology of communion as it has emerged in this study can be seen in Martyr's distinctions, especially his notions of union with Christ, what effected communion with both Christ and communion with other Christians, and the dictum that union with Christ is not effected by the Incarnation per se, but is non-spatial, non-corporal.

⁶⁰ Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate* VIII.13. 'Si enim vere Verbum caro factum est, et nos vere Verbum carnem cibo dominico sumimus, quomodo non naturaliter manere in nobis existimandus est, qui et naturam carnis nostrae jam inseparabilem sibi homo natus assumpsit, et naturam carnis suae ad naturam aeternitatis sub sarcamento nobis communicandae carnis admiscuit.' As quoted in Harding.

translate Hilary's initial term, *sacramentum* through his later use of one of its Greek equivalents, *mysterium*, and giving it an English connotation based on a rendering of the Greek, and not the Latin, a rendering incommensurate with its Patristic sense.⁶¹ He did not justify why he did this, but it did free him from admitting that the doctrine of real presence was taught in the first 600 years of the Church's existence.

Jewel's notions of the Incarnation as deployed against Harding, Nicholas Sander claimed, had completely eviscerated the relevance of the Incarnation for salvation, as Jewel's faulty thinking on the Eucharistic presence of Christ demonstrated. Sander treated all the minutia of Jewel's arguments, contradicting his use of the Fathers, but also attacking his theological imprecision. He was a bit unfair to Jewel in not seeing Jewel's use of nativity as a synecdoche for the Incarnation, though his condemnation of how Jewel thought the Incarnation effected the Christian's union with Christ certainly placed Sander on the side of the doctrine of the Fathers. Jewel's giving to Christ's human nature an archetypal structure by his nativity, Sander noted, rendered Jewel's other three means of union with Christ superfluous. If Christ's human nature is identified with all of humanity's by the fact of his Incarnation, then why is there a need for baptism? and so on:

[for] we may well say, that Christ doth not only not dwell in every mans body in his nativitie, but also that he dwelleth not in their bodies or soules, who either did not partake of his flesh at al by faith, or els did unworthely partake therof either by Baptism, or by the Eucharist, or any other way.⁶²

Sander saw in Jewel an ambiguous use of theological terms, a use that led to contradictions, especially if Jewel wished to argue that Christ was united to the believer, basing this argument on the same language used by the Catholics when they taught that Christ was 'in' the sacrament of the altar. Sander is aware that Jewel did not give the same meanings to his terms, but nonetheless, his employment of the terms would entail inconsistency:

you defend that Christes body may not be in many places at once. which doutless you meane of his naturall body. and his body is by no meanes more natural then by the nativity thereof. But you say

⁶¹ See the two articles in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, 'Sacraments', pp. 749–51, and 'Sacramentum', p. 751. Produced by the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, edited by Angelo Di Berardino. trans. Adrian Walford (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). Hilary, who had been exiled from Gaul to Asia Minor during the Arian controversy, would have been well acquainted with the Greek term for the sacraments, *μυστήριον*, and thus Jewel's imputation of the alternative meaning is fanciful at best, disingenuous in the least, and betrays his cause, regardless.

⁶² Sander, *Supper*, f. 388b.

now, that Christes body by his nativity dwelleth really, substantially, and fleshly in our bodies, and certainly our bodies dwell in many places: therefor you are against your own doctrine.⁶³

Later in his rebuttal, Sander picked up on this when dealing with Jewel's treatment of what fleshly union entails, in it not being 'fantastical':

how construe you these wordes of St Paul? All the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth corporally in Christ: is it only to say, it dwelleth truly in Christ? Well: but it may dwell truly in Christ, though Christ be not man: therefore by your exposition a phrase is found, whereby the truth of Christes body may be wiped away, whensoever it please the Protestants.

First published in Zurich in 1549, though not published in England until 1587, Bullinger's *Sermonum Decades* had already reified Sander's warning that such notions would vitiate the Incarnation when the Zurich Reformer posited that not only were the words of institution, *hoc est corpus meum* to be seen as symbolic language, but so too were the apostle John's 'the Word became flesh', since the divine nature is immutable and could not become flesh.⁶⁴ For the Catholics apologists, a correct understanding of the Eucharist was inseparable from a right apprehension of Christology.

The Catholics damned Jewel's sacramental theology as well in regard to his notion of Eucharistic consecration. Bishop Scot of Chester had first raised this issue among the Elizabethans during debate of the bill of uniformity, that the Protestant Communion service had no notion of consecration, and that as such had no notion of either grace attendant to the sacrament, or a doctrine of presence. Scot based his argument upon Cranmer's assertions that consecration was nothing more than separating a thing from its common use to a use in a sacred manner. The thing itself experienced neither change nor increase nor alteration, nor is anything necessarily added to it.

Consecration is the separation of any thing from a profane and worldly use unto a spiritual and godly use.

And therefore when usual and common water is taken from other uses, and put to the use of baptism, in the name of the Father etc., then it may rightly be called consecrated water, that is to say, water put to an holy use.

Even so when common bread and wine be taken and severed from other bread and wine, to the use of the holy communion, that portion of bread and wine, although it be of the same substance that

⁶³ Ibid., f. 389a.

⁶⁴ *Decades*, V.9. p. 436. Cf. Rorem, 'Calvin and Bullinger', part II, p. 381, fn 181/76. The endnotes for this two-part essay are confused, as in the text they run consecutively over the two parts, but the numeration of the notes in the second part in the text of the notes begins again at 1.

the other is from the which it is severed, yet it is now called consecrated or holy bread and holy wine.

Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them, but that they be used to an holy work, and represent holy and godly things. And therefore St. Dionyse called the bread holy bread, and the cup an holy cup, as soon as they be set upon the altar to the use of the holy communion.

But specially they may be called holy and consecrated, when they be separated to that holy use by Christ's own words, which he spake for that purpose, sayin of the bread, *This is my body*; and of the wine, *This is my blood*.

So that commonly the authors, before those words be spoken, do take the bread and wine but as other common bread and wine; but after those words ... they take them for consecrated and holy bread and wine.⁶⁵

E.C. Ratcliff points out that for Cranmer the words of institution, far from being what they were in the canon of the Mass, part of the rite whereby the elements were changed into the body and blood of Christ, now have only an intentional value, for the real referent is the congregation. All mention of Christ having blessed the elements prior to *hoc est* which was in the 1549 Prayer Book was removed from the 1552 edition, not to be restored in the Elizabethan one. For Cranmer, the use of the elements in their respective rites, whether water or bread and wine, constituted their consecration.⁶⁶

In answering Jewel's Challenge Harding employed bishop Scot's arguments before the House of Lords in 1559 that the Church of England lacked a true Eucharist for it lacked consecration.⁶⁷ Yet Jewel was hardly happy to respond with Cranmer's idea of a mere separation toward an end appointed distinct from the elements of the Eucharist itself. Jewel claimed that consecration, as Cranmer had said, was still analogous to baptism, but that the words are now said with reference to the elements. Jewel distinguished consecration from use in a way Cranmer had not, for whom consecration was to a specific purpose. Jewel made consecration the preparatory element necessary for use. Regardless of how Jewel parsed the rite, it was still dependent on the analogy Cranmer had made between the Communion and baptism, predicated on the tenuous and dubious use of St Augustine as an authority. It became great fodder for Harding's compeers.

Sander struck at Jewel by attacking first the notion that the Protestants of England had a consecration. A general blessing grants a

⁶⁵ Cranmer, *True and Catholik*, pp. 181–82.

⁶⁶ E.C. Ratcliff, *Liturgical Studies*, A.H. Couratin and D.H. Tripp, eds. (London, 1976), pp. 203–13.

⁶⁷ Cardwell, *A history of Conferences, 1558 etc.* pp. 105–17, especially 112 ff. Ratcliff cites Scot from Strype, *Annals*.

general benefit, such as to say 'God bless you', but this is not the case with the Eucharist, which has a particular end in its blessing, namely that by the Spirit of God, the elements of bread and wine would be changed into the body and blood of Christ. Sander used as an illustration God's blessings of the seas at creation that they might produce an abundance of fish, and this same would hold true of the chalice: 'Tell me no more that Christ willed it to signifie his blood: for I tel you out of the Word of God, what soever words have bene spoken belonging to any creature by the way of blessing, they have wrought that which they did signifie.'⁶⁸ More importantly for Sander, the language of signification that the Protestants employed to demonstrate that *hoc est corpus meum* was metaphorical withered for lack of this one condition, namely, consecration:

Bring me no more of those paltry examples: I am a dore, I am a vine, the rock is Christ, John the Baptist is Elias, the holy Ghost is a dove, and a numbre more of that sort. I answer in one word to al, that none of these were spoken by God in the way of blessing. The scripture saieth not, that Christ blessed any certaine vine, saying: this is Christ, or: This is my body. He sayd many thinges without blessing, and he blessed sometymes without speaking.⁶⁹

Sander than cited St Ambrose that the words of blessing, not merely the words of institution, were what wrought the change of the sacrament from what nature had made it into something more: 'Quantis utimur exemplis, ut probemus, non hoc esse, quod natura formavit?' For Sander, the blessing produced the consecration, for the blessing wrought the change, not the words of institution. For good measure he then quoted Chrysostom from his homily on I Corinthians 10 concerning what the consecration has produced: 'The same which is in the chalice, is that which flowed from the side [of Christ], and thereof we are partakers.'⁷⁰

Sander did not end his treatment of Jewel there, but considered also how baptism differed from the Eucharist in such a way as to preclude it from being an analogy to baptism as regards its intents and ends. He gives ten reasons and ways how baptism differed from Holy Communion, and ended the section with his own challenge to Jewel. Some of his arguments treat accidental matters (time of day, and so on), but others were substantial. He first noted that the sacrament of baptism is the name of a washing, and thus an act, whereas the Eucharist is properly the body and blood of Christ, and thus while the washing is done once, the Eucharist (that is, the body and blood) remained even after the priest had completed the rite itself. This arises from baptism's

⁶⁸ Sander, *Supper*, f. 252b.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, ff. 252b–53a.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 254a.

fundamental goal of union with Christ, whereas the Eucharist is that very union with Christ that baptism intends. Further, baptism may be done of deacons, even the laity, but the same is not the case with the Eucharist, which requires the presence of the ordained ministry. Baptism was never adored. Baptism, as the first sacrament is the most necessary, but the Eucharist is the most honorable, and is the believer's union in Christ. Whatever defects may attend the other sacraments, they were obliterated by the Eucharist (Sander quoted Dionysius the Areopagite here). Most importantly, baptism united the Christian to Christ, not to baptism; whereas the Eucharist is that union itself; being united to the Eucharist is being united to Christ. Sander's challenges then follow:

I know M. Juel will prove Baptism and the Eucharist to be of like force, concerning the meane of uniting us to Christ, he must bring forth such phrases, where Baptism may be called of Christ him self the body of Christ, where the Eucharist may be sayd to prepare us to Baptism, as well as Baptism to it. where Baptism is sayd to be worthy the highest honour, as it is sayed of Christes body in the Sacrament. where the last and highest copulation is assigned to Baptism as it is the Eucharist. where speciall consecration of priests, speciall prerogative of tyme, speciall warinesse in using the matter is no lesse required to the substance of Baptism, then of the Eucharist [that nothing be spilled or dropped on the ground].⁷¹

Stapleton, who cited Sander's arguments on consecration, picks up on this last point concerning the care with which the consecrated elements are treated when he indicts the English Protestants for denying consecration. Who can deny that the English lacked a consecration, Stapleton asked, for if the action refers not to the people, but to the elements, then why did bishop Ponet use the remainder of the sacramental wine to water his flowers?⁷²

Instances of Catholic consternation over Jewel's and his fellow Protestants' assertions could be multiplied. Questions concerning Eucharistic adoration – to which should be appended the question of the canopy, the particulars of transubstantiation, the Eucharistic sacrifice, *inter alia*, are all attendant on the questions of whether and how the Christian is united to the death of Christ in the Eucharist. If the resurrected and life-giving body of Christ, born of the Virgin and worshipped by the shepherds, is present in the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, as the Catholics maintained, then these other matters were all demonstrable. One question as regards the Eucharist, however, was not merely a matter of one side's particular doctrines or Eucharistic interpretation per se, but transcended the questions peculiar to the

⁷¹ Ibid., ff. 377b–78a.

⁷² Stapleton, *Return of Untruthes*, f. 6b.

sacraments qua sacraments, and touched also the doctrine of the Church or ecclesiology, and this was the question of the so-called private Mass.

The Recusants and Jewel's ecclesiology

The private Mass was on the one hand a deflection, a red herring, an issue much like the canopy or *individuum vagum*, by which Jewel hoped to demonstrate that the Catholics lacked antiquity; but on the other hand it hit a real nerve for the Catholics, for it brought into question a great many other things, most importantly the question of how the communion of the saints was realized by and within the sacrament. Put simply, Jewel opposed the practice of priests communicating the elements to themselves alone, even if other people were present for the Mass, who though present did not receive. To Jewel, people should always communicate, and no Eucharist should be done privately or solely, for this then breached the very idea of communion. This becomes more important when the visibility of the Church is tied to civil obedience to the prince, making attendance and communication in the Sunday communion service evidence of both loyalty and purity of faith. These assertions betrayed the axioms of both parties. For Jewel, as noted above, the act of participation by the people and minister created communion; communion was a corporate action. For Catholics, the Eucharist, union with Christ, produced the communion of the saints. Communion with other Christians was thus effected by union with Christ, and therefore communion is had with all Christians so united to Christ, whether they were communicating in the elements or just attending. Moreover,

as in our praying alone, we communicate with all Christendome, so in receiving alone, we communicate with the whole body of Christ the supper of our Lorde is therefore called a communion, because all the lyvelye membres of the church are brought thereby to an unitie with Christ their head.⁷³

Rastell, here defending and amplifying Harding's analogy of prayer with the Eucharist, related both to the question of the unity of the Church. Rastell had already noted that

as prayer is made for other, so in lyke manner is the bodye of Christ offred by him for other. Offred (I saye) once uppon the crosse immediatlye by hym selfe in a bloudy and visible maner, to the redemption of mankynde: and yet daylye styll offred by hym, through the ministry of his priestes, in mysticall and unbloudy

⁷³ John Rastell, *A Replie*, f. 113b.

fashion, to the employing of that redemption The commoditie of prayer is allwayes common: but it the acte of praying is more oft private then common. The receyving of the sacramento is a personall and singular action: but the commoditie, when it foloweth, is communicated with the whole bodye.⁷⁴

While Catholics defended the doctrine of papal primacy and universal jurisdiction, they wrote far more about the unity of the Church existing as a consequence of the sacraments, and most importantly of the Eucharist, the consummation of the Christian's life in Christ. While the visible head of the Church was certainly the pope, the real unity of the Church was predicated upon the benefits of the Incarnation, benefits distributed through the sacraments. Jewel on the other hand, through the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy and Eucharistic receptionism, had effectively made these Catholic contentions nullities.

When Jewel posited the monarch as the center of his ecclesiastical polity he was following in the footsteps of his immediate English predecessors, but unlike them gave it a far more substantial rationale, so much so that all subsequent defenders of it based their assertions on Jewel. Claire Cross notes that:

Jewel stands foremost among these early English Erastians: to a very considerable extent the arguments he put forward in 1562 to justify the crown's authority within the church retained their cogency throughout the reign. Later writers defending the royal supremacy explored his ideas in greater depth, they did not seriously modify them.⁷⁵

Yet it was not only Jewel's vision of an English polity with its singular place for the prince within the Church, but also his concept of the nature of Church authority in regard to councils, his definition of the communion of the saints, and his emphasis on the relationship of the sacraments to the visible Church that marked him out for the measure of Catholic polemical fury. While certainly the center of Catholic polemical attention, Jewel was hardly the lone malefactor: bishop Robert Horne of Winchester emerged as a target in the pages of Stapleton's ponderous *Counterblaste to M. Hornes vayne Blastte*. Horne had sought to vindicate the necessity for bishops and all clerics to swear the oath of Supremacy in response to Feckenham's refusal to be converted by his persuasions. Feckenham had already penned a justification of his stance that he delivered to Horne while the bishop had the former abbot in his care at Winchester. Yet while Stapleton's *Counterblast* defended Feckenham, as he focused his invective on Horne, Stapleton concerned

⁷⁴ Ibid., ff. 112b–13a.

⁷⁵ Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London, 1969), pp. 27–28.

himself with Jewel as well. Stapleton had already entered the lists against Jewel in 1565 with his *A Fortresse of Faithe first planted amonge us englishmen*, a work built upon his translation, also published in 1565, of the venerable Bede's *History of the Church of England*.

A recurrent theme in all three of Stapleton's works is the unity of the Church, not only over space but also over time. Stapleton's essential purpose in translating Bede, a notable thing in and of itself,⁷⁶ was to demonstrate that the faith of Bede, a faith expressed in the eighth century was identical to the faith of the English and the rest of the Church in the first six. Bede's testimony became the substance of Stapleton's *Fortresse*, and it is from this vantage that he launched his attack on Jewel, asserting that England's creed in the last 900 years was that of the first 600. Yet Stapleton's arguments were not some collection of proofs culled together to compete in some form of gamesmanship against Jewel, but to bolster several essential affirmations that Catholics in general held against all Protestants. Stapleton maintained as axiomatic that Christ's Church could never fall from its essential purity, even though at times rascals may creep in. Were this so, Stapleton wrote, then the testimonies of the Scriptures and even Christ himself, were of no value, and in the event there was no faith to be held. Stapleton attacked the Protestant *sine quo non* of the Church's defectibility throughout his first section. But in Chapter Eight he makes his most sustained case for the perpetual resilience of the Church by linking it to the doctrine of the Incarnation, and with it Christ's promise to remain with the Church till the end of the age. The connection Stapleton made between the perseverance of the Church predicated on the Incarnation and the sacraments is palpable.

To say that Christ had a church so many hundred years, but a blinde church, a superstitious Church, a church of idolaters, a church of antichrist, al which Calvin in efect saith and more, is as wicked or worse then to sai he had no church at al, suposing the expresse testimonies of holy scripture so much so often assuring unto it a perpetuall sanctification of God and the everlasting assitaounce of the holy Ghost. To saie he had al that time no church at all, is to saie that all that time he was not head of his misticall body, he had not al things subiected unto him, brefely that he had not the effect and purchase of his most blessed incarnation, death, and resurrection.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ 'Stapleton's Bede is the first masterpiece of English patristic translation in the Renaissance.' Mark Vessey, 'English Translations of the Latin Fathers', in Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West, from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, Vol II. (Leiden, 2001), p. 809. Vessey devotes several pages to Stapleton's work.

⁷⁷ Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of Faithier first planted amonge us englishmen, and continued hitherto in the universall church of Christ* (Antwerpe: Ihon Laet, 1565), f. 40a.

Nicholas Sander took the same argument against Jewel's and Protestantism's notion that the Church of Christ had deserted the truth:

To say that this church or kingdom of Christ did lie privie, or was hidden any one hower (after that he had planted it in all Countries by his Apostles) is to make Christes kingdom more obscure than ever the synagoge of the Iews were, or then ever the monarchies of the Assyrians, or of the Persians, or of the Grecians, or of the Romans were.⁷⁸

Sander's clear reference here is to the prophecy of Daniel and the four kingdoms, but the more immediate reference is to the opening of Jewel's *Apologia* which noted that truth wandered from place to place, a vagabond, little regarded and quickly assailed by those ignorant of it. The Protestant repudiation of the medieval Church had compelled Jewel to cast his argument in this way, but it was a double edged argument. On the one hand, he wished to assert that catholicity and universality is something that the Catholics do not have, and further that it was no mark of the Church. And thus he could scarcely argue Protestantism's universality since he had damned the previous immediate 900 years of the Church's history for superstition and being under the domain of Antichrist. Thus, since catholicity is no sign of the truth, contrary to all previous Christian opinion, this then creates a necessity for the place of the prince and the regional Church in the preservation of the Christian faith. For Jewel, history becomes the struggle of the monarchs and emperors who defended the pure faith, pitted against the tyranny of Rome and its wayward entourage of prelates. So for Jewel, Thomas A'Becket becomes a traitor to Henry II, while King John becomes a champion of England, a victim of the despotism of Innocent III.⁷⁹

Jewel's doctrine and that of England, the Catholics asserted, destroyed all concepts not only of the catholicity and universality of the Church, but also the integrity of doctrine. Stapleton, in his response to Horne, condemned Horne's attempts to get Feckenham to swear to the oath of Supremacy, arguing that would Feckenham have done so he would have denied the communion of saints and the unity of the Holy Catholic Church. He would have broken the communion of saints in that he would have severed himself from the fellowship of the Church in all nations, of which England until recently had itself been part. He would have renounced the Holy Catholic Church by swearing that part of the oath that renounced the authority of all foreign bishops. Yet the very concept of the unity of the Church demanded fealty in faith to the

⁷⁸ Sanders, *The Images of Christ*, f. NA.

⁷⁹ For Beckett, Jewel, *Works*, III, pp. 374 ff.; for John, IV, p. 687.

Church of Christ throughout the world as embodied in the bishops. Horne, according to Stapleton, was now asserting the exact opposite of what had previously obtained in the history of the Church: once bishops of a particular place were prescribed by general councils, 'yet all the Bishoppes of England nether have or may at any time prescribe over *every foraine Prelate* without the realme of England'.⁸⁰ Horne and Jewel, in keeping with the tenets of the second proposition of the Westminster Disputation, valorized the regional Church at the expense of the universal.

Rastell accused Jewel of equivocation on the question of conciliar authority, seeing in his granting of doctrinal prerogatives to regional councils a means by which he could pick and choose what he wished to believe and by which he then could justify England's breach with both its past and with the universal Church. By the same stratagem which he had used to eradicate the normative authority of the Church Fathers, Jewel had granted to England's prelates and prince an authority which he said had been pretended by councils. By contrast, Rastell noted that provincial councils, while not to be despised, were never held by the Fathers to be in opposition to general councils, and that except for heretics, no council was ever convened in contempt of the whole Church. Rastell, in his marginalia, asked what should come if by such standards as Jewel used that 'the Baron like one waie and the Palsgrave an other, maie both defend themselves by these examples and conteime what soever Authoritie in Christendom?' Rastell concluded that Jewel and the English, and by extension, all of Protestantism, had now set themselves up as arbiters for all of the Church, living and dead.

All this might be true [that God's truth is truth only if so acclaimed by a general council, and thus the Catholics had claimed for themselves to be judges of God], if the Holy ghost had not promised unto the Church to tary with it for ever, and to instruct it. Againe, Gods Trueth is trueth in it selfe: yet unto us it is not knowen, but by meanes. Now among those meanes, which is the most worthie? The text of the Scripture, which except some body tel me, I shal not know, in what estimation to have it: the repose of a few men of our owne parshe? or Country? Or the determination and consent of a general or provincial council? I should thinke, then, seeing we come to faith by meanes of men whom we credite, it were not amisse to harken Chiefly after the voice of a general Council, where, As greate authoritie and as worthie of credite is represented, as maie be possiblie found in al the world. But M Jewel is afeard of a folie. and like a wyse man, and such as worketh surely, he careth for none but for God him selfe: and Let men tel hym what they list, he hangeth not upon the Authority of any of them al, Or of al together, receiving

⁸⁰ Stapleton, *Counterblaste*, f. 430b.

of Gods owne mouth (I trow) immediatly, that which confirmeth hym and his faith and religion.⁸¹

In opposition to the Royal Supremacy and the supposed autonomy of English bishops to alter and change religion, and to act as the final court on what is and is not licit, Rastell affirmed the authority both of the bishops in council and the papal prerogatives, in which he saw a guarantee of the Church's stability, unity and continuity.

How now then? should any wise man, and desirous of the truth, have talk with an heretike aboute the open and close speaking of the priest, which dependeth of that other question, whether the Bishoppes and heades of the church, may not rule the churche of Christ, as they shall see expedient? what a doe is made, about the communion under one kynde: [etc.]? in which questions, the heretike hath this advantage, that whiles these thinges are indefferent, he maye bring for him selfe, a probably argument, and the Catholike, what so ever he shall bring (except he goe to a higher question) he shall speak but probablye, and so the hearer of bothe partes can not dissalow greatly, any one. But if we wold come to that, which is the chefe in allsuch indiffernt matters, and reson, whether we shold not obey the lawfull bishops and heads: this question concluded, would sone put to silence all heresy, and settle well the consciences of true Catholikes.⁸²

Thus, for Harding, Sander, Dorman, Rastell, Stapleton and the other Catholics, the sacraments, while creating union with Christ, were guarded as to their truth and purity by the visible Church, that is, the bishops and the pope. Jewel and England had severed themselves from this institution, the universal Church, by implementing an oath denying the unity realized within the episcopacy of the whole Church, and made real by union with Christ found in the Eucharist.

⁸¹ Rastell, *Beware*, f. 118a–18b.

⁸² Rastell, *Confutation*, f. 149a–49b.

A prelate public and private: Jewel caught between Puritans and princes

Janus as an English bishop: public sentiment and private bias

As regards to the two ecclesiastical worlds, England and Zurich, which formed and informed his thought and life, his deference to them and their respective theologies as absorbed and modified by him, John Jewel incarnates a Janus figure: his public face addressed his English audience of literate commoners, clerics, nobility and her Majesty; his other, private face peers through his intimate correspondence with Zurich where resided his Oxford mentor Peter Martyr, as well as a number of other notable figures integral to the Reformation in Zurich and even in England. Fixed in the doorway, he faced on the one side the life and duties of an English Protestant prelate; and on the other, that of a sheltered, pilgrim *emigre*, who had dutifully, albeit belatedly, followed his teacher into exile, and who still looked to his mentor and his mentor's colleagues for answers and advice. When interrogating Jewel the prelate, the public image, one is answered by a confident defender of the Elizabethan Settlement: armed with his two swords of Scripture and the Patristic writers (as Jewel apprehended them), he challenged any to contradict that the English Church as defined by the 1559 Settlement, stood within the most ancient Catholic tradition as defined by the Scriptures and the Patristic writers of the Church's first 600 years.¹ The English bishop showed himself the dutiful servant of her Majesty, his writings aimed at that great threat to England, the Antichrist of Rome. But even though Jewel's polemical writings exude a dogged support for his prince and for the 1559 Settlement, his enthusiasm for England and

¹ The parameters Jewel set in his 'Challenge Sermon' were '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, for the space of six hundred years'. Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 20. These boundaries though, are problematic (does Jewel ever use them to define the parameters of English belief?) and will be treated in the conclusion. Cf. *Apologia*, in *Works*, III, p. 77.

her Church, while neither merely nor purely a public matter, exists largely within the purview of his public discourse.

But the private Jewel, the one who corresponded with foreign divines, never exuded the regard for England that his public writings did. Thus Jewel, this image of moderate Elizabethan Protestantism, whose pen writes his own icon on the pages of polemical tract and sermon, assumes a different visage in his personal missives: no less the Protestant, but in many ways less the defender of the Supremacy, more precisian and far from the assured scholar, the master of all the facts. This dissonance arises because Jewel expressed different concerns to two different audiences, concerns nonetheless which at best must be labeled incommensurate. He seemingly posited the Apostolic Church as an ideal, and publicly defended the English Church for having apprehended this archetype in contrast to Rome. Yet all the while that Jewel is trumpeting England's piety, his writings to Zurich complain that in truth, the Church of England had attained only a modicum of so grand a state as that of Zurich, let alone Apostolic purity.

Jewel's public persona presents an English bishop who embraced not only the Protestant settlement of religion, but the right of his prince to effect this change; whereas the private Jewel, while commending English efforts, also voices disaffection. Is there a difference between the Erastian Jewel, the author of the *Apologia*, on the one hand, and the ecclesiastic who lamentingly agreed with Peter Martyr that the vestments of the English clergy were the 'relics of the Amorites', on the other? Furthermore, Jewel was not at all pleased with either the extent or the pace of English Reform, again lamenting to Martyr:

How much more delicately and gently is truth now fought for, than lies were defended some time ago! Our hasty adversaries acted always without precedent, without authority, without law; we do nothing except with circumspection, prudence, consideration, and calculation, as if without our edicts and precautions God himself could hardly keep his authority; so that many leisurely and scurrilously joke, that, as Christ was once cast out by his enemies, so now he is kept out by his friends.²

In February 1562, Jewel wrote Peter Martyr, concerning the linen surplice, that it, along with the very rubbish and dust of error, had not yet been removed.³ This difference between the public and private Jewel

² 'Quanto nunc mollius et remissius veritas propugnatur, quam pridem defendebantur mendacia! Adversarii nostri omnia praecipites, sine exemplo, sine jure illo, sine lege; nos nihil nisi circumspecte, prudenter, considerate, callide; quasi sine nostris edictis et cautionibus Deus ipse vix possit auctoritatem suam retinere: ut multi nunc otiose ac scurriliter jocentur, "Christum, antea ejectum ab hostibus, nunc excludi ab amicis".' Jewel to Martyr, 14 April 1559. *Works*, IV, p. 1204.

³ Jewel, in *Works*, IV, p. 1245.

confronts the reader only when the entire corpus of Jewel's writings, both as apologist and as correspondent, is considered. When thus comprehending the entirety of Jewel's writings, one is compelled to wonder about the coherence of his thought on the monarch's function and place in the realm, for it was only by her good pleasure that the 'scenic dress' of which he disapproved, continued; for, as he would later write to Bullinger and Lavater in 1566 concerning the desired alteration in the official stance on vestments, Elizabeth 'is not able to bear any change in religion at this time.'⁴ One must also question the unity of Jewel's thought on what a Protestant commonwealth should be, and what he believed the nature and character of English Protestantism was? Finally, how could Jewel function while holding two seemingly contradictory opinions?

This seeming duplicity of Jewel is not some Puritan/Anglican dichotomy, some struggle between Canterbury and Geneva; but is instead an expression of Jewel's resignation to the reality that the required mode of Protestant reform in England was one identified with his doctrine of the role of the godly prince. This doctrine, for all intents and purposes termed Erastian, had been the reality of English religion since Henry VIII, and in a modified form was that of Zurich.⁵ However vacillating she may be, Jewel had cast his Protestant hopes on Elizabeth. The returning exiles, or at least Jewel, had hopes for her religious zeal, and that religion would be materially restored to the favor and status it had officially enjoyed in Edward's day. 'Concerning the state of religion, it has been effected (would that it were with good portents!) so that it exists as it was in your late times here under Edward,'⁶ he would write to Martyr; but this official status, as Jewel would note, still fell short of Edward's time. Elizabeth had obstacles to overcome in 1559 which Edward, the young Josiah, was able to face in different ways. Unlike Edward, who had several bishops, including the archbishop of Canterbury, to lead the charge for the change of religion, Elizabeth was faced with a combatively conservative House of Lords, led by an episcopal bench thoroughly Catholic in their religion;⁷ and a precarious international position complicated by Mary's ineffectual part in the

⁴ 'Sed regina ferre mutationem in religione hoc tempore nullam potest', Jewel, letter 8 February 1566. *Works*, IV, p. 1267.

⁵ Though the term derives from the Heidelberg doctor, the doctrine he defended was alive and well before Erastus's confrontation with Withers.

⁶ 'De religione transactum est (utinam bonis auspiciis!) ut esset eo loco, quo fuit ultimis tuis temporibus sub Edouardo.' Jewel, Letter to Martyr, May 1559, *Works*, I, p. 1209.

⁷ Only one of the sitting bishops would subscribe to the change of religion, Anthony Kitchin of Llandaff. Carlson, 'The Bishops and the Queen' (Dissertation, Princeton University, 1962), p. 65.

Spanish war with France. As noted, how matters had been handled in 1549 could well have steeled the Catholics for what they faced in 1559.

In Zurich no such obstructions to reforming piety had existed for some years. The civil and ecclesiastical governments existed as a unity, one that the clergy of the city seemingly happily endorsed.⁸ Jewel also accepted these Erastian premises, at least theoretically; the real question is, could he live with them in the concrete reality of England? For many of Jewel's colleagues the answer was no, though Jewel never openly contradicted them till 1571. The answer to this will be found by examining Jewel's program for reform, an agenda predicated upon his peculiar vision of the Christian commonwealth, and then comparing this with Jewel's estimations of Zurich and his opinions of other foreign Reformers as well. It will also entail a comparison of Jewel's public assessment of the religious state of affairs in England as expressed in his public writings, letters and sermons, with that appraisal of England voiced in his private letters with the Zurich Reformers. Only then can a reconciliation of these dissonant points be made, based on an understanding of Jewel's ecclesio-political principles.

Jewel's public disposition as the dutiful Protestant bishop

It hath been an old complaint, even from the first time of the patriarchs and prophets, and confirmed by the writings and testimonies of every age, that the truth wandereth here and there as a stranger in the world, and doth readily find enemies and slanderers amongst those that know her not.⁹

In the beginning of the *Apologia* Jewel imputed true religion with a remnant character and an exile status; and that by nature those ignorant of truth were her enemies. A difficult scenario emerges: on the one hand, Jewel sees truth's adherents as the persecuted minority with neither *patria* nor domicile, while at the same time he seeks to place the Church of England within the mainstream of Catholic orthodoxy reaching back to the most ancient and apostolic Church. For Jewel, the enemies of truth were those who sought to overthrow the Protestant order of England, and thus in his polemical writings he concerned himself with the perceived abuses and real threats advanced by the Church of Rome: abuses with respect to ritual, doctrine and piety; threats such as sedition

⁸ Pamela Biel, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Zurich Clergy, 1535-1575* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991). See especially Chapter 1, 'The Doctrine of One Sphere', pp. 12-43.

⁹ Jewel, *An Apology, or Answer, in Defence of the Church of England*, in *Works*, III, p. 52. Lady Ann Bacon's translation.

within, and wars prosecuted from without. These deviations and perils Jewel contrasted with the purity of Christianity in England, the true heirs of Apostolic and Patristic religion. Of course Jewel also saw this model realized in Zurich, where, to be sure, the ideal had been far better apprehended than in England.¹⁰ The martial parallel to the doctrinal aberrations and liturgical abuses of Rome, were the threats to the life and limb of English Protestantism, threats reified once in Mary, and continued in the Catholic powers of Europe. 'But we truly see ... so many thousands of our brethren in these last 20 years have borne witness unto the truth in the midst of most painful torments that could be devised; and ... princes, desirous to restrain the gospel'.¹¹ Jewel hardly had a monopoly on this comparison of Elizabethan piety with Marian darkness and decadence. Foxe notes that

we shall never find any reign of any Prince in this land or any other, which did ever show in it (for the proportion of time) so many great arguments of God's wrath and displeasure, as were to be seen in the reign of this queen Mary; whether we behold the shortness of her time, or the unfortunate event of all her purposes.¹²

In Jewel's thought, one of Elizabeth's chief duties was to protect the Protestant establishment from the shades of Marian times and the present threat of the Catholic powers. Consequently, the nature of all his public discourse, until his last year of life, focused on publicly justifying the doctrine and polity of the Church of England against its Roman detractors. Even with the emergence of a defined Presbyterian movement, Jewel's most precise apology for the Elizabethan supremacy, *A View of a Seditious Bull*, was written in 1570. Having been granted the privilege to define his communion within the confines of the 1559 Settlement, the bishop of Salisbury orients his agenda for reform in contradistinction to the Church of Rome, portraying England's Church and commonwealth as true to the Scriptures, Fathers and ancient councils. In all of Jewel's works there persists the constant theme that England, and by extension Protestantism, was not the innovator, nor the inventors of new doctrine. Jewel bitterly denounced the notion that he or any Protestant ever wanted some radical form of Christianity which swept away one order for another, as some forms of Anabaptism explicitly proclaimed. This very libel of sedition and rebellion, often thrown at Protestants, and certainly at Jewel by Harding, Jewel himself

¹⁰ Jewel had noted the identity of religion that existed between England and Zurich, Cf. letter to Martyr (28 April 1559, *Works*, IV, pp. 1207–9), in which Jewel boasted that England's doctrine did not differ in the slightest from the confession of Zurich.

¹¹ Jewel, *Apologia*, in *Works*, III, p. 55.

¹² Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, VIII, 625.

had used against his traditionalist detractors.¹³ The order which saw the monarch sitting over the Church Jewel always maintained, just as much a bludgeon against Rome as against Geneva.

Jewel had spent virtually his whole life in a realm where the monarch governed the Church. Even upon abandoning the realm as an exile from 1555 to 1559, he resided for the bulk of that time in Zurich, a city explicitly Erastian in its polity, and among the chief proponents of that political theory. The particulars of Jewel's own doctrine drew from the specifics of the Elizabethan Settlement, and was at once a defense of both Elizabeth and the Protestant character of official English religion. Nonetheless, the axioms that guided Jewel did not arise from his making a virtue of an Elizabethan necessity. Many of the essentials have already been discussed, but one point should be further emphasized, namely Jewel's comparison of Elizabeth's godly ordered regime with Mary's superstitious and ignorant one: 'It is incredible even to hear, what a pasture and forest of superstition everywhere emerged in that darkness of Marian times.'¹⁴

Though worried about the sad condition of religion within England, and though cassock and surplice troubled his conscience, nonetheless Jewel saw England's need for order outweighing any concern that may have troubled him about things not materially pertinent to the Faith, what he had termed in the *Epistola, de re vero ipsa*.¹⁵ For Jewel, order was the required ingredient necessary for reform; an order, however disconcerting the prospects may have been, that flowed from Elizabeth, England's prince and her Church's Supreme Governor. This reliance upon the monarch is a key to understanding Jewel's attitudes and actions as regards the Puritans and Presbyterians. A key to this can be seen in Jewel's view of the international question of religion and the dangers, real or supposed that threatened England. The cause of this concern, both as a threat to the intrinsic stability of the English religious life and as an ever-present military danger, was Rome: not only a fomentor of religious ignorance, but of sedition and rebellion as well. Jewel felt keenly the threats that popish monarchs were to Protestantism: the religious wars that Charles V prosecuted against the Schmalkaldic League had initially brought Bucer and Martyr as exiles to England; Catholic Mary had subsequently sent Martyr packing again, with Jewel as the exile soon following. But it was not only Catholic or traditionalist influences that caused Jewel consternation: he often showed an almost

¹³ Jewel, *Defence of the Apology*, Works, III, pp. 187 ff.

¹⁴ 'Incredible tamen dictu est, in illis tenebris Mariani temporis quanta ubique proruperit seges et sylvæ superstitionum.' Jewel, Works, IV, p. 1216.

¹⁵ Jewel, *Epistola*, in Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist for the Church of England*. London, 1963, Appendix, p. 218.

equal aversion to the influence of Lutheran ideas, particularly ubiquitarianism,¹⁶ so foreign to his own views on the Eucharist, views garnered in the main from Martyr and shared with Bullinger, as has been discussed. It would be at the Queen's good pleasure that such doctrines were excluded from England. On this count, Elizabeth was not only the guardian of the lives of the people who held this Faith, but the defender of the Faith as defined by the Protestant Settlement as well.

Jewel cast Elizabeth as the Lord's anointed, whom God had set upon Zion's holy hill. He took this language from the second Psalm about the rage of the nations against the Lord's anointed. This imagery, originally applicable to David, but universally applied by both Protestant and Catholic alike to Christ,¹⁷ Jewel uses as justification for the Elizabethan royal supremacy within the English Church. To Jewel, Elizabeth's prerogatives in the Church may be based upon her status as monarch, but they were not merely civil in extent; they were also religious. In the sixth section of the *Apologia* Jewel takes up the question of why the English would not come to Trent. One of the main reasons Jewel annexes is the exclusion of the voice of princes from the Council. But why should princes not have a voice in councils?

For besides that a christian prince hath the charge of both tables committed to him by God, to the end he may understand that not temporal matters only, but also religious and ecclesiastical causes, pertain to his office; besides also that God by his prophets often and earnestly commandeth the king to cut down the groves, to break down the images and altars of idols, and to write out the book of the law for himself; and besides that the prophet Esaias saith, 'A king ought to be a patron and nurse of the church;' I say, besides all these things, we see by histories and examples of the best times, that good princes ever took the administration of ecclesiastical matters to pertain to their duty.¹⁸

Jewel further cited the example of Moses, 'a civil magistrate, and chief guide of the people, [who] both received from God and delivered to the people all the order for religion and sacrifices, and gave Aaron the bishop a vehement and sore rebuke'.¹⁹ Jewel never lived to see the biblical Deborah become the Virgilian Dido (*Dux femina facti*),²⁰ but he could hardly have disapproved.

¹⁶ Jewel stated his opposition to this doctrine ever coming to England in letters to both Martyr and Bullinger, *Works*, IV, pp. 1245–46, 1263–64.

¹⁷ This association goes back to the New Testament. Cf. Acts 4: 25–28.

¹⁸ Jewel, *Apologia*, in *Works*, III, p. 98.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ These words, 'The leader of the deed, a woman', from Virgil's *Aeneas*, I, line 64, a reference to Dido's flight from Tyre and her tyrant brother, were stamped on a medal commemorating the English victory over the Armada.

To Jewel's public audience, whether the English faithful or Recusant polemicists, the picture of England was one of harmony, the English Church united under their one sovereign, agreed as to the essentials of the Faith, and exercised in charity on things indifferent. This is the clear message of Jewel in both his *Apologia* and especially the *Epistola*, but in Jewel's letters to Zurich, he very much looks like those very English Protestants whose dispositions the *Epistola* is meant to slight. How could Jewel hold such zealously Protestant opinions and still remain the dutiful subject and defender of both Elizabeth and her Settlement? This can only be apprehended by seeing in Jewel not some erudite theologian on the order of his mentor Martyr, but instead someone who could answer the more precise Protestants with the same reply he gave to the Papists: the valorizing of the religious prerogatives of the prince at the slighting of theology. With respect to Catholics, Jewel would restructure how the Fathers were used; with the Puritans, it was a revamping of the categories of conscience.

