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ABSTRACT

This study seeks to trace the development of English Protestant literature from the time when evangelical books were first allowed to be published in England up till the death of Henry VIII in 1547. Polemic is understood less as a literary genre in its own right as a matter of intent and approach on the part of individual authors. The work thus involves a consideration of a wide variety of literary works including devotional and exegetical material.

Chapters 2 - 6 seek to examine the Protestant books that were brought out in England during the administration of Thomas Cromwell. Protestant writings were initially tolerated because their anti-papal and pro-monarchical sentiments complemented the policies of Henry VIII. In chapters 3 and 4 the work considers the relationship between Protestant ideas and other reformist currents in England, in particular those of Erasmian humanism and government apologetic. In chapter 5 through consideration of the work of two Protestant translators William Marshall and Miles Coverdale, it is shown how Protestant notions of salvation could be fused with an Erasmian emphasis on a reformation or morals. Chapter 6 continues to explore the interaction between Protestantism and government policy by examining the evangelical beliefs of Cromwell's official apologists and the works of unofficial writers. Between 1534 and 1540 English Protestants were heavily influenced by the direction of government policy. Most Protestant writers simply accepted Henry's supremacy of the church as a matter of fact and most sought to complement the government's religious reforms by attacking the same targets of government policy.

Chapters 7 and 8 examine the Protestant literature which
followed the reaction of 1539/40. Although some writers such as Thomas Becon continued to operate in England most Protestants were forced to flee overseas. In exile they developed more radical ideas on the Mass and on clerical celibacy which were of importance to the later reforms of Edward VI.

Through consideration of the relationship between Protestant writing and the progress of reform and reaction in England the study seeks to present a more realistic appraisal of the diversity and eclecticism of English Protestant theology in its early stages of development.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
Whatever the long term consequences, Henry VIII's break with Rome had at least one immediate effect upon the development of English Protestant literature. Following the anti-papal legislation of the Reformation Parliament of 1533, and the removal of Thomas More, the principal defender of traditional belief, Protestant books for the first time came to be openly printed in London. Previously prohibited, and their authors forced into exile, Protestant writing from around 1534 began to make its own contribution to reforming ideas in England as part of a sudden outburst of intellectual activity. Exiles returned to take up political and pastoral roles, printers vied with one another for the right to bring out particular books, and a new generation of writers and translators emerged dedicated to the cause of evangelical reform. Protestant ideas, if not officially accepted, had at least become acceptable to those authorities who now yielded power. For Protestant writers, Pharaoh had fallen; the people of the book had been liberated, given by God a little space to breathe and rest after a long and grievous persecution. 

An investigation of the Protestant writings which followed the break with Rome is, in large part, a study of the effects of the new climate of tolerance upon the theologies and arguments of the reformers. More particularly, it is an examination of how ideas and techniques which for the most part had been articulated and developed outside England, came to be applied to shifting political and religious circumstances within the realm. English Protestant theology was in no sense the offspring of the break with Rome, no more than it was simply a
transplanted growth of the European continent. Many of the theological ideas which found their way into the treatises, expositions, sermons and liturgical writings which were printed in England had originated in the books of the early Protestant exiles. If, as D.B. Knox affirms, the leading ideas of the English Reformation had been clearly and vividly espoused and propagated by native theologians in England before the close of Henry's reign,\(^2\) it can be more confidently asserted that the principal composers of those ideas were England's earliest Protestants. The exiles stamped English Protestantism with its own emphases and character, a concern for morality as the clue to theology and the core of religion.\(^3\) In the writings of Tyndale, Barnes, Joyes and Frith, many of the salient features of English Protestantism can be located. Thus, the starting point of any examination of Protestant writing in England must be the literature of England's first Protestants.

For later polemicists both the subject matter and the criteria of religious debate had been determined by the early exiles. Above all, the refugees firmly established the primacy of scripture as authority in matters of the faith. The first published book of the exiles was Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. With this initial work Catholic defences in England against the tide of the new heresy were completely swept away. The Bible was immediately established as a rival authority to Rome. The institutionalised channels of authority ultimately leading to the papacy, were simply bi-passed by a direct appeal to the Scriptures - the source of all authority.
Early English Protestantism rejected the exegetical power and privileges of the clergy, in advancing the notion of the layman's right to interpret the scriptures for himself. Following Tyndale's work, the cause of the Bible in English was proclaimed as both illumination and exposure of historical and contemporary ecclesiastical corruption, and as the sole standard for the assessment of religious truth. "The Word is the judge that must examine the matter, the perfect touchstone that trieth all things, a day that discloseth all juggling mists." In a single instance the exiles determined the precise course of the entire Reformation debate in England and brought it to a head with a relentlessly comprehensive attack on the credibility of the Roman Church, in accordance with the standards they had set, standards which were simply taken from the books of the Old and New Testaments.

In their assault on the Roman church, the exiles made a second lasting contribution to Protestant literature, with their use of secular and ecclesiastical history. Originally put forward to counter accusations that Protestantism was an innovation that threatened to undermine the existing social and religious order, the argument from history became one of the most important of polemical techniques. In the works of Tyndale and Barnes, history was used to paint a popular picture of Catholicism as a conspiratorial power which represented the greatest threat to the material and spiritual welfare of the English people. The present religious crisis was given vital historical depth. Historical methods underwent a necessary transformation as history took on an essentially maleable character. Traditional sources were rejected in
advance as clerically corrupt, a further stage in the attack on ecclesiastical monopolies. The relevant of contemporary English events was highlighted by the illuminating glare of the past.

In the appeal to scripture and in the emphasis on history, the exiles determined the principal arguments of English polemical literature. Their influence, however, was not simply confined to internal affairs, to the subject matter of debate. Indeed, the most telling contribution of the exiles to Protestant writing in England has to do with the form of their writing rather than with its content. Between 1525 and Henry's break with Rome, England's earliest Protestants created a new language of persuasion, one which was far removed from more traditional forms of religious expression. To be effective language had to be "laicised". In the exiles' works theology was moved out of the universities and law courts and into the market place, the court of public opinion. Polemicists altered their style and their arguments in an endeavour to gain the attention of the populace. Protestants developed innovative methods for the communication of what they saw as traditional truths. In so doing, the exiles supplied English literature with its first effective propaganda; a sustained literary campaign which supplanted traditional channels of debate. Henceforth, it was believed that the victory of the Reformation could be decided quite simply be whether or not its leaders knew how to put across its theological content to the people. A new audience was created, a lay readership for whom theological issues were both novel and appealing.

By as early as 1520 Catholic authorities in England were
forced to acknowledge the danger of reforming books. Within months of the publication of the papal bull *Exsurge Domine*, Luther's works were prohibited in England. By 1528 the authorities were compelled to turn their attention to the books of English reformers. In a letter to Thomas More, Bishop Tunstall of London emphasised the problem of heretics "causing (their) books to be imprinted and brought in great number into this realm". A small faction of heretics brought out the full potential and danger of the new technology of printing to a realm that lay in unsuspecting vulnerability. The press was transformed from a passive agent, a mechanised scribe, into a revolutionary instrument of political influence and ecclesiastical and social subversion. In the forty or so editions that the exiles brought out between 1525 and 1535, the printing press was established as the crucial agent of propaganda and persuasion, an agent, moreover, which operated independently of the checks or restraints of political authority.

In the long run, the exiles' provision of printed vernacular polemics may well be their greatest achievement. Subsequent propaganda campaigns were indebted to the initial work of these Protestant refugees. More particularly, the exiles determined for many years to come that religious writing in England would necessarily involve the discussion of controversial issues. The new market for printed religious books, which they helped to create, was henceforth characterised by its insatiable appetite for controversy. In his *The Congregationalism of the Last Three hundred Years*, H.M. Dexter was able to identify no less than seven thousand two hundred and fifty controversial books
chronologically arranged from 1546 to 1879. Of sources prior to 1661 Dexter listed a total of one thousand eight hundred and sixty seven. Of more limited scope, but of more pertinence, Peter Milward's *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age* operates with six hundred and twenty titles and a total of two hundred and forty three authors. Moreover, out of a total of three hundred and ninety four books printed in English during the Protectorate of the Duke of Somerset, two hundred and seventy four dealt with religion. Of these, one hundred and sixty espoused controversial doctrines. More importantly, all but one of these works came from Protestant authors. During Mary's reign over eighty pamphlets were brought out by exiled Protestants in comparison with only a handful of official Catholic statements. From the days of the earliest exiles the printing of religious books in England was dominated by Protestant polemics. Furthermore, these very works played the key role in the creation of a fresh demand in the minds of the already literate, thereby stimulating other literary forms. Traditional modes of communication were given fresh direction and impetus by the addition or distillation of controversial religious ideas and new techniques. Many of the changes and developments which took place in the language and literature of Tudor England can be traced to the work of the first Protestants.

However much historians have acknowledged the importance of printed controversial literature, detailed analysis of the processes involved in polemical writing is still in its infancy. The small amount of work that has been done has been directed
to the numerically insignificant controversial literature of Catholicism, studies which have largely focused on the career of Thomas More. Some of this work is, nonetheless, of value to the study of Protestant literature, if only by default, in clarifying how Protestant controversial writing differed from that produced by the defenders of traditional belief.

According to J.M. Headley, the distinctive features of Catholic Reformation polemic can be located in the development of a new type, outlook and method; quantitative and qualitative factors which differentiate sixteenth century polemic from Patristic and Scholastic writing. Modifications in educational patterns, coupled with "the changed circumstances in which the Church found itself", led to the emergence, "on the part of the great Church of traditional belief", of a polemical stance, "a controversialist literature expressive of its total rejection of heresy". In practice, controversialists assumed the method of sustained verbatim quotation of the particular work of a given opponent. Abbreviation and summary, recognizable features of both patristic and scholastic polemics, were discarded in favour of a rigid inflexible adherence to the full text of the heretic or schismatic. Patristic controversies, of which Origen's reply to Celsus is perhaps the best known example, relied on a method of discrimination as the means of arriving at the central issues of the debate. The "quaestio" method of the schoolmen - the isolation of a text, and the systematic break-down of its arguments into manageable proportions - did not necessitate the entire quotation of the opponent's work.

At the basis of Reformation polemics Headley marked the shift
from selective to verbatim quotation in terms of a fundamentally new understanding on the part of the Catholic Church's defenders, of their own role and of the person of their opponents. The "two arms of controversy", apologetic and polemic, were thus defined: "While apologetic directs itself to the non-Christian, the outsider and the infidel, and therefore must defend and present convincingly to an alien audience the Christian God, ethos, and world view, polemic is directed against the enemy within, to the heretic, schismatic, and doctrinal opponent. Hence the issue is not the total presentation of Christian religion, but rather the defense of certain specific doctrines". 20

Headley's view brings out an important feature of polemic, namely that it has only limited aims, whether in reputation of an opinion, custom, or person. Nonetheless, his proposed contextual approach to the matter is adequate only in terms of the Catholic controversial literature that he discussed. Protestant controversial writers seldom adopted the method of verbatim quotation. Moreover, Protestant polemics had far greater purport and intent than the mere defence of certain specific doctrines. Indeed, it may be said that the term Protestant polemic has no significance in terms of Headley's strategy of counter-action but that it applies to the very opposite: an offensive, crusading mentality that finds concrete expression in a wholesale attack on an alien anti-Christian system. Tyndale's phrase that "it is impossible to preach Christ except thou preach against Anti-christ", 21 conveys the essential component of early Protestant polemics, that they are, a priori, confrontational; born out of dissidence and nurtured
in enmity. Defence and explanation form no part of the polemicist's vocation.

Alan Richardson's definition of Christian apologetics as being concerned with the validity of theological language, provides fresh insight into this particular category of religious literature. Both polemic and apologetic operate within the context of the debate over the meaning and significance of religious interlocution. Both must find expression in the thought-forms of the day, and are associated therefore, in the first instance, with the applicability of traditional theological discourse to the contemporary situation and, secondly, with the appropriate use of current linguistic practices in the religious dimension. The dissemination of religious literature in the vernacular in Tudor England gives peculiar cogency to Richardson's views.