Abusus tollit usum

Past studies of the English Reformation treated adiaphora as a theological question. Bernard Verkamp's *The Indifferent Mean*,²¹ explicitly presents adiaphora as a prism through which one can see and understand that the English Reformation was an exercise in the definition of a theological *via media*. Far from a mere ritual heuristic, adiaphorism was a 'theory ... found to lie at the very center of the [English Reformer's] thinking, profoundly affecting almost every move they made'.²² Verkamp limited his study to the Tudors prior to Mary, and protested the need to expand it into the Elizabethan period, assuming the two a unity.²³ Verkamp's emphasis upon the theological and his premise of the unity of the controversies of John Hooper and Puritanism is echoed in J.H. Primus's *The Vestments Controversy*, which explicitly links the concerns of Hooper with those of the Elizabethan Puritans.²⁴

²¹ Bernard J. Verkamp, *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, and Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1977).

²² *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 174. Verkamp maintains that the picture of adiaphora remains incomplete, that is until a study of it is done which treats from Elizabeth to the Tractarians. Nonetheless, 'if the Henrician-Edwardine "indifferent mean" outlined above is anywhere approximate to accuracy, it may rightly be afforded a piece of the praise heaped ... upon the Elizabethan Settlement.'

²⁴ *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the*

Indeed, this connection had been made in the sixteenth century, both implicitly and explicitly: implicitly when Alexander Nowell in 1565 reproduced as his own Martin Bucer's four arguments against Hooper's discontent;²⁵ explicitly when Matthew Parker, asked for the Privy Council to act in support of him, citing the council's actions in the case of Hooper both as precedent and as an illustration that only the Council's intervention would suffice to thwart Precisian recalcitrance.²⁶

Nonetheless, the identification of Hooper with the Puritans begs the question of the two episodes' essential unity, slighting the dynamic of both the events of the Elizabethan period and the overt politicalization of adiaphora by the Elizabethans. That the Edwardian incidents provided a model for the Elizabethan contest is clear; the difference between the two pertains to the merely incidental nature of the Hooper situation in the larger picture of the Edwardine Church's program of reform, as opposed to how the apologists for the Elizabethan order turned their confrontations into an exercise in creating a uniform order that transformed liberty of conscience into unity and conformity;²⁷ and that transformed adiaphora from the particulars surrounding *caritas*, into categories of submission and obedience. For the Elizabethan apologists, and particularly Jewel, adiaphora become not the incidentals within the context of uniformity – what they had been in the instance of Hooper, but a theological means for attaining a political end. By the 1560s, questions of adiaphora become absorbed into the larger category

Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth (Kampen, 1960). William West made this same connection, depicting Hooper as the father of the Puritan movement, *John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism*, Zurich 1955. Though this conclusion is contradicted by Hooper's most recent biographer. Cf. E.W. Hunt. *The life and times of John Hooper (c. 1500–1555), Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewiston, c. 1992). Hunt, sees Hooper (pp. 303–7) as merely a Church Calvinist (appropriating this concept from Tyacke, and it may be a fair use, but Hunt does not expand on this definition). While carping about vestments, they were eventually and ultimately adiaphora, and he would never have separated from the Church of England. Hunt even numbers him among the likes of Cox, Grindal and Scory, though why and how he does not elaborate. But Cf. West, pp. 62–74. M.M. Knappen was of the same mind concerning the question of the unity of the two instances, each given a chapter in his study of Puritanism. M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939).

²⁵ Primus, *Vestments*, p. 93.

²⁶ *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, ed. John Bruce Esq. (Cambridge, 1853), pp. 234, 280–81.

²⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch sees in the Hooper incident a reaction by the Edwardine clergy, and particularly Cranmer and Ridley, to the rising tide of Anabaptism and radicalism. This intransigence by Cranmer and Ridley had not been the case just two years earlier in the case of the consecration of Robert Farrar. MacCulloch notes that when Robert Farrar was consecrated bishop of St Davids, Cranmer and Ridley had not used the form of either the Henrician or the Edwardine ordinals. *Cranmer*, p. 397. Both MacCulloch and Primus wonder how often Hooper wore his vestments after his consecration.

of obedience to crown and Parliament. John ab Ulmis had written Bullinger that both Cranmer and Ridley were as opposed to the vestments as had been Hooper, but that they were only willing to act against them when consensus was reached among crown, parliament and people.²⁸ This is the contrary of the motivation of Parker, though perhaps in line with the thought of Jewel, who loathed the surplice, but who would without the Queen, seek to effect nothing. This stance needs to be remembered in considering the frustration of the Puritans.

Horton Davies posits three reasons why the Puritan agenda failed: the foremost is Elizabeth's intransigence; next were those Protestants concerned less for reform than for the peculiar identity of the English Church, personified, Davies says, by the 'avaricious' Richard Cox and the Coxians of Frankfurt; finally, those prelates who had fallen from their pure state of grace as zealous Protestants, and had instead 'developed a fatty degeneration of the conscience as they became religious civil servants charged with creating a religiously compliant people for their sovereign',²⁹ by name, Aylmer, Parkhurst, Horne and Jewel. Yet when considering the apologetical categories of the sovereignty and unilateral prerogative of national churches as animated by royal authority, these three factors quickly coalesce, actually emerging not as some virtue born of necessity, but the coherent, albeit idiosyncratic, argument of an English Church which had known only Reformation within an Erastian context.

The Elizabethan idea of the prerogative of the national Church had been championed at Frankfurt, where the Coxians and Jewel had wished that 'they woulde do as they had donne in England, and that they would have the face off an English church';³⁰ a Church independent of an intangible entity called the universal Church.³¹ Further, the clergy Davies slights had from 1559 already maintained the prince's prerogative via their defense of the third proposition of the Westminster Disputation, that matters of ceremony, rite and doctrine were subject to the nation's perceived needs. Thus whatever degeneration may be imputed to their later actions, Davies' decadence seems already to have existed in 1559 in the cases of Aylmer, Horne and Jewel with the smell of Zurich barely off their clothes. Though consciences may be pricked, since a bare minimum

²⁸ *Original Letters*, p. 426.

²⁹ Davies, *Worship and Theology*, pp. 45–46.

³⁰ *A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford in Germany anno domini 1554 Aboute the Booke off off [sic] Common Prayer and Ceremonies and Contiued by the Englishe Men Theyre to the Ende off Q. Maries Raigne*. Heidelberg: Schirat, 1574, 1575. Reprinted by Edward Arberas Vol I of 'A Christian Library', 1908, p. XXXVIII.

³¹ The response of the Knoxians in Frankfurt was that they would have the face of the Church of Christ. *Brieff Discours*, p. XXXVIII.

of Reformation evangelical piety was maintained, they took up their respective English crosses and followed Elizabeth. Vestments could be abhorred but still countenanced: for Jewel, these dregs of popery and relics of the Amorites remained perfectly licit, and within the domain of the royal prerogative.³² These he could live with; the absence of prince he could not. In this sense, a national church who formed her identity around externals – most notably Her Majesty and Parliament – must also exist on the minimum of doctrinal distinctives: the more defined the doctrine, the more limited the scope and extent of the Church's inclusivity. Yet this does not entail that for Jewel and his coreligionists England's was merely some visible Church, whose existence depended not a whit on the Spirit of God. Nonetheless it would seemingly demand a great deal of charity for such an institution to function.

Consequently, where Protestants maintained minimal doctrinal content in their confessions, there also was found the most broad employment of adiaphora as a defense for external actions. The most notable instance of the employment of adiaphora outside of England was Melanchthon's defense of the Augsburg and Leipzig Interims. Luther had distinguished the Christian under grace from Israel under the law; and those who by faith had been freed from bondage, from those still bound by the commandments of men, for example, traditionalists.³³ Luther, however, had no burning passion to tamper with even impious rites:

[W]e nevertheless both beg and urge you most earnestly not to deal first with change[s] in the ritual, which [changes] are dangerous, but to deal with them later. You should deal first with the center of our teaching and fix in the people's minds what [they must know] about our justification Adequate reform of ungodly rites will come of itself.³⁴

Both Luther and Melanchthon embraced latitudinarian views on order, rite and discipline when these had no express Biblical parameters.³⁵ Still, the Christian conscience, free from 'Jewish' observances, could use such rites for godly discipline. 'Some works ... commanded are in themselves adiaphora ... such are the rules about not eating meat, wearing a long or short dress and the like – if not commanded or prohibited in God's word', wrote Melanchthon.³⁶ Nonetheless, the individual Christian had

³² Cf. Jewel's letters to Peter Martyr in *Works*, IV, pp. 1222–24 (5 November 1559) and pp. 1205–6 (14 April 1559).

³³ This is one of the central themes, and the basis of a good deal of the argument as well, of Luther's 1520 treatise, *The Freedom of a Christian Man*.

³⁴ Martin Luther, 1530 letter to the clergy of Lubeck, *Luther's Works*, Vol. 49, *Letters* II. ed. & trans. Gottfried G. Krodel (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 262–63.

³⁵ Verkamp, *Indifferent Mean*, pp. 26–28. If the Bible had not forbidden it, then it was licit.

³⁶ Philip Melanchthon, *Loci Communes* trans., and ed., Clyde L. Manschreck (Oxford,

a bounden duty to obey the magistrate if things even more than indifferent were required: 'I, on the contrary, would magnify, in political matters, the authority of the magistrate, which indeed is of no little weight; and there are many things which are made lawful by reason of such authority, the lawfulness of which might otherwise be doubted.'³⁷ Adiaphora begin with the conscience, but not in abeyance of the rights and prerogatives of princes. Melanchthon lived by this advice. In April 1547 Charles V, finally able to react militarily to the question of Lutheranism, crushed the Schmalkaldic League and both turned his attention to the reform of the Catholic Church by situating himself in Innsbruck, opposite Trent, and by imposing his will on the Lutherans of the Empire with the Augsburg Interim. For Melanchthon, though faced with the *fait accompli* of Charles V's victory, his definition of justification survived, but the other stipulations of the Interim wiped away everything Luther's Reformation had effected. To Melanchthon, the concession on justification by faith alone meant the continuance of the evangelical cause. But the ministers of the unvanquished city of Magdeburg, however, saw in Melanchthon's appeal to adiaphora a tacit justification of the Mass and a surrender of the Gospel. Most vocal and vitriolic of the Magdeburg clergy was Matthias Flacius Illyricus, whose arguments fall into two categories. First, the vestments and rites of Rome were materially those of the old covenant cult of Israel, and as such were done away in Christ. Second, and relevant to the English situation, Flacius Illyricus contended that the idolatry of Antichrist had defiled the Latin vestments and rites, and as such they were no longer fit for use, that is, *abusus tollit usum*.³⁸

John Hooper had been in Zurich when the verbal conflict between Flaccius and Melanchthon began, the arguments he used in his debate with Ridley and Cranmer bearing close affinity to those of Flaccius³⁹

1965), p. 308.

³⁷ Melanchthon to Bucer, 8 November 1531, in *Original Letters*, p. 556. The particular matter Melanchthon here references is the state of Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Even though the marriage itself is odious to the law of God, it does not warrant a divorce, and the will of the magistrate is ample to overrule any conflict of affinity.

³⁸ Flacius's treatise, in an expurgated form was reprinted in the Puritan tract *The Fortress of Fathers*, and is reproduced in Leonard Trinterud's *Elizabethan Puritanism* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 101–6. Cf. p. 102, where is made particular allusion to the resurrecting of popish rites and usages.

³⁹ Whether Hooper read Flacius Illyricus, or whether similar circumstances produced similar results, is debated. That the later English radical political tracts took their inspiration from the Magdeburg *Bekentnnis* seems clear. Cf. Esther Hildebrandt, 'The Magdeburg Bekenntnis as a Possible Link Between German and English Resistance Theories in the Sixteenth Century', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Vol. 71 (1980), pp. 227–53.

(*abusus tollit usum* excepted). They are significant on two counts. First, in questions material to the faith, the prince had a legitimate concern; but in matters of adiaphora, all coercion, by definition, was prohibited. Thus he happily presented his case before Edward VI against the oath contained in the ordinal, the king then striking out the offending article with his own hand. The offending article, the last part of the oath to the king's supremacy, contained in the service for the Ordering of Deacons, required of all that

in case any othe bee made, or hath been made by me, to any person or persones, in mayntenaunce, defence, or fauoure of the Bisshophe of Rome, or hys auctoritie, iurisdiction, or power, I repute the same, as wayne and adnichilate: so help me God, all Saints and the holy Evangelist.⁴⁰

The king's action in this regard concerned something material, not indifferent, and as such was a legitimate sphere for royal activity. Thus Hooper's stance was consistent with his essentially conservative position on the power and authority of the civil government. His short treatise on Romans 13 embraced only passive resistance, even to the point of bowing the neck to tyranny.⁴¹ Yet in his notes before the council, he questioned the council's right to interfere in his dispute with Ridley. He is ready to bow to the will of the council, but Hooper wanted the controversy settled in the ecclesiastical realm. For Hooper, questions of adiaphora were beyond the pale of the civil government for a simple reason: once the government – civil or ecclesiastical – imposed itself on the will of the individual in matters indifferent, its manifest tyranny had obliterated the indifferent thing, rendering it an offense.⁴²

This particular form of argument appears in Hooper's compeer, the Polish emigré John à Lasco.⁴³ In his 1552 tract 'The Abolition of Vestments',⁴⁴ à Lasco revisited Flaccius Illyricus's diatribe against Melancthon: the identification of certain vestments with Aaronic and

⁴⁰ *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* (London, 1910), p. 300. Also in *The Two liturgies of Edward VI*, p. 169.

⁴¹ 'Annotations on Romans XIII' in John Hooper, *Later Works*, Vol II of *Works*, Parker Society Edition (Cambridge, 18, 1852), esp. pp. 95–112.

⁴² Hooper's notes, trans. by Edward P.C. Greene, appear in Iain H. Murray, ed. *The Reformation of the Church: A collection of Reformed and Puritan documents on Church issues* (Edinburgh, 1965), pp. 55–62. For the original Latin C. Hopf, 'Bishop Hooper's "Notes" to the King's Council', *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLIV (January–April, 1943), pp. 194–99.

⁴³ Horton G. Davies, *Worship and Theology*, Vol. I, p. 350.

⁴⁴ This short treatise was never published till later printed by the Puritans in the Elizabethan Vesterian controversy of 1566. Murray, *Reformation of the Church*, pp. 61–62.

Levitical garb, the freedom of the Christian, *inter alia*. But à Lasco also notes,

We know that the Roman Pope is the very Antichrist; wherefore his priesthood also is Antichristian, by which the whole priesthood of Christ is utterly trampled upon. But forasmuch as the principal part of the papistical priesthood consists in ceremonies, anointing, shaving of hair, mitres and vestments, it follows that if we condemn the Pope's priesthood because it is Antichrist, we ought also to avoid all its parts and manifestations.⁴⁵

In short, *abusus tollit usum*.

Edmund Guest,⁴⁶ Elizabethan bishop of both Rochester and Salisbury, continued this line of thought, when prior to the 1559 Parliament, he wrote Cecil concerning rites and ceremonies,⁴⁷ that 'Ceremonies once taken away, as evil used, should not be taken again, though they be not evil of themselves, but might be well used'.⁴⁸ Guest further slights certain rites:

because these ceremonies were devised of men, and abused to idolatry. For Christ with his apostles would not wash their hands before meat ... because it was superstitiously used. Paul forbad the Corinthians to come to the gentiles tables, where they did eat the meat which was offered to idols: though an idol was nothing, nor that which was offered to it any thing.⁴⁹

For Guest, as for à Lasco, the abuse of the vestments by Rome renders them illicit.⁵⁰

These arguments appear in the two foremost early Elizabethan Puritans, Thomas Sampson, dean of Christ Church Oxford, and Laurence Humphrey, president of Magdalen College, Oxford. In letters sent to Zurich in 1563 and 1566, first Humphrey, and then Humphrey and Sampson confederate, sought to justify their defiance of archbishop

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 65.

⁴⁶ Guest, one of the eight Protestants at the 1559 Westminster Disputation, and the only one not a former exile, would eventually be buried next to Jewel (whom he followed at Salisbury) in the North aisle of the Cathedral. He knew Cecil from their days together at Cambridge.

⁴⁷ Though otherwise more conservative than his fellow Elizabethan bishops, Guest gave two explicitly biblically annexed reasons why such an agenda should guide the English Settlement. Patrick Collinson, in *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 61 notes that like Cheyney in Gloucester, Guest tended toward consubstantiation in his Eucharistic theology.

⁴⁸ Edward Cardwell, *A history of Conferences and Other Proceedings connected with the Book of Common Prayer: from the year 1558 to the year 1690* (Oxford, 1849, Republished 1966), p. 49.

⁴⁹ Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 50.

⁵⁰ Guest's own arguments against the Puritan position is taken up in Primus, *Vestments*, pp. 91–92.

Parker's attempts at uniformity, and to seek both mediation and vindication from Zurich. Their joint letter of 1566 shows a marked development from Humphrey's 1563 epistle. Humphrey initially asked whether an adiaphoron could still be so after having been so long contaminated by superstition and used to beguile the ignorant; and whether the 'command of the sovereign ... for the sake of order' is sufficient to remove any material offense?⁵¹ By 1566, the questions had expanded into both a direct questioning of the right of the prince to prescribe the wearing of vestments, and as well the denial that the surplice was even a thing indifferent.⁵² To Humphrey, the superstitious abuse of the vestment by Rome had rendered its use completely detrimental, and now a matter beyond civil jurisdiction. To Humphrey *abusus tollit usum*.

If *abusus tollit usum* be granted, then by definition adiaphora, having no meaning, drives those who use it to a *reductio ad absurdum* version of the pure Church.⁵³ Once the indifferent thing has been abused to the point that it is now either harmful, or even arguably so, there would eventually be nothing, not even the most banal conventions, that would not fall prey to such a liturgical rubric. This should not, however, be understood as the Puritan position, since for them there was a canonical limit to their assertions, *sola scriptura*. Yet even this category or canon begged the question of who should consider a thing an abuse just as much as it begged the question of whose prerogative it was to interpret Scripture. *Abusus tollit usum* was not, however, found only among the more precise, but also among the defenders of Elizabethan policy, in particular Jewel. For these another canonical constraint emerged, that of the supreme governor of the Church. Both the expansion of adiaphora and the reductionist employment of *abusus tollit usum*, served the establishment's end which posited the prerogative of national churches and their respective princes to alter rites and customs, and to define the limits of conscience. Thus the edict of the prince could revivify a use once destroyed by an abuse, rendering the question of abuse mute.

It has been shown how Jewel's doctrinal minimalism and liturgical diversity became the prolegomena of the royal prerogative, but this is not only when his polemics addressed Rome. This is not always seen. Collinson notes that 'if we are inclined to place ... Jewel ... in a class of

⁵¹ These two appear in Humphrey's 1563 letter, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, p. 134. Humphrey does distinguish the tyranny of the pope from that 'just and legitimate authority of the queen'.

⁵² Humphrey et al. to Bullinger, July 1566. *Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, pp. 157–66.

⁵³ Flacius ended his life ironically, in a monastery. Sampson was deprived of his office, and many of the other deprived clergy proceeded to begin their own voluntary church. Humphrey conformed, but only after Jewel denied him a benefice in Salisbury diocese.

his own, it must be with the recognition that his ... *Apology* ... erected all its defences on one flank only and allowed not so much as a suspicion that the ... settlement could be threatened from a protestant corner'.⁵⁴ This oversimplifies Jewel's answer to Traditionalist accusations: his basic contentions about the right of the monarch to order the life of the Church apply equally to those from the left who also argued for universal uniformity, albeit one based on premises other than Rome's. Jewel's 1562 anonymous *Epistola* rebuts a French libel that England's is a fractured ecclesiastical state, one at odds with itself both doctrinally and ceremonially, and one which saw the faithful in contention with crown and convocation.⁵⁵ Jewel admits a liturgical liberality of long standing in England, as 'indeed always our particular churches – Salisbury, York, Hereford and Bangor – have offered public prayers to God different from one another';⁵⁶ a diversity mirrored among the ancient Syrian, Egyptian, Roman and African Churches.⁵⁷ But Jewel insisted that the English Church had a greater unity than the traditionalists. Concerning the gospel, there was no dissent.⁵⁸ The several assertions concerning the English Church in Jewel's *Epistola* – the unanimity on essentials (*de re vero ipsa*), the indifferent character of liturgies and vestments, and most importantly the reality that the English Church was well ordered – all recur in his *Apologia*, where Jewel subordinates the final two categories to the right of the prince, and through the prince to the national Church; that is, royal prerogative in ritual and liturgical matters.⁵⁹ As noted in dealing with Rome, questions

⁵⁴ Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 61.

⁵⁵ 'Nos omnes, studiis et contentionibus, in factiones et sectas distractos esse: nihil apud nos esse certi: non Episcopos inter se, non Concionatores, non Ecclesiarum ministros, non homines singulos, vel de doctrina, vel de Ceremoniis convenire: quoniam sibi pro sua libidine Ecclesiam suam fabricari.' *Epistola* in John Booty Appendix, *Jewel as Apologist*, p. 210.

⁵⁶ 'Semper enim Ecclesiae nostrae particularres ut sunt Sarisburiensis, Eboracensis, Herfordiensis, Bangoriensis, aliter atque aliter publicas Deo preces persoluerunt.' *Epistola* in Booty, p. 220.

⁵⁷ *Epistola* in Booty, pp. 220–22. In his Challenge Sermon, Jewel had already used this diversity and seeming lack of uniformity in liturgical practice against those who would argue for the necessity of the unity brought by the Roman rite. Cf. Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 23.

⁵⁸ 'De re (Euangelii) vero ipsa, nihil inter nos est dissidii.' *Epistola* in Booty, p. 218: As for England and vestments, says Jewel, we are all agreed, from the prince down, that such things are neither holy nor polluted in and of themselves; such things are *adiaphora*.

⁵⁹ Cf. Bryan D. Spinks, *Western Use and Abuse of Eastern Liturgical Traditions* (Rome and Bangalore, India, 1992); cf., the review of Jewel and the Greek liturgies, G.J. Cuming, 'Eastern Liturgies and Anglican divines 1510–1662', in Derek Baker, ed. *The Orthodox Churches and the West: papers read at the fourteenth Summer Meeting and Fifteenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 231–39, especially 234–35.

of rite concerned him only as they touched on the issues of antiquity: was the Roman rite the most ancient? Who invented the Canon of the Mass? Were the Greeks – a pedigree as ancient as Rome's – practitioners of private Masses? Did the Greek liturgies differ in significant ways from the Latin? Could all the accretions contained in the Roman Mass be either found in or justified by the ancient Church? As early as the 1559 Challenge Sermon he used the Liturgy of St James in comparison to the Mass. And when he cited them, Jewel used the Liturgies of St Basil and St John Chrysostom to show that universal conformity in rite had never existed.⁶⁰ That the English rite only contained elements of the primitive forms was inconsequential, for ultimately a universally binding liturgy did not exist: each dominion would have varying orders as region and situation dictated.⁶¹ This polemic against Rome also spoke to the question of Puritanism. As noted in the discussion of the Challenge Sermon and the *Apologia*, Jewel effected this doctrinal and ritual minimalism by using the stratagem of *abusus tollit usum*: he cited Erasmus, Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux and Jerome as arguments against monasticism. Jewel did so not to reform, but to destroy. Sloth, impiety, worldliness were cited not merely to discredit, but to bolster *inter alia* Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries.⁶² Though his polemical duplicity is apparent, it would be wrong to think that he does not believe himself justified. On the one hand, less doctrine meant greater inclusion within the English realm, and thus at least a modicum of consensus among the Protestants. Incidentals were just that; substantially, per Jewel's persistent refrain, England was united behind her queen. For Jewel, the greater the realm of nonessentials, the more narrow the domain of positive theology; the greater the unilateral rule of the prince, the more excluded the claims of some universal pontiff.

Jewel concurred with Flaccius, à Lasco, Guest, Humphrey and Sampson, that the abuse destroyed the use; but Jewel denied that by this argument the Precisians were vindicated in their contentions, for the prince had privilege over questions that trumped conscience.⁶³ In this regard Jewel was also being true to the memory of Martyr and the

⁶⁰ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 887–88. Jewel had as well read Nicholas Cabasilas's *Interpretation of the Divine Liturgy*, and was also conversant with the liturgy of St James.

⁶¹ 'In short, Jewel is not really interested in the eastern liturgies as forms of service, but simply as useful allies in the battle against Roman claims.' Cuming in Baker, *Orthodox Churches*, p. 235.

⁶² Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 798–801.

⁶³ As discussed above, this is Jewel's basic argument to Harding in defending those in the Church of England who refused to wear the surplice: it had been befouled by Roman superstition, *Works*, III, 614–18. Doubtless Jewel would not grant the prince a prerogative so vast that even evil could be called good, yet this can become easily a question of degrees, as the seventeenth century would demonstrate.

Florentine's part in the controversy with Hooper in which he had enjoined Hooper to conform. Martyr had argued that vestments were licit things, however defiled they be, and defenders of vestments, both in England and in Zurich, employed Martyr's arguments against Humphrey and Sampson. Further, in his commentary on I Corinthians Martyr had said that use of indifferent things was left to the discretion of the Church, and that since the Church had such discretion, obedience was obligatory. Whitgift eventually used this very argument in his controversy with Cartwright, appealing to Martyr as his authority in the subject.⁶⁴ The prince's prerogative as governor of both religion and conscience supplanted that of the medieval bishop, with the prince as religious head given greater unilateral prerogatives than even that granted any general or regional council. Jewel did not grant the monarchy all the prerogatives he believed had been assumed by Rome, but did nonetheless grant it vast and unilateral rights over order, doctrine and ceremony. Treating the prerogative putatively enjoyed by Justinian over matters liturgical, Jewel notes that 'it is lawful for a godly prince to command bishops and priests; to make laws and orders for the church; to redress the abuses of the sacraments; to allege the Scriptures; to threaten and punish bishops and priests, if they offend'.⁶⁵

In the *Defence of the Apology* Jewel maintained that '[no] new-imagined extraordinary power' had been granted the prince, but this should not be taken as akin to some medieval limitation on the prince, but analogous to the protean topos of the Henrician primacy 'as far as the law of God allows', for he maintained the right of the prince

to be the nurse of God's religion; to make laws for the church; to hear and take up cases and questions of the faith, if he be able; or otherwise to commit them over by his authority unto the learned; to command the bishops and priests to do their duties, and to punish such as be offenders. Thus the godly emperor Constantinus sat in judgement in a cause ecclesiastical Greater authority than Constantinus the emperor had and used our princes require none.⁶⁶

The telling clause – 'to take up ... questions of faith if he be able' – even as a concession, destroys any limitations to Jewel's definition: a theologically trained monarch would enjoy unprecedented privilege in the definition of dogma. And though the uninformed prince would merely have a judicial right (as Elizabeth certainly exercised in the case of Grindal and the question of prophesyings) and not a magisterial one,⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Cf. Gary W. Jenkins, 'Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558', in Frank James, ed., *Peter Martyr and the European Reformations* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 47–69.

⁶⁵ Jewel, *Works*, I, p. 287.

⁶⁶ Jewel, *Works*, III, p. 167.

⁶⁷ Cf. Patrick Collinson, 'If Constantine, then also Theodosius', reprinted in *Godly*

even lacking aptitude in theology, the prince still grants others to judge in matters of doctrine only 'by his authority'. When it was to his advantage Jewel employed diversity as a grand answer to Harding – it meant no Roman universality; but this did not stop him from claiming uniformity on the national level, for the sovereignty of the prince limited the conscience. By this tactic Jewel trumped Puritan appeals to a ubiquitous Church of Christ: the royal prerogative excluded diversity in the national Church. The prerogative and jurisdiction of the universal Church, the court appealed to by both the Puritans and the Traditionalists, could not exist. Further, because of the royal prerogative, regional churches possessed a right of jurisdiction even over general councils.⁶⁸

Matthew Parker's approach to adiaphora stressed the transforming character constituted in the royal prerogative. That Rome may have defiled the linen surplice was irrelevant, for the garment had no sacerdotal function, but only one of order.⁶⁹ Further, the appeal to conscience against authority could not stand, for it is never a tyranny to obey the prince's ordinance in matters that could be shown to be merely one of preference, which in the case of vestments adiaphora entailed. The conscience is free, obedience is not.⁷⁰ With this bifurcation of the internal from the external, and by his ability to redefine what were legitimate scruples, Parker has erected outward conformity in apparel above individual purity of conscience. Likewise, Elizabeth's letter to Parker of 25 January 1565 emphasized not dogma but discipline and above all else, unity and charity. The attempt by some to exercise their liberty in respect to outward garb could only 'impair, deface and disturb Christian charity, unity and concord, being the very bands of our religion'.⁷¹ In this anti-Augustinian twist, charity no longer assumed the face of unity, but of purity and order; Augustine's notion of love as the bond of unity could not exist, for obedience was now that bond; love or charity becoming at best the goal of order. The 1559 Settlement and its amplification in Parker's *Advertisements*, redefined the place of both charity and the individual's conscience within the new arrangement.⁷² Bullinger's

People (London, 1983), pp. 108–33.

⁶⁸ As already noted in Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr recounting the Westminster disputation, Jewel gives his own expansion on the third debated point: *quamvis ecclesiam provincialem, etiam in jussu generalis concilii, posse vel instituere, vel mutare, vel abrogare ceremonias et ritus ecclesiasticos, sicubi id videatur facere ad aedificationem*. *Works*, IV, p. 1199. One wonders why for Jewel a general council would ever be called.

⁶⁹ Primus, *Vestments*, p. 90.

⁷⁰ Primus, *Vestments*, p. 91.

⁷¹ Elizabeth R. to Parker 25 January 1564, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, Parker Society (Cambridge, 1848), p. 225.

⁷² For the *Advertisements*, see Henry Gee and W.J. Hardy. *Documents Illustrative of*

sentiments that the royal decree made vestments pure, vindicated Parker's claims for a monarchical, ecclesiastical primacy; and essentially defined the supreme governor's prerogative as a unilateral royal privilege.⁷³ Although Parker had to implore Cecil for his, the Queen's and the council's visible backing, it was largely the first two who were the political impetus for Parker's actions.⁷⁴ Parker hardly needed this motivation, finding the precisian disruption of unity and order catalyst enough.⁷⁵

Jewel remained silent to his English audience on the matter of vestments per se, initially seemingly above the fray, but nonetheless he refused Laurence Humphrey a benefice in his diocese, due to Humphrey's 'vain contention about apparel'.⁷⁶ Jewel's position vis-à-vis Humphrey and the Puritans was no different than that assumed in Frankfurt when with the Coxians he would have the face of an English Church. His earliest apologetics, though seemingly facing Rome, also gave the back of the hand to Puritanism, elevating the right of the monarch above any quibbling about non-essentials. Liberty of conscience had given way to a principle of unity adumbrated and realized in the prerogative of the prince. Horton Davies notwithstanding, the Puritans failed, as the Presbyterians would come to learn, owing to the status of England's Church as a national institution, governed by Her Majesty, and happily bolstered even by the most zealous of her clergy. For Hooper and the Puritans adiaphora had been an appeal to the right of conscience; for Parker, Jewel and other Elizabethan apologists, it had become a presupposition for royal prerogative. But as the 1566 letter to Bullinger demonstrates, this value Jewel posited in the prerogative of the prince did not leave Jewel without sympathy for the concerns of Humphrey and Sampson, but it did entail looking at them in a different light.

The dilemma of a private man in public life: Jewel's private correspondence

Any assessment that places Jewel on the radical side of the English establishment party comes from his private and personal life and not his

English Church History (London, 1914), pp. 467 sq.

⁷³ Bullinger to Sampson and Humphrey, *Zurich Letters*, Vol I, pp. 345–55.

⁷⁴ Cf. Elizabeth's letter of 25 January 1564 to Parker and Cecil's thoughts as well. *Correspondence*, pp. 223 ff.

⁷⁵ Parker to Grindal, 28 March 1566, *Correspondence*, pp. 272–74.

⁷⁶ Jewel, Letter to Archbishop Parker, 22 December 1565, *Works*, IV, p. 1265.

published works. Jewel's personal letters to Zurich, largely written to Martyr and Bullinger, reveal an individual alternately encouraged and discouraged by the state of English religion, but possessed also by an impertinently cynical attitude with respect to his nation's spiritual disposition. This incredulity appears in terse and deprecatory comments about vestments and the thoroughness of reform. He sees the pace of religious change and the apathy of those who say they want it as a problem. Jewel had written Martyr in the spring of 1559 that some satisfied themselves with only a half reformed Church, instead 'seeking after a golden, or, as it rather seems to me, a leaden mean'.⁷⁷ This cynicism further manifests itself in cryptic and unflattering allusions Jewel made respecting the person of Elizabeth, which shall be treated below. Not that all of Jewel's sentiments betray disillusion, for he believed some real reform had been effected.

What [Josiah Simler] you write, that you hope that our bishops will be consecrated without any superstitions and fetid ceremonies, I suppose that is, without oil, the chrism, or the tonsure, you are not mistaken. For uselessly the bilge would be emptied, if we should suffer these relics to remain in the bowl. Those oiled, shaven and fat hypocrites (personatos) we have sent to Rome, from whence we initially received them.⁷⁸

None denied that some reform had been accomplished; it is Jewel's disaffection with its pace and thoroughness that seemingly limits his enthusiasm, though not his loyalty, for the Elizabethan Settlement. Several substantial areas of complaint emerge from the letters Jewel wrote to his friends in Zurich, for example, the plight and future of the English ministry and those things which either hindered or denoted the imperfection of reform.

Jewel had wished neither the dignity nor the duties of the episcopal office: 'I [have been appointed] to Salisbury; but this obligation I have absolutely determined to discard.'⁷⁹ For Jewel, the duties of a bishop would be a burden and a distraction from study, and as had been the wont of those who previously had desired the quiet of a scholar's life, for example, Anselm and Augustine, the episcopacy was a privilege not happily embraced. Jewel expressed greater concern, however, for the

⁷⁷ Jewel, *Works*, p. 1210.

⁷⁸ 'Quod scribis, sperare te episcopos apud nos sine ullis superstitionis et putidis ceremoniis inaugurari, hoc est, opinor, sine oleo, sine chrismate, sine novacula; nihil falleris. Frustra enim exhausta esset sentina, si istas reliquias pateremur in fundo residere. Uncitos istos et rasos, et personatos ventres Romam remisimus, unde illos primum accepimus.' Jewel, Letter to Simler, 2 November 1559, in *Works*, IV, p. 1220.

⁷⁹ 'Ego ... Sarisburiensis: quod ego onus prorsus decrevi excutere.' Jewel, Letter to Martyr, 1 August 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 1215.

condition of the universities, especially his Oxford, in an apparently tragic state both intellectually and morally. In his very first letter to Martyr on his return to England Jewel opines that 'Oxonii a tuo discessu duae praeclarae virtutes incredibiliter auctae sunt, inscitia et contumacia'. Two months later he warned Bullinger not to send any men to England for an education, as they would only return 'impios et barbaros'. Even a year later he would write to Martyr that Oxford was 'sine boins literis, sine lectionibus, sine sudio ullo pietatis'.⁸⁰ These laments echoed his thoughts that he was going to be wasted as a bishop on the administration of the Church. In the event, as Jewel's tenure as bishop progressed and he became more and more obligated to his two debates with Harding, debates which saw Jewel neglect the more significant arguments made against him by others, his correspondence with Zurich fell off. Thus the private scholar was torn from the otiose shadows of his library and thrust into the arena of public duty for which he had little appetite. This may account for the lack in the resources in time necessary to answer his critics.

Unlike his polemical works, 'renaissance self-fashioning' notwithstanding, Jewel never intended his letters for public consumption. Nonetheless Jewel's essentially private correspondence reveal a great deal about his public life. Any investigation reveals both a scholar needing more time to study and a Reformer embittered about the pace and extent of reform. Since the correspondence gives insight into those things he would not say in public, they become a fairly good lens through which to view his public sentiments. Certainly care must be taken, as these letters may be considered as having been written to his 'Zurich public', that is, Martyr, Bullinger, Simler, Ochino, et al. Yet this distinction hardly sustains scrutiny, as if Jewel were playing to two audiences, writing what he thought each would want to hear. Unlike his English readers who never saw these letters to Zurich, his Zurich readers were part of his public audience, reading at least some of his polemical writings. Peter Martyr wrote Jewel lauding the *Apologia*.⁸¹ The essentially private nature of Jewel's correspondence can be illustrated with two examples. In March 1566, Jewel asked Bullinger for information on three matters, two of which are important.⁸² The first matter concerns the Greek Orthodox Churches and whether they practice any form of 'private Mass'. Jewel had previously written on this in 1565 against Harding, noting that the Greeks had never used the private Mass. Having now

⁸⁰ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1199, 1212, 1232.

⁸¹ *Zurich Letters*, I, Appendix I, Letter I, pp. 339–41.

⁸² Jewel, *Works*, IV, 1269–70. The other question concerns the identity of a certain Camotensis. Jewel never found out that Camotensis, ironically, was John of Salisbury.

made his boast, Jewel asks Bullinger to authenticate his claims. The second point concerns the nature of the 794 Council of Frankfurt. As noted, Jewel, as had most Protestants, had maintained that the council had condemned the Seventh Ecumenical Council, held in 787 in Nicaea to defend the veneration of Icons; and as other Protestants, Jewel took little note of the mistranslations of texts that affected and effected so many of Frankfurt's decisions. For this he was duly taken to task by his Catholic detractors, though Harding in his work against the *Apologia* proved equally as confused about the exact nature of the medieval justification of icons as had most Protestants. Nonetheless, Jewel having made his boast must now scurry to check his sources and cover his assertions.

Another piece of evidence which betrays the private nature of Jewel's correspondence appears in a series of letters to Martyr in 1559 and 1560 in which Jewel repeatedly referred to Elizabeth by the pseudonym Glycerium, the deflowered waif in Terence's *Girl from Andros*, whose dubious paternity stands as one of the play's central motifs. Along with this, Jewel gives to the Earl of Arran the patronymic of Crito, one of Glycerium's suitors in the play: Arran had been one of Elizabeth's suitors before his slide into insanity.⁸³ Given Elizabeth's paternity, its ostensible status before both the papal court, and even for a time English law, and given the brazen rumors about her and the younger Seymour, and then those making the rounds about her and Leicester, this hardly seems the classical character with which to flatter her. Conjecture alone can provide why Jewel used such a tawdry sobriquet of his monarch, though perhaps it may have arisen from Jewel's friendship with Parkhurst who was with him and Martyr in Zurich. Parkhurst, as was previously noted, had been the chaplain to the dowager queen Catherine Parr when Elizabeth had been placed in her house, and when she had become the object of the less-than-honorable affections of Parr's husband, Thomas Seymour. Catherine eventually, for all intents and purposes, threw Elizabeth out of her house.⁸⁴ It may be posited that she had made Parkhurst privy to the whole matter. This is also a far cry from the Jewel who would later extol Elizabeth's lineage as coming from both the houses of Lancaster and York.⁸⁵ This impolitic allusion, the question about Greek Eucharistic practices and the nature of the Council of Frankfurt, disparaging remarks about vestments, and the complaints treating the tardy progress of religion, inform us that the audience for his letters was far different than the audience for his public works. Indeed,

⁸³ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1224, 1228.

⁸⁴ Starkey, *Elizabeth, the Struggle*, pp. 66–71.

⁸⁵ Jewel, *Seditious Bull*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1144.

Jewel probably would have been horrified to have known that his private letters would somehow be made public. Yet while his missives betray him as a less than politic subject and a far from assured scholar, they also present him as a reluctant English prelate.

As opposed to his busy, abstemious and penurious life as John Sarum, Jewel recalled his days in Zurich as a time of otiosity, enjoyed with his mentor, Martyr; a season passed in a city reformed and zealous for the Protestant faith. For Jewel, Zurich always remained a *beau ideal*: 'O Zurich! Zurich!' Jewel wrote to Martyr in the summer of 1559, 'how much more often I now think of you than ever I thought of England when I was in Zurich.'⁸⁶ None of the exiles corresponded with Zurich to the extent Jewel did. Jewel's correspondence comprised some 31 per cent of all the epistolary remains of the English to Zurich between the time of Mary's death and Jewel's in 1571, 36 of 117 letters. And while Jewel wrote more letters to Zurich than any of the other former exiles, he nonetheless would often preface his letters with apologies for not writing as often as he should. While others, for example, Humphrey or Cox, wrote as if to a group of concerned arbiters, men interested in England for the Gospel's sake, Jewel's letters affect a personal bent, beyond the topoi of ritual niceties; letters not merely concerned with public issues, but with the personal concerns of both recipient and writer. Jewel never appealed to those in Zurich as arbiters, or as bishops in absentia, whatever his deference to them. Certainly Jewel voiced his concerns, but not as Sampson and Humphrey who sought some sort of accreditation from Zurich in their struggle against vestments.⁸⁷

Jewel's identification theologically with Zurich, his place of residence during his time as a Marian exile, and specifically his identification with his Oxford and later Zurich mentor, Peter Martyr, demands little substantiation. Jewel had accompanied Martyr to Zurich from Strasbourg when the latter had to leave the Imperial city due to pressure brought on him because his Eucharistic views were at variance with the Lutheran consubstantiation allowed under the Peace of Augsburg.⁸⁸ Such an identification of Jewel with Zurich and Martyr is also seen in Jewel's private correspondence spanning the 13 years of his post-exilic life. Zurich as an ideal or archetype is one key to understanding Jewel's thoughts toward the Puritans and their relation to the prerogative of the prince. Yet Jewel's narrow identification with Zurich does not preclude other associations, even with Geneva. Nor should it rule out that Zurich represented for Jewel a Reformed body of thought favorable to the

⁸⁶ 'O Tigurum, Tigurum! quanto ego nunc saepius de te cogito, quam unquam de Anglia, cum essem Tiguri!' Jewel, *Works*, IV, 1210.