The most incisive analysis of polemic has been provided by Louis A. Schuster. For him, polemic is by nature a divisive process; one that proceeds dialectically whilst "operating on a problematic of exclusiveness". Its starting point is a "pre-emption of positions". Positions which, once uprooted from their original context, are polarised by the polemical process and are set in opposition and pitted against each other. "In the course of this dissolution and arraignment of hitherto complementary principles, the positions of each become exaggerated and, in the exaggeration, the tension of equilibrium is lost. The radical depth of truth in which they flourish is sacrificed to a restructuring of positions with an orientation towards militancy. In other words, these positions, like dogmatic
pronouncements, are structured under the pressures of particular antitheses that are seen as threatening.\textsuperscript{25}

Schuster's account of the polemical process helps to clarify the contradistinction between it and apologetic. While polemic can exist apart from interpersonal controversy, it nevertheless requires a basis of integrated presuppositions, whether they are present in institutional or structural form, or in the intellectual complexion of the individual, in order for the dialectic to take effect.

Unlike apologetic, polemic is a process that develops according to the interplay of opposites, the clash of extremes; one that seeks total agreement or destruction in preference to understanding or tolerance. The two operate with fundamentally different modes of intent. One is holistic, aiming to present the complete; the other is disjunctive, seeking the fragmentation of the whole and the retention of the essential. For that reason, confessional standpoints are invariably related to polemics; polarization having the unfortunate tendency to result in schism. That is not to say however, that apologetic belongs to the realm of comparative religion and polemic to a denominational setting (a misunderstanding to which Headley comes dangerously close) for this would involve imposing categories upon the two processes which are anachronistic. The polemicists of both ecclesiastical standpoints in the sixteenth century would be in agreement with each other in maintaining that they were dealing not with a lapsed Christian brother but with something far more dangerous. In short, they saw the other as a non-Christian, an infidel, equivalent to the Jew and the
Turk. Catholic and Protestant polemicists represented far more than the contrapositioning of ecclesiastical standpoints, but were the advocates of two mutually exclusive systems of soteriology.

In this study the terms polemic and apologetic are used in line with Scuster's analysis. Polemic is considered as having less to do with details of disputation, details which, for the most part, are no more than the actual techniques of controversial writing, than with the question of intent and approach. Accordingly, it is immediately apparent that polemical writing cannot be regarded as single literary genre in its own right. Controversial techniques and opinions can be discovered in a profusion of literary forms, ranging from works of biblical translation and exegesis, to works of a pastoral, devotional, historical dramatic, poetic and even legal nature, and examples of each literary genre can be analysed from the point of view of the polemical processes involved in their composition. The literature of polemic is both vast and diverse. It should, however, be recognised that the polemics do share common characteristics and that their processes and confines are open to detailed investigation, whether they exist within the limits of dialogue and debate, or in the doubts and troubles of individual conscience.

Whilst the study of the processes involved in polemic is still in its infancy, investigation of the literature of polemic has itself yet to reach maturity. For the most part, English Protestant polemics have only been examined when they appeared
as the product of religious and political dissidents; when, in short, the polemicist saw himself in conflict with the established order of the day. The exilic books of the early refugees and the Marian Protestants have received far greater attention than the works of the native writers of the reign of Edward VI and those books produced in England from 1534 to 1540.26 In general, individual books have only been regarded as proper objects of historical enquiry when they transcend their self-imposed limits of offensive intent and acquire, as in the case of Tyndale's Obedience of a Christian Man, some form of political significance. Similarly, works of literary inventiveness, such as More's A Dialogue concerning heresyes, or Tyndale's New Testament, have been as well scrutinised as they have been copiously praised. Admiration, however, cannot serve as a fountainhead for the study of the vast majority of Reformation polemical writings. Alongside a handful of important, influential treatises, there exists a voluminous mass of material which is of little political value and doubtful literary quality. Controversial writing may attract a Tyndale, a More, a Hooker, a Donne, and a Milton, but they fill the eyes as lush plateaux overlooking a stony barren land where Marshall, Becon, Joye, Brinkelow, and Bale have dominion. The controversial literature of the sixteenth century has received from C.S. Lewis the unfortunate label, "drab age prose", 27 and more than one scholar has claimed that polemical works, often of indelicate plebeian stamp, have prevented early Tudor prose from being adequately examined. 28 Among historians of religious writing polemics have often been regarded as peripheral to the main
currents of literature. C.C. Butterworth's account of the work of George Joye is very much representative of this type of outlook. Out of a total of over two hundred and fifty pages, only a mere thirteen are devoted to Joye's polemics against the Bishop of Winchester. Similarly, J.F. Mozley's account of Miles Coverdale reserves discussion of the many books which Coverdale brought out between 1535 and 1540 for an appendix. By implication the polemical writing of Protestants is seen as of secondary import to their work as translators, exegetes, politicians or dramatists.

For the period which followed Henry's break with Rome few attempts have been made to investigate Protestant literature, inspite of the fact that the new political circumstances had a decisive impact upon the development of reformed thought. For some historians the unofficial literature of the reform has only a tangential relationship to the history of the political actions of the Henrician Reformation. For others Protestant writing is seen as largely peripheral even to the reformist literature. According to G.R. Elton, for example, under the direction of Thomas Cromwell the production of religious and political writing turned from controversy to constructive thought. Many Protestant books were not concerned with political questions or with issues of social reform. Their historical importance is therefore minimal. In recent years many historians have sought to direct attention away from the often arid propaganda of Protestant and Catholic theologians and onto the more attractive writings of English humanists.
the theology of the English Reformation on the basis of their investigation of humanist works, it is necessary to give a brief outline of one of the most important and influential of these studies.

According to J.K. McConica's *English Humanists and Reformation Politics*, both the popular and intellectual basis for the English Reformation under Henry VIII was supplied by Erasmian humanists. Through the influence of Thomas Cromwell the English humanist community was called to the support of government policy. Erasmus's own concerns with evangelical doctrine, based upon a historical study of the scriptures, coupled with his recognition of the importance of remaining within the central tradition, supplied the ideological framework upon which the Henrician reformation was built. "In the five year interval defined by the executions of More and Cromwell, the Henrician commonwealth had been given a definite character. It was an Erasmian policy, a capricious mansion which could contain most opinions except the extremes of Protestantism and a rooted attachment to Rome".33 "The media via of the Henrician settlement was to many not simply a compromise, but the fulfilment of a positive tradition rooted in the cause of Erasmian reform". Moreover, for McConica, the humanist community in England survived the death of its principal architect Thomas Cromwell. In the works of the humanists surrounding Catherine Parr, the perpetuation of Erasmian patronage exerted meritorious influence on both court and letters.34 The activities of this circle provided the continuity between the Henrician reformation and the religious settlement of the reign of Edward VI, a reign, moreover, during
which Erasmian ideas continued to exert influence. McConica’s thesis is of importance for several reasons. Firstly, McConica greatly advanced historical understanding of a wide group of scholars, of their aims and beliefs, and of the ways by which their ideas were propagated. Secondly, in investigating the writings of this group, McConica’s study shed light on the interaction between humanism and the political reforms of Henry’s reign. His view of the Henrician reforms as a policy which essentially amounted to an "official Erasmianism", shattered historians’ attempts to distinguish between the process of England’s evangelisation and the official acts of Church and State. For McConica, the notion of the "two English Reformations" was no more than a fabrication, a redundant formula which ignored the relations between the literature of reform and the policy of the government. In McConica’s view, both the official reformation carried out by the Crown and Parliament, and the reforming treatises which were put out during the 1530s, can be explained as part of a single process, the acceptance of Erasmian ideas of reform. Erasmianism had come to replace Erastianism, the view that the Reformation in England was an act of state.

Though of considerable merit, McConica's thesis is not without fault. In the first instance, his attempt to accommodate virtually every piece of social, religious and political writing in England under the banner of Erasmianism serves to obscure a number of profound ideological differences within the literature of the 1530s and 40s. Under examination McConica’s concept of Erasmianism proves to be a many headed beast, one which
includes, on the one hand, the thought of stern Catholic defenders such as More and Fisher, and, on the other, Protestant reformers such as Melanchthon and Tyndale. Confessional differences, which were regarded by the participants involved as crucial, are almost completely overlooked. Secondly, McConica's emphasis on the contribution of the humanist community to the ideology of the English reformation ignores the significance of ideas which emerged in other intellectual groupings. Writers who, unlike Tyndale, cannot be ensconsed in the Erasmian stronghold, are ignored, no matter how prolific or popular their works may have been. In England the words of refugees such as Turner, Bale and Joye are seen as too radical to have been of much importance and too few in number to receive attention. In examining the literature which followed Cromwell's fall McConica's emphasis on the activities of the Catherine Parr circle ultimately distorts. A quite massive body of Protestant writing, produced largely in exile, which sought to emphasise the very discontinuity of events in England, the shift from reaction to tolerance and the lurch back to persecution; a body of literature which was produced by reformers who would exert considerable influence as bishops and scholars during Edward's reign, received no consideration whatsoever. By contrast a handful of humanist tracts were seen as providing the continuity between the reforms of Henry VIII and the settlement of Edward VI.

Possibly the most damning criticism of McConica's argument, however, is that his view of the Henrician reform as an essentially Erasmian polity overlooks the fact that it was not
thus regarded by many of the participants involved. Whilst many scholars may have been attracted to Henry's policies because he seemed to preserve what many felt to be the essentials of Catholic orthodoxy, many were attracted to those same policies because they believed that they would result in the complete destruction of the doctrine and practices of Catholicism in England and the establishment of a purified church along reformed patterns or worship and belief. The task of the historian is not simply to account for what eventually happened but is to attempt to understand problems and situations in the way that they were seen by contemporaries. For many writers of the 1530s and 1540s, McConica's notion of Erasmianism bore no relation to their perception of the policies of Henry's reign.

That notwithstanding, McConica's work raises a good many questions which must be asked in any examination of Protestant literature in the period which followed Henry's break with Rome. In the first place, as a result of his emphasis on the literary achievement of Erasmian humanists, it is necessary to assess precisely how many Protestant books were actually brought out. Was the production of Protestant work quantitatively significant in the period which followed the exiles' propaganda campaign? Secondly, McConica's work has made the task of attempting to label or to define the moral and spiritual crosscurrents of the early reformation in England more important than ever. No longer is it possible to examine English Protestant literature as merely a manifestation of Lutheranism. According to J.K. Yost, not only was there never any unified movement of Erasmian
reform in the Reformation as a whole, that there did not
develop in England any strictly Lutheran movement.41
Protestant writers were, from the first, an extraordinarily
disparate group, emerging out of several English traditions
and institutions, capable of espousing radically different
theological positions.42 Even those united by similar
experiences or by common propagandistic aims belonged to no
structural organization. Thomas More's belief in a Lutheran
conspiracy, whereby Protestant writers combined to launch an
organised attack on the Catholic Church and its adherents, was
no more than a figment of his own imagination.43 Later English
Protestantism can no more be characterised as Lutheran than
Erasmian humanism can be hailed as papist.

Thus a crucial task of this analysis of Protestant polemic
is to investigate the precise theologies of particular authors;
to examine the influences at work in specific writings. To
do so it is necessary to look at particular books in some detail.
When closely examined, what conclusions can be drawn concerning
the nature of Protestant theology in England?

A third area of investigation concerns the interplay between
Protestant ideas and other reformist currents. Suspicion of
McConica's antithesis between Lutheranism and Erasmianism
necessitates a more detailed enquiry into the relationship
between humanist culture and Protestant ideology. In the words
of J.K. Yost, it is important to emphasise not only humanism's
effect on English Protestantism, but also the 'Protestantisation
of English humanism'.44 What evidence is there to show that
the English humanists remained untouched by Protestant ideas?
To what extent does the evidence of Protestant beliefs in the writings of official humanists undermine the concept of Erasmian polity? A study of Protestant literature must further attempt to explore the interplay between Protestant ideas and the official action of the political Reformation. The religious literature of the reform cannot be investigated apart from the political circumstances in which it was produced. Polemics cannot be studied in isolation either from the particular social and political context in which they were written, or from the intellectual make-up of individual polemicists. Conversely, polemic was designed to a large extent to effect change, change which was at least partly achievable through the agency of the political authorities. To what extent did the Protestant ideas which found their way into print remain peripheral to the ideological basis of Henry's reform? In short, what exactly was the relationship between the religious policy of the Cromwellian administration and the ideas of the Protestant reformers?

Two final points. This investigation of Protestant polemic from 1534 to the close of Henry's reign involves a consideration of the art or craft of controversial writing itself. In the first place, it is necessary to examine the ways in which Protestant reformers appropriated, selected, revitalised restamped ideas and arguments which had, for the most part, been formulated either by exiled Englishmen or by continental Protestants. The Protestant writers of Henry's reign were, by and large, second rate scholars. Apart from biblical translations no English Protestant writing of the period can be
described as of seminal importance to the development of reformed theology, and no author hailed as a major figure in European thought. They were, with few exceptions, purveyors and not creative theologians in their own right. On the whole their modus operandi was simply to employ other peoples' arguments to specific ends. In so doing, however, they did help to endow English Protestantism its own distinctive character. Though a hybrid, comprised of a variety of influences and emphases, English Protestantism was by no means without character or definition.

Secondly, in evaluating the techniques by which polemicists forged their arguments, it is crucial to assess how the writers saw themselves. What, in short, was the role of the Protestant polemicist? How far was the writer's self understanding determined by political factors? More particularly, it is necessary to investigate how polemicists employed models and paradigms in order to clarify their activities and to see how these models of teacher, pastor, informant, and prophet emerged and developed according to the situation in which the writers found themselves. The reemergence of persecution in 1539/40 had a distinct impact upon Protestant literature. How far did the new refugees of the 1540s rely on the work of the previous exiles as explanation of the new political climate? More importantly, what new ideas were developed by English Protestants in the second Henrician exile?

In characterising polemic as a divisive process, a restructuring of positions with an orientation towards militancy, rather than as a separate literary genre, it is clear that the
study of polemical writing in England involves a potentially massive body of literature; one which was produced amidst a turmoil of political and spiritual forces; one which was not consistent in its theology and rationale, and one in which ideas, arguments, and proofs were fused and combined in the most chaotic manner. Protestant polemics belonged to a world in which truth and falsehood were seen as night and day; black and white banners of the confessional divide. Truth was not arrived at by argument; rather it had been given in advance. To debate with an opponent was not to inquire into questions of meaning and value, but was to declare one's sympathies in a war of attrition. Polemic was a form of witness, the revelation of an inner spirit. To attempt to understand the aims and the techniques of the writers who produced it is to enter into the Weltanschauung of Tudor Protestants.
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CHAPTER TWO

PAPACY, PROPAGANDA AND PROTESTANTISM:

EARLY ENGLISH POLEMIC

c.1534
By the middle of the 1530s, England-based printers were able to bring out a whole range of Protestant material. Books by the exiled heretics Tyndale and Joye appeared alongside translations of the works of continental reformers such as Bullinger, Melanchthon, Capito, and Luther. At the beginning of the decade Protestant works were prohibited and lists were compiled which identified the most seditious and heretical writings. Two years later known Protestant sympathisers were employed by the government as official propagandists for the King's cause.

The emergence of English Protestants in government service, together with the publication from within London of books which were formerly considered heretical, constitutes one of the most striking illustrations of the radical nature of Henry VIII's shift in religious policy in the early 1530s. By and large commentators on the Protestant Reformation in England have either ignored or failed to understand the significance of the effect of Henry's policies on Protestant literature. In D.B. Knox's study of Protestant theology, for example, there is no real acknowledgement of any substantial difference between the literature produced in England from 1534 onwards and the works of the Protestant exiles. All the works were apparently promoted with the same intent, and were united by a pervasively Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. Like Knox, many bibliographers have ignored the emergence of Protestant writing in England. In their defence it can at least be claimed that printers of English Protestant material were not, by and large, ardent supporters of the new learning. For most
of them, Protestant writings form only a small percentage of their complete publishing lists. Since what could be termed a fully fledged English Protestant press did not appear until during the reign of Edward VI, bibliographers have tended to focus not so much on the contents of the books of Henrician printers as on the political legislation of Henry's government which affected the English book trade. From this perspective it has proved difficult to assess the emergence of England-based Protestant writings, for it is certain that there was no single piece of legislation which lifted a ban on controversial material. From 1533 onwards authors, translators, and printers recognised that official attitudes had altered towards both the publication of the Scriptures and the printing of polemical literature. They did so however not as a result of any single government directive.

Moreover it should be emphasised that Protestant reformers did not have any monopoly over reformist literature and ideas, neither did they exist in isolation from other radical groupings. Protestant writings formed only a parenthesis within far broader literary confines and constituted only one ingredient in what G.R. Elton has termed a 'splendid porridge of reformist yearning'. Other ingredients may well have been of greater importance.

In the following chapters an attempt will be made to explore the interplay of Protestant literature with other reforming currents in the early English reformation. In chapter three attention is directed to the relations between Lutheran works and the writings of Erasmus and his followers. In this chapter our concern is with the interaction between Protestant literature and government propaganda.
In many ways, attempts to view the relations between Protestant and official propaganda have been unduly one-sided. One the whole these relations have only been examined in terms of theological influence, in the way, for example, in which continental confessions of faith influenced the formulation of English statements of belief. Yet the first official formulary of faith in England was not put out until 1536. By then both government propaganda and English Protestant writings were well established. To what extent did Protestantism influence government propaganda during the years prior to an official statement of faith? Conversely, how far did government works, which were not primarily concerned with matters of belief, affect the form and content of writings which were promulgated with an essentially religious concern?

In order to explore these issues it is necessary to examine the interaction between government propaganda and Protestant literature in three stages. Firstly, a brief outline will be provided of the main works and ideas of the government's early printed propaganda, with particular reference to the writings of Christopher St. German, the most prolific of the official polemicists in the early 1530s. Secondly, an attempt will be made to assess and evaluate the influence of Protestantism upon official propaganda. Particular emphasis is given to the contribution of Tyndale's ideas to the government's writings, and to the role played by evangelical reformers in the solution to the divorce. In part three attention shifts to the question of the impact of the government's policy and propaganda upon Protestant writings within England. This is examined with reference to two Protestant employees of the government, Thomas
In many ways the most significant development of controversial literature in the 1530s was the government's own use of propaganda. The campaign under the direction of Thomas Cromwell, was the first ever mounted by any European government and, as such, its importance cannot be measured by the success or failure of any individual piece of propaganda. The official publications of the government have received detailed, even exhaustive attention, and it is no part of this study to analyse the literature in any great depth. Having said this, however, several points need to be made.

In the first place, government exploitation of the printing press began late and proceeded slowly. The Divorce issue preempted the campaign. As Elton points out, since the King's great matter was originally supposed to be a matter of secrecy there could be no question of writing pamphlets about it until the situation was publicised in both Houses of Parliament in January 1531. The state of secrecy however, had not precluded the examination and collection of material in support of Henry's case. Between the summer of 1530 and the summer of 1531 Henry's agents compiled a list of supportive authorities which were published under the title *Collectanea Satis Copiosa*. This work, essentially a compilation of legal, scriptural, and patristic authorities and precedents for Henry's claim to autonomy and immunity, formed the basis for much of the official propaganda which followed. In November 1531 the government issued The
Determination of the most famous and excellent Universities of Italy and France, that it is unlawful for a man to marry his brother's wife and that the pope hath no power to dispense therewith. To some extent the title was misleading, for the bulk of the work consisted of an English translation of the Collectanea.

The Determination was not a successful piece of propaganda. It aimed at a scholarly audience and stylistically it remained dull throughout. A second work of the government attempted to rectify the shortcomings. The Glass of Truth covered much the same ground as the Determination, but in a lighter and more attractive manner. The book, which took the form of a dialogue between a lawyer and a priest, affirmed that the pope had overstepped his authority in his dealings with the King. Though concerned only with the King's marriage the Glass anticipated future developments. A way "might be found well enough to end the matter honourably within the realm, if the whole head and body of the parliament would set their wits and good wills into it". The government should encourage the clergy to break their unlawful oaths to the Papacy. Once this had been achieved a settlement would be forthcoming.

Towards the end of 1533 Berthelet printed a brief pamphlet entitled Articles devised by the whole consent of the King's most honourable Council. In nine points the Council affirmed the right of Henry to settle the Divorce issue in his own realm, the supremacy of general councils over bishops, and the illegality of the Pope's excommunication. Unlike the Glass, the Articles were scathing in their contempt of the Pope. Clement VII was personally attacked as a 'man neither in learning nor life
Christ's disciple', and the Popes themselves were referred to as the mere bishops of Rome. The Articles were intended to lay down what people should believe and do, and to counteract doubts about the Divorce and remarriage. Since their function was to justify actions that the Crown and government had already undertaken, they reflected the irrevocability of the break with Rome. In the Articles there is no longer trace of any willingness to seek accommodation with the Papacy.

The Determination, Glass, and Articles all sought to defend the Divorce. The next stage of government propaganda focused on the question of the Royal supremacy. In 1534 Berthelet printed books from two eminent churchmen that were designed to commend the King's claims to a learned audience. Edward Foxe's De Vera Differentia was the more impressive of the two, although it consisted of the usual scriptural, patristic, and conciliar proof texts. The second, Richard Sampson's Oratio, may originally have been a sermon. In it Sampson emphasised obedience to the King as the duty of all true citizens. The King had commanded that the Pope's authority be rejected. As ruler he was entitled to demand the obedience of his subjects.

In the following year the King's printer brought out what is now the best known piece of Henrician propaganda, Stephen Gardiner's De Vera Obedientia. The book introduced no new ideas, and, like Sampson's Oratio, it insisted that the true Christian is one who never fails in obedience to God. God's vicars, namely the princes, must be obeyed as God is obeyed. The King's supremacy was no new idea but had been obscured by centuries of papal contumacy. Gardiner's work was both more complete and more powerful than the books of Foxe and Sampson,
though like them, it was designed to persuade readers out-side England of the justice of the King's policy. With this literary aid Henry hoped to convert the King of France, whilst the pastors of Straasburg were so pleased with the book's antipapal arguments that they arranged for another printing, locally, with a new preface, probably composed by Bucer.\textsuperscript{17}

The influence of the early printed propaganda of the government is almost impossible to assess. Its popular appeal however, does not appear to have been great, for of all the books only Fox's \textit{De Vera Differentia} ran to a second English reprint.\textsuperscript{18} Of course government propaganda, even in its earliest stages, was a far more intensive programme than was indicated by its use of the printed book, and proclamations, bills, sermons, and parliamentary drafts all played a more important part in the campaign. In comparison with such legislation as the Act in Restraint of Appeals, books such as the \textit{Glass of Truth} and Sampson's \textit{Oratio} seem both poor and insignificant. Having said that, the government's use of the printed book between 1531-35 was not restricted to the half dozen or so works that have been discussed. On the contrary the canon of official polemic is somewhat larger than is generally maintained. From the early 1530s onwards the government gained notable success in recruiting writers for the specific task of producing official propaganda. As a result of this recruitment scheme, government propaganda was generally in the hands of capable literary talents. One of the most erudite and important of this group of official publicists was the lawyer Christopher St. German.\textsuperscript{19}
Christopher St. German and Official Propaganda