⁸⁷ See *Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, Letters LXVIII, LXIX and LXXI, pp. 151–55, 157–64.

⁸⁸ Cf. Chapter One.

proclivities of the hotter sorts of English Protestantism. This does not mean that Jewel saw the Zurichers as an ambiguous court of appeal, but that they, like so many other Protestants, had rightly indexed the relative importance of vestments in relation to the primacy of the magistrate over the Church, and in relation to the question of who would preach the Gospel.

Throughout the course of his career, Jewel affirmed certain merits of the Elizabethan Settlement, actually telling Martyr that in the Church of England 'omnia docentur ubique purissime';⁸⁹ but what he aimed for was the faith as professed in Zurich, even telling Martyr that the England he was working for would 'not depart the slightest degree from the confession of Zurich'.⁹⁰ But were the respective situations of England and Zurich analogous? The Zurich Reformers clearly embraced and endorsed what would later be called Erastianism, Bullinger and Gualter explicitly siding with Erastus in his Heidelberg debate with George Withers, a man heavily indebted intellectually to Beza and Geneva. Jewel agreed with Zurich's attitude on the relation of magistrate and Church. For Jewel, however, things in England were quite different than those in Zurich. Bullinger and his cohorts enjoyed a well-defined confession of faith, had the backing of the people of Zurich and thus their elected magistrates. This republican arrangement was not England's, where the religious situation was driven by the whims of the prince, whims that had pushed England in several directions throughout the course of Jewel's life. Yet however imprecise Elizabeth may be in the Faith, she seemingly had no qualms with her servants appealing to Zurich for advice and comfort, at least when it bolstered her propensities. Geneva, of course, was another matter.

Geneva's history in Elizabeth's England was hardly a happy one, though Calvin's writings enjoyed a wide popularity in England, and were, by one estimate second only to Erasmus in the number of printed editions by foreign divines.⁹¹ During Edward's reign, Calvin had been well regarded both among the bishops and at court, though he hardly had attained the stature he would later enjoy both among English Puritans and in France. But this changed during Mary's regime, owing

⁸⁹ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1224. While Jewel extolled the purity of doctrine 'in ceremoniis et larvis passim plusculum ineptitur.'

⁹⁰ nos articulos omnes religionis et doctrinae nostrae exhibuimus reginae, et ne minimo quidem apice discessimus a confessione Tigurina. Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1208. This passage may imply that a group of clerics, and with approval by the court, were formulating a doctrinal standard for the Church of England. It also clearly says Jewel's own hopes, and the standard of doctrinal purity he had assumed.

⁹¹ Andrew Pettegree, 'The Reception of Calvinism in Britain', in Wilhelm H. Neuser and Brian G. Armstrong, eds, *Calvinus sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion* (Kirksville, MO, 1997), Vol XXXVI, pp. 267–90.

both to matters peculiar to Geneva (that is, Calvin's triumph over the Perrinists following the Servetus affair) and to Geneva's status among many of the exiles.⁹² It should be recalled that the Knoxians in Frankfurt had appealed to Geneva, and that Knox, Whittingham, Goodman and others from Frankfurt had repaired to Geneva after the controversy. But Geneva had been blackened in Elizabeth's mind due to the impolitic splenetics of John Knox in his 1558 diatribe *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. Aimed at the Catholic monarch of England, Mary Tudor and the Catholic Regent of Scotland, Mary of Guise, Knox's screed against female rule provided his status as *persona non grata* in England upon Elizabeth's accession. Elizabeth could not have countenanced Knox's republicanism either. *The First Blast* was published in Geneva, so even in 1558 the city and all it comprehended became odious to Elizabeth, and seemingly for this reason alone. It later would become hateful in that it was the source both intellectually and morally of Puritanism and Presbyterianism. In the event, Elizabeth implicated Calvin since Knox published the book in Geneva. Calvin had dedicated his Commentary on Isaiah to Elizabeth, but the courier by whom he had sent the tome returned with the news that Elizabeth did not desire Calvin's homage, and all because of 'certain books lately published here'. Calvin attempted a defense of himself to Cecil, that he held Elizabeth's rule licit despite her sex, and that even were her extraordinary abilities not evident, it was no reason to cavil against her reign. Calvin held female rule to be exceptional, he confessed to Cecil, but not unwarranted. Further, though he told Cecil that he had said the same to Knox, he did not think that Knox was going to argue what he did, being quite unaware, for a whole year he claimed, that Knox had written the book. None of this was of any avail, at least as far as Elizabeth was concerned, though what Cecil's sentiments were toward Geneva in 1559 are not clear, as he was someone who supported the more austere forms of Protestantism as evidenced by his support of the puritanically inclined Henry 'silver-tongued' Smith.⁹³

⁹² MacCulloch, *Boy King*, p. 173–74. MacCulloch sees the Servetus affair as a catalyst which propelled Calvin and Geneva into prominence in the Protestant world, though this seems a facile conclusion, for the action was effected with the consent of many other Protestants, including Melancthon. Calvin's own ascendancy even in Geneva was only subsequent to the affair, albeit predicated upon it in that the Perrinists had hoped to use Servetus to embarrass Calvin, and the stunt blew up in their faces. MacCulloch is correct, nonetheless in his assertion that Edward's Reformation was more influenced by Zurich than by Geneva, though in truth, it seems even more influenced by Strasbourg with Bucer and Martyr than by Zurich.

⁹³ Smith was lecturer at St Clement Danes without Temple Bar in 1587, having been elected by the congregation. He held this post till 1589 or 1590, just prior to his death. The parish was under the patronage of William Cecil, who shielded him from Aylmer when the

Jewel's own assessment of Geneva and the English Genevans seems far from bellicose, and certainly not unfavorable, let alone hostile. Mention has already been made of the letter Jewel wrote during his time in Zurich to Whittingham and Goodman in Geneva, asking that they forgive him for any 'dicto insolentius', that any injury he had caused them arising from 'that most inauspicious and contentious affair in Frankfurt' would be set aside.⁹⁴ The editor of Jewel's works places this letter before Goodman's publication of *How Superior Persons are to be obeyed*, based on Jewel's April 1559 letter to Martyr in which Jewel noted that only Goodman's obstinance kept him from being able to show his face in England, as he was 'homo est satis acer, et ... nimium pertinax',⁹⁵ sentiments hardly commensurate with those expressed in the former letter. Yet Jewel's language implies an extended period of time had passed since the controversies in Frankfurt: he saw those contentions as something that occurred in the long past, hoping that any ill will among them had been set aside 'diuturnitate' and that for his part, any bitterness he had fostered he long since had discarded. He had not written, he maintained, because he entertained hope of seeing them face to face, but so much time had elapsed that he now thought it best to write, especially as a mutual friend was going from Zurich to Geneva. But whether he wrote before or after Knox and Goodman published their ill-timed polemics, Jewel was certainly not inclined to anathematize all things Genevan.

In the last letter he wrote to Peter Martyr (14 August 1562) Jewel makes a rather odd statement: 'Your preciseness (Greek, accuracy) and that of Geneva, however, does not please him [François Baudouin]. He is in this matter, it seems to me, unjust to Master Calvin, probably from the memory of their old dispute.'⁹⁶ The bulk of Jewel's letter concerns the recent affairs of the Church in France, affairs with which Martyr was very familiar, as he, along with Beza but not Calvin, had been at the Colloquy of Poissy representing the interests of the Reformed Church in France.⁹⁷ Martyr, just before leaving for the Colloquy, had written Jewel

London bishop sought to deprive him for non-conformity. See Thomas Fuller, *The sermons of Mr. Henry Smith ... learned treatises: all now gathered into one volume. Also, the life of the reverend and learned authour*. London, 1675. Unpaginated.

⁹⁴ 'inauspicatissima illa causa et contentio Francofordiana.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1192–93.

⁹⁵ Goodman, as a consequence of his writings would become *persona non grata* in Elizabeth's England, though in April of 1571 he would swear fealty to Elizabeth, declaring she was his only liege. He took his oath before Jewel. Strype, *Annals*, II.1.

⁹⁶ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1254. 'ἀκριβειαυ autem illam sibi vestram et Genevensium non placere. Est in ea re, ut mihi quiden videtur, iniquior D. Calvino, nimium fortasse memor veteris simultatis.'

⁹⁷ Donald Nugent, *Ecumenism in the Age of the Reformation. The Colloquy of*

expressing fear that war alone seemed the outcome of the problems of France. Jewel now echoes Martyr's assessment of the situation, and accompanied this by an express desire that Zurich would take an open stand with the French Protestants: for after all, were not all the matters of the current religious contention ultimately connected? After meandering to some thoughts on the Council of Trent, Jewel returns to the concerns of the French Church, in which context he makes the above statement about Calvin.

The critic of Calvin and Martyr, François Baudouin (Baldwin in Jewel's *Works*), one time professor of Civil Law at Bourges, secretary to the Palatine Elector, and in 1561 the envoy of Anthony of Navarre at the Colloquy, had been the object of Calvin's invective *Responsio ad versipellem quendam mediatorem qui pacificandi specie rectum evangelii cursum in Gallia abruptere molitus est*.⁹⁸ Baudouin had left France in 1545, having been condemned in Arras for heresy, and had made his way to Geneva. But now in 1562 Calvin saw Baudouin as a consummate temporizer, someone overly imbued with an Erasmian spirit of conciliation. In truth, the tract Calvin attributed to Baudouin, the real object of his screed, was written by Georg Cassander, though it was Baudouin who had seen to its distribution at Poissy. Baudouin had stated, in correspondence with Cecil, that since the English moderation in the change of their religion had very much pleased him, he hoped to use whatever means at his disposal to effect the same in France. Nicholas Throckmorton, the English ambassador in France, related to Cecil that Baudouin wished to write a work defending the said English moderation. It is in the context of Baudouin's encomium of English restraint that Jewel related the above-quoted sentiment, and Jewel then dropped the matter, leaving his readers to wonder exactly what is the nature of Calvin's preciseness that Jewel thought defensible? He does not defend Martyr, his former mentor, but only Calvin, even though the libel of religious fastidiousness had equally impugned both. Perhaps Jewel believed his exoneration of Calvin would also cover Martyr, and that Baudouin, prejudiced by his grievance with Calvin, had merely painted both Reformers with the same brush. After all, since Martyr had attended the Colloquy, had been, along with Beza, the intransigent voice of Protestantism, and not Calvin, this makes Jewel's words a bit less enigmatic with respect to the two Reformers.

But the more telling and more interesting point is not Jewel's lack of overt apology for Martyr, but his defense of Calvin: that Baudouin is

Poissy (Cambridge, MA, 1974), especially Chs. V and VI.

⁹⁸ Bernard Cottret, *Calvin. A Biography* (Grand Rapids and Edinburgh, 2000). trans. M. Wallace MacDonald. (Paris: Éditions Jean-Claude Lattés, 1995), p. 249.

unjust (*iniquior*) in his indictment, and that the label of preciseness unfairly portrays how Calvin defined Reform. Jewel's confession, not that Baudouin had misinterpreted English attitudes and intent in the Settlement (though this is implied), but that the French lawyer's bias had led him to assess unfairly Calvin's severity, gives Jewel the face not of the *via media* which Baudouin preached, but that program countenanced by Martyr and Beza at Poissy, and by extension Calvin also. Jewel, if not having an affinity with Calvin, at least was not inimical to him; for Jewel, Calvin's itinerary was not the extreme that Baudouin thought, and that Baudouin had indeed wrongly divined what the English Reform entailed. Jewel would never balk at being labeled a moderate as a Reformer, the main of his polemical work flowed from his denial of innovation. But by the same token, Calvin would not scruple at this label either: as already noted, he had written to William Cecil disclaiming any affinity with the radical views of Knox in the Scot's *First Blast of a Trumpet* or any knowledge of its printing until a whole year after its appearance.⁹⁹ Further, the very dedication and purpose of Calvin's *Institutes* was to relieve French Evangelicals of the label 'Anabaptist', then synonymous with innovation. Jewel for his part, never lumped Calvin with Knox. In this regard, Jewel, although clearly having pinned his aspirations for English Reform on the 1559 Settlement, was not averse to seeing England becoming more like the cities of Geneva and Zurich. Further, he clearly sees himself and the Reformation in England as not incommensurate with Calvin, and at least not as compatible with the Erasmianism embraced by such as Baudouin and Cassander. It does affirm that Jewel did not see Martyr's exactness and Calvin's as incommensurate. Further, it implies that the liberality of the Elizabethan Settlement, in Jewel's mind, could probably be more narrowly circumscribed, or perhaps, as this appears the case, that Jewel saw the Settlement as far more coterminus with the aims of the continental Reformers than did others, hardly obtaining the Erasmian *via media* Baudouin believed.

Life with the Supreme Governor of the Church of England

That differences existed among the English Protestants Jewel acknowledged as early as his 1562 *Epistola*. Such disagreements Jewel portrayed as mere trifles, of little significance when compared with the greater divisions that separated either Roman Catholics from themselves, or Rome from Protestantism. Those who quibbled about such matters as

⁹⁹ *Zurich Letters*, Vol. II, Letter XV, pp. 34–36.

vestments had not affected the peace or doctrine of the Church of England; and though on matters of adiaphora some in the Church of England dissented from the Settlement, concerning the true material substance of religion, *de re vero ipsa*, the English stood united.¹⁰⁰ Jewel's apologetic demeanor ostensibly faced one direction: Rome. But Collinson notwithstanding,¹⁰¹ Jewel's *Apology* is hardly bankrupt of the means necessary for a defense of the Settlement from those who thought it wanting. Having been at Frankfurt during the conflict between Knox and Cox, it would be remiss to think that Jewel's work carried with it no answer to the Knoxians.

Given Jewel's part in the troubles at Frankfurt and his circle of associations which included such as Whittingham, Humphrey and Sampson, it may be wondered why he seemingly defined the terms of his apology only in view of Rome. That some of his own country would fault 1559 could only be taken as a given, especially as those whom Jewel had offended at Frankfurt had not even been satisfied with the seemingly more rigorous Reforms and order of 1552. John Hooper had already raised the matter of vestments within the Edwardian Church. But this formal oversight on Jewel's part was not some charitable wreath for those who did not wish to worship 'as they did in England'. Indeed, silence on this point was crucial within the context of his polemical work. The basic accusations the Catholics hurled against the Protestants cited them not only for their schism from the one true Church, but also that they stood estranged even from one another, equivocal on matters pertaining to their doctrine, ceremony and order. It would score Jewel few polemical points to assert the purity and unity of the English Church while simultaneously acknowledging that fellow Protestants, members of his own communion, saw the English Church as but half reformed. Thus the Church of England Jewel presented to the public stood united, not only in doctrine, but behind its monarch. The silence, far from some concession to Puritan notions, instead served the debate against Rome. In Jewel's public pronouncements – sermons, books, tracts, injunctions, letters with others in the English Church – he never questioned the Elizabethan Settlement, or the right and duty of the prince to defend and reform the Church when necessary. Only within the happy confines of his personal epistles did Jewel cross this boundary, though there was one exceptional incident, that of the crucifix in Elizabeth's royal chapel.

Jewel was prepared to jeopardize his episcopal office before consenting to this idolatry, for him perhaps an evil portent of things to come: 'That ill-omened, miscreant little silver cross, still remains in the

¹⁰⁰ Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, Appendix, *Epistola*, p. 218.

¹⁰¹ Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 61.

queen's chapel. Wretched me! This thing will easily be made into a precedent.'¹⁰² The crucifix in Elizabeth's chapel showed Jewel just what crosses he had to bear. Yet, though made a matter for a disputation, the affair resulted in neither what Jewel feared for himself, nor what he hoped with respect to the queen's chapel: Jewel stayed and so did the crucifix. Perhaps the specter of too much change, losing her new bishops as well as her old, did not sit well with Elizabeth. The crucifix's status became neither royally proscribed precedent, nor a definition of true religion. Though a grievous situation, the crucifix did not touch the basic doctrinal integrity of the Settlement, as it never stood as interpretive of it. Consequently, Jewel, though having withstood his archbishop and monarch on the question,¹⁰³ came out with his episcopal orders and the 1559 Settlement, intact. Though aired in public, in the end his opposition appears as a private spat, without any significant consequences for the English Church. From this incident we see that Jewel could not condone all of Elizabeth's religious sensibilities. To the extent he embraced and endorsed the Settlement, as it contained the royal will's definition for the established Church, Jewel remained an Erastian. However much of a popish precedent they may have set, that the crucifix and the royal chapel were not religious law, spared Jewel. Nonetheless, he did not see the monarch's prerogative as absolute; after all, he had been an exile. Yet even this was not some repudiation on Jewel's part of Mary's legitimacy, but merely his recognition that he could not live with his legitimate monarch's religion. Jewel himself understood that changes in religion, especially as they affected matters of state, contained dangers:

I know that all changes in the commonwealth are offensive and serious, and that many things are often tolerated by princes by reason of the times; and this initially, probably was not inconvenient; but now that the full light of the gospel has shone through, the very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed.¹⁰⁴

Having survived the issue of the crucifix, whatever other disaffection lurked in Jewel's soul he kept well under lock and key: the public persona

¹⁰² 'Crucula illa argenteola male nata, male auspicata, adhuc stat in larario principis. Me miserum! res ea facile trahetur in exemplum.' Jewel, letter to Martyr, 16 November 1559, in *Works*, IV, p. 1224.

¹⁰³ A debate was held between those who argued for the propriety of the crucifix in the queen's chapel, archbishop Parker and Richard Cox, and those who argued against it, Grindal and Jewel. See Jewel's letter to Martyr, 4 February 1560, in *Works*, IV, p. 1228.

¹⁰⁴ 'Scio omnes in republica magnas mutationes odiosas et graves esse, et multa saepe a principibus temporis causa tolerari; atque illud fortasse ab initio non fuit incommodum: nunc vero postquam erupit lux omnis evangelii, quantum quidem fieri potest, vestigia ipsa erroris.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1245.

of a bishop, fully in support of his prince and archbishop's actions, remained pristine. In his letters to Parker and others in the English Church, there is never a hint of dissent. Jewel's letters to his countryman presented a model, conforming bishop.

The matter of the crucifix also illustrates Jewel's perception of Elizabeth's place within his Christian Commonwealth. Jewel noted in *The Defense of the Apology* that the godly prince had defined limitations, chief among them the Word of God. But the monarch also retained the duty of nursing true religion, the establishment of ecclesiastical laws, the answering of the questions of religion – or the commitment of them to the learned, and finally the preserving of order among the clergy. He concludes this list by observing that 'Greater authority than Constantinus the emperor had and used our princes require none'.¹⁰⁵ Thus the government of the Church, while largely fallen to the prince, still was not hers properly when it pertained to more exact formulations, nor could it proceed further than God's law allowed. In the matter of the crucifix, the queen had overstepped her prerogative: a crucifix was idolatry. But unlike Mary, Elizabeth had not promoted the error, but kept it to herself. In this light we should again look at Jewel's opposition to vestments. In and of themselves, they were indifferent, having neither biblical warrant nor prohibition; and they certainly were not *de facto* idolatry. To go back to Jewel's earliest polemic, the anonymous *Epistola*, these things were not of the very substance of the Gospel. Matters like these could be relegated to the monarch's discretion, a staple and tenet of English religion since Henry VIII broke with Rome, and a *modus vivendi* embraced by Jewel even in Frankfurt. So while Jewel may have seen his hopes for further reform tied to a vacillating queen, she was the only hope he had.

Two things thus come into clearer focus. First, Jewel in his letters quite pointedly excoriated the use of the surplice, yet even the language used is not that of absolute prohibition. These garments, the 'relics of the Amorites', so much foolery and things hopefully soon discarded, were not the substance of the Gospel. Not that they were for the *bene esse* of the Church either, and Harding caused Jewel some consternation on this point. Jewel, having stated that what was not for the betterment of the Church should be abolished, had to answer Harding when the Louvainist pointed to those who would not wear cassock and surplice for this very reason. Jewel resolved the point by showing that those whose consciences were such, were brought to this state only due to the abuses of Rome. In their case, *abusus tollit usum*.¹⁰⁶ This would seem to

¹⁰⁵ Jewel, *Apologia*, Works, III, p. 167.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 614–18.

involve a contradiction, for if the abuse had destroyed the use, then ought not Puritan clergy be indulged? For Jewel, this was not the case. The reply to Harding, consequently aimed at Rome, did not absolve the Puritans of their disobedience to the prescribed English use. Vestments, though indifferent, were matters of order, and in a Church submissive to its Queen, were not open to debate. In this light, the prerogative of regional Churches, embraced and extolled in the *Apologia*, again emerges, but now as a foil to Puritanism.

In this regard, the previously mentioned incident involving Jewel's refusal in December of 1565 to allow Laurence Humphrey a benefice within the Salisbury diocese, due to the Magdalen College president's contentions over vestments, comes into sharper focus. Humphrey's opinion did not trouble Jewel, indeed Humphrey counted Jewel his friend, and as shown by a letter to Bullinger dated the following February, Jewel and Humphrey had similar convictions. But Jewel's private sympathies ended where Humphrey's public variance began. Jewel had written Parker explaining his position about Humphrey before the 1566 Advertisements, and therefore this action should not be seen as Jewel merely cowering to the prevailing episcopal wind: he had real scruples about Humphrey's position. As an English prelate, Jewel's first allegiance was to the 1559 Settlement, a settlement that preserved England from Marian atrocities. Integral to it was the concept that the prince had the right to make and establish laws for the good order of the Church. Jewel held out hope, quite naturally, that eventually Elizabeth would see things with better eyes, writing as much to Bullinger in 1566:

This contention about the linen ecclesiastical vestments {surplice}, about which you have heard ... has not yet quieted. That matter still somewhat disturbs weak minds. And would that all, even the most tenuous vestiges of popery be removed from our churches, and most importantly from our minds. But the queen is not able to bear the least change in religion at this time.¹⁰⁷

In this sentiment Jewel displays not the least recrimination against Elizabeth. Further, this statement communicates no change in Jewel's attitude or perception since 1559. His letters to Zurich, reflective of Jewel's aspirations, also give us the frankness of his mind respecting English polity. If Jewel could live in the English Church with his scruples about the crucifix, certainly the Puritans could live with the surplice.

So the *Apologia*, as well as Jewel's other writings, must be seen as more than merely an anti-Catholic document; contrary to Collinson's

¹⁰⁷ 'Contentio illa de ecclesiastica veste linea ... nondum etiam conquievit. Ea res nonnihil commovet infirmos animos. Atque utinam omnia etiam tenuissia vestigia papatus et e templis, et multo maxime ex animis omnium, auferri possent! Sed regina ferre mutationem in religione hoc tempore nullam potest.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1267.

assessment, though Jewel's apologetic may only look in one direction explicitly, it nonetheless does assert the foundational principles so vigorously assailed by the Puritans. In his contention for the right of regional Churches to establish their own liturgies and ceremony, and by his establishing the prince as the governor of the Church, Jewel implicitly contains a rebuke to those Knoxians at Frankfurt. And while perhaps not expressly in Jewel's mind at the time (though given his sentiments in the *Epistola* this may be argued in the affirmative), it even censures those Precisian contentions about vestments and the Presbyterian quibbles about Church government. The troubles at Frankfurt had given Jewel a taste of those English who were far more radical in their attempts at reform than he was. Such sentiments, too seditious even in their mild incarnation, had also existed even in Edward's day as the case of bishop Hooper and his refusal to wear episcopal garb illustrates. Jewel viewed the Puritans not as seditious, but as disorderly, contentious about minor issues when the substance, *de re vero ipsa*, should be emphasized. Conversely, Rome contained those:

such as hold not the true religion, as it is taught by the word of God, and hath been practiced in those churches which the apostles planted, and among those Christians which lived nighest unto that time when the apostles preached, because they know their religion which they profess now will not agree with that, they deal deceitfully and with guile.¹⁰⁸

Jewel saw in the Puritan cavils a means whereby order could be disturbed; in the Catholics he saw both the English order's and true religion's overthrow.

Turning the polemical guns on the Presbyterians: Jewel in 1571

Before looking at Jewel in regard to the Presbyterians of England and their emergence in 1571, it is necessary to look at his assessment of John Knox and Christopher Goodman following the accession of Elizabeth. As has been pointed out, Jewel understood the tenuous balance that realms maintained in matters of religion. The difficulties regarding the integration of Church and realm in France, especially as regards the changing of religion – 'Scio omnes in republica magnas mutationes odiosas et graves esse'¹⁰⁹ – undoubtedly obtained of England as well. Jewel's interpretation of the Protestant commonwealth necessitated both

¹⁰⁸ Jewel, *A Replie to Harding*, in *Works*, II, p. 830.

¹⁰⁹ 'I know that great (religious) changes in a commonwealth are weighty and hateful.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1246.

a prince whose will would support the Church and one whose religious proclivities would not change with the fortunes of politics. It also entailed a religion purified of the medieval doctrine that the spiritual estate was over the temporal, which would make Jewel's view of the prince untenable. Jewel discovered, however, that those who questioned his view of the constitution of society came to call in guises other than Catholic, Anabaptist or Unitarian.

That Catholic apologists had lumped the magisterial Reformers with the Reformation's more radical manifestations, had been a commonplace. But for Jewel the more radical elements included some from his own country and national Church, whose doctrine, while not anti-Trinitarian, nonetheless imbibed political radicalism. While other Reformers had to fight a war on two fronts, one against Rome and the other against the Anabaptists, Jewel in his struggle found himself defending the English Protestant Settlement from being defaced even by someone who had once been a chaplain to Edward VI, namely John Knox. Like Jewel, Knox had also repudiated the Anabaptists: they were more wicked than the papists, as they denied the basic Christian nature of the commonwealth and made purity a precondition of the true Church.¹¹⁰ Knox was also keenly aware that Catholic writers painted the Reformers with the same brush as they painted the Anabaptists.

Formerly, thereby have the conjured enemies of Christ's truth taken a boldness to blaspheme the same as a diabolical doctrine, which looses the bridle of all impiety. For the pestilent Papists, perceiving the licentious and inordinate life of some professors, did not only judge the whole number to be likewise infected, but also did neither fear nor shame to accuse the doctrine as the principal cause of such enormities. And thus, alas! do we expose the sacred and blessed word of God to opprobrium and rebuke by our inordinate lives.¹¹¹

But this revulsion of Anabaptist practice and belief about the nature of the Christian society did not hinder Knox from venturing into the forbidden political waters of both popular revolution and regicide.¹¹² Jewel needed to repudiate Knox, but at the same time his denunciation is also one of Harding and the Anabaptists, and even of the Puritans and Presbyterians, all who questioned Jewel's notion of the right of the Godly prince.

Harding pressed the matter of sedition and rebellion when he asked 'What meant ye when ye laid your heads together being at Geneva in

¹¹⁰ John Knox, *A Warning against the Anabaptists, a Letter to his Brethren in Scotland*, December 1557. Ed. with introductory essay by Kevin Reed (Dallas, 1984), p. 22.

¹¹¹ Knox, *Against the Anabaptists*, pp. 25–26.

¹¹² For a collection of all Knox's tracts treating the subject of rebellion and political resistance, see Roger A. Mason, ed. *John Knox, On Rebellion* (Cambridge, 1994).

queen Mary's days, the faithful brothers of England and Scotland, and devised a most seditious and traitorous book against the monstrous regiment of women?'¹¹³ Jewel's immediate reply was insistently to distance himself from both Knox and Goodman, whom he names, though Harding does not. The stratagem assumed, made in the immediate context against Harding's assertion that 'ye laid your heads together ... the faithful brothers of Scotland and England', was that far from a consensus among the exiles, these were but two men. Jewel keeps his numbers down, for he never mentions the former bishop of Rochester and Winchester, John Ponet, equally as radical as either Knox or Goodman. But Jewel was not equivocating: 'We will defend no man in his error. Let every man bear his own guilt. M. Calvin, M. Martyr, M. Musculus, M. Bullinger, and others whom you call the faithful of England, misliked that enterprise, and wrote against it.'¹¹⁴

In this section of his *Defense of the Apology*, Jewel found himself the apologist for various Protestant endeavors and actions that Harding had imputed with sedition: the Schmalkaldic League's war with Charles V, the deportment of the Germans and Luther respecting the peasants' revolt, and the endeavor of the Bernese against the Dukes of Savoy. Jewel handled each in its turn, and with various appeals to the law of arms (Bern) or the law of nature (the Schmalkaldic League). But with the matter of Knox he handles things differently; here he turns to a quote from St Augustine: 'There was a law made in Rome, called *Lex Voconia*, that no man should convey his inheritance unto a woman, no not unto his only daughter. Than which law I know not what may be more wickedly thought or spoken.'¹¹⁵ Having called Calvin et al., to stand as more representative of Protestant thought than Knox and Goodman, he now also throws Augustine into the mix. Not only were Knox and Goodman aberrant, but the truth found in Augustine better affirmed England's stance. Jewel also cites Numbers 27: 'If a man die without a son, his inheritance shall pass unto his daughter.' For Jewel, these not only distance England from Knox's radicalism, but set the trap for Recusant views as well.

In various letters to Peter Martyr, Jewel informed his friend of Knox's and Goodman's doings in Scotland, having passed along the information he had received from his old Oxford benefactor, Thomas Randolph.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Quoted in Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 664.

¹¹⁴ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 665.

¹¹⁵ *De Civitate Dei* III.xxi. Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 665.

¹¹⁶ Randolph had been the president of Broadgates Hall Oxford (now Pembroke College), wherein Jewel took refuge having been expelled from Corpus Christi. Charles Webb Le Bas, *Life of Jewel*, pp. 21–22. There are also some letters to Parkhurst, addressed from Broadgates Hall, and dated at this time. *Works*, pp. 1190–91.

Jewel, who had wished the Scots the best in their fight first with Mary of Guise and then later with Mary Queen of Scots, in no wise distanced himself from Knox and the Scottish enterprise, even though his past interaction with Knox and Goodman at Frankfurt had hardly been cordial. At Frankfurt the premises of arguments later employed by Jewel were championed by the Coxians: the right of regional Churches to establish their own liturgies and order. Knox's activities in Scotland created no trouble for Jewel's English conscience, but his writings that impugned the validity of Elizabeth's reign did. Jewel's arguments, consequently, are not merely for a Protestant, Elizabethan realm as opposed to that envisioned by the Recusants, as it is an apology by Protestant England against Harding's slander in lumping all Protestants as rebellious and bent on insurrection. Knox and Goodman needed repudiation on two counts: that a female could not function as the head of a realm and that an ungodly prince could be deposed. Jewel here explicitly answered the first of these; the correlative questions of political resistance and sovereignty he answered tacitly. The point here pertains to Elizabeth's right to rule despite her sex: it is a matter of lawful inheritance, or of property. By making this point Jewel moved the discussion away from such concepts as federated states (Elizabeth would never have used the word 'state' in its modern sense), and returned it to concerns more apropos a feudal realm than to a modern state. When Jewel asserted that the status of Elizabeth as ruler she owed to her inheritance from her father, he evaded and muted Knox's assertions that the royal title rested on the assent of the nobility or the Estates as God's Lieutenants.

The same is the duty of the nobility and estates by whose blindness a woman is promoted. First, in so far as they have most heinously offended against God, placing in authority such as God by His Word hath removed from the same, ... with common consent they ought to retreat that which unadvisedly and by ignorance they have pronounced, and ... to remove from authority all such persons as by usurpation, violence or tyranny do possess the same. For so did Israel and Judah after they had revolted from David and Judah alone in the days of Athaliah.¹¹⁷

Inasmuch as Knox's appeal was to Scripture, so too was Jewel's; but more importantly as it pertains to Harding more than to Knox, Jewel had also appealed to St Augustine. In Knox, like the Anabaptists, Jewel

¹¹⁷ Knox, *The first Blast of the Trumpet*, in Mason, *John Knox: On Rebellion*, pp. 43–44. For Knox, Goodman and Ponet, Cf. J.W. Allen, *Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1928), pp. 106–20, and also Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Vol. II. *The Age of Reformation* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 227–38.

must answer for someone whose polemic had moved Reformation principles in a radical direction. As in all of his disputes, Jewel wished to show not merely the veracity of his position, but its catholicity and antiquity as well. The quote from Augustine distanced him from Knox's heretofore novel interpretation and political assertions, and gave his view a distinct pedigree, though this idea did have its apologists elsewhere.¹¹⁸

In so doing, Jewel retained a set of categories each necessitated by his need for a political conservatism closely aligned with Protestant notions of Reform. Jewel had assented to Mary's succession, though he quickly fled when ostensibly imperiled by the conservative elements at Oxford.¹¹⁹ Jewel had delivered the Oxford oration upon Mary's accession, but, if Humphrey is to be followed, only fled when the religious climate became too hot for his health. Upon Mary's death, Elizabeth became the godly prince¹²⁰ who also would champion the truth of the Gospel. As both their claims rested on the same premise of legitimacy,¹²¹ of necessity the legitimacy of Mary's claim to the throne must be defended in the same way as Elizabeth's, notwithstanding Knox's form of contract government. Jewel never answered Knox's arguments *per se*; instead he cuts out the premise on which they are built, namely, a sovereignty residing in the estates. Jewel circumvents Knox's canon of authority, God's revelation in both Scripture and nature (male headship and physical disposition), on the one hand, with like scriptural authority, Numbers 27; and on the other, in a manner akin to his *ad majorem* arguments regarding the Donation of Constantine (cf. Chapter Two), by reposing in interpretive authorities whose collective and individual stature dwarfed Knox's: first the litany of current Protestant divines who dissented from the Scot, but ultimately St Augustine. Thus Jewel gives antiquity's sanction to his arguments about legitimacy, and by this also silently argues for the right of Elizabeth as sovereign of England against not only those Protestants who questioned her prerogatives as Supreme Governor, but also against those who would eventually seek a papal deposition of her.¹²²

¹¹⁸ For a brief synopsis of the view of the state or commonwealth in Tudor England, see Alan G.R. Smith, *The Emergence of a Nation State. The Commonwealth of England: 1529-1660*, 2nd ed. (London, 1997), pp. 87-96. Cf. the brief but informative essay on sixteenth-century English political theory, Christopher Morris's *Political Thought in England: Tyndale to Hooker* (Oxford, 1953).

¹¹⁹ Le Bas, *Life of Jewel*, pp. 30-33. Cf. Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, pp. 74-82.

¹²⁰ I never recall Jewel referring to her as 'princess'.

¹²¹ Political as opposed to personal, for if Anne Boleyn were Henry VIII's lawful wife, then Catherine of Aragon could not have been.

¹²² Cf. Jewel's *A View of a Seditious Bull*, published upon Pius V's bull of excommunication against Elizabeth, in which he frees the consciences of her Catholic

In the same way that Jewel incorporated more than bare biblical citations to bolster his claims in handling the liability of Knox, so too did he refrain from a merely biblicistic strategy when answering charges that Protestantism had created the plethora of anti-Trinitarian and Anabaptist sects. Jewel never gives Harding an inch on the question, giving as good as he got. The Peasants' Revolt, though against the oppression of Catholic rulers, was no Protestant movement, for Luther had condemned it; as to those who denied the Holy Trinity, the Zwickenfelters arose in Catholic Moravia and Silesia, Servetus in Catholic Spain, and so these could hardly be called the offspring of Protestantism.¹²³ With further respect to Servetus, he had been allowed to live in Catholic domains, though Jewel missed the opportunity to mention that he had been the personal physician to the bishop of Vienne.

As for ... Servete the Arian, and such other the like, they were yours ... You brought them up, the one in Spain, the other (David George) in Flanders. We detected their heresies, and not you. We arraigned them. We condemned them. We put them to the execution of the laws. It seemeth very much to call them our brothers, because we burnt them.¹²⁴

The one name that never emerges in this dispute is that of Bernardino Ochino, who had found his way first to Geneva and then to Zurich following Edward VI's death. Jewel made frequent reference to him in his early letters to Zurich, especially to Martyr, asking those receiving his epistles to give the former monk his greetings. Jewel must have known what had happened to him in Zurich, for while Ochino's apostasy occurred after Martyr's death and Jewel's correspondence with Zurich declines precipitously after it, he never mentioned Ochino in his letters after that. Ochino, like numerous other Italians, had adopted Unitarianism, and Harding must have been ignorant of the whole matter, for it seems improbable that he would have missed a chance to associate England's and Zurich's Protestants with such a notorious heretic. Needless to say, Jewel did not bring the matter up.¹²⁵

That Jewel countenanced Knox's Protestantism while abhorring his political ideals addresses a telling point about our Reformer. For Jewel the civil realm, especially the Elizabethan civil realm, represented the one sphere and arena where a thoroughly Protestant understanding of the Christian commonwealth must occur: an interpretation which embraced

subjects, and having granted them the right, urges them to revolt against her. *Works*, IV, pp. 1127–60.

¹²³ Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 664.

¹²⁴ Jewel, *Works*, III, p. 188.

¹²⁵ Mark Talpin, *The Italian Reformers and the Zurich Church. c. 1540–1620* (Aldershot, UK, 2003), especially pp. 111–69, 'The Ochino affair and its aftermath'.

a union of the crown and Church, a union repudiated by both Rome and the later Puritans. Though Knox was not a Puritan,¹²⁶ he had denied royal sovereignty of its unquestioned prerogative, something Jewel could not embrace. Thus Jewel repudiated the Catholic premise of the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal along with the Puritan assumption of their independence. In creating a Protestant commonwealth, the one *sine qua non* was her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth. Mary had shown, and the other Catholic countries continually demonstrated to Jewel, that the godly prince was a requirement for the preservation of the Gospel. Though partially noted previously, his comments to Martyr on this matter bear this out

It is incredible even to hear, what a pasture and forest of superstition everywhere emerged in that darkness of Marian times. We found ... votive relics of saints, nails with which the infatuated people dreamed that Christ had been pierced, and ... small fragments of the sacred cross. The number of witches and sorceresses has ... become enormous. The cathedral churches were nothing else but dens of thieves, or worse, if anything worse or more foul can be mentioned.¹²⁷

Thus any thought of Knox's resistance theories Jewel automatically dismissed as they created situations extraneous and dangerous to the English crown, for unlike the Empire and its electors, the crown of England was a matter of inheritance, in a sense, private property.¹²⁸ Dale Hoak likens Elizabeth's perception of her own state as one of occupying a post or a room which she alone could possess.¹²⁹ With respect to the Anabaptists, their notions were ungodly in the least, if not subversive of the kingdom of God in that they undercut the authority of the Church's guardian, the prince by making the prince merely a necessary evil of an evil society. In Jewel's vision of the English national Church, neither of these views could be given a place. In fact, both Knox and the Anabaptists were akin to the Recusants, as they each undermined the

¹²⁶ See Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge, 1960), Chapter VIII 'The Rise of the Presbyterian Movement'. Donaldson notes that the Presbyterian assertion that the Church should be independent of the crown appeared in England with Cartwright before it came to Scotland with Melville.

¹²⁷ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1216–18. Jewel ended his Oxford career when he threw his lot in with Protestantism at the accession of Mary, at the time when evangelical fortunes in England were at their lowest.

¹²⁸ In private Jewel saw the struggles of Knox and the Lords of the Congregation in Scotland, as well as those of the Huguenots in France, as all of a piece, and both enterprises supported by the English; in the case of the Scots militarily. Cf. letters to Martyr, the one undated, *Works*, IV, pp. 1226–27; and 14 August 1562, *Works*, IV, pp. 1254–55.

¹²⁹ Email correspondence relayed to me by Professor William Tighe of Muhlenberg College, 14 April 1998.

vitality of the Christian Commonwealth. Consequently, the definition and defense of the realm became the focus of Jewel's debate: definition since England's polity – church and crown – stood on a completely different theoretical basis than anything then entertained by the Catholics, the Anabaptists, or Knox; defense, for while Jewel may not wholly embrace every aspect of his monarch's whim, this polity alone could guarantee the continuance of the Protestant religion. In commenting upon the 1569 Northern rebellion and its fomenters, in language biblical in its form, and also reminiscent of that used by the eleventh- and twelfth-century imperial apologists, Jewel describes both the place of Elizabeth in her realm, as well as those who would oppose it.

This was done not long sithence [since]. You cannot but remember it: they were in arms, and had gathered a great company of confederates: the banner was displayed in the field.¹³⁰ What think you was their meaning? Or to what end did they rise? Among all those that live within this realm, whose person sought they? against whom bent they their spears? and against whose body drew they their swords? But the Lord preserved his anointed: he hath placed her upon his holy hill of Sion: no traitorous malice shall annoy her.

Consider now whence all this rebellion grew. There is not treason without conference. There [Rome], even there began all our trouble. The master of all this mischief sitteth at Rome, as I told you before: the coals were kindled here; but the bellows were there; and there sat he that blew the fire.¹³¹

The new canonical categories which Jewel proffered necessitated not merely a godly magistrate, but the godly prince; one whose unquestioned authority guaranteed stability not only in the civil realm, but also in the ecclesiastical. Jewel's vision of the Christian Commonwealth, both his public and private conception as shall be discussed, posited the peace of the Church. The responsibility for this peace rested on the prince's shoulders: 'the prince is the keeper of the law of God, and that of both tables, as well as of the first, that pertaineth to religion, as of the second that pertaineth to good order. For he is the head of the people, not only of the commons and laity, but also of the ministers and clergy.'¹³² It was only after this Bull had been issued that those English Protestants who questioned Elizabeth's status within the ecclesiastical realm overtly emerged, that is in the last year of Jewel's life.

Wyndham Southgate ends his survey of Jewel's life with a look at the bishop's activities regarding the Presbyterian controversy surrounding

¹³⁰ The banner displayed the five wounds of Christ, which is highly suggestive of an altar cloth design common in Catholic churches.

¹³¹ Jewel, *Seditious Bull*, *Works*, IV, p. 1158.

¹³² Jewel. Sermon on Haggai 1:2–4, *Works*, II, p. 997.

the 1571 Parliament. The analysis suffers from several flaws concerning Jewel both historically and theologically. Further, insofar as it follows Southgate's interpretation of Jewel as one of the founders of that protean beast called Anglicanism, it fails to discern that he was doing nothing new in 1571. Southgate's assumptions that Jewel's views on Puritanism in 1571 are the product of a slow development, and that Jewel was a defender of a *via media*, fails to see that what Jewel was doing in 1571 was completely commensurate with the rest of his polemical efforts. It is also blind to how Jewel's theology was nothing other than that embraced by the rest of the previous English Reformers, and more importantly, of almost all of the Continental ones, the Lutherans excepted. One of the chief, if not the chief problem with Southgate's appraisal of Jewel is the notion that what Jewel was facing in 1571 was Puritanism, pure and simple, when in fact it should be seen as another creature altogether. Collinson has pointed out that 1571 and 1572 saw not the old Puritans in a new phase, but new men who, taking the impetus from Puritanism, and being animated by a different though kindred spirit, sought a whole new basis for the Church of England, namely Presbyterianism. Presbyterianism certainly shared with the Puritans a revulsion for the number of ceremonies and rites retained by the English Church, but for them, these things were but secondary when considering the real causes of the failure of reform in the English Church, primarily the continued existence of episcopacy and all its accouterments, as well as the submission of the ministry of the Church to the laity, whatever its rank. The Puritans were quite content to live with both Her Majesty as Supreme Governor and bishops as administrators of the Church: for them it was a matter of the half-reformed measures that had been flowing from the arrangement, not the arrangement itself. For Presbyterians, the arrangement needed to go, root and branch:

A great reproof it is to all the learned, who have made some ado about shells and chippings of popery, but that which beareth up Antichrist chiefly, they have said little or nothing of it ... th' awful ministry of th' word and the right government of the church, ... matters of far greater weight and importance than ceremonies, and therefore more earnestly to be sought for and quickly pursued after.¹³³

The spirit of reform had pervaded the English Church throughout its ranks in the 1560s, with Jewel being no small part of this, as he, like most of his fellow bishops, desired alterations in the 1559 Settlement. Bishop Horne of Winchester had written to Rudolph Gualter in 1565 about the aspirations of many who wished to see the ornaments clause

¹³³ John Field quoted in Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 101.

of the Act of Uniformity removed. As we have seen, Jewel certainly would have agreed with this goal. But the 1566 Parliament proved a still birth for any ecclesiastical reform, even in regard to such things as the variegated English clergy were unanimous about, such as a binding subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles. Parliament would not meet again for another five years. In the interim the second vestarian controversy had already alienated more of the Puritans, and by 1570 the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, Thomas Cartwright, had left the country for the more agreeable confines of Geneva. Cartwright in his lectures on the Acts of the Apostles had divined within the text a system of government similar to the one propounded by Beza in Geneva. Cartwright believed the Church should be organized on the local level around a board of elders, some of them lay in nature, or what would be termed a ruling elder,¹³⁴ while regionally churches would be organized into *classes*. The roll of the lay elder was the oversight of morals and discipline. The threat to the Elizabethan Settlement was transparent to all who heard: what need is there for a godly prince if his function can be assumed by the lay elder. Though Cartwright did not return to England till 1572, his teachings, akin to those then ascendent in Geneva, and also among the French Huguenots, the Dutch Calvinists, and in the Palatinate, were already present in England by 1571. Collinson outlines the origins of this thought, noting that Calvin's close associate, Nicholas des Gallars had been the minister at the French Stranger church in London since the early 1560s. It is this system, just as opposed to the Ornaments rubric as any Puritan, that opposed the episcopal polity of the English Church, and with it the Royal Supremacy.

Jewel preached his last London sermon, apparently at Paul's Cross, sometime before the conclusion of the 1571 Parliament, as part of an episcopal campaign against the Presbyterians.¹³⁵ The sermon has not been preserved, but is known from allusions to it made in a Puritan tract.¹³⁶ Jewel defended several items, most notably the use of copes, vestments, the words in the ordinal for the ordering of bishops, 'receive

¹³⁴ Calvin had made a distinction, drawn from his reading of I Timothy 5:17, between preaching or teaching elders and ruling elders.

¹³⁵ See Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 116–21. Both Collinson and Southgate date Jewel's sermon after Parliament, but the tract which informs us of his sermon clearly says that it was delivered while Parliament had either yet to meet, or was still meeting.

¹³⁶ The tract is to be found in the Williams Library, London, and is the subject of a brief precis in Albert Peel, ed. *The Second Part of a Register*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1915), I, pp. 79–80. Cf. Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, pp. 102–3, where it appears that Southgate only knew the contents of the tract that were reproduced by Peel. It is also in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, Selden Supra 44, Folios 48r–52r. There is also a copy in Cambridge University Library [MS. Ee. II, 34, fols. 15–18], which had been in Parkhurst's letter book.

ye the Holy Spirit', and for an acceptance of the uses of the Church of England even though they were not all to everyone's liking. The authors of the tract appear to be Thomas Wilcox and one William White, a well-educated baker whose writings appear throughout the *Seconde Parte of a Register*, and who had a real influence on the first Presbyterians.¹³⁷ Jewel had argued for the existing English polity, but most of all for the necessity of unity in the preservation of the existing order. That this tract against Jewel was not another Puritan screed can be seen in the third section, wherein Wilcox and White pray:

that as he [God] moved the mariners to cast Jonah into the sea, so he would put into the heart of the Queens Ma[jesty] (whom God preserve) to remove you from your over quiet estates, pompous livings, and lordly titles Our meaning is, because you will neither reforme god his church yourselves for feare of losing your pomp and honor, neither will you suffer those which would, even with the loss of liberty, living, and life, that the beautiful face ['and purity' in the Williams' Library ms.] of the Apostolike Church might shine in England, which God for his crucified Christe Jesus sake bring to passe at this parliament if it be his good pleasure.¹³⁸

In keeping with this desire for the removal of the bishops, and in keeping with the denial that the ecclesiastical and the civil could be confounded, the authors go out of their way to point out that they will address Jewel as Beloved father in the Lord Jesus Christ, but they will not address him as lord, in that such a title was not countenanced by holy writ.

Jewel's sermon clearly appealed for unity, his arguments aimed at the criticisms and complaints of the Presbyterians. As Jewel's other polemics had also, so the sermon sought a unified face for the English Church. This needed unity must be seen in light of the threats from without, that is, the Catholic powers, and that schisms weakened not only the English Church, but the English nation as well. This echoed the opening address to the House of Lords in 1571 by the Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, who stressed the point that peace was the blessing of the Gospel, and that the realm needed to defend itself against the incursions of Rome.¹³⁹ This is the thrust of Jewel's polemic going back to the *Epistola*. The matters over which the Puritans were quibbling were insignificant in light of the substance of the religion they held commonly with the established Church. Nonetheless, these differences Jewel could now no

¹³⁷ Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 116.

¹³⁸ Selden supra 44, fol. 50r.

¹³⁹ Sir Simonds D'Ewes, *A compleat journal of the votes, speeches and debates, both of the House of lords and House of commons throught the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth, of glorious memory* (Wilmington, DE [1974?]) Facsimile of 1693 edition, pp. 137–39.

longer simply cover over by some appeal to the truth of the gospel itself, *de re vero ipsa*, which all in England held.

Like the tract against Jewel's sermon, and arising from the dissension in the Parliament of 1571, a short tract appeared purportedly outlining the proper government of the Church. It, along with Jewel's response, was printed for the first time in Whitgift's *Answer to a Certen Libell intituled An Admonition, &c.*¹⁴⁰ The tract is also reprinted in the Parker Society edition of Whitgift's works, forming the basis of the extended arguments between Whitgift and Thomas Cartwright over the nature of ecclesiastical polity. The Presbyterians annexed four arguments against the prelacy and Erastianism of the Church of England: that God had left a perfect pattern of church government in Ephesians IV, and therein is never mentioned pope, archbishop, or archdeacon; that the synagogue was a figure of the Church, and God omitted nothing from the figure so that the Church did not lack in its pattern;¹⁴¹ that where the substance of anything is perfect, so are its accidents, and as the primitive Church in its substance was most pure, and as it had no archbishops, so the purest of churches should have no archbishops; and finally, that the civil and ecclesiastical offices cannot be confounded.¹⁴²

The arguments that Jewel used in his replies both materially and formally echo those he had made against the Catholics. To the first Jewel used a simple plea by negation: Ephesians 4 does not mention presbyters, but it does mention prophets, so therefore the Presbyterians were equally condemned by their own text. Jewel denied the primacy of Ephesians 4 as any sort of pattern for Church government, and by this that there was no normative pattern for Church polity, but only what may be so determined by the needs of any region. This point is simply the same as the second proposition of the Westminster disputation, now applied to Presbyterianism.¹⁴³ In the rebuttal of the second point, Jewel followed the identical line of argumentation as in the first: the synagogue did lack perfection, for it had not the titles of apostles and evangelists. Again, if the Presbyterians wished to be consistent, then there was a necessity that

¹⁴⁰ Whitgift, *An Answer to a Certen Libell*, pp. 322–25. And in Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1299–300.

¹⁴¹ The emphasis upon the synagogue betrays a basic Puritan/Presbyterian emphasis upon the dogmatic and intellectual nature of the Christian faith to the detriment of the sacral or sacramental. Thus the synagogue and not the temple becomes the pattern.

¹⁴² Southgate believes this last article was not denying the right of the civil magistrate in religious affairs, but that the clergy had any civil prerogatives. This would clear the way for the Presbyterian notion of the ruling elder whose chief function was moral discipline. See *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, p. 101. I think that if this were the case, then Southgate's arguments would equally apply to even the ruling elder.

¹⁴³ See Chapter Two, section one: The Prospects and Duties of an Elizabethan Protestant.

their argument prove all they claimed. But there was a further, more telling point for Jewel here. The synagogue did have a title analogous to the title of archbishop, such as *Principes domus Dei, Principes familiarum sacerdotalium, et cetera*, and so it is clear that a hierarchy existed among the priests within the synagogue structure, as '[y]et were not all priests of like anciency [agency] in government'.¹⁴⁴

The third argument Jewel answered in two basic ways. First, accidents are not necessary to substances, and the substance of true religion still exists, for only its accidents have varied. Prophets and Apostles were accidental parts of the early Church, but they have now been replaced by universities and doctors. In ancient Israel, there was no king prior to Saul, but would anyone now say kings are not needful? So now also there are deans, prebendaries, archdeacons, and archbishops. Jewel then cites the authority of Erasmus, Chrysostom and Nicholas of Lyra concerning the status of Titus, and asks how could Titus be classified as anything but the archbishop of Crete especially appointed by Paul? The last of the four assertions, that the civil and the ecclesiastical cannot be confounded, Jewel effaced by merely pointing to Moses. Further, what ecclesiastics do as regards punishment and fines is an ecclesiastical matter, and does indeed pertain to the clergy, and thus there is an ecclesiastical government.¹⁴⁵

Jewel has taken some of the same stratagems he employed against the traditionalists and turned them on the Presbyterians, only instead of extending the chronological parameters to the year 600, he has limited them to the New Testament. Both parties he has challenged to find the exact particulars of the systems they profess. Granted, for the Presbyterians it was the substantial specifics, whereas for the Catholics many of the issues were peripheral, but the strategies are analogous. He has also largely denied for both parties the formative nature of the canons to which both had appealed: for the traditionalists, it was the ancient Church and Fathers; for the Presbyterians, a New Testament, even more explicitly a *sola scriptura* foundation for polity. Finally, in his dispute with the Presbyterians Jewel does not argue for what must definitely be held to the exclusion of other things, but merely for what may licitly be entertained. Yet what Jewel has here argued with the Presbyterians was the very same point that Rastell had made against him: not what can be assuredly found, but what can be licitly held, this may be believed. While Jewel had appealed to the Scriptures over the head of both Pope and council, the Presbyterians now appealed to it against him. Jewel seems to have read Rastell after all. That what Jewel

¹⁴⁴ Jewel, *Frivolous Objections*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1299.

¹⁴⁵ Jewel, *Answers to Certain Frivolous Objections*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1300.

had said to the Presbyterians could have been turned on him by the traditionalists shall remain an academic point: Jewel died 23 September 1571 while on an episcopal visit in his diocese.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ Le Bas, *Life of Bishop Jewel*, pp. 226–30.

This page intentionally left blank

Life as a bishop in Salisbury

The diocese of Salisbury before 1560

The diocese of Salisbury, comprised of Dorset, Berkshire and Wiltshire counties, dated back to Anglo-Saxon England. The initial dioceses of the area were begun shortly after St Augustine of Canterbury's mission, with Birinus establishing the diocese of Dorchester in 634, which seems to have encompassed much of the West Country. From Dorchester was begun the mission to Wessex. St Headda moved the diocese to Winchester, and upon his death the diocese was divided into Winchester and Sherborne, which encompassed Wiltshire, along with parts of Somerset and Dorset. In 909 Wiltshire and Berkshire were split off into separate dioceses, but in 1058 Herman, the Bishop of Ramsbury, reunited the dioceses, and in 1075 moved his see to Old Sarum, an Anglo-Saxon stronghold. The next bishop was St Osmund, who drew up the form of the liturgy known as the Sarum rite. In 1220 bishop Richard Poore, having decided to move the cathedral, laid the cornerstone for the new edifice on 28 April 1220. The entire structure was completed and dedicated by 1258. Because the cathedral itself was the product of a single vision and constructed over the relatively short span of 38 years, it has a unity lacking in other Gothic cathedrals. The cloisters and chapter house were added by 1284, both of which are on the south side of the cathedral (like any well-planned church, the cathedral was built with the doors in the west, the altar and congregation facing east). At some point after the initial crossing was completed, the decision was made to add a spire. Since it was not part of the original plan it soon became apparent that additional buttresses would have to be added internally. The internal additions make the crossing seem a bit more enclosed than it should. Nonetheless, even this was insufficient for the mass of the spire, as the original columns at the four corners of the crossing bow noticeably from the additional weight. Further, the spire, rising 404 feet from the floor of the cathedral, leans, with holes bored in the floor at the crossing where a plumb line has been dropped down from the spire's top, marking its decay.

By Jewel's day there were a number of buildings ancillary to the cathedral, including the episcopal palace, Braybroke House, which was the headmaster's residence and the cathedral school, the Song School or choristers' house, a deanery, Leaden Hall, and the chantry house of Lord

Robert Hungerford, put, of course, to other uses following the dissolution of the chantries in 1547. Leaden Hall and the episcopal palace were built concurrent with the cathedral. The present cathedral structurally is the same as in Jewel's day, though several things have changed. The episcopal palace is no longer the bishop's residence, which is now Mompesson House attached to the old Hungerford chantry, and the palace has gone through renovations largely due to damage sustained during the commonwealth period as it was then made into an ale house, and suffered accordingly. The palace is now the cathedral school. The greatest changes would be to the cathedral itself, which went through renovations c. 1790 under the architect James Wyatt. Later dubbed Wyatt the Destroyer, his several improvements included the demolition of the belfry, which was detached from the cathedral proper. The belfry had been a persistent problem for the chapter, as people were wont to wander among the bells, at times cracking them, and often getting them out of tune, so that they would have to be recast. On top of that, like the palace, it had been used as an ale house, and suffered much the same end.¹ The most notorious of Wyatt's deeds, however, came seemingly at the behest of the evangelical bishop who wished the cathedral to be brighter to aid in the people's reading of Scripture. Wyatt, accordingly, whitewashed the frescos on the nave ceiling, and broke out most of the stained glass from the enormous windows in the nave. Someone had the prescience to make sketches of the frescoes, which are now being redone.

The history of Salisbury's past bishops' relations with their chapter and city was never tranquil, and while Jewel did not face the turmoil others did, his time as bishop was not idyllic. The bishop of Salisbury was at the same time Lord of the city; the mayor, though elected by the people was his vassal. The fifteenth century had been one of confrontation between the lord bishop and his subjects. During the unrest surrounding the murder of the duke of Suffolk and the Cade rebellion in 1450, numerous local insurrections broke out, one of them in Salisbury. William Ayscough, bishop since 1438 and the confessor to Henry VI, had to flee Salisbury, but was caught at Edington during Mass and was dragged out of the priory church and stoned. Richard Beauchamp succeeded Ayscough, and though at great odds with the city and the mayor, avoided Ayscough's fate for the 32 years of his episcopacy. Both Beauchamp and the city, led by its four-time mayor, John Halle, appealed to Edward IV to revisit the bishop's traditional privileges; Beauchamp of course wanting them confirmed. Edward IV

¹ Dora Robertson (1938), *Sarum Close. A Picture of Domestic Life in a Cathedral Close for 700 years and the History of the Choristers for 900 years* (London: Jonathan Cape), pp. 232–33.

took Beauchamp's side, confirming by letters patent in 1472 those liberties and privileges granted to past bishops by Henry III and Edward III, further delineating the bishop's prerogatives. The charter – for it was often viewed as a constitution for the city thereafter – stipulated that the town of Salisbury belonged to the bishop, that the mayor, though elected by the people was his mayor, and should the people fail to elect a mayor in a timely fashion, the bishop had the right of appointment. Further, it was in the bishop's power to have his servants carry maces bearing the royal arms, and the right both to have a jail and to detain prisoners.²

Matters came to a head again under Henry VIII and his episcopal appointee, Nicholas Shaxton. After the death of Edmund Audley in 1524 the see of Salisbury had been granted to the papal Legate, cardinal Campeggio, but upon his deprivation of the temporalities in 1534 (he had left England in 1529 after he had ended the English trial for Catherine of Aragon) Henry granted the see to Shaxton, who was enthroned in 1536. Audley, a member of the nobility who nonetheless had little trouble with the town, was also a strong traditionalist. Upon his death he had erected an ornate chantry chapel, complete with pomegranates, a distinctive part of Catherine of Aragon's device, in the tracery. Following Henry's divorce from Catherine, as pomegranates were part of Catherine's coat of arms, the king ordered all pomegranates removed from all monuments, but those in Audley's chapel are still there. While this may speak to the question of the chapter's relative disposition about both the divorce and the supremacy, it should be noted that pomegranates can still be found in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, along with the initials of Anne Boleyn on what was once the rood screen. The chapter had the run of the cathedral following Audley's death, for Campeggio never came to his diocese during the six years of his residence in England, and thus the see stood essentially vacant for 12 years.³ Campeggio's disposition seems to have been that of the city's, for when Henry's case was made for his divorce from the cathedral pulpit, the congregation hissed and pulled the offending priest out of the lectern.⁴ In 1536, upon his arrival, Shaxton, an evangelical, made no pretension about how he would oversee the city and diocese. Whether the town was not ready for Shaxton and the Reformation, or whether the question of liberties was what provoked it, Salisbury, now with the added incitements of religion to bolster its animus, gave its bishop a rough go

² Fanny Street, 'The Relations of the Bishops and Citizens of Salisbury (New Sarum) between 1225 and 1612'. *W.A.&N.H.M.* 39 (1916), pp. 249–50.

³ Despite never having been there, and having taken the wrong side of the controversy, Campeggio's likeness is still among the carved miniatures of the bishops in the cathedral choir, his likeness being distinguished by his cardinal's hat.

⁴ Garrett Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon* (G. Mattingly, 1941), p. 336.

of it. In the event, the line between these two *causae belli*, at least as they pertain to Shaxton, seems nonexistent, as the bishop employed his privileges to effect evangelical change. Shaxton enforced the proscriptions against the veneration of images, and saw to the termination of the observance or night watch for St Osmund's day. The mayor and members of the town council, not to be stripped of their devotion, appealed to Henry VIII asking allowance to keep the feast and the vigil.⁵ Shaxton pushed the Royal Supremacy, had it preached by his chaplains, and when he published the king's writ granting a dispensation from Lenten fasting the decree was pulled down. Tensions rose when neither the mayor nor the sheriff would act to find out who did it. John MaDowell, one of Shaxton's chaplains complained to Thomas Cromwell that neither the mayor nor the bailiff was the king's subject: the mayor getting wind of this threw MaDowell into the city jail. The bishop now had to take up his case with Cromwell through his under bailiff John Goodall. The under bailiff wrote Cromwell that priests were still counseling penitents not to eat white meat during Lent, not to read the New Testament, and not to keep company with those of the new learning. Matters only grew worse when on Easter afternoon, 1539, Goodall came into the cathedral to find the choir filled with people venerating and kissing a monstrance. The monstrance had been placed in a 'tomb' on Good Friday, and was now resurrected for Easter, an unremarkable aspect of Catholic devotion. Goodall cited the injunctions against images in ordering the faithful to desist, and when they would not, he grabbed the monstrance, the host falling out in the process. Both Goodall and the mayor, who accused Goodall of being a sacramentary, brought the matter to Star Chamber. Only the intervention of Shaxton, who asserted that Goodall had acted out of zeal for the injunctions, and that he was not a sacramentary, spared the under bailiff any consequences for his action.⁶ A resolution to the situation was denied by circumstances: Shaxton refused to enforce Henry VIII's Act of the Six Articles, and renounced his office in 1539. Ironically, Shaxton would later become one of the more vocal Catholics in England.

The Diocese then fell to John Capon or Salcot. Jewel labeled Capon a profligate as regards money; though he was generous in his provision of the Cathedral's choristers.⁷ His incomplete altar tomb can still be seen in the cathedral nave, though he is not buried in it. Matters seem to have been more settled under Capon and there is no record of trouble. The vacancy of the see brought by his death in 1557 during Mary's reign

⁵ Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, p. 398.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 421–22.

⁷ Roberston, *Sarum Close*, p. 123.

would seem to have been meant for Peter Peto, who had been named after Campeggio's death. When he did not take it Mary named Francis Mallet, but owing to the dispute of Mary and cardinal Pole with pope Paul IV, the vacancy was never filled, and thus was a prize awaiting someone upon Elizabeth's accession.

Although Salisbury Diocese contained some Lollards, and while the evidence of a declining medieval piety exists,⁸ there is no reason to think that it was a haven of Protestantism at any time before Jewel arrived. Lollardy flourished along the trade routes from London through Oxfordshire and into the West Country, and there were 16 heresy trials in the diocese throughout the fifteenth century. In 1431 Lollards posted a number of handbills and broadsheets during Jack Sharp's rising, and a priest from Westbury was condemned and burned for heresy.⁹ Evidence abounds more for the preservation of traditional religion than not, and Andrew Brown points out that 'ultimately, the acceptance of reform may tell us more about the strength of royal power than the popularity of either faith'.¹⁰ While uprisings did not occur against either Henry's or Edward's reforms, there is the clear evidence that people were more than slow in implementing them.¹¹ Beyond the confrontations between Shaxton and the town listed above, which were clearly not sparked merely by Shaxton's appeal to the bishop's liberties and privileges, the town council of Salisbury, upon the death of Edward, quickly returned to the observing of obits and the establishment of chantries. The cathedral chapter also had elements that resisted Jewel. As already noted, among the canons of the cathedral was Thomas Harding. Harding has competition among the Salisbury canons for being the most noted for his conservatism. Edmund Powell, a resident canon, lived in Hemingsby house within the Close of the Cathedral. A fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, the university commended him to Henry VIII as a glory to the university when in 1523 he took up the pen against Luther in his *Propugnaculum summi sacerdotij euangelici, ac septenarij sacramentorum, editum per uirum eruditum, sacrarumq[ue] literaru[m] professorem Edoardu[m] Pouelum, aduersus Martinu[m] Lutherum fratrem famosum et VVicesistam insignem*.¹² His fall from grace began in 1525 when he became one of the councillors for Catherine of Aragon in her divorce proceedings, coming out with his *Tractatus de non*

⁸ Andrew Brown, *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England. The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250-1550* (Oxford, 1995), Chapter 10, 'The Reformation', pp. 223-49.

⁹ Richard Rex, *The Lollards* (New York, 2002), p. 92.

¹⁰ Brown, *Popular Piety*, p. 247.

¹¹ Barrett L. Beer, *Rebellion and Riot: Popular Disorder in England during the reign of Edward VI* (Kent, OH, 1982), p. 152.

¹² London, 1523.

dissolvendo Henrici Regis cum Catherina matrimonio. In 1533 Hugh Latimer cited him to Cromwell as Powell verbally attacked the bishop in a disputation, and fell even further from favor with his condemnation of Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn. In 1534 he was attainted, along with John Fisher of Rochester, and consigned to the tower. In all probability that is where he would have remained, until the coup that brought down Thomas Cromwell in July 1540. The Duke of Norfolk and Stephen Gardiner pounced on Cromwell, who was attainted, and then executed on 28 July. Powell, with Thomas Abel (Catherine's chaplain) and Richard Fetherstone, were drawn and quartered on 30 July for having 'traitorously adhered themselves unto the bishop of Rome'. All three had refused to take the oath of Supremacy, though it appears that their deaths were effected by the ascendant party of Gardiner and Howard ostensibly to make a show of loyalty to Henry.¹³ Ironically, Powell and the two other Catholics were each yoked to a Protestant who were that day burned at the stake for heresy, Powell being yoked with the notable Thomas Barnes.¹⁴ Besides Harding and Powell was Harding's fellow Recusant Thomas Heskyns, whom Jewel deprived in 1559, and who at that time was the chancellor of the Diocese of Salisbury. Heskyns had been at Oxford from 1528 to 1540, but then went to Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he proceeded MA (1540), BD (1548) and DD (1557). By 1566 he became a Dominican and is remembered for his *The Parliament of Chryste*. Like Harding he fled England for Louvain.¹⁵

Jewel, the cathedral chapter and the town of Salisbury

Jewel's first encounter with Salisbury was on his 1559 visitation, at which time he was elected bishop by the cathedral chapter, the *congé d'élire* for Jewel's episcopal appointment having been issued 27 July 1559, just before he left London for the visitation. Upon his return to London, with the royal assent given on 27 December, he was enthroned by proxy on 6 March 1560.¹⁶ It was on the visitation that Jewel enjoined subscription to the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, and that Jewel removed Harding for his failure to conform. After he had completed the

¹³ Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 393.

¹⁴ A dialogue was composed for the occasion: *The Metynge of Doctor Barnes and Dr. Powell at Paradise Gate and of theyre comunicacion bothe drawen to Smithfylde from the Towar* (London, 1540).

¹⁵ Southern, *Prose*, p. 48.

¹⁶ John le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541–1857*. VI Salisbury Diocese, compiled by Joyce Horn (London: IHS, 1986), p. 1.

visitation Jewel stayed in London for more than six months, during which time he preached his Challenge Sermon, and also saw to the publishing of the letters that he and Henry Cole exchanged on the matter.¹⁷ He departed for Salisbury only in May of 1560; though he hardly hoped for an auspicious arrival.¹⁸ On 7 May a bolt of lightning had struck the cathedral spire, which according to Jewel, had left a fissure 60 feet in length. Jewel was only too happy to hear about it second hand, for, he writes Martyr, had he been there no doubt this would have been blamed on him and his coming. Jewel consigns this putative judgment to the peoples' superstition, another way of describing their Catholicism.¹⁹ Whether Jewel had a peaceful life in Salisbury is hard to say. He seems to have taken his episcopal duties seriously, going on his first visitation as resident ordinary in November and December of 1560. Apart from this he went on three other visitations, issuing injunctions upon each, and was engaged in the fourth upon his demise in September of 1571. By comparison, as Southgate points out, Richard Cox of Ely has the record of but one visitation for his 21-year tenure.²⁰ Though, unlike Jewel, Cox did serve on the High Commission.

Jewel's years as the bishop of his diocese have been recounted and described by Anne Whiteman and most recently by Scott Wenig.²¹ Jewel took an active lead in the administration of his diocese, though he faced very much the same types of problems confronting other English bishops at that time: a dearth of educated clergy in particular and just a shortage of clergy in general, the recalcitrance of old mores and the repair of ecclesiastical properties. His 1561 report to Parker on the state of his diocese and its clergy reveals that of the 220 clergy 118 are listed by Jewel as mediocriter doctus or worse; 36 of the parishes were legally vacant, and another 54, at least, were under the care of pluralists. By 1565 Jewel's partial visitation records note that of the 57 parishes in three southern Wiltshire deaneries, 16 were vacant, while 24 reported having no sermons. Jewel, as was not uncommon with Elizabeth's

¹⁷ *The True copies of the letters betwene the reverend father in God Iohn Bishop of Sarum and D. Cole, upon occasion of a sermon that he said bishop preached for the Quenes Maiestie, and hir most honorable Counsel* (London: John Day), 1560.

¹⁸ As conveyed to Martyr in two letters, 22 May and 1 June 1560. *Works*, IV, pp. 1232–33, 1235–36.

¹⁹ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1233–35.

²⁰ Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, pp. 65, 74.

²¹ Anne Whiteman, 'The Church of England 1542–1837', in R.B. Pugh and Elizabeth Crittall eds., *The Victoria History of the Counties of England; A History of Wiltshire*, vol III (Oxford, for the Institute of Historical Research, 1956), pp. 28–56. Scott A. Wenig, *The Straightening of the Altars: The ecclesiastical vision and pastoral achievements of the progressive bishops under Elizabeth I, 1559–1579* (New York, 2000), pp. 138–53.

other bishops, had ordained large numbers of men in his first year of residency, with the numbers decreasing after that.²² While many of the Marian clergy conformed, with only 18 being deposed in the first five years, Jewel was aided further by the presence of clergy whom Capon had deprived under Mary for being married. Thus Jewel found a diocese at least nominally disposed to the change of religion. Nonetheless, given the size of his diocese – just under 300 parishes – Jewel's ordination of 60 men as presbyters, while certainly not filling all his needs, was commensurate with the combined numbers ordained by Grindal and Parker, 454 for the southern province and the London diocese. Jewel also attempted to enforce residency on his cathedral chapter, and seemed to have success in keeping most of his clergy in check. He would have problems with one lay vicar, though, as shall be seen, this was not a problem of residency. His most famous prebend, however, John Foxe the martyrologist, left no evidence that he ever sat foot in Salisbury.

In regard to the financial and physical decay of the diocese Jewel laid a great deal of blame at the feet of his predecessor, Capon, although much of the diocese's wealth appears to have been plundered with the spoilation of the monasteries and the chantries. Some of this loss eventually was even at the hands of the cathedral chapter, who during Jewel's tenure bought up what probably was the remainder of the cathedral's jewels, ornaments and copes over the protests of the chancellor of the cathedral.²³ Jewel himself oversaw some of the financial drain imposed on the diocese's finances since he ordered the removal of the roods and images that had been reintroduced in Mary's reign,²⁴ some

²² Wiltshire Record Office, Register of bishop Jewel 1560–71, microfilm D1/2/16 (part [the first section of D1/2/16 contains Capon's register, and is on the same roll of microfilm as Campeggio's and Shaxton's registers]). Wenig gives the number of Jewel's ordinations at 396, for his time as bishop up to 1569, though his calculations of numbers is deceiving. Wenig counts both ordinations to the diaconate and presbyteriate, though many of those ordained deacons were often made presbyters, some in the very year they were ordained to the diaconate, for example, Thomas Williams, who was ordained deacon and priest in 1560 (W.R.O. S1/2/16, f. 12r. 2nd section). This gives a false impression about the total number. Jewel was the first bishop of Salisbury recorded to have performed his ordinations within the chapel of the episcopal palace. *W.A. & N.H.M.* 25, p. 170.

²³ Kathleen Edwards, 'The Cathedral of Salisbury', in *History of Wiltshire*, p. 187.

²⁴ 'Accounts survive from the 134 parishes in the sample for Mary's reign, and show a considerable homogeneity in the process of Catholic restoration. By the end of 1554, all had rebuilt a high altar, and obtained vestments and copes, some or all of the utensils and ornaments of the mass (a crucifix, holy water stoup, chalice, pyx, pax, patten, sacring bell, chrismatory, cruets, censers and candlesticks) and some or all of the necessary books.' Ronald Hutton, 'The Local Impact of the Tudor Reformations', in Christopher Haigh, ed., *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 129.

parish registers testifying to the cost.²⁵ Yet while Jewel took an active hand in the destruction of images, he cannot be faulted with the destruction of the cathedral's stained glass, seeing rather to its restoration and glazing.

Nonetheless, despite the supine nature of the diocesan clergy he inherited, Jewel did not lack distraction at Salisbury, for while his chapter and clergy generally conformed to the new faith, this hardly meant that they were above giving their bishop grief.²⁶ Nor should it be assumed that Jewel's relations with the town were all that cordial either. The chapter Act book only infrequently mentions Jewel, though what is there does provide rather interesting reading, the most amusing surrounding the exploits of the organists Richard Chamberlayne and Thomas Smythe. In Dora Robertson's chronicle of the cathedral choristers, Smythe repeatedly appears the rogue and rascal, Robertson noting of Smythe that his 'exploits ... fill the Chapter Registers ... [and] only go to prove into what a sad state the Church of Sarum had fallen. The mere fact that this man was tolerated for 25 years in a responsible position casts very grave aspersions on the integrity of the Chapter'.²⁷ Smythe, first hired as the teacher of the boy choristers, first appears in the cathedral records in December 1563 when he got into a shouting match with Robert Chamberlayne, then the organist, during the Communion service. Smythe was vindicated, and Chamberlayne cited for having slandered Smythe.²⁸ Three years later Chamberlayne's wife Agnes appeared in the drama: both she and Smythe were cited to the Dean's court where Agnes testified that she confronted Smythe about his verbally abusing her husband. Smythe fled, said Agnes, and she gave chase; but once Smythe got to his house he turned and threw two rocks at her. Agnes, not to be outdone, returned the favor, and according to her that was the end of it. Smythe's version, bolstered by the testimony of one Thomas Tynckler, was that Agnes Chamberlayne had been the one who cast the first stone (though apparently not without sin). The verdict was not preserved, but within the year Smythe was the organist, and Chamberlayne was gone.²⁹

While Smythe emerged from his confrontations with the Chamberlaynes still employed by the chapter, thus having obtained some

²⁵ T.H. Baker, 'The Churchwardens Accounts of Mere', *W.A.&N.H.M.*, 37 (1907), p. 31.

²⁶ Southgate, who records only the confrontation between Jewel and the chapter over Parker's grant to Jewel of *jure metropolitico* status, argues that lack of evidence affirms Jewel's amiable relation with the chapter. Cf. *Jewel*, p. 72.

²⁷ Robertson, *Sarum Close*, p. 136.

²⁸ D. & C. Sarum, Act Book 'Blacker', p. 8.

²⁹ Dean's Act book. Cited in Robertson, *Sarum Close*, pp. 137–38.

form of vindication, by 1568 he found himself under the indictment of Jewel. Jewel on 14 October 1568 wrote to the chapter demanding that Smythe be removed from all functions (besides being organist, he was still the teacher of the choristers and a vicar), and that for a whole litany of offences, including drunkenness, quarreling in the choir, teaching the boys to be mockers, playing dice and that he had been charged with grave matters by a number of people (two married women are cited in particular), and that a number of other charges are still outstanding against him. Further, a complaint was lodged concerning Smythe and Gervase Sharpe, who had been the witness to Smythe's rock-throwing altercation with Agnes Chamberlayne, that punches had been thrown between the two in the cemetery, and that they then took their dustup into the choir and proceeded to hurl insults at each other while the choristers were singing. Jewel's demands fell on deaf ears. The chapter did deprive Smythe of his mastership of the choristers, but retained him in his post as organist, though imprisoning him for two days.³⁰ Smythe would, through various episodes of guilt and innocence, retain his post at Salisbury until his death in 1587.³¹

Jewel's problems were hardly confined to rowdy members of the cathedral clergy, but seem to have extended to dealings with the people and governance of Salisbury. No record exists of Jewel having a misery comparable with Shaxton's, but it seems that he was still keen on asserting his prerogatives. In 1561 Jewel was able to have Beauchamp's charter of 1472 reconfirmed (though the privileges that kept the diocese in the Beauchamp family had already been removed by Henry VIII).³² Jewel never shied away either from saying who was master of the town, having witnesses testify that he considered the town's people his subjects, the mayor his mayor.³³ Among his privileges were the granting of charters and the incorporation of guilds; he incorporated the Weavers and Tailors Guild in 1564.³⁴ But at some point Jewel rankled someone, as the other members of a commission he was on for the setting up of a

³⁰ Jewel's letter is in D. & C. Sarum, Register Blacker, pp. 38–39. Parts of it are translated in Robertson, *Close*, p. 139. The translation is by Canon Christopher Wordsworth.

³¹ Betty Matthews (1989), *The Organs and Organists of Salisbury Cathedral, 1480–1989* 4th ed. (Much Wenlock, UK: R.J.L. Smith for the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury Cathedral), p. 27.

³² P.R.O. Confirmation Roll 88, Sept 1st. 4 Elizabeth, Part I. Mem 11–17, quoted in W.A.N.H.M., 39 (1916), p. 329.

³³ *Historical Manuscript Commission Reports*, Ledger B., fol. 338a; *H.M.C.R.*, IV, p. 225.

³⁴ Jewel's Register, fol. 45a. and b.; 47a. My thanks to the Wiltshire Record Office, Trowbridge, for allowing me the use of microfilm of Jewel's, Campeggio's, Shaxton's and Salcot's registers. Cf. Also W.A.N.H.M., 39 (1916), p. 329.

jail for Sarum plain decided to meet without him, voting on the location of the jail without his knowledge or approval. On 2 January 1568 Jewel wrote to the magistrates of Wiltshire who had decided to put the jail in the village of East Harnham (which has now been consumed by West Harnham). Jewel talks about how this incommodious arrangement would imperil such a poor little village; which, should any of the prisoners escape, lacked the force to defend itself. What is more, the prisoners 'beeinge utterly sequestred from al manner reliefe of the whole Cittie, from whence thei have evermore hitherto had theire presente and greatest aide' could face deprivation. But these objections to the prison's proposed location all appear rather much a ruse, for East Harnham was no remote village in the nether reaches of the plain, but within sight of the cathedral, not more than 300 yards. At the end of the letter Jewel gets to the last cause why the approved location for the building of the jail would be such a detrimental thing: the jail would be situated immediately outside of his study window in the episcopal palace. East Harnham, just across the Avon from the Cathedral Close, was 'within one flighte-shoote [a stone's throw] of my house'.³⁵ He signs, 'yor poore frend, John Sarum'. Lacking sources, the meager ones at hand say little, it may be surmised that Jewel, at no loss for esteem in the rest of England or on the continent, scarcely garnered the respect his office asked at home. Yet if this is the case for Jewel it should be kept in mind that cathedral chapters, vassal towns, clerical subordinates and the laity employed by the cathedral (Smythe was a lay vicar, an office first used in Salisbury in the 1530s) often had their own agendas and interests, which, while not necessarily inimical to the concerns of a Protestant reforming bishop, may not have been commensurate with how the bishop hoped to effect reform. All of this may have been what Jewel expected, for even with Elizabeth's eventual confirmation of him in his status as lord of the city, he had come to Salisbury having no allusions about his status as one of England's peers.

Jewel the penurious and abstemious Lord Bishop

In the first months and years of his tenure as bishop, in his correspondence with the various Zurich reformers, Jewel complained about his disconsolate existence as an English bishop and the tedium to which this office relegated his life as a scholar. Others had not wanted

³⁵ The whole letter is reproduced from the original in Longleat by The Rev. Canon J.E. Jackson, 'Wiltshire County Gaols', *W.A.N.H.M.*, 9 (1866), pp. 82–87. Letter on pp. 83–84.

this life: Sampson for he believed it would have been a burden to his conscience; Parkhurst, for it would have been an imposition upon his already fine living of Cleeve Episcopi. Sampson, probably happily as far as Elizabeth was concerned, could never be coerced or seduced to the office; Parkhurst gave up Cleeve for Norwich. Initially Jewel's complaints and recriminations noted that while a number of new bishops had been designated for their respective dioceses, these episcopal sees were nonetheless purposefully being left vacant, because the revenues of their 'estates were in the interim sweetly augmenting the crown coffers'.³⁶ By the time the government had appointed Jewel Elizabeth had already left all of the vacant sees inherited from Mary remain so for more than a year in order that she might collect their revenues. In an earlier letter Jewel was at his quotable best when he likened the change in the status of bishops to the scholastic contentions over the nature of universals: 'No provision has been made for any of us (bishops) ... We merely carry about the empty titles of bishops, and have defected from Scotus and Thomas to the Occamists and Nominalists.'³⁷ These letters refer to both the financial exchange forced upon the English episcopate by Elizabeth, which transferred the bulk of their diocesan revenues to the Crown in return for permanent stipends; and to the delay between the *conge d'elire* confirming episcopal appointments and their eventual enthronement; an interim in which diocesan revenues were further being absconded by the crown. The span between the *conge d'elire* for Jewel and his enthronement was nine months, though he was one of the last of Elizabeth's initial appointments to receive the warrant, his enthronement in absentia occurring almost a year after his return to England.