St. German's first and best known work, The First Dialogue of the Doctor and Student, was originally published in Latin in 1523. The book formed the basic handbook for legal students until the emergence of Blackstone's Commentaries over two centuries later. The first English edition was printed by Robert Wyer in 1531, and in the same year a further edition was published by Robert Redman. 1531 also saw the publication of a second Dialogue, with additions. In 1532 St. German turned his attention to controversial matters with A Treatise concernynge the division betwene the spiratualtie and temporaltie, in which he articulated a whole series of grievances against the clergy, many of which had been raised in the Reformation Parliament of 1529. In this first session of the Parliament, complaints abounded that the laity were oppressed with probates of wills and mortuaries, that abbots and priors engaged in trade and merchandise, and that the clergy governed by laws that were contrary to the laws of the realm. In the Division St. German enunciated the principle of parliamentary supremacy in temporal matters. The clergy's pride, and its desire for special favour, coupled with diversity of opinion over the authority, power and jurisdiction of the spirituality, were seen by the lawyer as furthering a rift between laymen and laymen, between religious and religious, and, most seriously, between priests and priests. People had come to believe that the Church's response to criticism of its own abuses was wildly aggressive. Moreover it seemed that the Church responded less favourably to lay criticism; clerics were treated with far greater lenience.
St. German held that reform of the ecclesiastical courts should be carried out through parliamentary legislation. The clergy must be made subject to the discipline of civil law and civil courts. Canon law is excessively harsh; heretics are dealt with in a brutal, un-Christian manner. In place of brotherly correction the clergy have substituted abjuration and execution. Furthermore, clerical courts are biased in favour of the clergy. The covetousness of the minor clergy not only goes unchecked but is actually protected by the courts. 26

St. German did give some consideration to moral and religious affairs. To do so he adopted his favourite polemical device of reported speech. Some people have alleged that "neither preestes nor religious kepe not the perfection of theyr ordre to the honour of god and good example of the people / as they should do: but that some of them procure theyr owne honour, and call it the honour of god / and rather couet to haue rule ouer the people than to profyte the people". 27 Again some say that the spirituality "be more diligent to enduce the people to suche thynges / as shall brynge ryches to the church ..... than they be to enduce them to payment of theyr dettes, to make restitutions for suche wronges as they haue done / or to do the werkes of mercye to theyr neyghbours, that be poore and nedy / and that sometyme be also in ryght extreme necessite". 28 From this some have concluded that worldliness hinders true piety, and that the Church should rid itself of all possessions. Others have maintained that possessions themselves are not the fault but rather that the sheer abundance of them inhibits love of God. Unfortunately even these more moderate critics have been uncharitably handled by the clergy, who see the slightest
criticism as an indictment of their entire office.  

St. German's work presented a more temperate form of anti-clericalism than that which was proffered by the exiled Protestants. His argument stemmed from genuine humanist principles, and he well earns Pollard's description as a "moderate reformer". Nonetheless, the lawyer's attempts to present more radical points in the form of reported speech did not prevent his work from escaping hostile criticism. Thomas More devoted a long digression in his Apology to refuting the Divisioin, in which he skillfully avoided those aspects of St. German's argument which involved the question of the King's supremacy. In attacking the work More was forced to deal for the first time with a book that was both written and printed in London rather than issued abroad and surreptitiously brought into England. The style too was different from the usual polemical fare, and More had to come to terms with his anonymous opponent's air of objectivity and impartiality. The author of the Division was likened to someone who comes up to two men standing together and, pretending they are about to fight, slaps one in the face whilst holding off the other. This done he claims to have circumvented a quarrel. St. German's blame of the clergy was seen as ill-founded. Division between the spirituality and the temporality had arisen purely out of the malicious lies of Tyndale and Barnes, and the prevalence of heresy among the laity.

More's somewhat inflated response did not end the controversy, for in 1533 St. German responded with the book Salem and Bizance. In this work St. German argued that even if all the heretics in the world were annihilated—the controversy between clergy and laity would remain. Though expressed in the new form of a
dialogue the book covered the same ground as the *Division*. More, in turn, replied with *The debellacyon of Salem and Byzance*, again a long and rather redious rebuttal. Were the heresy laws to be relaxed, he argued, the streets would promptly swarm with heretics.

The *debellacyon* ended the controversy between the two lawyers; it did not end St. German's literary career however. In 1534 he brought out *The Addicions of Salem and Byzance*, a curious work in that it made no mention of More. The lawyer reiterated many of the arguments he had made in his previous works. Ecclesiastical courts within England exist not by the Law of God but merely by the sufferance of the King. The pride of the clergy remains a stumbling-block to reform. "Also it is a great ouersight in many religious men, that they wylle pretende, that the wey of their religion is the surest way to saluation". Clerics ought to live by the requirement of poverty. A general council must determine the power of the spirituality. In the first part of the work St German discussed a further series of matters that were in need of reform. The refusal of the clergy to sing masses for the dead unless they receive payment is reprehensible. The negligence and reluctance of the Bishops to confirm believers has devalued that sacrament. Episcopal visitations have failed to eradicate abuse. Few ceremonies exist for any other purpose than the profit of the clergy.

To what extent did St. German's writings reflect government opinion? Over forty years ago Franklin le van Baumer championed St. German as the intellectual exponent of Henry VIII's reform. His first polemical work, the *Division*, was seen as probably
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37. part of the government's propaganda campaign.39 Earlier A.I. Taft had noted a similarity between some of St. German's complaints against the clergy and the Supplication of the Commons of 1532.40 From this Pierre Janelle argued that St. German was retained in government service during the same year.41 More recent scholarship, however, has regarded these attempts to enlist as a government employee St. German with some disdain. According to G.R. Elton, the Supplication of the Commons was being drafted two years before the Division appeared, and, in any case, it was not official in origin.42 St. German may have borrowed ideas from the work, but there is no evidence that he was officially commissioned to do so.43 Furthermore, Elton's attempt to determine the corpus of officially sponsored work also excludes St. German from being seen as a government employee on the grounds that his writings were published by Thomas Godfray and not by the King's official printer Berthelet.44 On his own initiative St. German developed the official doctrine of Reformation statutes into a political philosophy. He was a thoughtful and able exponent of the views widely held among the practitioners of the common law.

Elton's conclusion that St. German was no more than an unofficial publicist remains open to question as a result of his misinterpretation of two crucial pieces of evidence. The first consists of an undated document concerning proposals for parliamentary legislation.45 The first half of the work, which was intended to come before the second session of the Reformation Parliament in 1531, was concerned with the reform of the clergy. It proposed that Parliament should establish a 'great standing council' of bishops and laity to review the whole problem of
ecclesiastical jurisdiction as administered in the Church courts. In addition the council should also examine the possibility of a vernacular Bible, and inquire into the spread of heresy by assuming control of all initial investigations. Particular abuses were to be abolished such as the exaction of fees for burial services and masses for the dead. Shrines and centres of pilgrimage were to be regulated by Parliament to avoid clerical rackets. The other half of the draft dealt with the perennial problems of poverty and unemployment.

The importance of the document, which had been described as arguably the most comprehensive reform manifesto devised in the entire reign of Henry VIII, lies in the fact that it was partially written in the hand of St. German, and was corrected and revised entirely by him. In other words St. German had full editorial control over the draft and must therefore be cast in the role of policy maker. The Submission of the Clergy and the Act of Appeals both followed up the radical suggestions of St. German's document, and many of its proposals were incorporated into later legislation.

The second piece of evidence which supports the conclusion that St. German was officially employed is the fact that his books, the Division, Salem and Bizance, The Addicions, and the New Addicions, were all issued from Berthelet's press. An edition of the former was brought out by Redman at the end of 1532 and beginning of 1533, around the same time as Berthelet's first edition, and it is not altogether clear which printer was first in the field. In either event Berthelet's involvement with both this book, and with St. German's other writings, confirms that the works were issued by the government as specific
propaganda tools. In the early part of 1533 Cromwell held a bond of 500 marks restraining Redman from infringing Berthelet's privilege ad imprimendum solum for the book called the Division of the Spirituality and the Temporality and for any other book privileged by the King. ⁵¹

As Elton points out, three later works of St. German, the Power of the Clergy, the Constitutions provincial and legatine, and the Answer to a Letter of 1534–35, were not published by Berthelet but were printed by Thomas Godfray. There is however strong evidence that the two printers pooled their equipment and were working within the same establishment. ⁵² Thus even St. German's later writings appear to have had some connection with official propaganda.

In the light of this bibliographical evidence the controversy between St. German and More takes on new meaning. No longer is it possible to view it as merely a quarrel between two lawyers over issues that were peripheral to More's main concerns as shown in his works against the Protestant exiles. Now the books of St. German and More are seen to provide literary expression for a complex power struggle that was being conducted within governing circles. On one side lay More, leader of the Aragonese faction, supported by Bishops Fisher, Tunstall, West, Clerk, and Standish, united in their loyalty to the Queen, and by their fierce opposition to both heresy and to attacks on the Church. On the other side of the political fence lay Cromwell, Foxe, Cranmer and St. German, the spokesmen and promoters of the Collectanea satis copiosa. ⁵⁴ In the propaganda war that was waged by both sides the works of More and St. German were not mere skirmishes but represent polemical engagements on a major
scale. The published writings of this elderly lawyer, belatedly plucked from a lifetime's service in the courts to public prominence, were put forward in order to prepare the ground for legislation and to quash the arguments of the religious and political conservatives. In the early years of government propaganda St. German can be justly acknowledged as the most capable exponent of the policy of reform.

(i) Tyndale's "Obedience" and the Royal Supremacy.

Possibly the most important contribution made by Protestantism to the development of the government's propaganda campaign consists of the way in which the polemical writings of the exiles provided the government with a successful model of an intensive literary campaign. In the first place the effect of the exiles' writings on the government was negative, resulting in an unambiguously hostile response. Prior to the appearance of religious polemics there are no signs that the authorities within England were aware of the potential dangers of the press.\(^{55}\) The first attempt in England to restrict the reading matter of the public arose out of a concern to condemn the works of Luther in 1521.\(^{56}\) The increasing number of outright condemnations of Protestant books throughout that decade and right into the 1530s confirms a corresponding increase in awareness on the part of the authorities of the emotive appeal of the exiles' writings, and of the concomitant need to exert tighter control over the press.

On the other hand the exilic literature provided positive elements which could be borrowed and adapted by Henry's propagandists. Works such as the Glass of Truth used many of the same polemical weapons as the controversial works of Tyndale, Frith, and Joye. That is to say, that the government propaganda gradually acknowledged the importance of the vernacular as a means of communication; recognised the importance of brevity and conciseness, coupled with a concern to make general points rather than focus too heavily on particular issues; valued scurrility and invective as suitable and effective modes of
persuasion; and, most importantly, determined that the Scriptures be used as the foremost criterion of judgement. The testimony of the Fathers and of later authorities constituted an important, though secondary, standard.

Although the government's early writings are no mere "livres de circonstance", they still suffer by comparison both with exilic literature and with the books of continental reformers. The books put out with official sanction between 1531/2 and 1535 certainly remained quantitatively inferior to the work of English Protestants. Almost three times as many books were put forward by the exiles, as were officially promoted by Henry's government. Despite being in possession of a model, the government was slow to grasp the importance of the printed book as a medium of propaganda. Moreover the government's writings suffered from severe shortcomings of presentation. Both the Determination and the Latin treatises, for example, were unlikely to appeal to a popular audience.

What then of Protestantism's ideological influence? It has long been assumed among historians of the Henrician Reformation that William Tyndale's teaching on obedience and authority anticipated the full-blown doctrine of parliamentary supremacy as enacted in the legislation of the Reformation Parliament. This view, though not without its critics, can be rather baldly summarised as the thesis that Tyndale's ideas on the nature of Kingship and the duties of subjects, enunciated in his 1528 Obedience of a Christian Man, introduced to the King the ideological basis for royal absolutism upon which Henry developed his claim to supremacy over the Church. The thesis, though long maintained, has seldom been tested against the hard
facts of government legislation and the ensuing propaganda. When seen alongside later official writings, to what extent did Tyndale's ideas shape the views of the governing authorities within England?