Nonetheless, Jewel put a brave face on the matter of episcopal finances, not always being as negative as the above assessment may imply. Jewel gave this impoverishment an evangelical, almost monastic twist, noting that the English bishops would not be so well endowed as their Marian predecessors, to the end that they may without distraction turn their attention to their pastoral duties:

For we wish our bishops to be pastoral, arduous, and vigilant. And that this might more quickly happen, the wealth of the bishops was lessened, and was reduced to a moderate level; that, having been

³⁶ 'Episcopi adhuc designati tantum sunt: interim praedia pulchre augent fiscum.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1224.

³⁷ '[N]ihil prospectum esse cuiquam nostrum [t]antum circumferimus inanes titulos episcoporum, et a Scoto et Thoma defecimus ad Occamistas et Nominales.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1222. The analogy hinges on the distinction that to a Nominalist (Occam per se), a term or name is an empty convention, and thus it is rightly to be applied to the English episcopate, as they had the title, but not the substance.

removed from these regal pomps and the distractions of court, they might quietly and dutifully tend to the flock of Christ.³⁸

Jewel's admission to Simler, however, belied his apprehensions about the extent of the duties that awaited him: when written, he had just returned from a three-month visitation in which he was implementing the Royal Injunctions in the southwest of England, of which visitation he had written Martyr that he had returned 'from a most disagreeably exhausting journey, with an exhausted body'.³⁹ In his letter to Rudolph Gualter, dated the same day as the ones to Simler and Martyr, Jewel opines 'as it pertains to me, you are well-informed of what labor it [the episcopal office] is, especially for a man untrained in such matters, and always in the leisure and shade of education, to be moved unexpectedly to the helm of the Church'.⁴⁰ But in the same letter he would again put the best take on the matter: 'Since, nevertheless, it is for the cause of God, to whatever degree we lack ability, we will that much more diligently work; for though in fact we are lacking in other things, I trust none the less that our desire will not fail.'⁴¹ Nevertheless he later opined that the episcopal lands served no other purpose than filling Her Majesty's coffers.⁴² This loss of revenue never distracted Jewel from his obligations to the fabric of the cathedral. Noting that it would take more than 2000 pounds to begin repairs, the cathedral chapter acceded to Jewel's plans. And while Jewel certainly saw to the removal of all images from the church, he was not one to smash stained glass. Indeed, the preservation of much of the stained glass that now survives is owing in no small part to Jewel who saw to its reglazing and caulking during his time there. Nor did he have conviction, as did Wyatt, to whitewash the mosaics in the ceiling. Perhaps he thought they were out of the range of veneration.

Aside from his duties in the cathedral and diocese, Jewel was also a member of the House of Lords, and also sat in on convocation. At the

³⁸ 'Nostros enim esse volumus pastores operosos, vigiles, episcopos. Quoque id commodius possit fieri, opes episcoporum imminuuntur, et ad mediocritatem quandam rediguntur; ut, semoti ab illa regia pompa et strepitu aulico, possint tranquillius et attentius vacare gregi Christi.' Jewel, Letter to Simler, *Works*, IV, p. 1220.

³⁹ 'Confecto molestissimo itinere, confecto corpore.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1216. *Conficio, conficere*, in the perfect has the sense of exhaustion. Thus 'having exhausted a most troublesome journey, with an exhausted body'.

⁴⁰ 'Nam quod ad me quidem attinet, tu optime nosti quanti laboris sit, homini praesertim imperito rerum, et semper in otio atque in umbra educato, repente admoveri ad gubernaculum ecclesiae.' Jewel, *Works*, IV, p. 1219.

⁴¹ 'Tamen quoniam Dei causa est, quanto minus possumus, tanto diligentius dabimus operam: etsi enim desint alia, voluntas tamen, spero non deerit.' Jewel, 2 November 1559, *Works*, IV, p. 219.

⁴² 'Interim praedia pulchre augent fiscum.' 16 November 1599, *Works*, IV, p. 1224.

end of his life he was put on the Court of High Commission with the express purpose of answering the charges of the Presbyterians. His life was thus one devoted not only to the duties of a bishop, visitations, the Pentecost convocation of the diocesan clergy, the meetings of Parliament, but also his obligations as a writer. The keeping of his palace, as described by Folkerzheimer gives the impression of diffidence about the affairs of court, though it seems that Jewel was truly desirous for the betterment of his diocese. Jewel never married, and perhaps he thought himself not of the disposition or the mettle of Boethius, who confessed that he never found marriage a hindrance to his studies. Certainly Elizabeth preferred Jewel and all her clergy celibate, never letting Parliament change Mary's law forbidding clerical marriage, the law only being changed under James I in 1604. According to the Injunctions, clergy could marry, though only with the consent of their ordinary, and that of two justices of the peace from the shire of the woman's residence.⁴³ In the middle of the twentieth century, having lived in Mompesson House for most of the war, the bishop moved his lodgings to the South Canonry, the building within the Close most removed from the cathedral itself, and the episcopal palace was then made into the cathedral school. The reason for this move was that the palace was far too large for a family home.

The best picture we have of Jewel's life in Salisbury comes from Herman Folkerzheimer, a student from Zurich, who, though apparently of some means even affected a vagabond life. He had been in France, but then took to the road with the beginning of the Wars of Religion, leaving New Rochelle for London, having enough money upon his arrival to buy a horse. By 8 July 1562 he had found his way to Salisbury.⁴⁴ Folkerzheimer left a remarkable picture of Jewel as a host, and his peculiar provision for Folkerzheimer leaves doubt whether Jewel's earlier blandishments of poverty were entirely accurate. Doubtless Jewel's munificence may have seemed liberal to a vagabond student, yet Folkerzheimer was not without means. Since Folkerzheimer had never been to Salisbury, what his account reveals exactly of what Elizabeth had left to the bishop may not be an accurate gauge of what episcopal life in Salisbury had come to. Regardless, Jewel assigned two youths to the Zurichers, boys acquainted with French, who showed him around town. The town impressed him, but more importantly, 'although the whole of the city belongs to the bishop, his domestic arrangements delighted me

⁴³ Hardy and Gee, *Documents*, p. 431. Injunction XXIX.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 1256–57. Jewel apparently must have been on wonderful terms with Josiah Simler, for he goes into great detail of how he laughs every time he remembers him, hobbled by his gout, supported by his crutches, the picture of old age, and after such a vital youth.

more'.⁴⁵ He reports on Jewel's palace where 'even sovereigns ... are ... suitably entertained', his gardens, and the stream where Jewel was now creating a lattice work in order to trap fish. Folkerzheimer, at the bishop's command, went hunting, and was pleased with the alacrity of the dogs in the chase. Jewel's attitude was another matter. 'The bishop indeed I perceive, does not take much delight in this kind of amusement. "What pleasure," he says, "I pray you, can possibly be derived from pursuing with fierce dogs a timid animal, that attacks no one, and that is put to flight even by a noise?" I should, however, tell an untruth, were I to say that I am not delighted with it.' Yet it was not merely for the amusement of his guests that Jewel had the dogs, but 'that the table may always give proof of the activity of the dogs and the labour of the huntsmen.'⁴⁶ Folkerzheimer showed himself quick to relay all these details, begging Simler's pardon for the delay in writing, but he had left France in secrecy, having nothing of worth either for food or drink, but now that Jewel had ended his Bohemian existence, he would be quick to relate all. After recounting his poor fare in his voyage, of mixing vinegar with water as a substitute for wine, he gets to the telling lines:

Immortal powers! what a sudden change I experienced, what a power of breathing freely after my long imprisonment! I am transplanted into the magnificent abode of a prosperous individual, with whom, as you know, I have long been on the most intimate of friendly terms. He directs his attendants ... The butler forthwith makes his appearance. And also, when dinner or supper time arrived, how can I describe to you the abundance or magnificence of the silver plate?

But for all of this, the opulence and good board of a bishop's life, Jewel appeared to Folkerzheimer as unaffected, having retained the demeanor of the Oxford don, the abstemious and disciplined student who would trek across the woods of Oxfordshire reciting his Cicero and Demosthenes. From this Folkerzheimer concludes that such things 'do not seem to afford much pleasure to their possessor, and appear to have been provided rather for his guests' sake than his own'.⁴⁷

This was not the only account left of Jewel's munificence, for there is also the account pertaining to Richard Hooker as related by Izaak Walton in his life of Hooker, penned in 1664 and appended to subsequent editions of Hooker's works. Jewel had known Hooker's uncle, John Hooker, at Oxford, and with him had gone into exile. Like Jewel, the elder Hooker had sat under the tutelage of Peter Martyr, and was in Zurich during the exile. He also, like Richard Cox, had gone to

⁴⁵ *Zurich Letters*, II, p. 86.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 86–87.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 87–88. Jewel also took Folkerzheimer to Old Sarum and Stonehenge.

Cologne. He ended up back in Exeter, where he resumed his acquaintance with Jewel upon the bishop's visitation of the city in 1559. About 1565 he commended his nephew Richard to Jewel's attention, and Jewel arranged for the young Hooker and his schoolmaster to appear before him in Salisbury at Easter. Jewel rewarded the teacher for having done so well with his ward, ordered a pension for Hooker's parents, and eventually sent him off to Corpus Christi with his blessings and largess. (Walton is confused with his dates, for while noting that Jewel sent Hooker to Corpus Christi when the boy was 15, he gives a date of 1567; Hooker began at Corpus Christi in 1569). Among Hooker's fellow students at Corpus Christi were Lancelot Andrewes and Edmund Spenser. Sometime very soon after this, probably 1571, Hooker returned home to visit his mother, as the story goes, after he had recuperated from an illness that lasted two months. Being destitute as students were, Hooker and a companion walked to Exeter, and stopped in Salisbury to see the bishop. Jewel fêted them and then sent them on their way. But once having dismissed the boys, Jewel realized that he had given them nothing for their journey, and so sent one of his charges to bring the two back. Upon their return he gave Hooker ten groats for his journey to Exeter, ten groats for his mother, the loan of his horse for the journey to and from Exeter, and his walking staff that he had possessed at least since his days in exile. Upon the return of the horse, the bishop said, he would give him ten more groats for his life in Oxford. But Hooker never had the opportunity, for Jewel died before he saw him again. The particulars of Walton's story, most elements of which appear more than plausible, though some of them with the ring of the apocryphal, such as the passing on of the staff, nonetheless comports with what we know from Jewel in the story of Folkerzheimer, and are also commensurate with the charity and liberality shown Jewel on numerous occasions during his own days as a student and an exile.

While undoubtedly a good host, liberal with his money, devoted to his diocese, an able administrator, and concerned about his cathedral fabric, Jewel will always be remembered as Elizabeth's apologist, the scholar among her episcopal bench, and, whether true or no, esteemed by many as one of the founders of that protean institution, Anglicanism.

Jewel as a scholar

Jewel's literary output, often evidence of more ardor than imagination, was the product of a disciplined cleric. Humphrey testifies that even in his days at Oxford he was an early riser, someone who spent his whole time in study. As seen in Folkerzheimer, Jewel had little time for

amusements and small regard for the finery of his office. Jewel produced something almost annually, as well as attending to his duties as a preacher and prelate: his sermons show themselves as the products of exacting work, and often reveal that clever twist of phrase so abundant in his letters. Yet whatever he produced, in comparison with other Reformers, it seems but slight, and that no doubt stemming from the exertions of his episcopal duties. Jewel's literary remains run to some 2300 pages, but even this is deceiving, for a good portion of this contains much of Harding's several works, most of which Jewel reproduced in his own two large responses to him, almost 100 pages of letters, 30 pages of Pope Pius V's bull against Elizabeth, over 300 pages of sermons, and this does not take into account the copious quotes from others that make up the large part of his writings. Thus while Jewel certainly produced important controversial pieces, it may be wondered what he would have produced had he spent the remainder of his life at Oxford instead of Salisbury, had he been a don instead of a bishop, and had he died at 59 as opposed to 49. His mentor, Peter Martyr, for example, who arrived in Frankfurt in 1542 and died in Zurich in 1562, wrote extensively over several areas of theology as well as producing a number of his commentaries. Martyr's *Defensio doctrinae veteris et Apostolici de sacrosancto eucharistiae sacramento adversus Stephanam Gardinerem*, runs over 700 large folio pages, and reproduces only a modicum of Gardiner's diatribes. Nonetheless, Jewel produced more than his fellow English Protestants, whether bishop or no, and that over the span of 12 years. Also, as shall be treated below, Jewel produced items that were never published. He was well-versed in the Church Fathers, and also in the early Church historians, for example, Eusebius, Socrates and Sozomen. Whatever provisos may be made, Jewel was the intellectual leader of Elizabeth's early episcopal bench.

Jewel's personal library, instead of staying at Salisbury cathedral was bought by Laurence Humphrey for Magdalen College.⁴⁸ At first the Magdalen community used the collection as regular library books, over time the volumes being replaced by newer editions. When it occurred to someone that the books had a value apart from their contents is not known, and they now reside in the Old Library of Magdalen College. A survey of the books gives some indication of Jewel as a scholar, with different books used differently by Jewel in his works. Some of the books provide indifferent information, for some of them were purchased late in his life, and thus could not have been part of his research for his apologies. But the investigation into what his underlining and marginalia reveal has several, often real difficulties to overcome. This is made baldly

⁴⁸ Neil Ker, 'The Library of Jewel', pp. 256–65.

evident when one looks on the inside cover of the third volume of Jewel's copy of the venerable Bede's *opera*.⁴⁹ When I first saw it, the librarian noted that Jewel had doodled on the title page. I sat staring out onto the cloisters, and there on the far side of the court, atop one of the buttresses sat exactly what I had been looking at on the title page of Bede: a gargoyle, a representation of one of the seven deadly sins. In short, a Magdalen student had been the artist, and may well have been looking out the same window I was.⁵⁰ This raises the question of how much other extraneous material within these volumes is the work of Magdalen College's wards, and what is Jewel's. Fortunately Jewel's clear handwriting, both his English script and his Latin, is easily enough discerned within the text.

John Garbrand makes clear that Jewel used a notebook system, along with the aid of students of some sort for the collection of his facts and citations. Garbrand, Jewel's literary executive, in his preface to Jewel's *Sermons at Court and Paul's Cross*, speaks about Jewel's practice of taking notes:

For, besides his advised observation of all such things, as in the adversary's books deserved answer; and besides that he disposed a summary and full collection of such matter as he would use for the disproof of the same, the which he conceived in short notes; this may be a notable testimony that he had purpose to set down the authorities out of the fathers and quotations truly and plainly: whereas in times before he had gathered sundry books of common-places out of the Greek and Latin and later writers, he did peruse afresh the authors themselves, and made every where in them special marks, for the difference of such places whereof he made choice. Those were all drawn forth and laid to their themes by certain scholars, who wrote them out by such direction as he had given them.⁵¹

There are marginalia in Jewel's hand, and it may be assumed that he did the lion's share of the underlining, but much of what he underlined never made it into his works. His copy of Nicholas of Cusa's *De concordantia catholica* is filled with underlining, along with the marginal note, *Apol.*, or *pp.*, (papacy) which appears 72 times in his copy of *De concordantia catholica*, yet very little of what he underlined made it into either the *Apologia* or the *Defense of the Apologia*. Some of the things are interesting, such as his side comment on Cusanus's

Est enim oratio. omnibus creaturis potentior. Nam angeli seu intelligentiae, movent orbes, Solem et stellas: sed oratio potentior,

⁴⁹ Beda, *Opera* (Basel, 1565), 4 vols, Magdalen Library shelf mark, h. 12. 6–9.

⁵⁰ I wondered whether it was the image of sloth – I should have made inquiry. I also wondered how different were modern students than their past fellows.

⁵¹ Garbrand's preface, in Jewel, *Works*, II, p. 966.

quia impedit motum. sicut oratio Iosuae, fecit sistere Solem. Sic fortior influentii stellarum, fortior anima, quae sine cibo non sustentat corpus: sed oratio sine cibo, longo tempore sustentavit sanctos, in Helia, Mose, et aliis. Item fortior omni creatura, quia nulla potest transformare in creatorem creaturam: sed oratio consecratis transfert.⁵²

To which Jewel wrote in his margin, *Ridiculum*. At other places where Cusanus treats Eucharistic matters Jewel's marginalia comments with 'fatuum' and 'blasphemis'.⁵³ Both of these were taken from Cusanus's sermons. As opposed to Nicholas of Cusa's sermons, there is no evidence whatsoever that Jewel read any of the sermons of Bede, for there are no marks on any of them. The Cusanus volume represents one of the most marked of Jewel's works. Though the mathematical treatises are neglected, the philosophical ones are not, with a good bit of marginalia in the text of *De docta ignorantia*, along with some 12 crosses in the margins next to specific passages. There is only one place noted in *De visione dei*, though this would go well with Jewel's aversion to images:

Homo non potest iudicare, nisi humaniter. Quando enim homo, tibi faciem attribuit, extra humanam speciem illam non quaerit; quia iudicium eius, est infra(m) humanam naturam contractum, et huius contractionis passionem, in iudicando non exit. Sic si leo faciem tibi attribuerat, non nisi leoninam iudicaret, et bos, bovinam, et aquila, aquilinam. O Domine, quam admirabilis est facies tua, quam si iuvenis concipere vellet, invenilem fingeret, et vir, virilem, et senex senilem.⁵⁴

⁵² 'Namely prayer is stronger than all creatures. For the angels or intelligences move the spheres, the sun and the stars; but prayer is stronger, since it impedes their motion. Thus the prayer of Joshua made the sun stand still. Thus by the influencing of the stars, the soul is stronger, which without food cannot sustain the body; but prayer without food has sustained for a long time the pious, in Elijah, Moses, and others. Likewise it is stronger than all creatures, since none is able to transform the creature into the creator; but the prayer of consecration performs this transformation.' Nicholai de Cusa *Opera Omnia* (Basel, 1565) p. 549. Magdalen shelf mark, I. 9. 14.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 522, 584. 'Substantia panis, in confessione sacramenti, debet in superiorem substantiam Christi translumi, alioqui non esset perfectum sacramentum, in quo debet contineri, omni modo possibili, transsubstantiatio [The substance of the bread, in the confession of the sacrament, ought to be transfigured into the superior substance of Christ, in other respects it is not able to be a perfect sacrament, in which is necessary to be contained in every way possible, transubstantiation {or, 'the transubstantiated thing'}]. (522, fatuum).' 'Sic hoc sacramentum, est verum manna, et regnum coelorum, Hierusalem supercoelestis (584, blasphemis).'

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 185. Chapter VI of *De Visione dei*. 'A human can only judge humanly. For if a man attributes a face to You, he does not seek a face other than this human species, since his judgement is bound by human nature, and in judging cannot escape the passion of this contract. thus if a lion attributed a face to You, it would not think of it except as a

The passage is, of course, deceiving in that it would seem that any image is ipso facto an idol, though Cusanus predicates the whole of *De visione dei* upon an exercise which necessarily entails an icon. Jewel never used the passage in his extant writings. Besides his notations, underlining and marginalia in Cusanus, there are extensive markings in Bede, Jerome,⁵⁵ Eusebius,⁵⁶ and Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II).⁵⁷

Jewel left the most marginalia in his own copy of his 1567 edition of *An Answer in Defence of the Apology of the Church of England* (first edition), pages 94–131, with another extended section on page 149, and then again on pages 324 and 325. There are other notations in the book that shall be discussed below.⁵⁸ The pages cited contain copious marginalia, all in Jewel's very legible hand, though at some places – the tops of pages and on their edges – the writing is difficult, if not almost impossible to discern. Apart from these particular pages in this volume, the marginalia on the other pages and in the other volumes of Jewel's library – there are some 35 which contain marginalia – reveal a system of note taking and transcribing of sections of text from the particular monograph into notebooks.⁵⁹ Jewel's pervasive writing in the margins of the 1567 *Defence of the Apology*, presents something of a puzzle: what he used it for is rather evident for anyone who would compare what is in the margins with the second edition of *The Defence of the Apology*, for the marginalia is merely the additional text of the expanded 1570 and 1571 editions. Thus where Jewel's writing, due to time or to the tiny space in which our prelate tried to squeeze his words, is illegible, it can be deciphered by comparing the marginalia with the 1570/1571 editions of Jewel's work, as the notes were added whole cloth, with at times minor stylistic changes. This 1567 copy merely served as Jewel's 'corrector's copy for the later edition. The real question is why did Jewel write out his changes on these pages, while the other corrections and emendations to the 1570/1571 editions were evidently first written out some place else, and then added? At several places, Jewel begins his marginalia on the recto side of the folio (the odd numbered page) and then continues his marginalia onto the verso of the preceding folio, cf. 111–10, 115–14, 119–18, 121–20, 123–22, 127–26, 128–29, 130–31. This was done because what he added he wished to keep all on the same

lion, and so a cow as a cow, and an eagle as an eagle. O Lord, how admirable is Your face which if a youth were to conceive it would figure it as young, a man as mature, and an old man as aged.'

⁵⁵ Hieronymous, *Opera* (Basel, 1537). Magdalen shelf mark, e. 12. 10–13.

⁵⁶ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastica Historia* (Paris, 1544). Magdalen shelf mark, e. 8. 1.

⁵⁷ Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *Opera* (Basel, 1551). Magdalen shelf mark, I. 17. 1.

⁵⁸ Jewel, *A Defence of the Apologie* (London, 1567). Magdalen shelf mark, O. 17. 8.

⁵⁹ Ker 'Library', pp. 256–64.

page. However, he does abandon this practice on page 324 where Jewel writes upside down at the top of the page, and then, having run out of room on page 324, adds an additional line of thought on page 325. Nothing else appears on page 325, and it is the last he writes in the volume, apparently switching from this approach to one using notebooks, though the sporadic and irregular way he did this marginalia reveals either disorganization, or else the attempt to make some final notes.

The Parker Society Edition of Jewel's works indicate, by the use of tiny hands, the beginning and end of the various additions that Jewel made to the later edition of *The Defence of the Apology*. Only on page 264 of the Parker Society Edition did the editor, Ayre, fail to note where Jewel had made an insertion, and this is revealed from this marginalia. The marginalia correspond almost verbatim to what Jewel had written by hand. Why Jewel chose to use this copy as he did, and only on these pages for this operation cannot be discerned from the present evidence. He had other places where he wrote out the other additions he made, and wherever Jewel made further editions, they are marked in this copy of the 1567 edition by 'AAA' in the margins, with a corresponding 'AAA' at the insertion point in the body of the text. The quotes and additions were then made from the notebooks. On verso pages (the even numbered), beginning with the verso of the previous folio, where there is more than one addition made, Jewel used 'BBB'. No marks or indications are present that tell us anything about the notebooks from which the additions were taken; it is probably that all such heuristic matters were themselves contained in the notebooks.

Jewel could have produced more, it seems, had he had the time. At least four works were in some stage of manuscript form, but never published, and are now lost: *A paraphrastical exposition of the epistles and gospel throughout the whole year* (apparently sermons and notes on the lectionary), *A continue exposition on the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments*, *Commentary on the epistle to the Galatians* and *Commentary on the epistles of St. Peter*. Jewel's first literary executor, John Garbrand, who had been a minister in Buckinghamshire, but whose father was a noted Oxford printer, published all of Jewel's posthumous works, though essentially they were all collections of sermons. Yet we know from Jewel's letters that he had other things that he was thinking about, most notably some thoughts on ubiquitarianism which he hoped to publish, but even while he wrote this to Simler, he found himself distracted by the 1563 Parliament.⁶⁰ Certainly these would have given a better picture of Jewel than his massive florilegia of patristic

⁶⁰ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 1260–61, 23 March to Simler.

and medieval citations that crowded and blurred his thoughts in his more substantial works. Thus what is thought of Jewel, this first bright star of that unrepentant Protestant establishment, is often constructed from what others wished the Church of England to be.

Jewel and the identity of the English national Church

Jewel and his legacy

Jewel died on 23 September 1571 at the Episcopal house of Monkton Farley in Wiltshire while on a visitation of his diocese. He was 49 years old. Both Humphrey and Parkhurst record the incidentals of Jewel's death, though Humphrey does so more fully.¹ Both present Jewel's death as peaceful, dying in the midst of prayer, giving pious admonitions to those around him. Apparently pneumonia brought on Jewel's death, and though knowing he was sick, he refused to suspend the visitation even though begged to do so, responding that it became a bishop to die in the pulpit. His duties seemed to have increased in the last year of his life, finishing the third edition of his *Defense of the Apologie*, attending Parliament in the spring, preaching at Paul's Cross against the Presbyterians, and then undertaking a visitation. In the spring of 1571 he had also been placed on the Court of High Commission, replacing Richard Cox, and promising Parker his full support in enforcing uniformity against the Puritans and Presbyterians.²

Edwyn Sandys, bishop of London and archbishop Matthew Parker must have conceived publishing a biography of Jewel shortly thereafter, and entrusted the task to the erstwhile nonconformist Laurence Humphrey. The chief source of Humphrey's life seems to have been both Humphrey's own recollections and especially those of Parkhurst, at least that is how Parkhurst saw it. Parkhurst notes in a letter to Rudolph Gualter dated 9 March 1572 that Humphrey had already sent him two letters,

asking and entreating me that (as he was formerly my pupil, and always very close to me) I should send him a thorough account of what I know of him. In order to gratify a friend and to discharge a just debt to the spirit of my dearest Jewel, I have written many but not all things. These I shall send to Oxford in a couple of days. I can tell more of Jewel than the whole of England.³

¹ Parkhurst, *Letter Book*, pp. 108–09; Humphrey, *Vita Ivelli*, pp. 252–57.

² John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 4 volumes (Oxford, 1821), II, pp. 66, 75.

³ R.A. Houlbrooke ed., *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst. Compiled during the years*

Along with Parkhurst, Humphrey was the logical choice for the prelates to draft for the project: he had been at Oxford when Jewel was there, had been a companion of Jewel at Zurich during the Marian exile,⁴ and as noted, upon Jewel's death, Humphrey purchased the bishop's library on behalf of Magdalen College.⁵ Though Humphrey had not shared the warmest of ecclesiastical relations with Jewel, Jewel had denied Humphrey a benefice in Salisbury diocese due to the Magdalen president's contrariness about vestments, the two never seemed to have been permanently alienated by it. Humphrey eventually did conform, yet the former rift between the two could never be inferred from the *Vita Iuelli*: Humphrey is always adulatory.

Humphrey composed his biography of Jewel over the two years following the bishop's death, signing the dedicatory epistle on 23 September 1573, two years to the day after Jewel's demise.⁶ Humphrey dedicated the book to Parker and Sandys professing that hagiographical and morally pedagogical ends guided his writing: to hold Jewel up as an exemplar of the scholarly life and to cast him as a paragon in the proper and pious governance of the Church. As an exemplary bishop and administrator, Jewel's life demonstrated the best way to defend the Church, providing a means and pattern for the future fight against the papal hydra. As a scholar Jewel's life would supply an illustration to the English clergy of pious erudition, thus providing the English ministry with an archetypical guide in bringing happiness to those whose souls they guarded.⁷ In regard to Jewel's academic rigor, Humphrey wanted the manner and discipline of Jewel's scholarly life, both at Oxford and at Sarum, placed before all those at the universities. Humphrey hoped to incarnate by this image (he uses the word *speculum*, mirror) the singleness of mind and discipline required of students. The students thus piously chastened, emboldened against pleasure's seductions, and having been captivated by a love of the truth Jewel proclaimed, would themselves then seek to defend the Church of England from error.⁸ These

1571–1575 (Norfolk: Norfolk Record Society, 1974–75), p. 66.

⁴ There is some confusion about the exact details surrounding Humphrey's flight from England and his relation to the Marian church. See Christina Garrett, *Marian Exiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), pp. 193–94.

⁵ Ker, 'Library,' pp. 256–65.

⁶ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. xxix.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. xx–xxiii.

⁸ 'Secundo. Speculum est Theologorum, ut non male labores et cogitationes suas ponant, nec in res inutiles, nugatorias aut impias, operam conferant, nec animos infirmos et egrotos in deteriore partem applicent, sed ut in solidae cognitionis indagazione versentur, et veritatem Iuelli exemplo fortiter contra omnia inimicorum iacula defendant, et Britannicum sint, illum clarissimum Scythicarum Ecclesiarum gubernatorem Britannionem imitentur, qui dogmatum impietatem et Valentis Imperatoris surorem in Christianos

two devices that Humphrey employed – Jewel the scholar defending truth and Jewel the warden guarding the Church, embrace in their clearly Protestant rhetorical strategy substantial elements of truth. As a scholar, Jewel comprehended a complete change from earlier forms of theological method, and this not only in distinction with his Catholic opposition, but even when compared with his own mentor, Peter Martyr Vermigli. Jewel's scholarship became the instrument employed in completing the second of Humphrey's two categories, that of the defender and nurturer of a new type of Protestant arrangement.

That England's metropolitan and its third ranking bishop were behind the program demonstrates the esteem in which the English hierarchy held Jewel's work both before and after his death. Already as early as 1563 Parker had desired the *Apology* to be made part of the Church of England's confession, bound together with the Articles of Religion and Alexander Nowell's catechism, and enjoined without dissent.⁹ Needless to say, the queen resisted the move, not for lack of love of the *Apology*, but because she wished to maintain only a modicum of doctrine. (Though how any could think the *Apology* rife with theology is perplexing.) Parker was more successful in getting the *Defence* into parish churches, even though this move was resisted by of all people Parkhurst, who thought that placing Jewel's work in the churches a risk:

Touching the bishop of Sarum's work, as I have singular cause to allow as well as of the author as of his works, so do I conjecture that the placing of such controversies in open churches may be a great occasion to confirm the adversaries in their opinions, that having no wherewith to by Hardings's books, shall find the same already provided for them; where like unto the spider sucking only that may serve their purposes, and contemning that is most wholesome, will not once vouchsafe to look upon the same.¹⁰

Despite Parkhurst's fears, which he confesses are but his own, Jewel's works were widely disseminated, and it became remarkable that an

coarguit, divinissimi Davidis vocem usurpans, *Loquebar in testimonijs tuis coram Regibus est non consundebat.*' Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, p. xxvii. What Humphrey means by 'Scythicarum Ecclesiarum' except perhaps government of foreign churches, I am not sure.

⁹ Strype, *Annals*, I.1, pp. 473–74. In some general notes of matters to be moved by the clergy in the next Parliament and synod, with marginalia by Parker, in 'A certain form of Doctrine to be conceived in articles, and after to be published and authorized', three items are touched: the first two concern Nowell's catechism and the articles as in Edward VI's time. 'Thirdly, to these articles also may be adjoined the *Apology* revised and so augmented or corrected, as occasion serveth.' These articles were to be bound together, and to be taught without dissent.

¹⁰ Quoted in *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker* (Cambridge, 1853), p. 416 (fn. 2), 17.

English parish would not have some form or copy of Jewel's works.¹¹

In tandem with Jewel's corpus, Humphrey's *Vita Iuelli* has since its day been the basis for virtually all who wrote on Jewel's life, lending them both its hagiographical themes, and its laudatory appellations. And while it certainly was not the beginning of Jewel's status in the Church of England, it facilitated it, providing those who afterwards wrote sympathetically on the bishop an image that was never abandoned. Daniel Featley's biography, attached to the first publication of Jewel's collected works in 1609, followed the main outline of the *Vita Iuelli*, and even translated some of Humphrey. Featley's work, however, appended to the large 1609 folio volume of Jewel's work, only runs to 22 pages.¹² Like Humphrey before him, Featley portrayed Jewel only in a flattering light: he compared his lapse under Mary to that of St Peter's at Christ's trial (an analogy drawn from Humphrey); he paid special attention to Jewel's diligence in his writing, that the bishop produced something almost every year; and quoted Humphrey (without citation) that when upon his fatal illness he was enjoined to rest, Jewel replied that 'it becommeth best a bishop to die preaching in the pulpit'.¹³ Featley also first raised the specter of Jewel's unpublished manuscripts. Following Garbrand's death in 1589, Jewel's remaining papers were turned over to Robert Chaloner DD, of Christ Church, and the sometime Puritan John Rainolds of Corpus Christi College. Rainolds at the time of Garbrand's death was still inclined to Puritanism, but by 1604 his less than assertive performance before James I riled many of his Puritan brethren.¹⁴ He died in 1607 and was buried at Corpus Christi College, Featley preaching his funeral. It was probably his association with Rainolds that allowed Featley to see the phantom manuscripts.¹⁵ But despite Humphrey's and

¹¹ My thanks to Professor John Craig who provided me this information from his paper, 'Erasmus or Calvin? The politics of Book Purchase in the English parish, 1538–1640'. Delivered at the 2003 Sixteenth Century Studies Conference, Pittsburgh. Professor Craig's conclusions are based on work he had done as a Munby fellow at Cambridge University for the academic year 2002–3.

¹² Featley, *Life of Jewel*, pp. xvii, xx, xxx. 1609 edition of Jewel's works, pp. xiii–xxxii (xxxiv the pages are mis-paginated, and should read xxxiv). By contrast, Humphrey's biography runs to some 287 pages. Only 209 of these are actually Humphrey's biography, there are 33 pages of epigrams and poems written at the time of Jewel's death appended to the work, 45 pages on dedicatory and introductory concerns.

¹³ Featley, *Works Jewell*, pp. xvii, xx, xxx. Featley's work does present some unanswered questions. On page xxii he talks about Hooper of Gloucester inquiring of Jewel about the meanings of certain Welsh and Irish words. But Hooper had perished outside his cathedral in 1555 during the Marian persecutions.

¹⁴ Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 455–62.

¹⁵ Woods, *Atheniae Oxoniensis*, II, cols. 76–80. Featley was the son of the cook of Magdalen College, and then later entered Corpus Christi College. Named Fairclough by

Featley's efforts, unanimity about Jewel and his work was short-lived.

The liturgical and theological unpleasanties that led up to the English Civil War illuminate the esteem and status that Jewel had obtained within the Church of England. Aside from the status of having his *Apologia* in every church, the publication of his full works in 1609 and their dissemination, archbishop Laud managed to pull Jewel into the polemics and controversies that embroiled England leading up to the Civil War. Laud's interlocutors used both Jewel and Foxe to condemn the use of the communion table as an altar, noting that this altar-wise use was a Catholic innovation. Laud injudiciously responded that if that were the best use that could be made of Jewel and Foxe it would be best to take them out of the parishes. The remark was quickly made into the thirteenth of the 14 charges made against Laud under the heading of 'ceremonial breaches'.¹⁶ Yet Jewel was not only to be a trouble for the archbishop, for Laud was able to show that Jewel admitted that reverencing the altar and the consecrated elements was permissible, as long as the people were rightly informed that this was not the body and blood of Christ.¹⁷ Laud also cited Jewel when denouncing that prelacy spawned the papacy and popish dogmas. Yet, Laud noted, according to Jewel the papal Church existed nowhere prior to 600, and that episcopacy was universally held. Indeed, 30 of the bishops of Rome were martyred before the year 300, and none affirmed either the supremacy or universal jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome.¹⁸ Granted, Laud's use of Jewel is a bit disingenuous here, for Jewel never argued that no popish or Catholic dogmas predated 600 (Jewel would never have condoned the cult of the saints or prayers to and for the dead, though he did not deny their existence), but that since the Catholic faith, as then practiced, had features not to be found in the first 600 years it lacked a claim to catholicity. Laud also cited Jewel against his antagonists' defamation of the term 'unbloody sacrifice', for Laud's accusers had damned him with

Wood, he died in prison in 1644. He had been a witness against archbishop Laud, but could not subscribe to the Covenant. When his reasons, which he had penned to bishop Ussher of Armagh, were discovered, he was branded a traitor, degraded and imprisoned.

¹⁶ William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, Vol 4, *Life & Troubles of Archbishop Laud*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford, 6th ed. 1869. pp. 226, 405.

¹⁷ Laud, *Library*, VI, p. 58. Laud is actually stretching the point, for Jewel never specified either altar or host in his comments, just that 'kneeling and bowing, stand up, and other like, are commendable gestures and tokens of devotion, so long as the people understandeth what they mean, and applieth them unto God to who they by due', in *Replie*, in *Works*, I, p. 319. Though Laud may be associating particular actions to Jewel's words, 'and applieth them unto God to whom they be due' could have been pulled from the decrees of the Seventh Ecumenical Council.

¹⁸ Laud, *Library*, III, p. 384.

holding by the use of these words the views embraced by cardinal Bellarmine.¹⁹ Jewel, again, does admit that the term is used by the Fathers, but wants to deny that they intended by it any notion of sacrifice at all even analogous to that embraced by Catholics, and instead took those places where various Fathers, for example, Eusebius *inter alios*, speaks of the unbloody sacrifice as nothing other than prayers and thanksgiving (a sense certainly found in the Fathers when using the term sacrifice, though, it should be noted, never in connection with the term 'bloodless' or 'unbloody'). Jewel also noted that the Fathers speak of Christ's birth as a daily thing, but since they could not have meant that Christ was born of the Virgin every day, so must they not have meant that the daily, unbloody sacrifice was to be identified with Christ's death upon the cross.²⁰

Laud's citations of Jewel served the archbishop a double purpose. Though the theological one should hardly be slighted, it is the rhetorical one that he was certainly after, for he wanted to show himself Jewel's heir (though this is certainly a strained assertion), and that he was doing nothing other than speaking as had the bishop of Sarum. This use betrays the regard in which Laud's accusers held Jewel's reputation; perhaps to the same extent it betrays both Laud's regard for Jewel, and also what Laud's nemeses believed Jewel was defending. Regardless of the archbishop's sincerity in his use of Jewel, both Laud and his accusers believed that an appeal to the bishop of Sarum was an appeal to an unsullied, Protestant reputation that was to be identified with the best that was Elizabeth's Church. One no less than Richard Hooker had commented that Jewel was 'the worthiest divine that Christendom had bred for some hundred years'.²¹

Regardless of how the more precise saw Jewel, like Laud, the rest of the High Church party were quick to latch onto his appropriation of the Fathers in his defense of the English Church. This was true into the nineteenth century, that is, until the Oxford Movement. In the summer of 1833 following the Irish Temporalities Bill, by which Parliament abolished two archbishoprics and eight bishoprics in the Church of Ireland, the Oxford professor John Keble preached his assize sermon 'National Apostasy' (July 1833), and with it gave a formal commencement to the Anglo-Catholic, or Oxford Movement.²² Keble's sermon

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 358.

²⁰ Jewel, *Works*, II, pp. 732–36.

²¹ Richard Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Vol I. (1841), p. 314. ed.

²² For a discussion of the Oxford Movement (also known as the Tractarians, after the name of their publications, *Tracts for the Times*), see Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church, Part One, 1829–1859* (London, 1966). Also Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship in Context, 1760–1857* (Cambridge, 1996). There is some debate about how prominent the assize sermon was in

traduced the British Government for taking upon itself the surreptitious prerogative claiming sovereignty over matters spiritual. Keble knew that this was no new or imagined power, to use Jewel's words, but what Keble attacked was not merely an action of the British government to relieve its Catholic subjects in Ireland, but the very basis of the Church of England as then governed, that is, its Erastian nature, an existence founded in the Reformation and on Reformation piety and doctrine. The Tractarians rather emphasized the Church of England's claim to a Catholic traditional past, one founded on medieval and patristic piety, but not aligned with Rome. The High Church party had theretofore looked to Jewel for his defense of prelacy and adoption of vestments, *inter alia*; and there were those, for example, Jelf, Churton and Perceval, who did not want to see Jewel discarded but defended. But it would only be a short time before the esteem they had for him would be revised. Jewel, with the whole of the Reformation, was drawn into the fray, and whereas the Reformation had for earlier members of the High Church party been seen as a positive, for the Tractarians it became a scandal. Froude found Jewel's *Defense of the Apology* disgusting, and saw the Reformation as 'a limb badly set – it must be broken again in order to be righted'.²³ E.B. Pusey, however, wished to defend the English Reformers' sincerity, noting that they could not as yet preach the authority they believed they possessed. Pusey also overlooked all of the English dealings with the continental Reformers, trying always to maintain that England's was a singular Reformation that owed little to foreign influences, and positing what Peter Nockles has called an evolutionary view of the English Reformation that only came to an end in 1661. This is where John Henry Newman drew the line. Newman edited Froude's *Remains* and there found how little regard Froude possessed for Jewel and Cranmer. It was a position Newman embraced: 'I must say that the *historical* character of its agents are such, that one need not go into their doctrines or motives.' Though Newman does not reference Jewel, he took particular aim at certain disingenuous arguments employed by the English Reformers, contending that 'when they would attack some tenet or practice of Rome, they attacked something which Roman Catholics could and do condemn as much as their opponents do', and that 'without perversions and misrepresentations of this kind the Reformers would not have succeeded'.²⁴ After his

the minds of Keble's fellows at Oxford. It certainly played a large part in Newman's mind. Cf. Chadwick, pp. 60–100.

²³ Quoted in Peter Nockles, 'Survivals or New Arrivals? The Oxford Movement & the 19th Century Historical Construction of Anglicanism'. Paper delivered at Colloquium 'Anglicanism and the Western Church: Continuity and Change', Rome, 2002.

²⁴ Ibid.

conversion to Roman Catholicism, Newman was quick to take on Jewel's anti-Romanism, seeing in him one of the great problems with Protestantism, that he was nettled about inconsequential things and glossed over the substantial issues (cf. Chapter 2, fn. 102).

The Parker Society and its vast publication project arose in opposition to the Tractarians. Publishing the works of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel, Fulke, Grindal, Bale, Coverdale and Whitgift, the Parker Society sought to make available the works of the English Reformers in an effort to halt any dispute about the nature of the English Church. They also published, as if to put the truth to Tractarians' assertions about foreign divines, Heinrich Bullinger's *Decades*, the purchase of which, like Jewel's works, was enjoined on English parishes. Almost simultaneous to the publications by the Parker Society, Oxford University Press also published a collection of Jewel's works, in eight volumes. The Parker Society editions, however, had the advantage over the Jelf editions in that the Parker Society had all of Jewel's correspondence to Zurich (as well as that of the other English Elizabethans), which the Society had previously published under a separate title. The Parker Society editor of Jewel's works, the Reverend John Ayre, appended a short biography of Jewel to the fourth volume, again basically following Humphrey's life of Jewel.²⁵

Though published 15 years before Ayre's biographical memoir, Charles Webb Le Bas produced the most complete of Jewel's biographies. Le Bas followed Humphrey's script closely, but, as noted in the introduction, was rather more critical of the author than of the subject, wondering how someone so petulant about vestments as Humphrey could write about someone so sainted as Jewel. Nonetheless, this did not stop him from taking a good bit of Humphrey whole cloth. Le Bas, a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge and an evangelical, wrote about Jewel as a champion of the evangelical cause and the English national Church. Le Bas, far from sharing sympathy with Humphrey's qualms, noted of the dread vestments that they were 'certain innocent and decorous solemnities which the fathers of our Reformation deemed worthy to be preserved'.²⁶ In this he adumbrated the work of the Parker Society in that his biography was a challenge to those in the High Church party who wanted to coopt Jewel for their causes. Le Bas had also

²⁵ John Ayre, 'Biographical Memoir of John Jewel, sometime bishop of Salisbury', in *Works*, IV, pp. v–xxx. Almost all the biographers of Jewel quote Humphrey's quip by Parkhurst, that once Jewel was his student, but now he has become Jewel's, *Vita Iuelli*, p. 29. Cf. Featley, p. xiv; Southgate, p. 7; Ayre, p. vii. *Olim discipulus mihi, chare Iuelle, fuisti./ Nunc ero discipulus, te renuente, tuus.*

²⁶ Le Bas, *Jewel*, p. 241.

penned biographies of that other Merton theologian John Wyclif and also of archbishop Cranmer.

In the past century two different scholars, already noted in the introduction, produced studies of bishop Jewel. Both John Booty and Wyndham Southgate were quite aware that prior to their endeavors Jewel's biographies were largely encomia, and both operated under the assumption that the biography of Humphrey was jaundiced, as if the Magdalen president and sometime Puritan had somehow duped the Elizabethan establishment in his portrayal of Jewel, making the bishop some part of a Puritan fifth column. Wyndham Southgate published his *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* in 1962, an expansion of his 1948 doctoral work at Harvard University. Southgate divided his work into two parts: its first section, pp. 3–108, was a précis of the life of Jewel. As such, Southgate culled material from sources far more diffuse than that used by previous authors, and filled in many of the holes left by the earlier biographers who so heavily depended on Humphrey. The second part treats the subject of the book's title, the question of doctrinal authority (pp. 111–216). Southgate departs from Jewel's earlier biographers who, according to Southgate, had seen Jewel as an evangelical to the left of Parker, filled with precisian tendencies, and trapped into conforming to the will of his archbishop and sovereign.²⁷ Southgate's dissent follows two counts. First, he sees the line of demarcation as one not between Jewel and his archbishop, but between Jewel and the hotter sort of Protestants, such as the dean of Christ Church, Oxford, Thomas Sampson and even Jewel's biographer Laurence Humphrey:

In the conventional and generally accepted characterization of Jewel's position and that of his colleagues, is it possible that a fundamental error has been made in blurring the line between them and the active puritans like Sampson while stressing the difference between their viewpoint and that of Parker? The vital line ... ought rather to be drawn between Jewel and his colleagues on the one hand, and Sampson and the Puritans on the other. The difference between the Archbishop ... and his bishops who did not love the vestments yet nonetheless regarded them as non-essentials, was far less than that between the bishops and the Puritans – perhaps not superficially, but surely so when the controversy was reduced to its fundamental issue.²⁸

Southgate asserts that Jewel's scruples about the linen surplice – the *cause célèbre* of the Puritans in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign – did

²⁷ This is also the view of the Anglo-Catholic Bishop Mandell Creighton, who wrote Jewel's biography in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Creighton, of course, saw this to Jewel's detriment, all of Jewel's other biographers to his credit.

²⁸ Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, p. 99.

exist, but these qualms were of only minor importance. For Southgate, the real issues Jewel emphasized were obedience and order; the substance of this assertion by Southgate shall be discussed later. More axiomatic for Southgate, however, is his identification of Jewel as a prototypical Anglican, whose use of reason and Scripture was echoed by later theologies: 'John Jewel was an Anglican, after Archbishop Parker the most important of the first generation of Elizabethan churchmen, the heir of the Christian humanists and of Cranmer, and the progenitor of Richard Hooker.'²⁹ Southgate wanted Jewel to embrace the same notion of the comprehension of Scripture that Hooker did, especially in connection to Hooker's distinction between what the Scriptures comprehend and what they contain. For Southgate, because Jewel had embraced Lady Bacon's translation of comprehend for *continere* in the *Apologia*, this entails a marginal *sola scriptura* stance for Jewel.³⁰ This raises several problems, not only about the nebulous and malleable word Anglican, but also about the historical question of when exactly this term could have been applied to a member of the Church of England? If Jewel had understood what Southgate meant by the term, would he have assented? That Jewel saw himself as no different theologically than Martyr or Bullinger can only give a negative response to this question.

Southgate makes one more assertion, the focus of the title of his monograph: that Jewel employed the Church Fathers in a positive and normative sense in the interpretation of Scripture. Consequently, the ancient Church would take on the same authority in the formation of ecclesiastical dogmas:

Jewel's treatment of patristic literature suggests at times a faith in patristic authority more basic than either the result of a mere counting of heads or the most convincing historical analysis would seem to justify ... As a group, however, Jewel did regard them as set apart, as superior to other men ... Consent, agreement among them, was an instrument through which God had chosen to instruct the Church.³¹

Southgate's Jewel used the Church Fathers in positive ways to construct a system of dogma, appropriating them to define the parameters of the Christian faith of the English Church. In this way, according to Southgate, Jewel had struck a course between those who based their dogmatics on biblicistic and *sola scriptura* grounds and those who made

²⁹ Ibid., p. x.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 143–60. However, see Booty, *Jewel as an Apologist*, Chapter VI, 'The Challenge Unmasked: The Problem of Authority', pp. 126–49. Booty asserts, I believe rightly, that Jewel adamantly affirmed the primacy and sole authority of the Scriptures.

³¹ Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, p. 189.

recourse to an abiding magisterium. Southgate's three assertions combine to give us a moderate Anglican with patristic sensibilities who was also a pragmatic Erastian, not carried away by the more extreme elements of English Protestant piety.

Southgate was just getting his work published by the time that John Booty was finishing his doctoral dissertation at Princeton University. Consequently, Booty had access to Southgate's doctoral dissertation, though he did not have recourse to his book. Regardless, Booty made only scant use of Southgate since his aim was more theoretical and theological and less historical and heuristic. Booty's work, having as its central theme Jewel's career as a polemicist, does necessarily treat Southgate's chief focus of doctrinal authority; but it concerns itself with several other issues besides: the Challenge Sermon, the *Apologia*, Jewel's scholarship, Puritanism and obedience, Jewel on the Eucharist, Jewel's personal clash with Thomas Harding and the question of the Church of England's polity. Unlike Southgate's Jewel, so concerned about some supposed *via media*, with Geneva on one end and Rome on the other, with room in England for all those moderates of both camps who wanted to live happily within her, Booty's Jewel defended a commonality of religion maintained by returning exiles; those who had been confederate on the continent were now to be so back in England. Booty does not identify these with some Puritan party, as had Sir J.E. Neale or Christina Garrett; they were out for purity of religion, but not in that strident sense which would identify them with the Knoxians of Frankfurt.³² To Southgate, Jewel had assumed his episcopal duties with his theological positions already intact; he was a moderate. For Booty on the other hand, Jewel progressed to his later, moderate understanding of matters, and this is especially true in regard to the vestarian controversy. To Booty, Jewel had returned to England from Zurich full of fervor, only to realize that England's tenuous political situation was threatened not only by the violence of those from outside the fold, but also by the carping of the Puritans. Seeing the Puritans as disorderly, putting too much emphasis on indifferent things, Jewel, with a verve equal to that which possessed him in his defense of England from the perils presented by the traditionalists, turned to defend the Elizabethan Settlement from those who would disturb it from within.³³ The external Catholic threats to the formal English Settlement, of course, for Jewel were chronic: Jewel published his *A View of a Seditious Bull* in 1570, just a year before his

³² Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, pp. 19–21. Booty at least at the time of his writing, did hold to Neale's and Garrett's thesis, that Elizabeth's hand was forced by the returning exiles. Cf. Booty, pp. 1–5.

³³ Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, Chapter IV, 'Jewel, Puritanism, and Obedience to the Queen', pp. 83–103. See especially, pp. 92–95.

death. Internally, however, the Puritans, according to Booty those who caviled about vestments, were emerging as a danger to the English order in their own right. Yet Jewel at the end of his life showed no substantial difference with the Jewel of 1559 and 1560, neither searching for some equipoise between Rome and Geneva, nor a precisian becoming an ensconced cleric. It is easy to see why Booty may have seen Jewel in this light. With the Louvain presses having ceased and the English Church on the verge of the Admonition Controversy, the threat to English order now would appear to be the Puritans and Presbyterians. Yet the resolution to Jewel's argument with them was no different than what it would have been with Rome, even though the contention may have been less hot.

Nicholas Tyacke, Peter White and all that revisionism

Following the publication of Nicholas Tyacke's *Anti-Calvinists*, the inquisition concerning the causes of the English Civil War extended back past the Stuart Church to the character of the later Elizabethan Church. Tyacke queried whether the Church of England was a Calvinist Church 'decaying' into an Arminian one, or at least an anti-Calvinist one; or was the Calvinist/Arminian controversy only a chimera, distracting historians from the real causes of the conflict?³⁴ Divining the theology of the later Elizabethan and Early Stuart Church necessarily comprehends questions touching the theological nature of the early Elizabethans as well, extending back past the 1595 Lambeth Articles to the Settlement of 1559. Elizabeth did not want more than a doctrinally minimal Church, and whether or not Jewel wanted this, owing to the slight doctrinal content of the *Apology* and to his *via negativi canonis* in the Challenge Sermon, he essentially defined the Church of England as such. While their attempts floundered to get even this modicum of dogma formalized, the bishops and doctors of the English Church – Jewel among them – became embroiled in matters of polity and not dogma *per*

³⁴ Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinism: the Rise of English Arminianism, ca. 1590–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987). See especially the extended preface to the 1990 paperback edition. See also Peter White, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present* 101 (1983), pp. 34–54; William Lamont, 'Comment: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 107 (1985), pp. 227–31; Peter Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635', *Past and Present* 114 (1987), 32–76, and Nicholas Tyacke and Peter White, 'Debate: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 115 (1987), pp. 201–29. And finally, William Lamont, 'The Puritan Revolution: A historiographical essay', in J.G.A. Pocock, ed. *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in association with the Folger Institute, 1993).

se. Thus the most notable theological treatises and controversies of the Elizabethan period, for example the *Apology*, the Admonition Controversy, the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, did not entail overly detailed debates about theology. If Tyacke's distinction between experiential Calvinism and Church Calvinism proves correct in demarcating later Elizabethan Puritanism from many of the ensconced clergy, then is this difference, even if only incipiently, discerned in an earlier period, namely, in the earliest years of Elizabeth's Church. Such a contrast of competing Calvinisms Peter Lake has demonstrated, and distinguishes the moderately Calvinist, evangelical establishment from those who believed themselves unable to condone the Settlement, and who thus took an active role in opposing it stretching back into Elizabeth's reign.³⁵ Though Lake does not extend this distinction back into the 1560s, beginning his study with the conflict between Thomas Cartwright and John Whitgift, nonetheless, Cartwright's contentions did not stem from any Puritan aversion to the doctrine of the Church of England. With respect to the 1560s Tyacke's and Lake's findings and distinctions require a sharper focus, for in 1559 and even in 1563, there cannot be perceived a clear Puritan party, as was later to emerge even as early as the Vestarian Controversy of 1566, and more explicitly by 1571–72 with the Admonition Controversy, and again in 1587 with the controversy over Cope's Bill and Book. What instead should be recognized is the existence of a Zurich party on the one hand, and a Genevan party on the other. If one group looked to Calvin and then Beza, then another group looked to Peter Martyr and Heinrich Bullinger and Zurich. This distinction is proved in its most notorious exception, Thomas Sampson, though also Laurence Humphrey to a lesser degree. Sampson had been a student at Oxford when Martyr was there, and was at Strasbourg during Mary's reign, both in Martyr's presence and absence. Even when Martyr was forced to leave Strasbourg, Sampson kept in contact with him. Upon Elizabeth's accession and during the first years of her reign he persistently importuned Martyr about matters of polity and rite, yet throughout he just as persistently refused to take Martyr's advice. Humphrey did the same, though he later conformed. As regards the other leading clerics of the first decade-and-a-half of Elizabeth's reign, they all followed form in regard to whom they chose as their ecclesiastical referees.

Yet to see England's reception of Calvinism (that is, predestination, even Beza's articulate definition, let alone Calvin's) effected only through

³⁵ Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), pp. 25–26. Cf. especially 'Predestinarian Propositions', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46, No. 1 (January 1995), pp. 110–23.

Geneva is to marginalize the formative influence of both Peter Martyr and Heinrich Bullinger, to say nothing of Jerome Zanchius, upon the English theological mind. Martyr's status in England following Elizabeth's accession has been given short shrift, but it is evident that he was widely read at the universities, and that his *Common Places*, both in Latin and in English, which went through 14 editions,³⁶ were widely disseminated. Collinson has noted that 'English theologians were as likely to lean on Bullinger of Zurich, Musculus of Berne, or Peter Martyr as on Calvin or Beza ... But if we were to identify one author and one book which represented the center of theological gravity of the Elizabethan church it would not be Calvin's *Institutes* but the *Common Places* of Peter Martyr'.³⁷ Given the priority of Martyr's work on predestination to Calvin's for the mind of England, the far greater logical cogency of his system, that Martyr was lecturing on Romans in England in 1550–52, with his commentary on Romans and the extended essay on predestination published in Zurich in 1558 while the exiles were still present, the deference paid to him both before and after his death and finally the continued influence and presence of the *corpus* of Heinrich Bullinger and the other Reformers associated with him in Zurich, the real influence in English thought at the universities and among the higher clergy, and the dominant one at that, is Zurich. Martyr, Bullinger, Musculus, Zanchius, *inter alios* could never be imputed with advocating freewill or slighting the monerger of divine grace as both efficient and final cause of the Christian's salvation. Given the place that their own doctrines of predestination played in their thought, and how those who opposed them on this they so quickly demonized, it must be wondered why someone would assume that their friends and compeers who had lived with them and whom they had sheltered would be of another mind on this issue?

With the publication of Peter White's *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic*, the question of Jewel's relation to the predestinarian debate became explicit.³⁸ White contends, contrary to Tyacke (ironically, Tyacke was once White's student), that there never was a consensus of Calvinism in any form in the Tudor/Stuart Church, and holds forth a number of English ecclesiastics to verify his thesis. But White's conceptual framework begs too many questions: he makes the definition of Calvinism roughly equivalent to a caricature which might have been

³⁶ The *Loci communes* was first published in 1576 and again in 1583, and the English translation was also published in 1583.

³⁷ Patrick Collinson, 'England and International Calvinism: 1558–1640', in Menna Prestwich, ed., *International Calvinism: 1541–1715* (Oxford and New York, 1985), p. 214.

³⁸ Peter White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 69–74.

produced by Richard Montagu – double predestination, limited atonement, slighting the necessity of good works – and his delineation of moderation seems largely analogous to the theological and ecclesiastical positions of John Cosin. White then reads these definitions back into the sixteenth century, and promptly finds what he wants.³⁹ White, turning his gaze on Jewel, calls on a distinction Jewel makes between trust and certainty to show that he is in no sense a Calvinist,⁴⁰ and then further asserts that Jewel is not even an Augustinian. White also notes some statements Jewel made about the interpretation of Scripture, which would imply a departure from the strictly Protestant understanding of the authority of Scripture.⁴¹ Yet as has already been shown, Jewel emphatically embraced the Scriptures as the only norm for doctrine, even if the prince has become a lord of the conscience, and could be given magisterial prerogatives.

Further, to claim that Jewel was not an Augustinian, let alone a Calvinist, begs the question then of what exactly he was: an Erasmian? a follower of Pighius? In fact he was just as much ‘Calvinist’ as was Martyr (who probably should be labeled a better Calvinist than Calvin). In his sermons on II Thessalonians Jewel makes abundantly clear not only the primacy to be given divine grace, but that the only cause of faith came from grace. Further, Jewel makes not merely a strong association, but a virtual identification of the Word of God as Scripture with the word of God that effects God’s will – the *fiat lux* of creation – in the life of the Christian, that is, regeneration. How does it come about that the human condition necessitated this action? ‘We are the children of Adam: we are flesh and blood, and nothing but vile clay and ashes. Our eyes are dim, our senses dull, and our hearts heavy. Christ telleth us truly: “Without me ye can do nothing”; neither hear the word, nor believe it.’⁴² Yet does this say enough? Once Christ has acted, can the soul reject him and turn him away, or, animated by a free will chose him to salvation?

³⁹ Lake, ‘Predestinarian Propositions’, pp. 110–23.

⁴⁰ Calvin spends several sections of the *Institutes* (III.2.15–28) explicating this very thing, that certainty is a necessary consequence of faith: ‘In the divine benevolence, which faith is said to look to, we understand the possession of salvation and eternal life is obtained (III.2.28).’ Calvin, *Institutes*, Vol. I, p. 573.

⁴¹ Though he does not reference him directly, White probably got this notion from Southgate and it shall be treated in the conclusion.

⁴² Jewel, *Commentary upon the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, in *Works*, II, p. 936. Jewel also imbibes that most classic definition of total depravity, that thing which of course brings the necessity for God to act as regards the sinner not only in Calvin but in Luther: ‘I which speak am but a worm, unworthy to creep upon the earth, yet the word which we have heard is the word of God, the word of comfort, and the word of life.’

Jewel would have answered the first question yes, the second no, for faith is not within the power of the heart God has not changed: 'It is God which openeth the hearts of the people, and maketh them tremble at his words. It is God which giveth the increase, and maketh his word to be of force.'⁴³ Further, Jewel posits that the wicked are not merely those who have rejected God, but instead are used by God for a particular end: that they stand as warnings to the elect. This is not some infralapsarian blandishment:

God has chosen you from the beginning: his election is sure for ever ... You shall not be deceived with the power and subtilty of antichrist, you shall not fall from grace, you shall not perish. This is the comfort which abideth with the faithful, when they behold the fall of the wicked; when they see them forsake the truth and delight in fables; when they see them return to their vomit and to wallow again in the mire. When we see these things in others, we must say: Alas, they are examples for me, and they are lamentable examples!

That Jewel's wicked are lamentable examples to the elect says a great deal about his own assumptions, and certainly how he contrasts the elect with the wicked places him firmly within the realm of Peter Martyr's own views on the doctrine of election:

God hath loved me, and hath chosen me to salvation ... He hath loved me he hath chosen me, he will keep me. Neither the example nor the company of others, nor the enticing of the devil, nor mine own sensual imaginations, nor sword, nor fire, is able to separate me from the love of God.⁴⁴

Jewel goes on: faith being the gift of God, it is not something that others possess, but that Christians possess only from God. Muslims do not have faith, for faith is only born from the Word of God. Here Jewel uses the Word of God as Scripture and the Word of God as *fiat* and declarative interchangeably. Thus the Word of God that brings salvation is also the Word of God that effects salvation. Faith does not bring salvation, for faith itself is a 'token of God's election', as is sanctification; he does not say works, though this is clearly implied by the term sanctification. Thus, faith and sanctification are the results, not the cause of election.⁴⁵

Regardless of what Jewel's actual theological position may say on this matter, White's six pages of revision approach the issue from the wrong vantage. Jewel was not a formal theologian, he never constructed any systems, nor did he ever leave any theological treatises. What works of this kind exist, his treatises on the sacraments and Scripture, are nothing other than postmortem compilations and collations of some of his

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 933.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 934.

sermons, their publication coming ten years subsequent to his death. He was instead the defender of an imprecisely constructed ecclesiastical communion; one whose foundation would have supported neither an institution as visualized by Jewel's more precise acquaintances, nor even Jewel himself. Morality and discipline were in the hands of the prince, the doctrine of the Church its ministers were obligated to confess was minimal. But having said that, Jewel did have an idea of what he wanted this communion to be, however imperfectly apprehended it was. In this sense, Jewel's life and career give some insight into the nature of the Elizabethan Settlement, if not into her majesty's own religious tendencies as well. Was Elizabeth the *politique*, or is the picture and description presented by Haugaard more exact, that of a moderate but firmly convinced Protestant?⁴⁶ Did Elizabeth use the Marian exiles as her pastors merely because they were available and trained, or did these returning Protestant émigrés more closely align with Elizabeth's own religious tendencies? From Jewel's perception, it would appear to be the latter of these two alternatives. This is the monarch whom Jewel defended in his post as her bishop and servant; and it is also the picture of her he presented to Peter Martyr Vermigli: 'Certainly this excellent woman, who is truly earnest of real devotion, although she desires a change [in religion] at the earliest time, nevertheless cannot be induced to effect such change without the sanction of law.'⁴⁷

Conclusion: The iconoclastic prelate under the skin of John Knox and Mary Tudor

Whether the religious conflict that existed in the first decade of the Elizabethan Church was the inexorable predecessor of that which occurred in the Stuart Church, or whether it merely adumbrated it, shall depend in part on where the Elizabethan Church in general and its episcopate in particular, fell within the wider world of Protestantism and in particular in its relation to the Swiss. As regards the Zurichers, Elizabeth's bishops never flaunted prelacy, bishops being administrators. But what of the day this liberality as regards the bishop's office no longer existed? As one of the most prominent of the Elizabethan bishops, Jewel's own niche within the Church of England's episcopate has warranted investigation. If Elizabethan Protestantism was some

⁴⁶ W. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: the struggle for a stable settlement of religion* (Cambridge, 1968).

⁴⁷ Verum optima et verae pietatis cupientissima femina, etsi omnia primo quoque tempore mutata cupiat, tamen induci non potest, ut quicquam velit immutare sine lege. Letter of 14 April 1559, in *Works*, p. 1205.

milquetoast affair that vacillated between two alternatives instead of steering its own course, whatever *via media* may have been, then Jewel as one of its definers (or ill-definers) must bear some responsibility for this imprecision. If, however, the Elizabethan Church was aligned with Zurich, then the failure of the Stuart Church to achieve some form of doctrinal unanimity stems from the likes of Cosin, Montagu and Laud 'kicking against the goads'. And if the episcopate of the English Church, along with the rest of its higher clergy – canons, deans, archdeacons, university professors – prior to James I stands in a clearly defined Protestant succession which goes back to Elizabeth's day, a day when moderation meant that Protestants were not Anabaptists, nor were they the fomenters of sedition; a day when 'moderate' or 'mean'⁴⁸ bore no pleasant connotation theologically, and had only a utility against Rome; then Tyacke's assessment would seem the correct one. But what if, with respect to Jewel, it were a matter of both? While the investigation of these broader questions as they pertain to the English Civil War exceeds the sphere of this work, nonetheless, Jewel's arguments with Rome sought to cast Catholic traditionalists as both subversive and doctrinal innovators; the Protestants as both the props of the monarch, and the true heirs of primitive Christianity. Consequently, the methods Jewel employed to accomplish these twin tasks played into the negative aspects of both of the above scenarios. Eventually Jewel indicted both Rome and 'Geneva' (viz Knox) as seditious, but Zurich was never so implicated. The question answered the following century was what would occur when 'Zurich' became the subversives.

On the one hand, Jewel professed a doctrine in line with the most prominent of continental Reformed theologians, and particularly Peter Martyr and Heinrich Bullinger.⁴⁹ On the other, Jewel, to cut out any claims that the Roman Church had to antiquity, employed a negative methodology in treating the ancient Church, both to slight the theological content of the Patristic writers, and to establish a new set of canonical categories: the chief two of these were the Erastian form of government of the Church of England with the godly prince at her

⁴⁸ Jewel had used the term 'leaden mediocrity', as opposed to a golden one, as a disparaging description of the Elizabethan Settlement and those who were overseeing the alteration of religion. Letter to Martyr, May 1559 in *Works*, IV, p. 1210.

⁴⁹ Jewel seldom commented upon Calvin, or mentioned any of the particulars of his theology. Two important exceptions have been noted and referenced in this study. The Genevan does appear in the *Defence of the Apology*, in which, ironically enough, Jewel defended him from Harding's grouping him together with the subversive writings of Knox (something which Elizabeth did not do. Cf. Calvin's letter to William Cecil, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. II, pp. 34–36). The second is the aside in a letter to Peter Martyr where Jewel defends Calvin from the slander that he is too precise when compared to the English Settlement. Jewel believes this libel unfair.

head,⁵⁰ and the Protestant doctrine of *sola scriptura*.⁵¹ For Jewel, the godly prince had to become the arbiter of the limits of Scripture and conscience, at least in some cases, for she guarded the religion of the people, and by the sword defended them from heresy. This Jewel did when he granted the prince sovereignty in regard to both tables of the law, comprehending both religion and order, both the laity and the clergy.⁵² In a Protestant guise Jewel had granted the prince a jurisdiction the equivalent of the medieval doctrine of the two swords – the temporal and the spiritual – which during the Middle Ages had, theoretically at least, always been kept distinct. Granting the queen the prerogative over vestments further substantiates her prerogative as well over certain matters of scriptural authority. This antinomy of conflicting ultimates has formed one of the basic tenets of this book. When the prince would side with those who went beyond both Geneva and Zurich, even beyond the most liberal Reformed limit, could there be any reconciliation of the two sides?

An acquaintance once remarked on what an intriguing fellow Jewel must have been, since he managed to enrage both Mary Tudor and John Knox. These seeming contraries in his nature, these putative conflicting principles of his professed beliefs, nonetheless, he tried sincerely to reconcile, finding a resolution in his Erastian ecclesiology, a dogma that fit hand-in-glove with his Protestant convictions. Yet I also think he was a calculating rhetorician, whose polemics and prose often mask the real dissonances of his life. Jewel maintained what would appear mutually incompatible beliefs and conflicting absolutes, and each fundamental to him: the primacy of the prince and the primacy of Scripture. Couple this with Jewel's use of undulating traditions in a communion that valorized particular customs and practices, all in an attempt to establish provincial and royal prerogative, and it can be seen how Jewel's rhetoric outstripped his dogmatics. Nonetheless, he aspired to a theologically precise dogmatics (right doctrine producing right practice), but he lived in a politically imprecise world: Jewel suffered both exile for his religious convictions under Mary, and pangs of conscience under Elizabeth. Moreover, while his views on the primacy of the prince and the

⁵⁰ This is one of the central tenets of the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, in Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 5–47. The English translation by Lady Ann Bacon, entitled *An Apologie or answere in defence of the Church of Englande*, in *Works*, IV, pp. 52–108.

⁵¹ That Scriptures are the final authority in all matters of faith is expressed throughout, but most notably in his references that they were the authority of the Fathers, their court of appeal, and that Christ and the Apostles knew no such thing as antiquity or tradition. Cf. *A Treatise of the Holy Scriptures*, in *Works*, IV, pp. 1161–88. Especially the section on the perspicuity of the Scriptures, pp. 1182 ff.

⁵² Jewel. Sermon on Haggai 1:2–4, in *Works*, II, p. 997.

autonomy of the regional Church alienated him from those of a precisian bent, his thoughts on the primacy of Scripture brought him into conflict with the traditionalists. These questions confronted Jewel not only when as a bishop he debated Harding and other traditionalists as regards the prerogative of the English establishment to order its own rites, but even in his earlier days, during his life both as a student at Oxford and as an exile from England, Jewel found himself opposing these very factions, and often employing – however embryonic in form – the same types of arguments he used later. The apparent contradictions of this position were lost on Jewel. The coherent *mélange* Jewel tried to effect of these antipodes unraveled in the seventeenth century.

Alister McGrath concluded his investigation into the intellectual origins of the Reformation with the assertion that no reductionist framework that sought only one dominant factor would work with so heterogeneous a movement as the Reformation, an epoch as diverse in its factors as it was in its constituent members. What is instead necessary, according to McGrath, is a hermeneutic for ‘the unfolding of a complex matrix of creatively interacting intellectual currents’.⁵³ In like manner, in trying to find the particular crux of Calvin’s theology, François Wendel noted: ‘If we want to speak of a “system” of Calvin, we must do so with certain reservations, owing to the plurality of themes that imposed themselves simultaneously upon its author’s thinking.’⁵⁴ Wendel presents a Calvin largely interested in the task of rightly interpreting the Bible, and that even the *Institutes* must be seen as preparatory exercises for a student’s further study of the Bible. Thus any attempt to press predestination, the sovereignty of God, the glory of God, or even the centrality of Christ, into service as the central motif of Calvin’s thought is futile.⁵⁵

John Jewel presents a similarly variegated picture. The conclusions that sundry studies have drawn from Jewel’s polemical tracts, specifically his Challenge Sermon and its consequent vindication in the *Answer to Harding*, his *Epistola*, the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* and the subsequent *A Defence of the Apology*, are varied and mixed. Southgate noted his use of Patristic authors, and how these positively guided Jewel in his interpretation of Scripture and his formulation of dogmas.⁵⁶ F.J. Levy cited Jewel’s use of history, and that his critical approach to sources shows him an heir of Renaissance humanism and criticism in the vein of

⁵³ Alister McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford, 1987), p. 197.

⁵⁴ François Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought* (New York, 1963) trans. Philip Mairet, p. 357.

⁵⁵ Wendel, *Calvin*, p. 358.

⁵⁶ Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, pp. 174–91.

Lorenzo Valla, that this formed the basis of his defense of England, and his assault on the traditionalists.⁵⁷ John Booty believed that Jewel venerated the Fathers, but that the ultimate determinative factor in his theological formation was his own private judgment over Scripture, a moral certitude that he for his part had properly divined the will of the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures.⁵⁸ Finally, Peter White asserted that Jewel left a legacy in these and in his other writings not at all Calvinistic in its intent, in fact, not even Augustinian.⁵⁹ In other studies of both Jewel and the English Reformation various interpretations have emphasized Jewel's precisian tendencies, his Erastianism, and his relative stance (whether a hot Protestant or not) among the other Elizabethan bishops.

While each of these interpretations stressed a single element in Jewel and gave some glimpse into his thought, none can assume a position so crucial in Jewel's thought that it relegates all other aspects of Jewel as ancillary or subsidiary. The one that most closely apprehends this singular description is Jewel's explicit Erastianism. When using Erastianism as a prism, Jewel's lack of theologically precise doctrinal formulations becomes not some complex *via media* between Rome and Geneva, but a means whereby a political necessity was wedded to an ecclesiastical virtue. Jewel's works do not present a body of theological literature abundant with insight, but instead give a pedestrian reading of scriptural texts, a prosaic use of the early Church, and a banal approach to its theological topics. Jewel's use of sources is often disingenuous, his logic faulty and his theology in several areas flawed. What Jewel really gives the student of the Reformation is an iconoclast in a prelate's vestments.

It is at this juncture – the institutional iconoclast – where two traits of Jewel converge: his Erastianism and his canonical revisionism. In an era when emergent nation states were leaving behind the old mores of feudal monarchies, Jewel likewise cuts the cords of his monarch from any ties with both the medieval past and the contemporary papacy.⁶⁰ Jewel had imputed his queen with the authority of empire and its right of jurisdiction over the Church. Yet he had not failed to notice that this very imperium had been granted to the barbarian kingdoms by a papacy wrongly conspiring against the Greeks in the making of Charles the

⁵⁷ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 106–10, 123.

⁵⁸ Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, pp. 141–49.

⁵⁹ White, *Predestination, policy and polemic*, pp. 69–74.

⁶⁰ Jewel would, however, use the feudal language of inheritance when seeking to justify the claims of Elizabeth to her throne, both against Pius V's *Regnans in excelsis*, and when Harding would slight Jewel via the arguments of Knox. See Chapters III and IV respectively on these.

Great emperor.⁶¹ What on the one hand Jewel denied – the right of the papacy to confer sovereignty – he was quick for England to apprehend, by saying that the prince has the authority of empire, since the various princes, and England's among them, had assumed the prerogatives of the empire.⁶² It would seem then that his prince's authority would be doubly illegitimate (there is a wicked pun here, though none intended), for since Rome had usurped what it did not have, how could the prince now arrogate the same from Rome? For Jewel, the answer lay first in the prince's authority apart from Rome. Whether Rome was a usurper was immaterial, for its usurpation over the Greeks was effected after the establishment of the English Church, which likewise had existed before the mission of St Augustine of Canterbury; that is, within the first 600 years of the Church's existence, and prior to the introduction of so many of the errors Jewel challenged.⁶³ Augustine of Canterbury represented the incursions of Rome into England, and with it the first persecutions attendant upon the Roman religion in that Augustine was not merely party to the murder of the monks of Bangor, but its instigator.⁶⁴ When Jewel strikes at Rome using the first 600 years as some form of canonical parameters he on the one hand destroyed the authority of a Patristic past (the prelate as iconoclast), cutting away not only any claim by Rome to this past, but cutting away the past itself as a canon. On the other hand, he introduced a new set of canons, categories in which the order of the realm as governed by the queen became paramount. Jewel's *sola scriptura* (one of these new canons) has given him David, Hezekiah, Josiah and Moses as patterns of civil authority over the Church. Jewel's commonwealth appears seemingly a prototypical divine right monarchy. Jewel's negative canon whereby he excised the Fathers of Romish notions has likewise yielded emperors who had wielded prerogatives over the Church, for example, Justinian, Constantine and Maurice, *inter alia*. Here Jewel's positive assertions come not so much as a foundation for his Protestant doctrine, but more as a buttress for the prerogative of the monarch, since the prince now assumed a right arrogated previously by Rome.

The Jewel that has arisen from this study is both a Puritan and a Prelate: he at once affirmed the authority of Scripture and the primacy

⁶¹ Jewel, *Apologia*, in *Works*, III, p. 75.

⁶² 'Since the powers of the empire are weakened (*imminutiae sunt vires imperii*), and kingdoms have succeed to the imperial power that right is common to christian kings and princes.' Jewel, *Ad Scipionem*, in *Works*, IV, p. 1098.

⁶³ In this Jewel is following the lead of John Bale and his *Image of the Two Churches*.

⁶⁴ Jewel, *Works*, IV, pp. 778 ff. Ironically, 12 times Jewel cited Gregory the Great's denunciation of any bishop calling himself a universal bishop, all the while happy to denounce Gregory's missionary, Augustine of Canterbury's tyranny.

of the godly prince. Consequently, he is lauded and blessed by both sides of this English dilemma; a bipartisan Jewel appealed to by both Puritan and conformist. Upon Jewel's death, the Puritan sympathizer and bishop of London, Edmund Grindal, wrote 'The excellent Bishop Jewel, of Salisbury, (the jewel and singular ornament of the Church, as his name implies,) we lost, or rather I should say, sent before us, about the beginning of October last'.⁶⁵ Grindal's sentiments were echoed by the son of the Zurich minister Rudolph Gualter, who was studying in Cambridge: 'Jewel had already departed this life, to the great loss both of his country and myself'.⁶⁶ In the same vein, Richard Cox, the chancellor of Oxford when Jewel was a student there, and the leader of the English defenders of the Edwardian prayer book at Frankfurt, and one of the defenders of the propriety of the queen to retain the crucifix in her chapel (a position maintained in open debate against both Jewel and Grindal), likewise lionized Jewel when he wrote to Heinrich Bullinger that 'the bishop of Salisbury (which I cannot relate without tears, as he was the treasure of the church of England) departed this life while on the visitation of his diocese, and hath gone from hence to heaven, to his gain indeed, but to our exceeding and intolerable loss'.⁶⁷ Jewel's preeminence among the disparate elements of English Protestantism can be further attested by the thoughts of the several English divines writing at times somewhat more removed from the bishop's death. That both the Laudians and the Puritans could find a use for Jewel for their own polemical ends shows the equivocal theological position our subject had attained.⁶⁸ This ambiguous position in which the seventeenth century cast Jewel can be apprehended even in the sixteenth.

Aspects of Jewel's theology, or perhaps a cashing in on the use of Jewel's name, was as well employed by an overtly Presbyterian agenda when in Cambridge, in 1586, a copy of the *Harmonia confessionum fidei* (a tract owing its inspiration to Theodore Beza) was published with a very Presbyterian gloss on Jewel's teaching on the power of the keys as contained in his *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. This sort of frontal

⁶⁵ Archbishop Grindal to Neinrich Bullinger, 25 January 1572, in *Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, p. 260. Jewel actually died 23 September 1571.

⁶⁶ Rudolph Gualter the Younger to Josiah Simler, 29 July 1572, in *Zurich Letters*, Vol. II, p. 260.

⁶⁷ Bishop Cox to Heinrich Bullinger, 12 February 1572, in *Zurich Letters*, Vol. II, p. 193. Bullinger had sent his son to England, and had placed him under the care of Cox and Jewel.

⁶⁸ In the eight volumes of Laud's works, he only alludes to Jewel four times. Lancelot Andrewes and John Cosin never refer to him, at least not in the editions of their works in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*.

assault on the established order Archbishop Whitgift had hoped to stop, and he had suppressed a London edition of the work.⁶⁹ That the Presbyterians sought to use Jewel for their own ends and arguments is also seen in Whitgift's printed arguments with Thomas Cartwright. The substance of their debate revolved around Jewel's *Answer to Certain Frivolous Objections*.⁷⁰ Cartwright, confronted by the now deceased Jewel as his antagonist is left with the retort to Whitgift that, though he does not deny that the tract was written by Jewel, and that the sentiments were his, nonetheless, were the bishop of Salisbury still alive, he would have repented of these errors.⁷¹ Notice has already been made of the use of Jewel by the Puritan William Fulke, whom some have noted as Jewel's successor as the defender of the English Church from Catholic attacks, and who imbibed for a time of Presbyterian notions,⁷² in his *An overthrow of Stapleton's Fortress*. Whether Laud, Cartwright, Fulke and others held Jewel in esteem, admired his scholarship, approved of his conclusions or were merely using the bishop as a foil against their own polemical nemeses, their use emphasizes the problematic question of who were the heirs of Jewel. The answer lies, I believe in both Jewel's Erastianism, and his strongly evangelical faith.

Jewel was foremost a Protestant, with strong affinities to the Swiss Reformed Churches. While explicitly he linked himself to Zurich, we have seen that he was not as averse to Geneva as some may think. On this basis alone, Southgate's assertion that Jewel was some proto-Anglican seems highly tenuous at best. Hand-in-glove with Southgate's Anglican Jewel is the one that is beholden to the Fathers as normative guides (the point touched on previously with respect to Peter White). Southgate quotes Jewel as saying that 'the fathers were inspired from heaven',⁷³ and then cites Jewel's *Defence of the Apology* to this effect.⁷⁴ Yet this quote is not directly from Jewel, but from St Athanasius, and Jewel used it not to enhance, but to diminish patristic authority. St Athanasius's reference to the Fathers was to the Apostles and their immediate predecessors; yet for Jewel, the Fathers to the Fathers (that is, the Apostles), the real source of authority, were the authors of Scripture.

⁶⁹ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 382.

⁷⁰ In *Works*, IV, pp. 1299–1300.

⁷¹ In Whitgift, *Works*, ed. John Ayre. 3 vols. (Parker Society, Cambridge, 1851–53), Vol. II, pp. 336–45.

⁷² Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 464, 477; and Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 108.

⁷³ Southgate, *Doctrinal Authority*, p. 189.

⁷⁴ Jewel, *Works*, III, p. 238.

Jewel's Swiss affinity, coupled with his negative polemical stance, also addresses the use made of Jewel by Peter White. White fails to grasp that Jewel was neither a theologian nor a systematic thinker, nor even a dialectician. That he never overtly dogmatizes on predestination says little, though Jewel does proffer enough throughout his works to clearly place him as a Protestant Augustinian to say the least.⁷⁵ Jewel's basically negative and reductionist approach to dogma yields little that passed as positive theology. Thus, any sweeping generalities drawn from his polemical works about what Jewel was or was not theologically are tenuous observations at best. Jewel was a Protestant called upon to defend the political necessity of the Elizabethan Settlement. Jewel wished the Settlement were more precise, but at the same time he realized that it alone protected England and England's Protestants from the shades of Marian persecutions and ignorance. These contraries must be held in equipoise when reading Jewel. In this sense, Jewel's larger works will appear as the public, rhetorical, exercises that they were: aimed at strengthening Protestant resolve and censuring traditionalist obstinance. Conversely, Jewel's private correspondence, while persistent in its anti-Catholic invectives, also betrayed the more precise elements in Jewel's disposition, one who wished more for English Protestantism than a meager implementation of the 1559 Settlement. Publicly, Jewel always remained the dutiful prelate, privately, the wistful precisian; but it was this dichotomy that allowed others to insinuate their private notions into the Church of England's life as well.