According to Stephen Haas there is evidence to suggest that Tyndale's ideas exerted a decisive influence on the work *The Glass of Truth*, and, as a result, on all subsequent propaganda. Haas's account of the development of Henrician propaganda differs markedly from Elton's view that the *Collectanea Satis Copiosa* contained all the evidence ever adduced in support of the new line of Henrician polemic. According to Haas, for example, *The Glass of Truth* should be placed a full year earlier than Elton's dating of 1532. More importantly, Haas argued that the contents of the *Glass* reveal a shift away from the ideas presented in the *Determination of the Universities*. Throughout the *Glass* the phrase 'law of God' was interpreted in a fundamentally different sense from that given in the *Determination*. In the latter the phrase was not used to bolster the royal prerogative or the divine-right kingship. Over and over again it provided merely a moralistic and spiritual justification for the divorce. Kings may not break the Law of God, and in relation to it are private persons, having no power or authority. In the *Glass* however, the 'law of God' is viewed entirely in pro-monarchical terms. It is the Pope who violates the law and who wrongly asserts that his word is equivalent to God's law demands that a subject accept royal policy without question. Obedience to the King is equated with the law of God and of nature, piety and loyalty thus being one and the same. According to Haas, the model for this pro-monarchical interpretation
of God's law was not found in the Collectanea but had emerged in Tyndale's Obedience. In several passages Tyndale presented succinct statements of princely authority. "The king is in the room of God; and his law is God's law, and nothing but the law of nature and natural equity, which God engraved in the hearts of all men". 

"God hath made the king in every realm judge over all, and over him there is no judge. He that judgeth the king judgeth God". "The king is, in this world without law; and may at his lust do right or wrong, and shall give accounts but to God only".

Although Haas's argument is to some extent separate from, and not dependent on, the old view that Tyndale anticipated the full-blown doctrine of royal supremacy, his case still suffers from some of the shortcomings of that thesis. Particularly problematic is the way in which Tyndale's remarks on royal absolutism are treated outwith the context of the Obedience as a whole. The Obedience, as W.D.J. Cargill Thompson has pointed out, was thoroughly Lutheran both in the general character of its argument and in pattern and subject matter. As with Luther's own statements on political authority Tyndale's observations on obedience to rulers were at least partly written in order to refute the accusation that Protestants advocated rebellion. Under no circumstances are subjects allowed to resist rulers, however tyrannical and oppressive their deeds may be. Although Tyndale expressed his ideas in extreme and unqualified language, he did not regard royal authority as either boundless or unconditional. True, rulers are divinely appointed and represent God on earth. Their authority, however, though greater and more elevated than the laws of men, was not undefined
nor was it infallible. The first limit on Kingly authority was the rule of faith. Were a ruler to command laws which were contrary to the faith, then his subjects would be obliged as Christians to disobey. In addition the ruler himself was bound by the dual laws of nature and love. His very office was designed for the sake of his subjects. He was appointed to protect his people from danger and to promote the principles of peace and justice. As such the ruler was not a free agent but existed to punish sin and to increase the wealth of his subjects. In putting the ruler's laws above those of man, Tyndale sought to avoid the view that resistance to secular authority could in any sense further the cause of justice. Hence, when seen in context, Tyndale's arguments seem far less a justification for royal absolutism than a fulfilment of Paul's command of Romans 13, "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities".

That notwithstanding, there is of course no good reason why Henry's propagandists could not have isolated Tyndale's statements on the ruler 'without law', thereby incorporating them into the arguments of the Glass of Truth. According to Strype, the Obedience was highly regarded by Henry precisely for the manner in which Tyndale advanced the notion of obedience, to authorities.68 Several years later, when Henry was presented with a new way out of his difficulties with the Pope on the basis of an assertion of the autonomy of England and the imperial authority of her King, Tyndale's remarks on the authority of rulers offered valuable ammunition to advance Henry's claims. That is not to say however, that Tyndale's political ideas formed the central core of Henrician propaganda
from 1531/2 onwards. To assume that much is to ignore Tyndale's other writings on the nature of obedience, and to underestimate the importance of the *Collectanea Satis Copiosa* as a source book of precedents and authorities. What can be more confidently and more reasonably assumed, however, is that a jaundiced selection of Tyndale's observations on the ruler 'without law' was incorporated into government propaganda alongside such equally prominent ideas as St. German's principle of parliamentary supremacy. When seen in the context of his political ideas as a whole Tyndale's remarks on obedience and authority do not anticipate the doctrine of royal supremacy. Tyndale, for example, would not have given the King the power over the Church that was claimed by Henry VIII after 1534, since his doctrine of the two kingdoms does not accord temporal rulers any intrinsic authority within the Church. When taken out of context however, his ideas helped to furnish a concept of monarchical authority upon which Henry's propagandists could draw.
(ii) Government recruitment and Protestant service.

The question of the ideological influence of Protestantism upon the government's early propaganda remains therefore a somewhat conjectural affair. Certainly some government employees appear to have read Protestant books. The writings of Christopher St. German, for example, suggest that their author had examined in some detail the central thesis of Protestant writers on the issue of faith and works. In the Addicions of Salem and Byzance St. German wrote appreciatively of the Protestants' claim that they were motivated by a concern for morality. "And the other parte saythe, that feythe onely justifieth before god; and they also, after as they meane, say trewely. For they calle hit no feythe, onlesse it haue good warkes. And therefore they styrre the people to good warkes all that they canne, that they may haue a lyuely feythe for they saye, that yf a man beleue all the articles of the feythe, and all that he is commaunded to beleue beside, and lyueth in deedsy symne, that he hath no feythe". In professing to know "none that holdeth opinion that good werkes be not necessaries to saluacyon, specially in men that haue full vse of Reasone", St. German reduced the disagreement between Protestant reformers and traditionalists over faith and works to a problem of semantics. The diversity of opinion was a question of terminology rather than substance. In addition to his recognition of Protestant ideas, St. German's argument is of further important in that it suggests that by the early 1530s educated laymen within England, indeed within government service, did not see Protestantism's emphasis on sola fides as a controversial or necessarily divisive issue.---His point was was that no-one except the anti-nomian believed that
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good works should be eschewed. Unlike Catholic polemicists St. German did not argue that Protestants had abandoned works or that they ignored neighbourly duties. Providing that good works were done, either as a means to salvation, or as the fruit of faith, the order and stability of society were left intact. The question of soteriology was thus pushed aside and replaced with a formula that sought to guarantee the harmony of the commonwealth.

Although St. German had probably read Protestant books or at least had encountered Protestant arguments in conversation, it cannot be said that they exerted a decisive influence over his political philosophy. As was shown St. German's career demonstrates the usefulness to the government of legal, rather than biblical or theological ideas. Yet neither those legal arguments, nor for that matter the principles of common law, provided the sole basis for government policy and propaganda in the early 1530s. St. German was not the only intellectual to gain government employment. Indeed there is strong evidence to show that the government actually sought to employ Protestant writers in its propaganda and diplomatic campaigns. Between November 1530 and November 1531 the government made extensive contacts with William Tyndale with a view to bringing about his return to England and enlisting his pen in the services of the King. In January 1531 Stephen Vaughan, Cromwell's servant in Antwerp, informed both the King and his minister that Tyndale was afraid to return because of persecution by the bishops. In April Vaughan wrote to Cromwell enclosing a copy of Tyndale's Answer to More. Vaughan was deeply impressed by Tyndale and hoped that the work would help secure his return. The outcome
was precisely the reverse. On perusing the book Henry became disturbed by Tyndale's theological unorthodoxy, and instructed Cromwell to make Vaughan cease his attempts. Cromwell's letter, which was heavily corrected and redrafted, conveyed the King's feelings, although Vaughan's reply indicates that Cromwell added a postscript authorizing the agent to contact Tyndale afresh and persuade him to submit to the King's mercy. Subsequent interviews with Tyndale were reported in letters of June of 1531 addressed both to the King and to his minister, and as late as November of that year Vaughan again wrote to Cromwell on Tyndale's behalf. Not until then was the matter finally dropped.

What was the significance of Vaughan's negotiations with Tyndale? Did they mark a genuine attempt by the King and Cromwell at recruiting the reformer or were they merely the result of Vaughan's own initiative? The case for the latter alternative has been argued by Elton although his argument raises several problems. Tyndale, it is claimed, cast himself into outer darkness in 1530 with his Practice of Prelates in which he unequivocally opposed Henry's divorce. For both Henry and Cromwell to have encouraged Vaughan's endeavour to recruit Tyndale in 1531 is totally improbable given Henry's furious reaction to the Practice. However, from Cromwell's letters to Vaughan it is clear that the King was very much an active participant in the attempts to secure Tyndale's return. According to the Minister, the King was 'right well pleased' with Vaughan's diligence in sending his book against More and in persuading him to come to England. Even after Henry's response to the Answer to More was made known Vaughan still wrote to the King, concerning Tyndale's apparent offer to
return and submit to any punishment, provided only that the King established an English version of the scriptures. Even if Vaughan is to be credited with the actual initiation of the plan to recruit Tyndale, the scheme was readily adopted both by the King and his minister. Moreover the attempt to recruit Tyndale was not without precedent. Simon Fish, whose anticlerical work *A Supplication for the Beggars* had aroused the hostility of the religious authorities, was protected from Thomas More and the bishops by Henry until his premature death in 1531. In April of that year Cromwell, writing on the King's behalf, instructed Vaughan to direct his attention away from Tyndale and onto his fellow reformer John Frith. The King "desires you to advise him to renounce his wilful opinions, and like a good Christian return to his native country, where he will find the King mercifully disposed". "By so doing you will highly merit of Almighty God and deserve high thanks of the King who will not forget your labor, if he perceived that you effectually intend it".

As with the dating of St German's entry into government service, the timing of the negotiations with Tyndale and Frith confirms that the government's interest in Protestant writers was bound up with the need to promote the argument in favour of the divorce. Even at these early stages of government policy and propaganda it is clear that the moves to gain Protestant support came largely from radical elements within the government who advocated a new line of argument on the Divorce. By as early as 1531/32 the leader of the radicals, Thomas Cromwell, appears to have been thinking along reformed paths and lines of evangelical theology. In an anonymous
letter of 1538 attributed to the civil and canon lawyer John Oliver, the author attributed his conversion to a reformed way of Bible study to discussions that he had heard at Cromwell's table around 1531. Other members of the radical faction had even stronger sympathies with evangelical theology and Protestant reform than had Cromwell. Edward Foxe, whose *De Vera Differentia* was printed as part of the government's propaganda campaign, had been a member of the White Horse Tavern circle of reformers at Cambridge in the early 1520s. In addition to *De Vera Differentia*, Foxe also appears to have been responsible for the compilation of the *Collectanea Satis Copiosa*, the work promoted by Cromwell as the corner stone of Henrician propaganda. According to Elton, the radical faction led by Cromwell recognised by the latter half of 1530 that their proposed solution to the divorce implicitly involved a complete break with the entire Roman Church. In other words, those who advocated a radical solution to the divorce were also radical about the reform of the Church. In developing an independent line on the divorce, the radicals sought to procure Protestant support. Apparently it was felt that Protestant writers, with their well established pedigree of antipapalism could help to provide the necessary literary talent with which the King's cause could be promoted. The need to justify England's independence and the authority of her King provided the government with a need to re-evaluate Protestant writers and their ideas. As such the shift from outright hostility and condemnation of Protestant writings to approbation of reforming opinion and support of its practitioners was the product of the radical solution to the divorce. The emergence of Protestant writers within England was intimately bound up with the policies advocated by Thomas Cromwell and his supporters policies which were being implemented well before the government drew up official statements of the faith.
3. The Impact of Official Propaganda upon Protestant Polemic, 1533-34.

It is, on the whole, more appropriate to examine the influence of Protestantism upon early Henrician propaganda in terms of its practitioners rather than of its principles. Protestant ideas on secular and religious authority provided at the most only one thread of the tapestry of Royal Supremacy. Other concepts that were more central to Protestant reformers exerted no apparent influence whatsoever. In short Protestantism's ideological usefulness to the government consisted largely of its inherent antipapalism, or, more precisely, its tradition of hostility to papal and religious interference in the temporal realm. In so far as Protestant writers maintained that hostility alongside a positive evaluation of temporal authority they could be of some use to governing authorities in England.

Consequently, although the negotiations with Tyndale and Frith did not bear fruit, the government did not abandon its attempt to recruit Protestants as diplomats and polemicists. Furthermore, this subsequent recruitment proved particularly successful. From 1531 onwards Robert Barnes, exiled heretic and one time leader of the White Horse Tavern group of Cambridge Protestants, was entrusted with a series of diplomatic missions on behalf of the King. In 1534 a comparatively unknown Protestant convert, Thomas Swinnerton, was given the task of producing an actual piece of official propaganda.

An examination of the respective careers of Swinnerton and Barnes helps to elucidate a number of important questions central to an examination of the relations between Protestant ideology
and government policy. How far for example, did Protestant employees seek to promote evangelical theology in their polemical writings? To what extent was their theological belief corrupted by the paramount concern to advance the King's policies? In short to what extent were Protestant theological ideas accommodated to the political realities of government policy?

(i) **Thomas Swinnerton**

Swinnerton was educated at both Oxford and Cambridge, according to Bale, "in all good arts and in the tongues". Upon completing his education he took holy orders. Biographies of Swinnerton are hampered by the fact that he used the pseudonym John Roberts. According to Anthony Wood, Swinnerton first used the alias during the time of More's period as Lord Chancellor in order to escape persecution as a heretic. This dating, however, conflicts with the testimony of University registers which identify Roberts as graduating B.A. from Cambridge in 1515, and M.A. in 1519. Swinnerton's adoption of the alias thus predated his embracing of Protestant opinion. Between his graduation from Cambridge and his first publication some fifteen years later, there are few records of his activities. According to Emden, Swinnerton undertook the duties of a parish priest, and can possibly be identified with a Magister Tho. Swynerton, vicar of Drayton (vacated by December 1520), and vicar of St. Clement's in Sandwich, Kent (compotus 14th December 1543).

Bale attributed three works to Swinnerton; *De Papicolarum Susuris*, *De Pontificibus Schismaticis*, and *De Tropis scriptuarum*. 
In recent years De Papicolarum Susuris has been identified as A Litel Treatise ageynste the mutterynge of some papistis incorners, a book published by the King's printer Berthelet in 1534 as part of the government's propaganda campaign.

The details of how Swinnerton actually came to be a government agent have never been examined, yet it appears that his entry into service followed the standard procedure of Cromwellian patronage. Prior to the Litel Treatise Swinnerton had brought on his own initiative a work entitled the mustre of scismatyke bysshoppes of Rome. On the strength of this work Swinnerton was recruited to produce propaganda for the government.

A mustre of scismatyke bysshoppes of Rome

The mustre was made up of ten sections of which three formed the bulk of the work. Swinnerton provided the Preface of the Translator - the Mustre itself, and translated The Life of Hildebrand and The Life of Emperor Henry IV from the eleventh century histories of Cardinal Benno. Unlike the roughly contemporary translations by William Marshall of Marsiglio of Padua's Defensor Pacis, and Lorenzo Valla's Donation of Constantine, Swinnerton's translations of Benno's lives were designed for a popular audience, the "good reder which art not lerned". For Swinnerton, the initial value of the lives consisted of the way in which they presented unsavoury aspects of the reign of a single representative of the papal office, Gregory VII. In recommending the translation of the Life of Hildebrand, for example, Swinnerton listed some of the qualities that the reader would find as abomination, detestation
execrable manners, pride, tyranny, poisoning, and necromancy. Benno's lives employed a good deal of legendary material and recorded particularly sordid episodes concerning the Pope, all of which were seen by the translator as illustrating the perversity of the papacy as a whole.

The translated sections have however a second and more important function than the mere revelation of scurrilous material. Commending his own method, Swinnerton pointed out that many scholars have put forward "as a luyung ymage, before a mans even (sic), the use, fruyte or còmodytes of hystories". Like Scripture, history has the capacity to provide models and mirrors with which contemporary events can be examined, hence Gregory's abuse of Henry IV is seen by Swinnerton as providing a paradigm for a proper understanding of Pope Clement VII's current dealings with Henry VIII. The model is loosely constructed by Swinnerton. The fall of the Emperor was not due to the influence of either his son or the nobility, as some chronicles tell, but was caused entirely by the malice of the Pope. Henry IV's high sense of justice was continually threatened by his enemies the bishops. His moral standards were the commandments of God, rooted in scripture. Thus for Swinnerton Henry IV was seen as a prototype of the truly just ruler.

This establishment of historical precedence received additional support from the translator's emphasis on the religious tyranny of the papacy. Hence a third function of the translated sections of the Mustre was that they served to break the stranglehold which the papacy exerted over the individual conscience: "That thou from hence forthe be not so superstycious, so insolent
& folysshe to thynke it well done, and alowed of god what so euer the rauenyng bysshoppe of Rome shall do, without or beside the worde of god". Papal dominion over England was seen by Swinnerton as not just a matter of political interference, but as a factor that touched on the practice and belief of every individual within the realm.

In his own Preface Swinnerton both drew out the lessons of Benno's lives and provided additional historical evidence of internal division within the Church of Rome. His main aim was to attack the "fonde folysshe fantasyc" that the Pope cannot err. Since Gregory VII lived a false immoral life, other Popes can do likewise. His purpose in writing was to expose the manners and practice of the Poes "right mete and conuenyent for the tyme that nowe is".

Swinnerton's attack on the papacy was argued at considerable length and in great detail. In the first instance he identified a total of thirty-three schisms among the popes between the years 243 and 1433. During the twenty-second schism, which allegedly lasted for forty years, there were never less than two or three popes at any one time. During the total period of division there were around fifty popes in all, many of whom were errant schismatics and heretics. This sheer multiplicity of popes was seen by Swinnerton as shattering any claims that have been, or can be made in support of the spiritual role of the Papacy. In concluding this almost statistical argument Swinnerton employed some cogent reasoning. None of the so-called Popes during the Avignon papacy could have been true since the clergy could not distinguish between them. After all, the clergy have, or at least claim to have, the spirit of Christ necessary to discern
truth from falsehood. If, however, they lack that spirit then the clergy themselves declare that they are no part of the true Church. The argument is thus three-sided. Either the papacy is false and the clergy true, or the papacy is true and the clergy false. The logic of Swinnerton's argument proposes a third solution, that both are false.

The charge of internal division was also sustained in Swinnerton's examination of the misdeeds of individual Popes. For each Pope listed, at least one serious fault was identified. The compilation of a case against the papacy was thus built up by the sheer quantity of evidence that the author provided.

The attractions of this type of polemic to the government are immediately apparent. Swinnerton's historical method complemented the government's own attempts, arising out of the Collectanea Satis Copiosa, to provide historical precedents for Henry's policies. In exposing the fact that many popes were unfit for office Swinnerton's argument could be seen as justifying Henry's decision to reject papal jurisdiction and authority. With this explicit political intent Swinnerton felt it unnecessary to acknowledge many of the sources of his historical argument. Fabricated stories, or the use of dubious legendary material were seen by the translator as every bit as important or valid as well documented facts. For Swinnerton the attribution of specific faults to particular popes is all important; provision of detailed references to the evidence which supported those accusations was not regarded as necessary. In the mustre Swinnerton actually claimed to have "left out here the names of y wryters, where I toke y substance of this prologue". Possibly he did so as a result of using prohibited works.
Joachim von Watt's *the olde god and the newe*\(^{115}\) had presented a similarly dark view of papal corruption, and had appeared on several lists of forbidden books. A more likely source of influence on Swinnerton however, is the work of Platina,\(^{116}\) which provided details of papal immorality that later proved embarrassing to supporters of traditional belief. In addition Swinnerton made some use of English histories, two of which, *The Chronicles of England* and *Fabyan's Chronicle*, were actually cited in the text.\(^{117}\)

The importance of Swinnerton's work, however, was not dependent on the author's academic rigour. Indeed the usefulness of his book lay in the fact that it constituted an unashamedly popular polemic, constantly directed towards the capacity of Swinnerton's unlearned reader. Much of the word addressed the reader directly, often in the form of rhetorical questions,\(^{118}\) whilst the author's use of marginal notes maintained a concern to involve the reader in the actual reasoning of the work. In the *Life of Henry IV*, for example, Swinnerton added the comment, "Here thou nedest no spectacles / for it is faire ynough".\(^{119}\) Throughout the book he summarised his arguments and drew out the lessons that the reader should learn. Generally his style was didactic although he made extensive use of popular forms of expression. In regard to the papacy and its followers Swinnerton used alliterative descriptions: "my masters the papy3tes, with the proctours of bycherly buggersters", or "myne olde popysshe papystes".\(^{120}\) Occasionally he inclined towards a colloquial style. Exempla and proverbial sayings abound. The scholastic-theologians, for example, were described as a ship without bottom on the Spanish sees. The papists fight
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with a pudding not with a sword. At other times Swinnerton was moved to emotionalism. "O good lorde, why doest y suffre these wretches thyne enemyes so longe to reygne, to rule, to deuoure, to murdre, to slee & kyll bothe the body and souls of thy poore creatures".

Swinnerton's awareness of the vox populi is also found in his employment of abuse and sexual denigration. The Pope was seen as a "false bloodsupper and Antechrist", the "foule tode of Rome", the "babylonycall strompet of Rome", a gorgle-faced Antichrist, a "foule romysshe rat". All the world know that he is "a bastarde, a symonyake, an heretyke, & a false vsurper of his dignyte". Innocent III was hailed as that "foule monstre and hoore of Babylone". Every pope suffers from ambition, pride, lordliness, envy, malice, disdain, private and open murder, oppression, tyranny, gluttony, and all manner of lechery. They are to be identified with Simon Magus, Judas, and with the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. Their aims are to burn, hang, create sects and division, and to wallow in debate, contention and strife.

With these expressions Swinnerton's anti-papal abuse went much further than existing government propaganda. At the same time however; the tenor of his argument kept firmly in line with official statements. Swinnerton's discussion of papal power advanced the same claims as had been made in the Determinatio of the Universities and in the Glass of Truth. The bishop of Rome has no more authority than any other bishop in Christendom. His jurisdiction is confined to his own diocese. The Pope therefore can neither interdict nor administer in other dioceses whether by marriage or dispensation. The Petrine commission
properly applies to all the disciples. If it were true, Swinnerton argued, that Peter alone was entrusted with the keys according to the gospel of Matthew chapter 16: 18-19 then the power to bind and loose was given to all the disciples as is recorded in Matthew 18:18. The power of the keys is therefore irrelevant. Papal power in England is but illusion, usurpation and tyranny. As a Christian minister the role of the Pope is to obey the temporal authorities, not to purchase the authority of headship for himself, by use of the sword. Within all realms where his authority is recognised, the Bishop of Rome is a traitor who makes insurrection against the duly appointed ruler.127

Like that of Erasmus, Swinnerton's anti-papalism had an essentially rational and pragmatic edge. There is simply no need for the Bishop of Rome to be the general head of the Church.128 As with St German, Swinnerton focussed his argument on the question of law. If the Pope is needed in England then so are his laws and decretals, yet the King's own laws are completely sufficient. Moreover, Swinnerton's attack operated on a fundamentally secular level. His appeal was to the self-interests of the reader.