Jewel's was no English theology, nor was he a champion of some creature later termed *via media*. What theology he had, he had garnered from Peter Martyr. But even this cannot be so quickly asserted without the very real proviso that Jewel is not simply Martyr sitting in rochet and chimere at Salisbury: Martyr, a Florentine, though he had left his Catholicism in Italy, had never abandoned his native city's republicanism. His Reformed theology, as that of Zurich, fit nicely with the republicanism of the Swiss cantons. As such, and even though there was a strong element of Erastianism in Zurich, it was never such that anyone believed that the decision of the magistrate would make that which was defiled clean, for example, vestments. Adiaphora was a concept the English conveniently coopted from the Lutherans and applied to their situation. Such distinctions as indifferent things have only a passing place in Reformed thought, and apart from the one passage of Martyr, which Whitgift was happy to force down the throat

⁷⁵ Cf. Jewel's commentary on I Thessalonians 1:5, *Works*, II, p. 821; and II Thessalonians 2:13, *Works*, II, p. 933. As noted, the second of these two texts Jewel makes the statements, consonant with Calvin, that the Christian stands only by the mercy of God, and not by faith, and that assurance proceeds from faith itself.

of Thomas Cartwright, there was no one else's theology to abduct on this issue. Bullinger and Martyr had counseled the English that it was better to assume the defiled habits than to let wolves take the pulpit. Yet when the precise and the wolves collided, as the more precise certainly believed that they did in England in August 1642, could the result have been anything other than civil war? The theology of the Church of England was subject to the prevailing theological winds, and repeatedly the object of multiple ones. If the monarch failed to reign in the theological passions of England's subjects, Jewel's Church had no way, theoretically, to resolve its conflicts, for it had neither recourse nor court of appeal beyond the prince – neither to tradition, a general council, nor a magisterium.

The propositions of Jewel's Challenge Sermon

The original articles of Jewel's Challenge Sermon

1. That there was any private Mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of 600 years after Christ;
2. Or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind;
3. Or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not;
4. Or that the bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church;
5. Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally or naturally, in the sacrament;
6. Or that his body is, or may be, in a thousand places or more at one time;
7. Or that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head;
8. Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour;
9. Or that the sacrament was then, or now ought to be handed up under a canopy;
10. Or that in the sacrament after the words of consecration there remaineth only the accidents and shews, without the substance of bread and wine;
11. Or that the priest then divided the sacrament in three parts, and afterward received himself all alone;
12. Or that whosoever had said the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for an heretic;
13. Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five Masses said in one church, in one day;
14. Or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people might worship them;
15. Or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue.

The following items Jewel added in his subsequent sermons

16. Or that it was lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of

consecration closely and in silence to himself;

17. Or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto his Father;

18. Or to communicate and receive the sacrament for another, as they do;

19. Or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the means of the Mass;

20. Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people, that the Mass, *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin;

21. Or that then any Christian man called the sacrament Lord and God;

22. Or that the people was then taught to believe, that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption;

23. Or that a mouse, or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught);

24. Or that when Christ said, *Hoc est corpus meum*, this word *hoc* pointeth not the bread, but *individuum vagum*, as some of them say;

25. Or that the accidents, or forms, or shews of bread and wine, be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself;

26. Or that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it;

27. Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience.

Chronology of Jewel's and Harding's publications relevant to the Challenge Sermon and the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*

Challenge Sermon Controversy

Jewel's Sermons

26 November 1559, Paul's Cross

17 March 1560, at Court

31 March 1560, Paul's Cross

Cole's initial letter, 18 March 1560

Jewel's first reply, 20 March 1560

Cole's second letter, 24 March 1560

Jewel's answer to Cole's second letter, 29 March 1560

Cole's third letter, 8 April 1560

Jewel's third response to Cole, 22 July 1560 (from Shirburne, in the diocese of Salisbury)

Jewel's extended response to Cole, dated 18 May 1560, was appended to the above letter.

Later in 1560 the sermon and all the correspondence were printed.

1564 Harding's *Answer to M. Juelles Challenge*

1565 Jewel's *Replie to Harding's Answere*

1566 Harding's *Rejoindre to M Jewel's Replie*

1567 Harding's *A Rejoindre to M. Jewel's Replie against the Sacrifice of the Masse*

Controversy over the Apologia

1562 *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* published anonymously.

1562 Parker's English translation.

1564 Lady Bacon's translation.

1565 Harding's *Confutation of a Booke intituled an Apologie.*

1567 Jewel's *Defence of the Apologie.*

1568 Harding's *Detection of sundry foul errors uttered by M.*

- Jewel in his Defence of the Apologie.*
1570, 1571 Jewel's enlarged edition of the *Defence of the Apology*.

Bibliography

Original sources

I. Jewel's works {none of the spellings are modernized}

The true copies of the Letters betweene the reuerend father in God Iohn Bisshop of Sarum and D. Cole, upon occasion of a Sermon that the said Bishop preached before the Quenes Maiestie, and hyr most honorable Counsayle (London, 1560)

The Copie of a Sermon pronounced by the Byshop of Salisburie at Paules Crosse the second Sondaye before Ester in the yere of our Lord. 1560. whereupon D. Cole first sought occasion to encounter (London [1560])

Epistola cuiusdam Angli, qua asseritur consensus verae religionis doctrinae & caeremoniarum in Anglia, contra vanissimos quorundam cavillos, quibus eandem suis ad plebeculam contionibus impugnare conantur (Np, M.LXVI [1561])

Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae (London, 1562)

An Apologie, or Aunsuer in defence of the Church of England, concerninge the state of Religion used in the same (London, 1562)

An Apologie or aunsuere in defencce of the Church of England. trans. Ann, Lady Bacon (London, 1562)

An Apologie, or Answere in defence of the Church of Englande with a briefe and plaine declaration of the true Religion professed and used in the same (London, 1564)

A Replie unto M. Hardinges Answere (London, 1566)

A Defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande conteinigne an Answere to a certaine Booke lately set foorth by M. Hardinge, and Entituled, A Confutation of &c (London, 1567)

A Defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande conteinigne an Answere to a certaine Booke lately set foorth by M. Hardinge, and Entituled, A Confutation of &c. Whereunto there is also newly added an Answere unto an other like Booke, written by the saide M. Hardinge, Entituled, A Detection of sundrie fowle Errours &c (London, 1571)

A Viewe of a Seditious Bul sent into Englande, from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome, Anno. 1569 ... Whereunto is added A short Treatise of the holie Scriptures (London, 1582)

- Certaine Sermons preached before the Queenes Maiestie, and at Paules crosse ... Whereunto is added a short Treatise of the Sacraments, gathered out of other his sermons, made upon that matter, in his cathedrall Church of Salisburie.* ed. John Garbrand (London, 1583)
- Certaine sermons preached before the Queenes Maiestie and at Paules Crosse, etc.* (London, 1583)
- A Sermon made in latine in Oxenforde, in the raigne of King Edwarde the sixth* (London, 1586)
- The Works of the very learned and Reverend Father in God Iohn Iewell, not long since Bishop of Sarisburie* (London, 1609)
- The Works of John Jewell; and a briefe discourse of his life* {by D. Featley} (London, 1609–11)
- The Apology of the Church of England; and An Epistle to one Signor Scipio a Venetian Gentleman, Concerning the Council of Trent* (London, 1685)
- The Works of John Jewel*, ed. John Ayre, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1845–50)
- The Works of John Jewel D. D. bishop of Salisbury.* ed. Richard Wm. Jelf DD (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1848)

II. Manuscripts

- Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 97, ff. 184–97
- Harleian Ms., 595, no. 27
- Wiltshire Record Office, Jewel's Register, D1/2/16, ff. 1–28, 29–45 (The register is divided into two sections)

Printed primary sources

- Aelfric, *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 receaved, in the Saxons tyme, aboue 600 yeares agoe* (London, 1567{?})
- Allen, William, *A Treatise made in defence of the lauful power and authoritie of Priesthod to remitte sinnes* (Louvain, 1567)
- Articles to be enquired in the visitation in the fyrste yeare of the raygne of our moost dread soveraygne Lady, Elizabeth* (London, 1559)
- Aylmer, John, *An Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subiectes Agaynst the Late Blowne Blaste, Concering the Gouverment of Women.* Strasbourge (London: John Day, 1559)
- Bateson, Mary, ed., 'A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to

- the Privy Council, 1564'. *Camden Miscellany*, IX, Camden Society, 2nd Series, LIII. Westminster, 1895 Bayne, Peter, ed. *Puritan Documents*, 1862
- Becon, Thomas, *Works*, ed. John Ayre, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843–44)
- Beza, Theodore, *Du Droit des magistrats*. Edited by Robert Kingdon (Geneva: Droz, 1970)
- A Booke of Certaine Canons concerning some parte of the discipline of the Church of England*. (London, 1571) STC No. 10063
- Booby, John E., ed., *Epistola cuiusdam Angli, qua asseritur consensus verae religionis Doctrinae & caeremoniarum in Anglia*. Appendix to *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1963), pp. 209–25
- *An Apology of the Church of England by John Jewel* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963)
- A brief discourse against the outwarde apparell and ministring garments of the popishe church* (Np, 1566. Attributed to Robert Cowley)
- A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford in Germany anno domini 1554 Abowte the Booke off off [sic] Common Prayer and Ceremonies and Contiued by the Englishe Men Theyre to the Ende off Q. Maries Raigne* (Heidelberg: Schirat, 1574, 1575. Reprinted by Edward Arberas Vol I of 'A Christian Library', 1908)
- Brodrick, G.W., *Memorials of Merton College* (Oxford, 1936)
- Bromiley, G.W. ed. and trans., *Zwingli and Bullinger* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953)
- Bullinger, Heinrich, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*. Edited by Thomas Harding. 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849–52)
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office*. Elizabeth, Vols I–IV, London, 1870.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, 1547–1580*. Edited by Robert Lemon (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1856)
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth*. ed. M.A.E. Green, 1872.
- Calvin, John, *Corpus Reformationum (Opera Calvini)* ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. 59 vols (Brunswick, 1863–80)
- *Commentaries*. trans Christopher Fetherstone for Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh. ed. Henry Beveridge, 22 vols (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979)
- *Calvin's Letters*. ed. Jules Bonnet. 2 vols. (London and Edinburgh, 1855–57)
- *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. ed. John T. McNeill. trans. Ford Lewis Battles. 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960)

- *Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice*, trans. Mary Deaty and Benjamin W. Farley (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991)
- *Treatises against the Anabaptists and against the Libertines*. ed. and trans. Benjamin Wirt Farley (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982)
- Camden, William, *Annales, or the History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England*. trans. Robert Nauton, 3rd ed. (London, 1635) STC No. 4501
- Cardwell, Edward, *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England, 1546–1716*. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1844)
- *A History of the Conferences and Other Proceedings, Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer; from the Year 1558 to the Year. 1690* (Oxford, 1849)
- *Synodalia: A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons, and Proceedings of Convocations in the Province of Canterbury, from the Year 1547 to the Year 1717*. 2 Vols (Oxford, 1842)
- *The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws as Attempted in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850)
- Churchwarden's Accounts of S. Edmunds and S. Thomas, Sarum, 1443–1702*. Ed. Henry James Fowle Swayne. Salisbury: Wiltshire Record Society (1906)
- Clarke, W.K. Lowther and Charles Harris, eds, *Liturgy and Worship* (London, 1950)
- Clay, W. K., ed., *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847)
- *Private Prayers put forth by authority during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1851)
- Cochrane, Arthur C. ed., *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966)
- Collins, W.E., *Queen Elizabeth's Defense of her Proceedings in Church and State* (London: The Church Historical Society LVIII, 1899)
- Cooper, T., *An Answer in Defence of the Truth against the Apology of Private Mass*. Ed. William Goode (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850)
- Cranmer, Thomas, *An answer ... unto a crafty and sophisticall cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner ... Agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy Sacrament of the body and bloud of our Sauour, Iesu Christe* (London, 1551)
- *A Defence of the True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concentering the same grounded and stablished upon*

- God's holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient Doctors of the Church* (London, 1550. reprint, East Sussex: Focus Christian Ministries Trust, 1987)
- *Writings and Disputations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843)
- *Miscellaneous Writings of Thomas Cranmer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846)
- Dasent, John Roche, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council of England*. N.S. II–VII. 1547–70 (London, 1890–93)
- Dering, Edward, *A Sermon preached at the Tower of London* (London, 1569)
- *A sermon preached before the Quenes Maiestie ... the 25 day of February. Anno 1569* (London, 1569)
- *A Sparing Restraint, of many lavishe untruthes, which M. Doctor Harding dothe chalenge, in the first Article of my Lorde of Sarisburies Replie* (London, 1568)
- D'Ewes, Simonds, Sir, *The journals of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, both of the House of Lords and House of Commons*, Collected by Sir Simonds D'Ewes (London, Printed for John Starkey at the Mitre in Fleetstreet near Temple-Bar, 1682)
- *A compleat journal of the votes, speeches and debates, both of the House of lords and House of commons throught the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth, of glorious memory* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, [1974?]) Facsimile of 1693 edition
- Dorman, Thomas, *A Proufe of certeyne articles in religion denied by M. Iuell, sett furth in defence of the Catholyke beleef therein* (Antwerp: John Laet, 1564)
- *A Disprove of M. Nowelles Reprove* (Antwerp: John Laet, 1565)
- *A request to M. Jewell* (Louvain, 1567; reprinted Mentson, Yorkshire: Scholar Press, 1973)
- Elizabeth Tudor, *Queen Elizabeth's Defense of her Proceedings in Church and State*, ed. W.E. Collins (London, 1899)
- Ellis, Henry, *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*, 3rd Series, 4 vols (London, 1846)
- Evans, Lewis, *A brieve Admonition unto the nowe made ministers of Englande: wherein is shewed some of the fruicte of this theyr late framed fayth* (Antwerp, 1565)
- Foxe, John, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, Ed. Stephen Reed Cattley. 8 vols (London, 1843–49; Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1965)
- Frarin, Peter, *An Oration against the unlawfull insurrections of the Protestantes of our time, under pretence of Refourme Religion*, trans. John Fowler (Antwerp, 1566)

- Frere, Walter Howard, ed., *Visitation Articles and injunctions*, 3 vols. (London, 1910)
- *Registrum Matthei Parker Diocesis Cantuariensis, A.D. 1559–1575*. Transcribed by E. Margaret Thompson, 3 vols (Oxford: Canterbury and York Society, 1928–33)
- Gardiner, Stephen, *A detection of the Devils Sophistrie, wherewith he robbeth the unlearned people, of the true byleef, in the most blessed Sacrament of the aulter* (London, 1546)
- *An explication and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed Sacrament of the aulter* (London, 1551)
- *De Vera Obedientia. An Oration made in Latine ... And nowe translated into English and printed by Michael Wood* (Roane, 1553)
- Gee, Henry and W.J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London, 1914)
- The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*, Introduction by Loyd E. Berry (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969)
- Grindal, Edmund, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal*, ed. William Nicholson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843)
- Harding, Thomas, *An Answere to Maister Iuelles challenge* (Louvain: Bogard, 1564)
- *A Briefe Answere of ... touching certaine untruthes, with which Maister Iohn Iuell charged him in his late Sermon at Paules Crosse the viii of Iuly Anno. 1565* (Antwerp, 1565)
- *A confutation of a Booke intituled An Apologie of the Church of England* (Antwerp: John Laet, 1565)
- *A Detection of sundrie foule errors, lies, slaunders, corruptions, and other false dealinges, touching Doctrine and other matters, uttered and practized by M. Iewel, in a Book lately by him set forth entituled, A Defence of the Apologie &c.* (Louvain: Ioannem Foulereum, 1568)
- *A Reioindre to M. Iewels Replie* (Louvain: Ioannem Foulereum, 1566)
- *A reioindre to M. Iewels Replie against the Sacrifice of the Masse* (Louvain: Ioannem Foulereum, 1567)
- Hardwicke, Philip, Earl of Yorke, *Miscellaneous State Papers from 1501 to 1726*. Vol. I. 1501–1625 (London, 1778)
- Haynes, Samuel, *A collection of State Papers, relating to Affairs in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth, from the Year 1542 to 1570* (London, 1740)
- Hayward, John, *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. John Bruce. Camden Society, O.S. VII (London, 1840)
- Heskyns, Thomas, *The Parliament of Chryste* (Antwerp, 1566)
- Hooper, John, *An answer unto my lord of wynchesters booke intytlyd a*

detection of the devyls Sophistrye wherwith he robbeth the unlearned people of the trew beleef in the most blessed sacrament of the autler (Zürich, 1547)

Humphrey, Laurence, *Ioannis Iuelli Angli, Episcopi Sarisburniensis vita & mors* (London, 1573)

Jenkins, Gary, 'Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558', in Frank A. James, ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations. Semper Reformanda* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004), pp. 47–69

'Between the Sacraments and Treason: Aspects of the Political Thought of the English Recusants in the First Decade of Elizabeth's Reign', in Wim Janse and Barbara Pitkin, eds, *Dutch Review of Church History* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005), Vol. 85.

JHC. *Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th, 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of Edward the Sixth, to March the 2nd 1628, in the Fourth Year of King Charles the First*. Vol. I (London, 1803)

JHL. *Journals of the House of Lords: beginning Anno Primo Henrici Octavi from Vol. I. to 1575*.

Ketley, Joseph, ed., *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552: with other Documents, set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844)

Knox, John, *The Works of John Knox*. ed. D. Laing. 6 vols (Edinburgh, 1846–64. Reprint, AMS Press, 1966)

— *The History of the Reformation within the Realm of Scotland* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982)

Liber Precum Publicarum, seu Ministerij Ecclesiasticae Administrationis Sacramentorum, Aliorumque Rituum & Ceremoniarum in Ecclesia Anglicana (London, 1560) STC No. 16424. Also revised edition of 1574, STC No. 16427.

Machyn, Henry, *The Diary of Henry Machyn: Citizen of an Merchant Taylor of London, from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*. Ed. J.G. Nichols (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968. Originally printed 1848, London: The Camden Society)

Martyr, Peter (Peter Martyr Vermigli), *An Epistle unto the right honourable and Christian Prince, the Duke of Somerset*. trans. Thomas Norton (London, 1550)

— *The Common Places of the most famous and renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr*, trans. Anthony Marten (London, 1583)

— *Most Fruitfull and learned Commentaries of Doctor Peter Martyr Vermil Florentine* (London: John Day, 1564). Contains his commentaries on Judges, Romans, the Pentateuch; sermons, orations, and letters, an account of the Oxford Eucharistic disputation and his

- biography by Josiah Simler
- *Defensio doctrinae ueteris & apostolicae de Sacrosancto Eucharistiae Sacramento* (Zurich: Froschouer, 1559)
- *The Peter Martyr Library*, Vol. 2, *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, Vol. XXXI Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, trans. and ed. with introduction and notes by John Patrick Donnelly, SJ (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 1995)
- *The Peter Martyr Library*, Vol. 7, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation*, Vol. LVI, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, trans. and ed. with introduction and notes by Joseph C. McLelland (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2000)
- Nowell, Alexander, *A Reproufe ... of a booke entituled, A proufe of Certayne Articles in Religion denied by M. Iuell, set furth by Thomas Dorman* (London: Henry Wyckes, 1565)
- *The Reproufe of M. Dorman his proufe of certaine Articles in Religion &c. continued.* (London: Henry Wykes, 1566)
- Parker, Matthew, *Correspondence, 1535–1575.* eds John Bruce and T.T. Perrowne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853)
- Pauk, Wilhelm, ed., *Melancthon and Bucer* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969)
- Pilkington, James, *Works*, ed. James Schoemfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842)
- Prothero, G. W., *Select Statues and other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, 4th ed. (Oxford, 1913)
- Rastell, John, *A Confutation of a sermon, pronounce by M. Iuell, at Paules crosse, the second Sondaie before Easter* (Antwerp: Iohn Laet, 1564)
- *A Replie against an answer (falsie intituled) in Defence of the Truth* (Antwerp: Iohn Laet, 1565)
- *A Treatise intituled, Beware of M. Iewel* (Antwerp, 1566)
- *A Briefe Shew of the false Wares packt together in the named, Apology of the Church of England* (Louvain: Ioannis Foulteri, 1567)
- Ridley, Nicholas, *Works.* ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843)
- Robinson, Hastings, ed. and trans., *The Zürich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during ... the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842, 1845)
- ed. & trans., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation, written during the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary: Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich.* 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847)

- Sanders, Nicholas, *The supper of our Lord set forth in six Bookes, according to the truth of the gospell, and the faith of the Catholike Church* (Louvain: Joannes Foulcrum, 1565)
- *A Treatise of Images of Christ, and of his Saints; and that it is unlauffull to breake them, and lauffull to honour them* (Louvain: Joannes Foulcrum, 1567)
- Sandys, Edwin, *Sermons*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1841)
- The Second Tome of Homelyes of such matters as were promesed and Intituled in the former part of homelyes, set out by the auctoritie of the Quenes Maiestie: And to be read in every paryshe Church agreablye* (London, 1563)
- Sermons 1559. Certayen Sermons appoynted by the Quenes Maiestie to be declared and read by all persones, vycars and curates, every Sonday and holy daye in theyr Churches* (London, 1559) STC No. 13648. Also other editions: STC Nos. 13649–13653 and 13655–13658.
- Staphylus, Fridericus, *The Apologie of Fredericus Staphylus*, trans. Thomas Stapleton (Antwerp: Iohn Laet, 1566)
- Stapleton, Thomas, *A fortresse of the faith first planted among us Englishmen* (Louvain: Joannes Foulcrum, 1565)
- *A Return of Untruthes upon M. Iewelless Replie* (Antwerp: Iohn Laet, 1566)
- *A Counterblast to M. Hornes wayne blast against M. Fekenham* (Louvain: Ioannem Foulcrum, 1567)
- STC. *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*. ed. A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave (London, 1926) 2nd edition revised and enlarged, begun by W.A. Jackson and F.S. Ferguson (London: Bibliographic Society, 1976–82)
- Schaff, Philip, ed., *The Creeds of Christendom*. 3 vols (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977)
- Strype, John, *Annals of the Reformation*. 4 vols (Oxford, 1821)
- *The Life and Acts of a Matthew Parker*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1821)
- *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, DD*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1822)
- *Ecclesiastical Memorials*. 3 vols (Oxford, 1824)
- *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1853)
- Trinterud, Leonard J., *Elizabethan Puritanism*. 2 vols (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971)
- Whether it be mortall sinne to transgresse civil lawes, which be the commaundment of civill Magistrates* (London, 1566 and 1570–71)
- Whitgift, John, *An Answer to a Certen Libell intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1573)

- *Defense of the Aunswere* (London, 1574)
- *Works*. ed. John Ayre, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1851–53)
- Wright, Thomas, ed., *Queen Elizabeth and her Times: a Series of Original Letters, Selected from the Inedited Private Correspondence of the Lord Treasurer Burghley, the Earl of Leicester, the Secretaries Walsingham and Smith, Sir Christopher Hatton, and Most of the Distinguished Persons of the Period*. 2 vols (London, 1838)

Secondary Works

- Ainslie, James L., *The Doctrines of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1940)
- Allen, J.W., *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1957)
- Allison, W.T. ed., *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (New York, 1911)
- Anderson, Marvin, *Peter Martyr: A Reformer in Exile* (Nieukoop: De Graaf, 1975)
- Archer, I., *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Aston, Margaret, 'Lollardy and the Reformation: Survival or Revival', *History*, 49 (1964), 149–70
- 'John Wycliffe's Reformation Reputation,' *Past and Present*, 30 (1965), 22–51
- 'English Ruins and the English History: The Dissolution and the Sense of the Past', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 36 (1973) 231–55
- *England's Iconoclasts. Vol 1: Laws against Images* (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1988)
- Aveling, J.H., *The Handle and the Axe: The Catholic Recusants in England from Reformation to Emancipation* (London: Blond & Briggs, 1976)
- Ayris, Paul and David Selwyn, eds, *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993)
- Baker, Derek, ed., *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500–1750*. Dedicated and presented to Professor Clifford Dugmore. Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979)
- Baker, J. Wayne, 'In Defense of Magisterial Discipline: Bullinger's "Tractatus de Excommunicatione" of 1568', in *Heinrich Bullinger*

- 1504–1575. *Gesammelte Aufsätze sum 400. Todestag*, Vol 1: *Leben und Werk*. Edited by Ulrich Gäbler and Erland Herkenrath. Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsegeschichte, Vol 7 (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975)
- *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1980)
- *Covenant and Community in the Thought of Heinrich Bullinger* (Philadelphia: Center for the Study of Federalism: Temple University Press, 1980)
- Baron, Hans, 'Calvinist Republicanism and Its Historical Roots', *Church History*, 88 (1939), 30–42
- Bartlett, K.R., 'The Role of the Marian Exiles', in P.W. Hasler, ed. *The House of Commons: 1558–1603* (3 vols, 1981)
- Baumer, Franklin Le van, *The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940)
- Bayne, C.G., *Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558–1565* (Oxford: Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, 1913)
- Beer, Barnett, *Rebellion and Riot: Popular Revolt in England during the Reign of Edward VI* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1982)
- Bennett G.V. and J.D. Walsh, eds, *Essays in Modern English Church History. In memory of The Very Reverend Norman Sykes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966)
- Betteridge, M.S., 'The Bitter Notes: The Geneva Bible and its Annotations', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 14.1 (1983), 41–62
- Bicknell, E.J., *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*. rev. ed. H.J. Carpenter (London, 1959)
- Biéler, André, *La Pensée Économique et Sociale ed Calvin* (Geneva: Librairie de l'Université, 1961)
- Blench, J.W., *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964)
- Booby, J.E., *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1963)
- Borgeaud, Charles, 'Cartwright and Melville at the University of Geneva, 1569–1574', *American Historical Review*, 5 (1899), 282–90
- Bossy, John, 'The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism', *Past and Present*, 21 (1962), 39–59
- *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976)
- Boulton, J.P., 'The Limits of Formal Religion: The Administration of Holy Communion in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart London', *London Journal*, 10 (1984), 135–54
- Bouvier, André, *Henri Bullinger: Réformateur et Conseiller Oecuménique ...* (Zürich: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1940)

- Bowker, M., *The Secular Clergy in the Diocese of Lincoln, 1495–1520* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968)
- 'The Commons Supplication Against the Ordinaries in the Light of Some Archidiaconal *Acta*', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (1971), 61–77
- 'The Supremacy and the Episcopate: the struggle for control, 1534–1540', *Historical Journal*, 18 (1975), 227–43
- 'The Henrician Reformation and the Parish Clergy,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 50 (1977), 30–47
- Bradshaw, B. and E. Duffy, eds., *Humanism, Reform and the Reformation: The Career of Bishop John Fisher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Brauer, Jerald C., 'Reflections of the Nature of English Puritanism,' *Church History*, 23 (1954), 99–108
- Brigden, S., 'Youth and the English Reformation', *Past and Present*, 95 (1982), 37–67
- Bromiley, G. W., *John Jewel, 1522–1572, the Apologist of the Church of England* (London, 1948)
- *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1953)
- Brook, V.J.K., *Whitgift and the English Church* (London: English Universities Press, 1957)
- *The Life of Archbishop Parker* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)
- Brooks, P., *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London: Macmillan, 1965)
- *Reformation Principle and Practice: Essays in Honour of A. G. Dickens* (London: Scholars Press, 1980)
- Brown, Andrew, *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England. The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250–1550* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)
- Burgess, Glenn, 'Common Law and Political Theory in Early Stuart England', *Political Science*, 40 (1988), 4–17
- *The Politics of Ancient Constitution* (London, 1992, and University Park, 1993)
- Burns, J.H., 'Knox and Bullinger', *Scottish Historical Review*, 34 (1955), 90–91
- Burns, J.H. and Mark Goldie, eds, *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Bush, M.L., *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977)
- Campi, Emidio, ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli. Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, in cooperation with Frank A. James and Peter Opitz (Geneve: Librairie Droz, 2002)
- Carlson, Eric Josef, ed., *Religion and the English People, 1500–1640.*

- New Voices and Perspectives*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies Vol. 45 (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1998)
- Christianson, P., *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978)
- 'Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1980), 463–82
- Clark, Francis, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1960)
- Clark, P., *English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: ... Kent 1500–1640* (Hassocks: Harvester, 1977)
- Clebsch, W.A., *England's Earliest Protestants, 1520–1535* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964)
- Collinson, P., 'The Authorship of *A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Frankford*', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 9 (October 1958), 188–208
- 'The Role of Women in the English Reformation Illustrated by the Life and Friendships of Anne Locke', *Studies in Church History*, 2 (1965), 258–72
- 'Episcopacy and Reform in England in the Later Sixteenth Century', in G.J. Cuming ed. *Studies in Church History*. Vol. 3 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966)
- *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley: University of California, 1967)
- *Archbishop Grindal, 1519–1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979)
- *The Religion of Protestants. The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- *Godly People* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983)
- 'The English Conventicle', in W.J. Shiels and D. Woods eds, *Voluntary Religion. Studies in Church History*, 23 (1986), 223–59
- 'Puritans, Men of Business, and Elizabethan Parliaments', *Parliamentary History*, 7 (1988), 187–211
- *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: religious and cultural change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: the third Anstey memorial lectures in the University of Kent at Canterbury, 12–15 May 1986* (New York: St. Martin's, 1988)
- Coolidge, John S., *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970)
- Cooper, J.P., 'The Supplication Against the Ordinaries Reconsidered', *English Historical Review*, 72 (1957), 616–41
- Cor da, Salvatore, *Veritas Sacramenti. A Study in Vermigli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Zurich, 1975)

- Cottrell, Jack Warren, 'Is Bullinger the Source for Zwingli's Doctrine of the Covenant?' in *Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575. Gesammelte Aufsätze sum 400. Todestag*, Vol. 1: *Leben und Werk*. Edited by Ulrich Gäbler and Erland Herkenrath. Zurcher Beiträge zur Reformationsegeschichte, Vol. 7 (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975)
- Cowell, Henry J., 'English Protestant Refugees in Strasbourg, 1553-1558', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, 15 (1934), 69-120
- 'The Sixteenth-Century English-Speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfurt', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, 16 (1937-41), 209-30
- 'The Sixteenth-Century English-Speaking Refugee Churches at Strasbourg, Basle, Zurich, Aarau, Wesel and Emden', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, 15 (1937), 612-55
- 'The Sixteenth-Century French-Speaking and English-Speaking Refugee Churches at Frankfurt', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, 14 (1929-33), 62-95
- Craig, Hardin, 'The Geneva Bible as a Political Document', *Pacific Historical Review*, 7 (1938), 40-49
- Cremeans, C.D., *The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949)
- Cross, Claire, *The Royal Supremacy and the Elizabethan Settlement* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1969)
- *Church and People, 1450-1660*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999)
- Cross, Claire, David M. Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick, eds, *Law and government under the Tudors: essays presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, on the occasion of his retirement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
- Cross, M.C., 'Noble Patronage in the Elizabethan Church', *Historical Journal*, 3 (1960), 1-16
- 'Churchmen and the Royal Supremacy,' in F. Heal and R. O'Day eds, *Church and Society in England, Henry VIII to James I* (London: Macmillan, 1977), 15-34
- 'The Development of Protestantism in Leeds and Hull, 1520-1640: The Evidence of Wills', *Northern History*, 18 (1982), 230-38
- Danner, D.G., 'The Marian Exiles and the English Protestant Tradition,' *Social Groups and Religious Ideas in the Sixteenth Century*. Ed. Miriam Usher Chrisman and Otto Gründler (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 1978)
- 'The Contribution of the Geneva Bible to the English Protestant

- Tradition', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 12.3 (1981), 5–18
- Davies, C.S.L., 'The Pilgrimage of Grace Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 41 (1968), 54–76
- *Peace, Print and Protestantism, 1450–1558* (St Albans: Paladin, 1977)
- Davies, Horton, *Worship and Theology in England from Cranmer to Hooker, 1534–1603* (Princeton: Princeton University Press; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970)
- Davis, J.F., *Heresy and Reformation in the South-East of England, 1520–1559* (London: Royal Historical Society Studies in History, 34, 1983)
- Dawley, Powel M., *John Whitgift and the English Reformation* (New York, 1964)
- Dawson, Jane, 'Revolutionary Conclusions: The Case of the Marian Exiles', *History of Political Thought*, 11 (1990), 257–72
- Dean, David M. and Norman L. Jones, eds., *The Parliaments of Elizabethan England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990)
- Dent, J.C., *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
- De Vocht, H., 'Thomas Harding', *English Historical Review* Vol xxxv (1920)
- Dickens, A.G., *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation* (London: English University Press, 1959)
- 'Secular and Religious Motivation in the Pilgrimage of Grace', in G.J. Cuming, ed., *Studies in Church History*, Vol 4 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), 39–64
- 'Heresy and the Origins of the English Reformation', in K.S. Bromley and E.H. Klossman, eds, *Britain and the Netherlands. II* (Groningen, 1971), 120–25
- *Reformation Studies* (London: Hambledon Press, 1982)
- *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509–1558*. 2nd ed. (London: Hambledon, 1982)
- Review of J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People*, in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985), 123–26
- 'English Protestant Society', Paper given at the Folger Library, 20 April 1987
- 'The Early Expansion of Protestantism in England: 1520–1558,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 78 (1987), 187–222
- 'The Shape of Anticlericalism and the English Reformation', in E.I. Kourai and T. Scott, eds, *Politics and Society in Reformation Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987), 379–410
- *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (University Park, PN: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989)

- Dictionary of National Biography ... from the Earliest Times to 1900*, 22 vols (London, 1885–1901)
- Di Gangi, Mariano. *Peter Martyr Vermigli: 1499–1562. Renaissance Man, Reformation Master* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1993)
- Dodwell, Charles Reginald, ed., *The English Church and the Continent* (London, 1959)
- Donaldson, Gordon, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960)
- Donnelly, J.P., *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Grace* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976)
- Doran, Susan and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People: the Church and Religion in England, 1529–1689* (London: Routledge, 1991)
- Duffy, E., *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)
- Dugmore, C.W., *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London: Macmillan, 1958)
- Eccleshall, Robert, *Order and Reason in Politics: Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1978)
- Eells, Hastings, 'The Contributions of Martin Bucer to the Reformation', *Harvard Theological Review*, 24 (January 1931), 29–42
- Elton, Geoffrey R., 'The Commons Supplication against the Ordinaries: Parliamentary Maneuvers in the Reign of Henry VIII', *English Historical Review*, 66 (1951), 507–34
- 'Thomas Cromwell's Decline and Fall', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 10 (1951), 150–85
- *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953)
- 'King or Minister?: The Man Behind the Henrician Reformation', *History*, 39 (1954), 216–32
- *The Tudor Constitution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960)
- *Henry VIII: An Essay in Revision* (London: The Historical Association, 1962)
- *Policy and Police: Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972)
- *Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973)
- *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government*. 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974)
- *Reform and Reformation, England 1509–1558* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977)

- *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. 2nd Edition, 1982)
- *The Parliament of England, 1559–1581* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Emerson, Everitt H., 'Calvin and Covenant Theology', *Church History*, 25 (June 1956), 136–44
- Ferguson, Arthur B., *Clio Unbound: Perception of the Social and Cultural Past in Renaissance England*, Duke monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies number 2. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1979)
- Figgis, J.N., *Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius: 1414–1625*. Intro. by Garrett Mattingly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916)
- Firth, K.R., *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- Franklin, Julian H. ed. and trans., *Constitutionalism and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Pegasus, 1969)
- Fussner, F. Smith, *Tudor History and the Historians* (New York: Basic Books, 1970)
- Garrett, C.H., *The Marian Exiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938; reprint 1961, Cambridge)
- Gee, H., *The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments* (London: Macmillan, 1902)
- George, C.H. and K., *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570–1640* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961)
- Gerrish, B.A., 'The Confessional Heritage of the Reformed Church', *McCormick Quarterly*, 19 (1966), 120–34
- 'The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions', *Theology Today*, 23 (1966), 224–43
- 'John Calvin and the Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper', *McCormick Quarterly*, 22 (1969), 85–98
- Ghosh, Kantik, *The Wycliffite Heresy. Authority and Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Graves, Michael A.R., *The Tudor Parliaments: Crown, Lords, and Commons, 1485–1603* (London: Longmans, 1985)
- Gray, John R., 'The Political Theory of John Knox', *Church History*, 8 (1939), 132–47
- Greaves, R.L., 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought', *The Historian*, 31 (November 1968): 21–35
- *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation. Studies in the Thought of John Knox* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, Christian College Consortium, 1980)
- 'The Nature and Intellectual Milieu of the Political Principles in

- the Geneva Bible Marginalia', *Journal of Church and State*, 22.2 (1980), 233–49
- *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981)
- Greenblatt, Stephen, *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980)
- Greenslade, S.L., *The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960)
- Guy, John, 'The Henrician Age', in J.G.A. Pocock, ed., *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in association with the Folger Institute, 1993)
- Habbakuk, H.J., 'The Market for Monastic Property, 1539–1603', *Economic History Review*, 10 (1958), 362–80
- Hagen, Kenneth, 'From Testament to Covenant in the Early Sixteenth Century', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 3:1 (1972), 1–24
- Haigh, Christopher, *The Last Days of the Lancashire Monasteries and the Pilgrimage of Grace* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969)
- 'Puritan Evangelism in the Reign of Elizabeth I', *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977), 30–58
- 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation', *Past and Present*, 93 (1981), 37–69
- 'From Monopoly to Minority: Catholicism in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 31 (1981)
- 'The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation', *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), 995–1007
- 'Anticlericalism and the English Reformation', *History*, 68 (1983), 391–407
- ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (London: Macmillan, 1984)
- 'Revisionism, the Reformation and the History of English Catholicism', with a comment by P. McGrath, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36 (1985), 394–406
- ed., *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- *Elizabeth I* (London: Longmans, 1988)
- 'The English Reformation: A Premature Birth, a Difficult Labor, and a Sickly Child', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 449–60
- *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)
- Hall, B., 'Calvin Against the Calvinists', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, 20 (1962), 284–301
- 'Puritanism: the Problem of Definition', in *Studies in Church*

- History*, ed., G.J. Cuming, 11 (1965)
- 'The Early Rise and Gradual Decline of Lutheranism in England (1520–1600)', in D. Baker, ed., *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c. 1500–1750* (1979), 103–31
- Haller, W., *The Rise of Puritanism, 1570–1643*; or, *The Way to the New Jerusalem* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938; repr. Harper & Row, 1957)
- Hargrove, O.T., 'The Predestinarian Offensive of the Marian Exiles at Geneva', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 42 (1973), 111–23
- 'The Predestinarian Controversy Among the Marian Protestant Figures', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 47 (1978), 131–51
- Haugaard, W., *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968)
- 'John Calvin and the Catechism of Alexander Nowell', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 61 (1970), 50–66
- 'Elizabeth Tudor's Book of Devotions', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 12 (1981) 79–105
- Heal, F., 'The Bishops and the Act of Exchange of 1559', *Historical Journal*, 17 (1974), 227–46
- *Of Prelates and Princes. A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980)
- Heath, P., *The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969)
- Helmholz, R.H., *Roman Canon Law in Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- Henderson, Katherine and Barbara F. Macmanus, eds., *Half Human-kind: Contexts and Texts about Women in England, 1540–1640* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985)
- Hexter, J.H. ed., *Parliament and Liberty: From the Reign of Elizabeth to the English Civil War* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1972)
- Higham, Florence, *Catholic and Reformed: A Study of the Anglican Church: 1559–1662* (London: Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1962)
- Hilton, J.A., 'Catholicism in Elizabethan Northumberland', *Northern History*, 13 (1977), 44–58
- 'The Cumbrian Catholics', *Northern History*, 16 (1980), 40–58
- Holmes, P., *Resistance and Compromise: The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Hopf, Constantin, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford:

- Oxford University Press, 1946)
- Houlton, R., *Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation, 1520–1570* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
- Horie, H., 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement: 1558–1563', *Historical Journal*, 34 No. 3 (1991), 519–37
- Hudson, A., *The Premature Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)
- Hudson, Winthrop, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1980)
- Hughes, Philip, *The Reformation in England*. 3 vols. (London: Hollis and Carter, 1950–54)
- Hughes, Philip Edgecumbe, *Theology of the English Reformers* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965)
- Hunt, George L. and John T. McNeill, eds., *Calvinism and the Political Order* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965)
- Hurstfield, J. ed., *The Reformation Crisis* (London: Arnold, 1965)
- *Freedom, Corruption and Government in Elizabethan England* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1973)
- Ingram, M., *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England: 1570–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- Ives, E.W., 'Faction at the Court of Henry VIII: the Fall of Anne Boleyn', *History*, 57 (1972), 169–88
- *Faction in Tudor England* (London: The Historical Association, 1978)
- *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987)
- James, Frank A., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination. The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- James, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations. Semper Reformanda* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004)
- Johnson, A.F., 'The Exiled English Church at Amsterdam and its Press', *The Library*, Fifth Series 5/4 (1951)
- Jones, Norman L., *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion, 1559* (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Royal Historical Society and Humanities Press, 1982)
- *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age. England in the 1560s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993)
- *The English Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002)
- Jones, Whitney, R.D., *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539–1563* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963)
- Jordan, Constance, 'Women's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (1987), 421–51
- Kearney, H., *Scholars and Gentlemen. Universities and Society in Pre-*