"This realme of Engläde hath been greuously vexed, troubled, pylled, polled, shorne, shauen and scraped euem to y very harde bones and mary".129 Throughout his Preface the benefits of Henry VIII's reign are contrasted with the robbery undertaken by the Pope.130 Swinnerton's own paradigm for Henry's relations with the Pope is that used by Tyndale: King John's dealings with Innocent III. For Swinnerton, John was unjustly treated as a result of two factors: his demand for finance to aid the defence of the realm, and his refusal to accept the Pope's appointment of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury.131
Whilst the example of King John operated largely on a negative level, as a warning to what to expect and avoid, Swinnerton drew out a strikingly positive lesson. In a part of the mustre devoted to the issue of the duties of subjects to their sovereign Lord, he created an image of an army of bishops and popes which constantly wage war on England. Moreover this was no mere metaphor. According to Swinnerton, the common people should treat the papists as they would the Turk, and should be willing therefore to shed blood for their king in battle. "There I saye thou art bounde vnder the payne of dampnacion to stryke". Defence of the realm, however does not justify random violence, since the right to determine when and where to fight is entrusted to the sovereign alone. If Henry VIII decides to resist papal aggression he need only command his subjects, "nay but euen wynke vpon vs!", and they will draw their swords and fight like Englishmen!

With this militant appeal to nationalism, together with his abuse of the papacy, Swinnerton clearly saw the mustre as an important aid to government propaganda. In his discussion of the extent of papal power he claimed to be aware that he touched on other books' material. Earlier he directed the reader to resort "unto the glasse of truthe, &. to the booke named the determinacions of the uniuersities / where it is ryght excellently and passynge well declared & debated what the power of the pope is / how far it extendeth / and what he may do". In many ways however, the mustre appears to reflect more the influence of the later government work, Articles devised by the King's Council, which had been printed towards the end of 1533 than either the Glass or the Determination.
Unlike the Glass, the Articles violently attacked the person of Clement VII and substituted the title of Bishop of Rome in place of Pope. Clement's excommunication of the King had resulted in widespread fears of divine retribution, and had revived the tales of King John and the effects of that interdict. The Articles were framed in order to quell popular doubts about the progress of Henry's divorce by an insistence on the duty of Christians to follow the decisions of their King. In the light of the Articles Swinnerton's polemic seems to have been designed as simply an elaboration or a more expansive version of government opinion. In his attitude to the pope and in his stress on obedience Swinnerton went no further than this most recent statement of official policy.

The hypothesis receives further support by a consideration of the dating of the mustre. In the earliest surviving edition of the complete work the translated section on the lives of Hildebrand and Henry IV begins with the signature Al. The preface of the translator (mustre), which precedes the translations, also begins at Al, and like them it has its own colophon. On the basis of this separate pagination it appears certain that the translations of Benno's lives were either published separately, or had been intended for an independent printing from the translator's preface. According to Anthony Wood, Benno's lives were first brought out sometime in December 1533. At the end of the complete composite mustre the date of publication is given as the 24th March 1534. In addition there are significant differences in tone between the translations—and-Swinnerton's own preface the latter displaying far more scurrility and militance.
Hence in view of both the style and dating of the works, it seems likely that a more abusive and politically aware Prologue was added to the translations sometime during the first few months of 1534 following the government's publication of the Articles of the King's Council.

Having said this, it cannot be concluded that the *mustre* was actually produced as a piece of government propaganda. After all, the book was not issued from the official press of Berthelet, but was brought out by Wynkyn de Worde for John Byddell. Between 1533 and 1539 Byddell's press was specifically devoted to the production of controversial books. In 1534 he brought out the second edition of Robert Barnes's *Supplication unto Henry VIII*, whilst in the following year he arranged for the printing of Erasmus's anti-papal satire *Julius Exclusus*. In the light of these works the *mustre* appears very much representative of Byddell's printing concerns.

Furthermore, not all of the ideas expressed in Swinnerton's Prologue derived from government publications; indeed parts of the work echoed some of the themes of the Protestant exiles' literary polemics against Thomas More. In particular Swinnerton considered the issue of unwritten verities. Initially he took an apparently conservative stance. "Truthe it is that the worde of god unwryten is of as great strength and efficacite as y worde of god wryten, I meane yf it be the very worde of god in dede". Once more however, Swinnerton's argument developed along pragmatic lines. There is nothing outside of scripture necessary for salvation. The papists are not able to say precisely how much of the gospel is unwritten, and it is hardly likely that the apostles wrote in order that the gospel
should be left insufficient. Because the papists cannot prove the bishop of Rome’s authority by written testimony they seek refuge in the invisible word. The temporality does not need the spirituality to assure them which is the true Word of God. Papistical spirituality is not the true Church of God; it does not know the true Word, and therefore it lacks understanding of the Holy Spirit. The whole purpose of anti-Christian papalism is to deny all scripture.\textsuperscript{145}

This brief section on the sufficiency of scripture for salvation is the only part of the entire work which suggests that the author had any leanings towards Protestantism. To claim, as D.B. Knox does, that the \textit{mustre} sought to advance reformed doctrine under cover of a long prologue confuting the papal claims,\textsuperscript{146} is to read far too much into the writing. Certainly the general absence of controversial religious material may have aided the publication of the book, yet it cannot be said that the book was let through any sort of ban on Protestant writing.\textsuperscript{147} In the \textit{mustre}, which represents one of the earliest independent pieces of pro-government polemic, the author was careful to avoid any theological unorthodoxy altogether, rather than to advance Protestant ideals surreptitiously.

\textit{A litel Treatise ageynste the mutterynge of some papistis in corner:}

On the basis of the talents that he had displayed in the \textit{mustre} Swinnerton gained employment as an official polemicist. His first work for the government, entitled \textit{A Litel Treatise}, was brought out in the second half of 1534, only a matter of months after the publication of the \textit{mustre}. The work emerged following
... a memorandum of Cromwell which drew attention to the need
to combat opposition to the second marriage. In particular
the memorandum sought to counteract denigration of Cranmer.\textsuperscript{148}
The \textit{Litel Treatise} reiterated many of the arguments of earlier
government polemics concerning papal power and jurisdiction.
Accordingly aspects of the work echoed themes used in the \textit{mustre}
which was itself heavily influenced by government apologetic.
The papist view that the keys of the Church were given to
Peter alone was hailed as a deception.\textsuperscript{149} The pope is not
the head of the Church but is merely a brother.\textsuperscript{150} As such
he can err, and be open to correction. The authority of the
Bishop of Rome is limited to his own diocese, and in any case,
he is subject to the power of a general council.\textsuperscript{151}

A principal allegation dealt with in the treatise was that
a speedy and radical reform of religious matters has an essentially
harmful effect. In short, it severs the bond of custom, so
'making all our forefathers do amiss'.\textsuperscript{152} The objection was
skilfully met by Swinnerton who examined the issue of religious
change within the confines of political authority. Papal
authority, he claimed, as our forefathers rightly understood,
ascended from the grants of Kings and Princes, and the consent
of common men.\textsuperscript{153} Whenever Popes have exerted influence within
England the fortunes of the realm have declined. As in the
\textit{mustre} antipapalism was expressed chiefly in social and economic
terms. "What pilleth he yerely. What mischeuous meanes doth
he inuent and seke out, to robbe and spoyle us of our welthe.
What lawes hath he deuysed, what pencons out of abbeyes exempt,
what peter pens out of parishes, what pardones, what kynde of
cursynges, & blessynges & absolucions. What wyles, what
gyles, what fraudes, what diuillishe deceytes and snares, are daylie couerly couched to catche coyne from the peple". Such tyranny justifies the actions of the King to constrain the power of the pope and to deliver his realm from captivity.

As the expression of government opinion the Litel Treatise was a more restrained polemic than the independent mustre, although Swinnerton's talent for scurrility was evident throughout. The word 'papists' was again a term of opprobrium, and his abuse of the pope was constantly alliterative: "This wily wat hath walked all this lōge while"; "the pope he polled a pace for his parte". Though historical examples of papal errancy were not provided, the treatise made a more extensive use of the Fathers, and a more positive evaluation of the early church as a model for subsequent religious and ecclesiastical practice than its predecessor.

In addition Swinnerton gave several colloquial references. The papist view that the world was a better place before the reforms, was ridiculed as being as wise a saying as the claim that since the crying down of Gallyhallpens the learning of Duns never prospered, or the opinion that since Tenterden steeple was built Sandwich haven has ever more decayed. Like the mustre the treatise contained a strong appeal to reason. In his conclusion he stressed that both scripture and reason affirm that subjects be obedient to their rulers. In many ways the need for the Litel Treatise was seen to arise out of the arguments of books like the mustre. "For so moche that somme controuersie, at the fyrst sight of certayne bokes of late put forth the concernynge the bysshoppe of Rome, called the pope, rose amonge the people, some meruaylynge that we
shulde so sodeynely relynquyshe and forsake that custome, that had so longe continued, and somme were so blynded, that they thought it shulde be ageynste our feythel to forsake the pope, but I thynke they, that so supposed, dyd put more their trust in the pope, then in Christ". Thus the motives of those who oppose the progress of reform were seen by Swinnerton and the government as stemming from a false theological outlook.

The Tropes and Figures of Scripture.

On the evidence of both the mustre and the Litel Treatise, Swinnerton cannot be identified as a particularly ardent Protestant writer. Naturally the government work evinced no trace of Protestant ideas, whilst the independent mustre gave only a cursory account of the doctrine of sola scriptura, a doctrine that was by no means the exclusive property of Protestant theology. Yet on the basis of Swinnerton's later career it appears that the author certainly sympathised with evangelical ideas at the time of writing both works. In 1536 Swinnerton wrote a work entitled The Tropes and Figures of Scripture, which though intended for publication was never brought into print. In the dedication to the work Swinnerton recognised and approved Cromwell's ecclesiastical leadership. Somewhat modestly he claimed that "this labour I graunte had been feate for a man of more rype lerninge than I as for good Master Moryson". The labour in question purported to be an analysis of religious language, or, more precisely, an enquiry into biblical hermeneutics. Swinnerton's object was to show
how and when the literal interpretation of scripture should be employed. The lessons of the work were threefold. Firstly, the reader should compare the senses of particular words with their meaning in other parts of the scriptures. Secondly, he should examine the context or circumstances in which the words were spoken. Thirdly, he should make his interpretation according to the rule of faith and charity.\textsuperscript{163}

Swinnerton's enquiry owed a considerable debt to Quintilian's \textit{Institutio},\textsuperscript{164} a classic work on rhetoric. Of more importance however, was his use of contemporary controversial literature. On the one hand he disparaged Eck and Cochleus, and More's work against Robert Barnes.\textsuperscript{165} On the other hand he cited Melanchthon, Barnes's Supplication, and Tyndale's \textit{Parable of the Wicked Mammon} for a discussion of justification by faith.\textsuperscript{166} Swinnerton's own principles of scriptural interpretation indicate a particular indebtedness to Tyndale. In the opening of his \textit{Obedience of a Christian Man} Tyndale addressed himself to the papists' fourfold interpretation of the bible, and argued for the overwhelming priority of the literal sense.\textsuperscript{167} In the \textit{Tropes and Figures of Scripture} Swinnerton repeated Tyndale's attack on the papists almost word for word. As with Tyndale, the various interpretations of scripture were identified with the political activities of two distinct groupings. The first seek to promote the affairs of the King, in harmony with Christian doctrine. The second resist God's teaching and libel it as the product of "new fangled faccions". A literal interpretation of the Bible was thus seen as a touchstone of the Royal Supremacy.

In attacking the papist misuse of Scripture Swinnerton
examined the rationale of particular popish practices and traditions. The commandment to avoid images, for example, when interpreted literally forbids all kinds of bodily reverence, and all outward oblation and sacrifice done before them. Worship consists solely of that which God accepts as service, that which is revealed in His Word. To use incense, candles, coats, capes, shoes, oblations, kneeling, crowning, kissing, and licking before images is to please the devil and to commit idolatry.