- Industrial Britain* (London: Faber & Faber, 1970)
- Keep, David J., 'Bullinger's Defence of Queen Elizabeth', *Heinrich Bullinger 1504–1575: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag, Vol 2: Beziehungen und Wirkungen*. Edited by Ulrich Gäbler and Erland Herkenrath (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975)
- Kelley, Donald R., *François Hotman. A Revolutionary's Ordeal* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973)
- 'History, English Law and the Renaissance', *Past and Present*, 65 (1974), 24–51
- *The Beginnings of Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981)
- 'Ideas of Resistance before Elizabeth', in R. Stier and H. Dubrow eds., *The Historical Renaissance* (Chicago, 1988)
- 'Elizabethan Political Thought', in J.G.A. Pocock, ed., *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in association with the Folger Institute, 1993)
- Kendall, R.T., *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- Ker, Neil P., 'Oxford College Libraries in the Sixteenth Century', *The Bodleian Library Record*, 6 (1959), 459–515
- 'The Library of John Jewel', *The Bodleian Library Record*, IX no. 5 (1977), 256–65
- Kingdon, Robert M., 'The First Expression of Theodore Beza's Political Ideas', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 46 (1955), 88–100
- *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555–1563* (Geneva: E. Droz, 1956)
- 'The Political Resistance of the Calvinists in France and the Low Countries', *Church History*, 27 (September 1958), 220–33
- *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement, 1564–1572* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967)
- Knappen, M.M., *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Chicago, 1939)
- *Constitutional and Legal History of England* (Hampton, CN: Archon Books, 1964)
- Knox, R.B. ed., *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Nuttall* (London, 1977)
- Knox, Samuel J., 'Christopher Goodman – A Forgotten Presbyterian', *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, 28 (December 1950), 221–32
- Krumm, John M., 'Continental Protestantism and Elizabethan Anglicanism (1570–95)', in Franklin H. Littell, ed., *Reformation*

- Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland Bainton* (Richmond, 1962), 129–44
- Lake, Peter, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- 'Puritan Identities', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), 112–23
- 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570–1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (1987), 32–76
- *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterians and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988)
- Lake, Peter, and M. Dowling, *Protestantism and the National Church in England* (London, 1987)
- Le Bas, Charles Webb, *The Life of Bishop Jewel* (London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1835)
- Lamont, William, 'The Puritan Revolution: A Historiographical Essay', in J.G.A. Pocock, ed., *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in association with the Folger Institute, 1993)
- Lehmberg, S.E., *The Reformation Parliament, 1529–36* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970)
- *The Reformation of Cathedrals* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988)
- Levy, F. J., *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1967)
- Lewis, Clive Staples, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954)
- Linder, Robert D., 'Pierre Viret and the Sixteenth-Century English Protestants', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 58 (1967), 149–71
- Little, David, *Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1969)
- Loach, J., *Parliament under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- *Edward VI* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995)
- Loades, D.M. *The Oxford Martyrs* (London: Batsford, 1970)
- *The Tudor Court* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1987)
- *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989)
- *The Reign of Mary Tudor: politics, government, and religion in England, 1553–1558*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1991)
- *Politics and the Nation, 1450–1660: Obedience, Resistance, and Public Order*, 4th ed. (London: Fontana Press, 1992)
- *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504–1553* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)
- MacCaffrey, W., *The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime* (Princeton:

- Princeton University Press, 1968)
- *Queen Elizabeth and the Making of Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980)
- MacCulloch, D., 'Catholic and Puritan in Elizabethan Suffolk: A County Community Polarises', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 72 (1981), 232–89
- *Suffolk and the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)
- *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1990)
- 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), 1–19
- *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)
- *The Boy King. Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999)
- Maclure, M., *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534–1642* (Toronto, 1958)
- Malone, M.T., 'The Doctrine of Predestination in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker', *Anglican Theological Review*, 52 (1970), 103–17
- Manning, Roger, *Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1969)
- 'The Crisis of Episcopal Authority during the Reign of Elizabeth I', *Journal of British Studies*, 11 (November 1971), 1–25
- *Village Revolts: Social and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)
- Manschreck, C.L., *Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1958)
- Marchant, R.A., *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960)
- Marshall, Peter and Alec Ryrie, eds, *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Martin, Colin and Geoffrey Parker, *The Spanish Armada* (New York: Norton, 1988)
- Martin, G.H. and J.R.L. Highfield, *A History of Merton College* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Martin, J.W., 'The Elizabethan Familists', *Baptist Quarterly*, 29 (1982), 267–81
- 'The First that Made Separation from the Reformed Church of England', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 77 (1986), 281–312
- Mattingly, Garrett, *Catherine of Aragon* (London, 1942)
- *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959)
- *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971)
- McLelland, J.C., *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the*

- Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957)
- 'Covenant Theology: a Re-evaluation', *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 3 (1957), 182–87
- 'The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination According to Peter Martyr', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 8 (1965), 255–71
- 'Calvinism Perfecting Thomism? Peter Martyr Vermigli's Question', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 31 (1978), 571–78
- McLelland, J.C. & G.E. Duffield, eds, *The Life, Letters, and Eucharistic Writings of Peter Martyr* (Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1967)
- McConica, James K., *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965)
- 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford', *English Historical Review*, 94 (1979), 291–317
- McCullough, Peter E., *Sermons at Court. Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- McDonnell, Kilian, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967)
- McFarlane, K.B., *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Non-conformity* (London: English Universities Press, 1952)
- McGinn, D.J., *The Admonition Controversy* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949)
- McGrath, Alister E., *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987)
- *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986 and 1993)
- *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993)
- McGrath, P., *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I* (London: Blandford, 1967)
- 'Elizabethan Catholicism: A Reconsideration', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), 414–28
- McNeill, John T., 'The Church in the Sixteenth-Century Reformed Theology', *Journal of Religion*, 22 (July 1942), 251–69
- 'The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought', *Church History*, 18 (September 1949), 153–71
- *The History and Character of Calvinism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954)
- Meyer, Carl, *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559* (St Louis: Concordia, 1960)
- Milner, Benjamin Charles, Jr., *Calvin's Doctrine of the Church* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970)

- Milton, Anthony, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- Møller, J., 'The Beginnings of Puritan Covenant Theology', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 14 (1963), 46–67
- Monihan, Arthur P., *Consent, Coercion, and Limit: The Medieval Origins of Parliamentary Democracy* (Kingston: McGill University Press, 1987)
- Morey, Adrian, *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I* (Totowa, NJ: Rowan and Littlefield, 1978)
- Morgan, J., *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes to Reason, Learning and Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Morris, Christopher, *Political Thought in England, Tyndale to Hooker* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953)
- Muller, R.A., 'Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis?', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 11.1 (1978), 69–81
- Neale, Sir J.E., 'The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity', *English Historical Review*, 65 (1950), 304–32
- 'Parliament the Articles of Religion, 1571', *English Historical Review*, 67 (1952), 510–21
- *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559–1581* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1953)
- *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1584–1603*, 2 vols (London: Jonathan Cape, 1957)
- *The Age of Catherine de Medici* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1943)
- New, John F.H., *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition, 1558–1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964)
- Nichols, James Hastings, *Corporate Worship in the Reformed Tradition* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968)
- Norwood, Frederick A., 'The Marian Exiles: Denizens of Sojourners?', *Church History*, 13 (1944), 1000–1110
- Oakley, Francis, 'On the Road from Constance to 1688: the Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan', *The Journal of British Studies*, 2 (1962), 1–31
- O'Connell, Marvin R., *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964)
- O'Day, Rosemary, 'The Law of Patronage in Early Modern England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 26 (1975), 247–60
- *The English Clergy: the Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession, 1558–1642* (Leicester: Leicester University Press; distributed by Humanities Press, 1979)
- *Education and Society, 1500–1800: the Social Foundations of*

- Education in Early Modern Britain* (London: Longman, 1982)
- *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London: Methuen, 1986)
- O'Day, Rosemary and F. Heal, eds., *Continuity and Change* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1976)
- *Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1977)
- *Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500–1800* (Leicester: Leicester University Press; distributed by Barnes & Noble, 1981)
- O'Donovan, Joan Lockwood, *Theology of Law and Authority in the English Reformation*, Emory University Studies in Law and Religion (Atlanta: Scholars Press, Emory University Press, 1991)
- O'Donovan, Oliver, *On the Thirty-Nine Articles, A Conversation with Tudor Christianity* (Exeter, 1986)
- Palliser, D.M., *The Age of Elizabeth: England under the later Tudors: 1547–1603* (London: Longman, 1983)
- Parmiter, G. de C., *The King's Great Matter* (London: Longmans, 1967)
- Parry, G.J.R., *A Protestant Vision: William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- Pauk, Wilhelm, 'Martin Bucer's Conception of a Christian State,' *The Princeton Theological Review*, 26 (1928), 80–88
- Pettegree, Andrew, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)
- *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (St Andrews Studies in Reformation History, Aldershot, England: Scolar Press, 1996)
- Phillips, James E. Jr., 'The Background of Spenser's Attitude toward Women Rulers', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 5 (October, 1941), 5–32
- Phillips, John, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535–1660* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973)
- Pocock, J.G.A., *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957)
- Pocock, J.G.A., ed., *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in association with the Folger Institute, 1993)
- Pogson, R.H., 'Revival and Reform in Mary Tudor's Church: A Question of Money', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 25 (1974), 249–65
- Pollard, A.F., *Henry VIII*. London: Longman, 1902, 1905, 1951, reprinted with a preface by A.G. Dickens (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966)
- *Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, 1489–1556* (London, 1904, 1956)
- *Wolsey: Church and State in Sixteenth Century England* (London:

- Longman, 1929, 1953) Repr. 1966 Harper & Row.
- Pollen, J.H., *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Longmans, 1920)
- Porter, H.C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958)
- ed. *Puritanism in Tudor England* (New York: Macmillan, 1970)
- Powell, K.G., *The Marian Martyrs and the Reformation in Bristol* (Bristol Historical Association, Local History Pamphlet no. 31, 1972)
- Preston, J.H., 'English Ecclesiastical Historians and the Problems of Bias, 1559–1742', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 32 (1971), 203–20
- Prestwich, M. ed., *International Calvinism: 1558–1715* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985)
- Primus, J.H., *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1960)
- Pritchard, Arnold, *Catholic Loyatism in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1979)
- Procter, Francis and Walter Howard Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1958)
- Pugh, R.B. and Elizabeth Crittall, eds., *A History of Wiltshire*, Vol 3 (London: Oxford University Press for The Institute of Historical Research, 1956)
- Read, Conyers, *Social and Political Forces in the English Reformation* (Houston: Elsevier Press, 1953)
- *Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1955)
- Regan, G., *Elizabeth I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
- Reid, W. Stanford, *The Trumpeter of God: a Biography of John Knox* (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1974)
- Rex, Richard, *The Theology of John Fisher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- 'The Crisis of Obedience: God's Word and Henry's Reformation', *The Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), 863–94
- Richardson, Cyril C., *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (Evanstown, IL, 1949)
- Ridley, Jasper, *Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962)
- Roemer, Paul, 'Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Part I: The Impasse', *Lutheran Quarterly*, II.2 Summer (1988), 155–84
- 'Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Part II: The Agreement', *Lutheran Quarterly*, II.2 (1988), 357–90
- Rose, Elliott, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives to Recusants and Puritans under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press, 1975)
- Rupp, Gordon, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947)
- 'Patterns of Salvation in the First Age of the Reformation', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 57 (1966), 52–66
- Russell, C., 'Arguments for Religious Unity in England, 1530–1650', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1980), 201–26
- Salmon, J.H.M., *The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959)
- Scalingi, Paula Louise, 'The Scepter of the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516–1607', *The Historian*, 41 (November 1978), 59–75
- Scarisbrick, J.J., 'The Pardon of the Clergy', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 12 (1956), 22–39
- 'Clerical Taxation in England, 1485–1547', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 11 (1960), 41–54
- *Henry VIII* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1968)
- *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986)
- Simon, J., *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966)
- Skinner, Quentin, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Vol II. The Age of Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)
- Slack, Paul, ed., *Rebellion, Popular Protest, and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- Smith, L.B., *Tudor Prelates and Politics* (London: Princeton University Press, 1953)
- 'The Reformation and the Decay of Medieval Ideals', *Church History*, 24 (1955), 212–20
- 'Henry VIII and the Protestant Triumph', *American Historical Review*, 71 (1966), 1237–64
- Smithen, Frederick J., *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation* (London: James Clarke, 1927)
- Somerses, Fiona, Jill C. Havens and Derrick G. Pitard, eds., *Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2002)
- Southern, A.C., *Elizabethan Recusant Prose, 1559–1582* (London: Sands & Co., 1950)
- Southgate, W.M., 'The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin', in *The Making of English History*, ed. Robert L. Schuyler and Herman Ausubel (New York, 1952)

- *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962)
- Spalding, J., ed., *The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws of England: 1552* (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992)
- Spufford, M., *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)
- Starkey, David, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (London: George Philipps, 1985)
- *Elizabeth, the Struggle for the Throne* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2000)
- Strong, Roy, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan portraiture and pageantry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986)
- Sutherland, N.M., 'The Marian Exiles and the Establishment of the Elizabethan Regime', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 78 (1987), 253–84
- Talpin, Mark, *The Italian Reformers and the Zurich Church, c. 1540–1620*, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003 [Mark Talpin])
- Taylor, F.J., 'Scripture and Tradition in the Anglican Reformation', in *Scripture and Tradition*, ed. F.W. Dillistone (London, 1955)
- Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-century England* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978)
- Thomas, W.H. Griffith, *The Principles of Theology: An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles* (London, 1951)
- Thompson, J.V.P., *Supreme Governor: A Study of Elizabethan Ecclesiastical Policy and Circumstance* (London, 1940)
- Tierney, Brian, *Religion, Law, and the Growth of Constitutional Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- 'Medieval Foundations of Elizabethan Political Thought', in Gordon Schochet, ed., *Law, Literature, and the Settlement of Regimes*, Proceedings of the Folger Institute for the History of British Political Thought, II, 1990
- Tittler, Robert and Jennifer Loach, eds. *The Mid-Tudor Polity, c. 1540–1560* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1980)
- Tittler, Robert and S.L. Battley, 'The Local Community and the Crown in 1553: the Accession of Mary Tudor Revisited', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 136 (1984), 131–39
- Todd, Margo, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- 'The Godly and the Church: New Views of Protestantism in Early Modern Britain', *Journal of British History*, 28 (1989), 418–26
- Tonkin, John, *The Church and the Secular Order in Reformation*

- Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971)
- Trinterud, Leonard J., 'The Origins of Puritanism', *Church History*, 20 (March 1951), 37–57
- Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinism: the Rise of English Arminianism, ca.1590–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987)
- *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)
- Tyler, P., 'The Status of the Elizabethan Parochial Clergy,' in G.C. Cuming, ed., *Studies in Church History*, Vol 4 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967)
- Vander Molen, Ronald J., 'Anglican against Puritan: Ideological Origins during the Marian Exile', *Church History*, 42 (March 1973), 45–57
- Verkamp, Bernard J., *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1977)
- Wallace, Ronald S., *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament* (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1957)
- Walsham, Alexandra, *Church Papists. Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (London: The Royal Historical Society, 1993)
- Walton, Robert C., 'Bullinger's Answer to John Jewel's Call for Help: Bullinger's Exposition of Matt. 16:18–19 (1571)', *Heinrich Bullinger 1504–1575: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag*, Vol 2: *Beziehungen und Wirkungen*. Edited by Ulrich Gäbler and Erland Herkenrath (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975)
- 'The Institutionalization of the Reformation at Zürich', *Zwingliana*, 13 (1972), 497–515
- Walzer, Michael, *The Revolution of the Saints* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965)
- Wendel, François, *Calvin: sources et évolution de sa pensée religieuse* (Paris, 1950), English Translation, *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963) trans. Philip Mairet.
- Wenig, Scott A., *Straightening the Altars. The Ecclesiastical Vision and Pastoral Achievements of the Progressive Bishops under Elizabeth I, 1559–1579* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000)
- Wernham, R.B., *The Making of the Elizabethan Foreign Policy, 1558–1603* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980)
- West, W. and Morris S., 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism', *Baptist Quarterly*, 15 (October 1954), 346–68
- White, B.R., *The English Separatist Tradition from the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers* (Oxford, 1971)
- White, Helen C., *Tudor Books of Private Devotion* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951)

- White, Peter, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 101 (1983), 34–54
- *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church, from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Whiting, R., 'Prayers for the Dead in the Tudor South-West', *Southern History* 5 (1983), 66–94
- *The Blind Devotion of the People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Williams, Penry H., *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)
- Woodhouse, F.H., *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547–1603* (London: Macmillan, 1954)
- Youngs, J., *The Dissolution of the Monasteries* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1971)
- Yule, George, 'Continental Patterns and the Reformation in England and Scotland', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 22 (September 1969), 305–23
- Zaret, David, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985)
- Zeeveld, W.G., *Foundations of Tudor Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1948)
- Zell, M., 'The Personnel of the Clergy in Kent in the Reformation Period', *English Historical Review*, 89 (1974), 513–33
- 'The Use of Religious Preambles as a Measure of Religious Belief in the Sixteenth Century', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 50 (1977), 246–49

Dissertations

- Baker, J. Wayne, 'Covenant and Society: The *Respublica Christiana* in the Thought of Heinrich Bullinger', PhD, University of Iowa, 1970
- Bourgeois II, E.J., 'A Ruling Elite: the Government of Cambridgeshire, circa 1524–88', Cambridge University PhD, 1988
- Butler, Charles J., 'Religious Liberty and Covenant Theology' (Temple University, 1979)
- Carlson, Arvid, 'The Bishops and the Queen' (Princeton University, 1962)
- Dietel, William M., 'Puritanism vs. Anglicanism: A Study of Theological Controversy in Elizabethan England' (Yale University, 1956)
- Huelin, Gordon, 'Peter Martyr', PhD, University of London, 1955
- Keep, D.K., 'Henry Bullinger and the Elizabethan Church', PhD,

Sheffield University 1970

Mullins, Edward L.C., 'The Effects of the Marian and Elizabethan Religious Settlements upon the Clergy of London, 1553–1564', (University of London, 1948)

Parrott, Edgar G., 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of Peter Martyr and John Jewel', San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, CA, 1965

Spielmann, Richard M., 'Elizabethan Exiles: A Discussion of the Content and Influence of English Writings of Seven Elizabethan Exiles', ThD General Theological Seminary, 1964

Vessy, Wesley James, 'The Sources of the Idea of Active Resistance in the Political Theory of John Knox', PhD, Boston University, 1961

West, W.M.S., 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism', PhD, Universität Zürich, 1955

Whiting, R., 'The Reformation in the South-West of England', PhD, Exeter University, 1977

Index

- Abel, Thomas 208
adiaphora 20, 68, 87, 109, 112,
162–74, 184, 186, 187, 235, 249
Allen, William 115, 121
Ambrose, St. 72, 130, 136, 137, 138,
139, 147
Anabaptists 60, 90, 159, 163, 183,
189, 191, 193, 194, 195, 242
Anselm, St 65, 175
Antwerp 119, 120, 121, 125, 129,
131, 132, 136, 138, 151
Arcadius 106
Athanasius, St 128, 248
Audley, Edmund 205
Augustine of Canterbury, St 104, 203,
246
Augustine of Hippo, St. 22, 48, 65,
80, 82, 109, 134, 135, 138, 139,
145, 171, 173, 175, 190–92
Aylmer, John 47, 62, 164, 180
Ayre, John 12, 48, 232, 233
Ayscough, William (b. of Salisbury)
204

Bacon, Lady Anne 85, 89, 90, 158,
234, 243, 253
Bacon, Sir Nicholas 63, 85, 86, 198
Bale, John 41, 232, 246
Bangor, 87, 170, 246
baptism 141, 144–8
Barlow, Richard b. of Chichester 39,
117, 119, 126
Barnes, Thomas 208
Barnstaple, school at 7, 118
Basle 65, 221
Bayne, Ralph b. of Coventry 61
Baudouin, François 93, 181, 182, 183
Becket, Thomas A', St 152
Bede, the venerable, St 151, 220–22
Bentham, Thomas 52
Bernard of Clairvaux, St 85, 95, 171
Berrynarbor 6, 7, 118
Beauchamp, Richard b. of Salisbury
204, 205, 212

Beza, Theodore 60, 69, 179, 181,
182, 183, 197, 237, 238, 247
Boleyn, Anne 13, 192, 205, 208
Booty, John 3, 48, 86, 233, 235, 236
Brethren of the Common Life 15, 80,
82
Broadgates Hall (Pembroke College)
37, 190
Bucer, Martin 21, 25, 29, 30, 51, 89,
142, 160, 163, 180
Butts, William 47
Bullinger, Heinrich 4, 23, 31, 42, 47,
49, 54, 56, 60, 85, 89, 94, 142, 145,
157, 161, 164, 173–77, 179, 187,
190, 232, 234, 237, 238, 242, 247,
250
Burrey, Peter 10

Cabasilas, Nicholas 171
Calvin, John 21, 31, 41, 42, 45, 46,
49, 60, 69, 79, 89, 98, 113, 127,
139, 142, 145, 151, 175, 179, 180,
181, 182, 183, 190, 228, 238, 239,
242, 244, 249
Calvinists, Calvinism 3, 13, 60, 110,
120, 121, 163, 197, 236–9, 245
Cajetan, Thomas de Vio, cardinal 91,
132, 133
Cambridge 7, 9, 16, 21, 25, 30, 38,
41, 46, 47, 62, 116, 117, 118, 168,
197, 205, 208, 232, 247
Campeggio, Lorenzo, cardinal, b. of
Salisbury 205, 207, 210, 212
Capon (Salcot), John b. of Salisbury
206, 210, 212
Carew, Peter 36
Cartwright, Thomas 1, 172, 194,
197, 199, 237, 248, 250
Cassander, George 69, 182, 183
Catherine of Aragon 14, 36, 166,
192, 205, 207, 208
Cecil, William 47, 57, 86, 88, 168,
174, 180, 182, 183
Chamberlayne, Agnes 211–12

- Chamberlayne, Richard 211
 Charles Martel 90
 Charles the Great 245
 Charles V 19, 21, 44, 48, 49, 160, 166, 190
 Chedsey, William 62
 Cheke, Sir Richard 47
 Chrysostom, St. John 30, 31, 78, 124, 147, 171, 200
 Cicero 11, 32, 33, 34, 102, 217
 Cleve Episcopi 11, 12, 24, 37, 214
 Cole, Henry 62, 63, 71–5, 88, 122, 123, 209, 252
 Colet, John 8, 15, 16
 Collinson, Patrick 61, 168, 169, 184, 196, 197, 238
 Communion, *see* Eucharist
 Constance, council of 65, 97, 100, 101
 Constantine 83, 100, 106, 246
 Consubstantiation (see also ubiquitarianism) 29, 75, 76, 78, 168, 179
 Conciliarism 84, 95, 97, 99, 100–103, 108, 153,
 Cooke, Sir Anthony 51
 Cooper, Thomas b. of Lincoln 130, 137, 138
 Cosin, John 239, 242, 247
 Coverdale, Miles 10, 25, 117, 232
 Cox, Richard b. of Ely 30, 32, 40–45, 47, 62, 63, 67–9, 116, 117, 163, 164, 174, 178, 184, 185, 209, 217, 225, 247
 Cromwell, Thomas 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 31, 47, 206, 208
 Cranmer, Thomas ab. of Canterbury 1, 9, 13, 20, 22–5, 29–31, 37–9, 40, 43, 46, 60, 62, 77, 79, 110, 113, 116, 117, 124, 139, 140, 142, 145, 146, 163, 164, 166, 231–4
 Cyril of Alexandria, St 137, 142, 143
 Daniel the prophet 38, 152
 David, king of Israel 105, 161, 191, 246
 Davies, Horton 164, 174
 Denny, Anthony 47
 Deventer 15
Devotio Moderna 80
 Dickens, A.G. 21, 23, 25, 53, 64
 Donation of Constantine 83, 192
 Dorman, Thomas 118, 131, 135, 136, 139, 154
 Dormer, Jane 54
 Douai 117, 118, 119, 121
 Dionysius the (Ps)Areopagite, St 148
 Edward III 205
 Edward IV 304
 Edward VI 2, 4, 9, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 23–6, 31, 35–7, 39–41, 45, 55, 56, 58, 60, 68, 107, 116, 117, 118, 126, 157, 167, 179, 180, 188, 189, 193, 207, 237, 247
 Elizabeth I
 accession, 53, 116, 237, 238,
 relations with Parliament, 44
 her foreign interventions, 49
 the Settlement of religion, 52, 53, 54, 55, 67, 68, 157, 160, 162, 172, 185, 186, 236, 241
 the Royal Supremacy, 59, 101, 105–7, 119, 127, 160, 161, 165, 172, 191, 192, 194, 195
 and Mary, 53, 54, 107
 her excommunication, 96, 104, 105, 107, 108
 and Calvin, 180
 and Knox, 180
 Jewel's opinion of, 175, 177, 187, 243, 245
 and Thomas Seymour, 177
 and her episcopal bench, 61, 214, 216
 Elizabethan Settlement 1, 2, 44, 45, 51–6, 57, 64, 67, 86, 89, 110–12, 155, 156, 159–62, 170, 173, 175, 179, 183–5, 187, 189, 196, 197, 235, 237, 241, 249
 Elton, Sir Geoffrey 14, 17, 21, 23
 Erasmus 8, 10, 15, 16, 33, 34, 35, 80, 82, 89, 97, 171, 179, 200
 Erastianism 4, 44, 46, 59–60, 95–112, 114, 150, 156–60, 164, 179, 185, 199, 231, 235, 242–5, 248, 249
 Erastus, Thomas 60, 157, 179
 Etheridge, George 116
 Eucharist 9, 11, 13, 21, 23, 25, 28–31, 46, 55, 70, 73, 75–7, 81, 89, 91–3, 95, 122–4, 126, 129–34,

- 136–47, 149, 150, 152, 154, 161,
177, 178, 211, 219, 221, 229, 235,
241, 243, 251
Eusebius 106, 126, 219, 222, 230
- Featley, Daniel 2, 228, 229
Fekenham, John 62, 116, 150, 152
Ferdinand I Habsburg 49, 100
Fetherstone, Richard 208
Ficino, Marsiglius 15
Fisher, John b. of Rochester 10, 11,
14, 87, 208
Fitzjames, Richard b. of London 8,
11
Flacius Illyricus, Matthias 166, 167,
171
Flaminio, Marcantonio 22
Fleet prison 37, 35
Folkerzheimer, Herman 216–18
Fowler, John 118, 119
Foxe, John 51, 62, 64, 210, 229
Foxe, Richard b. of Winchester 10,
11, 32
France 16, 37, 48, 49, 53, 57, 85, 86,
88, 90, 93, 104, 158, 179, 181, 182,
194, 216, 217
Francis I 19, 48, 49
Frankfurt 2, 25, 40–46, 50, 52, 264,
174, 180, 181, 184, 186, 188, 191,
235, 247
Frankfurt, Council of 85, 94, 177
Froude, Hurrell 3, 231
Fulke, William 94, 232, 248
- Garbrand, John (née Herks) 114,
142–3, 220, 223, 228
Gardiner, Stephen b. of Winchester
14, 18, 19, 20, 23, 30, 31, 47, 53,
59, 126, 129, 208, 219
Garrett, Christina 43, 44, 45, 235
Geneva 40–46, 51, 52, 60, 112, 157,
160, 178–82, 189, 193, 197, 235–8,
242, 243, 245, 248
Gerson, Jean 80, 101, 102
Gilby, Anthony 42
Glycerium (*Girl from Andros*) 37, 177
Goldwell, Thomas (b. of St. Asaph)
116, 118
Goodall, John 206
Goodman, Christopher 43, 44, 51,
180, 181, 188, 190, 191
- Gratian 86, 106
Gratius, Ortvinus 33
Grindal, Edmund 51, 59, 62, 68, 106,
127, 163, 172, 185, 210, 25, 47,
232, 247
Gregory VII (Hildebrand) 110, 111
Gregory Nyssa, St 141
Gregory of Tours 69
Gregory I the Great 104, 146
Grey, Lady Jane 36, 41
Gualter, Rudolph 60, 179, 196, 215,
226, 247
Guest, Edmund (Gheast) b. of
Rochester and Salisbury 39, 61, 168,
171
- Harding, Thomas 7, 29, 59, 65, 66,
71, 73–9, 82–7, 94, 95, 111, 112,
115, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123,
125–31, 133–35, 138–41, 143, 144,
146, 149, 154, 159, 171, 173, 176,
177, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 193,
194, 207, 208, 219, 227, 235, 242,
244, 245, 153
Harpfield, John 62
Haugaard, William 241
Heath, Nicholas ab. of York 31, 54,
116
Henry III 205
Henry VI 204
Henry VII 14
Henry VIII 4, 9, 11–24, 29, 30, 31,
38, 47, 59, 82, 101, 105, 116, 125,
157, 166, 171, 186, 192, 205, 206,
207, 212
Henry III (Germany) 109
Henry IV (Germany) 90, 111
Hereford 25, 87, 170
Heskyns, Thomas 117, 122, 208
Hilary of Poitiers, St 82, 141, 143,
144
Honorius 106
Hoake, Dale 194
Horne, Robert b. of Winchester 25,
47, 62, 63, 88, 116, 119, 121, 150,
152, 153, 164, 196
Hooker, Richard 2, 57, 217, 218,
230, 234
Hooper, John b. of Gloucester and
Worcester 25, 137, 142, 162, 163,
166, 167, 172, 174, 184, 188, 228,

- 232
 Howard, Henry, earl of Surrey 19
 Howard, Thomas, duke of Norfolk
 19, 208
 Huick, John 9
 Humphrey, Laurence 2, 4, 7, 10, 11,
 19, 22, 24, 26, 32, 35, 38, 39, 42,
 43, 47, 48, 51, 168–9, 171, 174,
 178, 184, 187, 192, 218, 219,
 225–8, 232–3, 237
 Hutten, Ulrich von 33
- Images or icons 8, 68, 69, 70, 84,
 118, 120, 122, 125–9, 133, 152,
 177, 206, 210, 211, 215, 221, 222,
 251
- Innocent III 152
- James I 216, 228, 242
 Jelf, William 3, 231, 232
 Jerome, St 66, 82, 104, 131, 132,
 138, 139, 171, 222
 Jewel, John b. of Salisbury
 Birth 6
 Schooling 6–7
 higher education, 7–13, 25–36
 ordained, 13, 24
 apostasy, 36–9, 42–3
 exile, 38–52
 in Frankfurt, 40–46
 in Zurich, 46–52
 at Padua, 47–8, 96
 returns to England, 51–54
 Challenge Sermon, 57, 67, 70,
 73–7, 84, 88, 95, 171, 235, 249,
 251–2
Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 6,
 57, 58, 73, 85–95, 96, 98, 105,
 112, 115, 133, 138, 152, 156,
 158, 161, 162, 170, 171, 176,
 177, 186, 187, 220, 229, 234,
 235, 244, 247
Epistola, 57, 85–95, 96, 160, 162,
 170, 183, 186, 188, 198, 244
Epistola ad Scipionem, 47, 48, 57,
 95–112
 View of a Seditious Bull, 57,
 96–112, 159, 192, 235
 election and consecration as
 bishop, 208, 214
 life at Salisbury, 208–24
- death, 201, 225
 posthumous reputation, 226–41
 John A' Lasco, *see* Lasco, John A'
 John of Salisbury 94, 176
 Josiah 157, 246
 Julian (the Apostate) 43
 Justinian 95, 98, 172, 246
- Keble, John 230, 231
 Kempis, Thomas A' 80, 97
 Knox, John 2, 25, 31, 41–45, 164,
 180, 181, 183, 184, 188–95, 235,
 242, 243, 245
- Laet, John 119
 Lake, Peter 237
 Lasco, John A' 21, 25, 40, 167–8,
 171
 Latimer, Hugh 1, 9, 38, 39, 40, 46,
 60, 208, 232
 Laud, William ab. of Canterbury 3,
 229, 230, 242, 247, 248
 Le Bas, Charles Webb 4, 232
 Leo I the Great 95, 136
 Leo IX (Bruno of Toul) 109
 Leo X 16
 Lever, Thomas 41
 Levy, F. J. 244
 Liturgy 20, 25, 28, 31, 41, 42, 44,
 45, 63, 87, 124, 125, 169, 170, 171,
 188, 191, 203
 of St James 78, 124, 171
 of St John Chrysostom 78, 171
 of St Basil 78, 171
- Loades, David 53
 Lollards 8, 207
 Louvain 30, 39, 40, 59, 117, 118,
 119, 121, 130, 186, 208
 Luther, Martin 10, 17, 18, 22,
 30, 60, 79, 80, 82, 90, 97, 98,
 110, 112, 113, 126, 132, 153,
 165, 166, 190, 193, 207,
 239
- Machyn, Henry 70
 MaDowell, John 206
 Mallet, Francis 207
 Marshall, Richard 38, 39
 Marsiglius of Padua 18, 101
 Martin de Magistris 133, 134
 Mary, the blessed Virgin 91, 106,

- 124, 127, 131, 148, 230
 Mary I 9, 20, 25, 26, 30, 34, 36, 37, 40, 44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 60, 61, 107, 116, 117, 157, 159, 160, 179, 180, 192, 194, 206, 207, 210, 214, 216, 228, 243
 Mary of Guise 180, 190, 191
 Mary Queen of Scots 19, 191
 Maurice of Saxony 49
 Maurice I (Byzantine emperor) 100, 246
 Melanchthon, Philip 165–7, 180
 monasticism 17–19, 20, 33, 79–82, 109–11, 171
 Montagu, Richard 100, 239, 242
 More, Thomas 8, 10, 14, 16, 118
 Moses 105, 161, 200, 221, 246
 Musculus, Wolfgang 42, 190, 238
- Neale, Sir John 44, 45, 235
 Newman, John Henry cardinal 3, 72, 79, 231, 232
 Nicaea, council of (325) 65, 98, 100
 council of (787) 128, 177
 Nicholas Cusanus 80, 82, 83, 84, 220–22
 Nicholas of Lyra 200
 Nowell, Alexander 47, 163, 227
- Ochino, Bernardino 21, 22, 25, 30, 176, 193
 Oglethorpe, Owen (b. of Carlisle) 61, 62
 Osmund, St 203, 206
 Oxford University 6, 7–13, 15–16, 19–26, 32–9, 47, 50, 55, 59–62, 71, 107, 116, 117, 133, 142, 176, 178, 190, 192, 194, 207, 208, 217–19, 225, 226, 230, 237, 244, 247
 All Souls College 118
 Corpus Christi College 10, 11, 19, 24, 32, 33, 35, 37, 60, 61, 114, 190, 218, 228
 Christ Church (Cardinal) 9, 24, 30, 37, 38, 39, 168, 228, 233
 Magdalen College 9, 10, 11, 24, 168, 187, 219, 220, 226, 228, 233
 Merton College 7–12, 19, 30, 33, 233
 New College 7, 117, 118, 119
- Padua 21, 47, 48, 96, 101
 Parker, Matthew (ab. of Canterbury) 4, 12, 39, 47, 55, 67, 68, 69, 85, 118, 163, 164, 169, 173, 174, 185, 186, 187, 118, 209, 210, 211, 225, 226, 227, 233, 234
 Parker Society 3, 6, 47, 59, 74, 86, 199, 223, 232
 Parkhurst, John 9–13, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 37, 38, 46, 51, 66, 164, 177, 190, 214, 225, 226, 227, 232
 Parr, Catherine 12, 13, 177
 Paul, St 58, 63, 91, 100, 130, 133, 137, 145, 168, 200
 Paul IV 53, 117, 207
 Paul's Cross (*see also* St Paul's Cathedral) 26, 32, 36, 55, 70, 71, 197, 220, 225, 253
 Peace of Augsburg 49, 92, 96, 178
 Perne, Andrew 25, 61
 Peto, Peter 207
 Petrarch 89
 Philip II 48, 53, 107, 117, 118
 Pico della Mirandola 15
 Pighius, Albertus 91, 239
 Pilkington, James 47
 Pius II (Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini) 84, 222
 Pius V 57, 96, 97, 104, 105, 107, 117, 192, 219, 245
 Poissy, Colloquy of 86, 181, 182, 183
 Pole, Reginald cardinal, ab. of Canterbury 40, 54, 207
 Ponet, John 25, 41, 148, 190, 191
 Powell, Edmund 207, 208
 Predestination 237–9, 244, 249
 Presbyterians, Presbyterianism 2, 51, 137, 159, 160, 174, 180, 188, 189, 195–99, 216, 225, 236, 247, 248
 Primus, J.H. 162, 163, 168
 Puritans, Puritanism 43, 44, 112, 116, 137, 156–201, 225, 228, 233, 235, 236, 237, 244, 245, 246, 248
 Pusey, E.B. 3, 231
- Rainolds, John 114, 228
 Randolph, Thomas 37, 38, 190
 Rastell, John 77, 124, 125, 129, 120, 131, 132, 137–41, 149, 153, 200
 Ratcliff, E.C. 146
 Reuchlin, Johann 33

- Rex, Richard 17, 18
 Ridley, Nicholas, b. of London 1, 9, 13, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 40, 46, 60, 62, 116, 126, 163, 166, 167, 232
 Rochester 7, 8, 14, 25, 61, 168, 190, 206
 St. Mary the Virgin Church, Oxford 24, 26, 32
 St. Paul's Cathedral 8, 15, 62, 71
 Salisbury 1, 59, 65, 66, 67, 71, 87, 88, 100, 112, 117, 118, 168, 169, 170, 175, 187, 203, 253
 cathedral chapter 203–5, 207, 208–10, 211–13, 215
 Sampson, Thomas 32, 65, 66, 68, 69, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 178, 184, 214, 233, 237
 Sander, Nicholas 64, 115, 118, 122, 128, 129, 139, 144–8, 152, 154
 Sandys, Edwin b. of London 4, 47, 52, 54, 62, 225, 226
 Scotland 25, 30, 37, 180, 190, 191, 194
 Scott, Cuthbert b. of Chester 61, 62
 Scory, John 25, 39, 41, 62, 117, 163
 Sedgwick, Thomas 116
 Servetus, Michael 180, 193
 Seymour, Edward 12, 14
 Seymour, Thomas 12, 177
 Sharpe, Gervase 212
 Shaxton, Nicholas b. of Salisbury 205, 206, 207, 210, 212
 Simler, Josiah 12, 60, 175, 216
 Smith, Richard 9, 22, 30, 39, 40, 116, 118, 133
 Smythe, Thomas 211–13
 Socrates (church historian) 219
 Southgate, Wyndham 3, 43, 48, 70, 195, 196, 197, 199, 209, 211, 233, 234, 235, 239, 244, 248
 Sozomen 219
 Stapleton, Thomas 115, 118–23, 136, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, 248
 Strasbourg 12, 13, 21, 22, 29, 30, 40, 42, 45, 48, 51, 52, 54, 92, 178, 180, 237
 Strype, John 38, 68
 Sunningwell 24, 26, 61
 Sylvester I 83
 Tellenbach, Gerd 108–10
 Terence 37, 177
 Thomas Aquinas, St 87, 135, 214
 Thomas A'Becket, *see* Becket, Thomas A'
 Thomas A' Kempis, *see* Kempis, Thomas A'
 Throckmorton, Sir Nicholas 36, 40, 86, 88, 182
 Tresham, William 9, 30
 Trinterud 114, 166
 Tunstall, Cuthbert 18, 31
 Tyacke, Nicholas 162, 236–8, 242
 Tyndale, William 10, 17, 18
 ubiquitarianism 31, 75, 76, 79, 92, 161
 Ulmis, John 30, 164
 Unitarianism, 189, 193
 Valdés, Juan 22
 Valentinian 106
 Valla, Lorenzo 15, 83, 245
 Vaughan, Edward 126
 Vendeville, Jean 121
 Verkamp, Bernard 162
 Vermigli, Peter Martyr 1, 4, 9, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 42, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59–62, 64–8, 76, 77, 79, 88, 89, 92, 96, 113, 117, 133, 135, 139, 140, 142, 155, 156, 157, 160, 161, 162, 171, 172, 173, 175–9, 180, 183, 190, 193, 194, 209, 215, 217, 219, 227, 234, 237, 242, 249, 250
 vestments 4, 66, 67, 70, 86, 87, 126, 156, 157, 162–79, 184, 186–8, 197, 210, 226, 231–3, 236, 243, 245, 249
 Vincent of Lerins, St 90, 113
 Viret, Peter 42
 Virgil 161
 Walter de Merton 7
 Watson, Thomas (b. of Lincoln) 61, 62, 64, 116
 Westminster Abbey 8, 25, 57, 62, 63, 116, 153, 164, 168, 173, 199
 White, Peter 236, 238, 239, 240, 245, 248, 249
 White, John, b. of Winchester 52, 54, 61, 64

- White, William 198
Whitgift, John, b. of London and ab.
of Canterbury 1, 172, 199, 232,
237, 248, 249
Wilcox, Thomas 198
Winchester 10, 14, 25, 52, 116, 118,
119, 150, 203
Winchester, school 118, 119
Wittingham, William 41–5
Wolsey, Thomas cardinal, ab. of York
8, 16, 30
Wyatt, James 204, 215
Wyatt, Thomas 36
Wyclif, John 8, 98, 233
Zanchius, Jerome 2, 238
Zurich 1, 2, 4, 12, 21, 22, 29, 41, 43,
47–51, 56, 59, 60, 89, 93, 114, 145,
155–60, 162, 164, 166, 168, 169,
172, 175–9, 180, 181–3, 187,
193–213, 216, 217, 219, 226, 232,
235, 237, 238, 241, 242, 247, 248,
249
Zwickenfelders 193
Zwingli, Ulrich 3, 10, 29, 31, 79,
139, 142