In Swinnerton's eyes the main Romish abuse was the monastic regime. Popish vows are false, and celibacy is equated with buggery. To abjure marriage is itself devilish. All sects are creatures of Satan. Purgatory is but a monastic fantasy, a preoccupation with works-righteousness. Towards the close of the work Swinnerton turned his attention to the doctrine of justification by faith. According to the Scriptures justification, remission and forgiveness of sins are attributed to faith alone, and not to any human agency. Unlike his sources, Tyndale and Barnes, however, Swinnerton saw faith merely as an 'inner work', which in itself did not occasion justification. Rather, justification was applied only to those whom God had already called to salvation.

Swinnerton's language reveals him to be no great theologian, yet he may still be described as a competent interpreter of reforming ideas. Though the theology of the Tropes and Figures derived from exilic works, Swinnerton attempted to make his observations on religious language relevant to the political situation in 1536. By then, attacks on images and monasteries were part of government policy. In the text of his work
Swinnerton referred to a recent, controversial aspect of government reform, the execution of the Charterhouse monks. According to him, the monks, in sticking to the doctrine of their God at Rome, were rightly hanged, drawn and quartered as traitors. Hence in this work of 1536 Swinnerton was able to make a far stronger correlation between government action and Protestant ideas than was evident in his writings of 1533-34.

The Tropes and Figures was the climax of Swinnerton's literary career. Soon after completing the writing Swinnerton, armed with a licence to preach, set off to evangelize the countryside. His activities in Lincolnshire in the spring of 1536 aroused the hostility of Bishop Longland who in a letter to Cromwell complained that Swinnerton's preaching offended the people. Swinnerton, he alleges, lacks three things: learning, knowledge of the doctors, and discretion. Furthermore some men have claimed that he is immoral. 'His sermons are not fruitful, but rather seditious, and he preaches on those doubtful matters which were forbidden to be touched till the determinations were published'. In addition Longland blamed Swinnerton for causing idleness and poverty since his teaching that the people should read English books all day has encouraged them to forsake worldly labour. The Bishop saw the preacher's licence as undermining his own authority. Without this seal of officialdom, he argued, people would not admit Swinnerton into their company, neither would they hear him. Apparently official recognition was highly valued by Swinnerton. When pressed not to preach on controversial subjects he defended himself with the claim that he knew the King's mind.

Cromwell had to be seen to take action against Longland's
coarse preacher. His order for Swinnerton's apprehension on the 9th of May, however, arrived too late. By then as Longland ruefully admitted, Swinnerton had escaped to London or Essex, his costs aided and his flight facilitated by unnamed men. It is indeed possible that Cromwell deliberately delayed his order for arrest in order to let his protégé escape and continue his preaching elsewhere. 177

According to both the record of his preaching activities and the testimony of his written books Swinnerton became more radical as the decade progressed. Certainly he became more confident about expressing his beliefs. By 1536 he felt able both to present distinctively Protestant ideas, and to acknowledge their source. Two years earlier in the mustre he deliberately withheld the writings from which he took the bulk of his prologue. This increase in confidence was largely determined by political developments. In 1533-34 the government's main concern was with the essentially political affairs of divorce and supremacy. By 1536, with the attack on images and monasticism, religious factors had come to the fore. Ideas which could be openly voiced in 1536 were not necessarily tolerated in 1533-34. In the light of these developments it appears that in his early works Swinnerton was careful to veil his Protestant beliefs behind a concern to persuade his readers of the validity of the government's policies. Like another Protestant employee of the government, Edward Foxe, Swinnerton displayed his Protestant sympathies in his activities, rather than in his writings. In the mustre, for example, historical and not theological ideas flourish. The very fact that historical arguments dominate even an independently produced polemic
illustrates the considerable influence of the government's own historical emphasis upon Protestant writing within England.

(ii) Robert Barnes

Although Swinnerton's published works showed little interest in theology and no substantial trace of Protestant doctrine it should not be concluded that the expression of controversial issues was deliberately suppressed. In April of 1534 Chapuys reported that Henry VIII ordered his preachers for Easter to say the worst things against the pope that they could. By the end of the year a number of Protestant writings had been brought out in London, many of which complemented the anti-papal propaganda of the government. Within this category of Protestant polemic the most important book of the year was Byddell's edition of Robert Barnes's Supplication unto Henry VIII.179

Born in Norfolk around 1495, Barnes became a novice at the Augustinian house in Cambridge in 1511/12. Following a period of study at the University of Louvain he returned to Cambridge around 1522/23 as Prior of his order. There he introduced the study of classical Latin authors and gained for himself bachelor and doctoral degrees.181 Barnes is reported to have been converted to Protestantism by Bilney. By 1525 he had emerged as the spokesman of the White Horse Tavern group of Cambridge Protestants. On Christmas eve of that year he preached a sermon in St. Edward's Church in which he attacked the civil and ecclesiastical abuses of the day. Soon after he was charged with twenty five points of heresy and was
examined before Wolsey. Under pressure from his friends Barnes agreed to recant and was compelled to bear a faggot at St. Paul's Cross. In 1526 he was placed under house arrest at the Augustinian priory in London. Whilst there he appears to have sold copies of Tyndale's New Testament to a group of Lollards. This indiscretion was reported to the authorities who removed Barnes to Northampton, according to Foxe, 'there to be burned'. Towards the end of 1528 Barnes escaped and fled from England. Following a brief stay in Antwerp he arrived in Wittenberg where he became a close friend of Luther, Bugenhagen, and Melanchthon. It was from Wittenberg that he published his first work in 1530, Sentenciae ex doctoribus collectae; a series of doctrinal statements supported by authorities taken from the scriptures, doctors and canon law. The work formed the basis for his next book, the 1531 Supplication unto Henry VIII.

According to the title-page of the 1531 Supplication, the work consisted of three parts. (i) A Supplication unto Henry VIII; (ii) The articles for which Barnes was condemned by the spirituality; (iii) A disputation of eight commonplaces confirmed by scripture, the doctors, and canon law. The commonplaces were as follows: Only faith justifieth before God; What is holy church, and who be thereof and whereby men may know her; What the keys of the church are and to whom they be given; Freewill to man, after the fall of Adam, of his natural strength, can to nothing but sin; It is lawful for all manner of men to read holy scripture; Men's constitutions which be not grounded in scripture bind not the conscience of man under the pain of deadly sin; All manner of Christian men,
both spiritual and temporal, are bound when they will be houpled to receive the sacrament in both kinds under the pain of deadly sin; It is against scripture to honour images and to pray to saints.\textsuperscript{186}

Byddell's 1534 edition also opened with a section entitled "A supplication unto the most gracious prince H. the viii"; however, only the first four pages, themselves a partial revision of the earlier version, remained and the rest of the section was completely rewritten.\textsuperscript{187} In its new form the section consisted of an attack on the loyalty of the clergy, which Barnes examined by focussing on the subversive character of the oaths taken by bishops to the Pope. The second part of the book, the defence of the twenty five articles from Barnes's Cambridge sermon and trial, followed the original fairly closely though the fifth article on the legality of reading scripture was largely rewritten.\textsuperscript{188} Following the articles Barnes inserted an entirely new section entitled "The whole disputation between the bishops and Doctor Barnes",\textsuperscript{189} an account of Barnes's examinations before the University authorities and the bishops following his Christmas eve sermon. In the part of the book devoted to commonplaces many of the doctrinal statements were altered. The article on justification by faith was revised. In the place of the article on the Church Barnes substituted a new section with the same title, in which he replied to the criticism made by Thomas More of the original article.\textsuperscript{190} The section on the power of the keys was omitted altogether whilst the section on freewill received minor alterations. The remaining four articles were completely abandoned and replaced with a long new section entitled "By
God's word it is lawful to priests that have not the gift of chastity to marry wives", which was also based on one of the articles in the 1530 Sententiae.

The 1534 Supplication.

(i) Controversy with More.

The 1531 Supplication met with mixed response. Stephen Vaughan was wildly enthusiastic, judging it the Protestant book most likely to appeal to a popular audience. In a letter to Cromwell Vaughan requested that Barnes be given an audience before the King to present his case in person. Cromwell was asked to "look well upon Dr. Barnes' book. It is such a piece of work as I have not yet seen any like it. I think he shall seal it with his blood". By late December Barnes was back in England under the King's promise of safety. During 1530 the increasingly unfavourable response of the Pope to Henry's divorce had caused the King to solicit the support of German Lutherans. Barnes's friendship with the Wittenberg theologians made him a suitable candidate for the government's diplomacy. Accordingly he was entrusted with the task of conveying Luther's view of the divorce back to England. Unfortunately for him Luther categorically denied the validity of Henry's case, thus condemning his first venture into government service as a failure. Unlike Vaughan, Thomas More was deeply perturbed by the Supplication "But to speak of Barnys boke surely of all theyr bokes that yet came abroad in England. (of all which never one sie or good) was never nor yet so bad, so folish nor so false as his...." In addition More vehemently opposed Cromwell's attempt to use
Barnes as an agent to the German Lutherans, and throughout Barnes's stay in England More's agents kept him under close surveillance. When More began writing his *Confutation of Tyndale* it is unlikely that he intended replying to the *Supplication*. By the end of 1532 however he had begun and possibly finished an attack on the book over what he termed "the brest of all this batayle", the doctrine of the Church.

More's attack illustrates some of the faults of his polemical technique, in particular his tendency to quote his opponent's arguments in full. Barnes's education and style of writing were constantly disparaged. He was, More alleged, merely a "lewde sedycyouse heretyke". Barnes, it was claimed, had suffered defeat in oral disputation, misused texts, adopted circular reasoning, contradicted himself, and wrote in bad English. At times More sought to correct Barnes's translations. Elsewhere he made polemical capital out of Barnes's mistakes in citing authorities. Much of the work was intentionally humorous. Of particular success was his creation of an imaginary dialogue in which Barnes was interrogated by a simple merchant's wife and by a secret hostess. A good deal of More's attack, however, was less subtle. Throughout he mocked Barnes's life and career, in particular Barnes's abjuration. Barnes's title of doctor was dropped in favour of 'frere' or 'frere frappe', and his condition was diagnosed as frenetic because he was no longer tonsured. According to More Barnes and all his fellow reformers who imagine an invisible Church derive their inspiration from the bottle rather than from the Holy Spirit. Like alchemists they are mere charlatans. Barnes's own arguments are mere "asseheaded exclamacyons,"
"bysy bullynge", "deuelysshe lyes whych he spetteth and speweth out vpon honeste men". He himself is like a "madde wylde bull", "a rude asset", "a fonde ape", "an abomynable hore", and the "deuyls lymme".

In his reply to More in the 1534 Supplication Barnes made no attempt to match like with like and sought to avoid the scurrility and invective of his opponent's polemic. Circumstances surrounding More's fall appear to have influenced Barnes's style. According to the reformer, if More were in the position he once enjoyed Barnes would write at greater length. However, since More is now unable to mock out of conceit, or spout his lies and allegations, he will simply pray that through God's grace More will revoke all the false doctrine that he has brought into the world. Barnes's response to More consisted of a mere fifteen folios in which he restated his earlier position on the Church. According to More the Church included both good and bad. In contrast Barnes believed that "the true churche of Christ, standeth in them onely, that be good men. For the kyngdome of Christ is distincted in very dede, from the kyngdome of the deuyll. For yuell men be doubtles the membres of the dyuell...." In so far as the pope makes all ecclesiastical laws applicable only to the clergy it is commonly believed that the Church and the spirituality are one and the same. In his earlier edition Barnes's intent was simply to declare that neither Pope, nor cardinals, nor bishops constituted the whole Church on account of any external office or authority. Before God there is no difference between priests and laymen. The true Church is known only by the scriptures. The Roman Church however is identified by its persecution, imprisonment,
and banishment and its love of the world. The members of the pope's church be "the ministers of Christ, but they serve Antichrist, they go gorgyously arrayed, of our lorde's goodes, vnto whom they gyue no honour. And of these commeth the deckynge of harlottes, that thou seyste sayly. The game players, disguysynge, and kynges apparell. Of this commeth golde in theyr brydels, in theyr sadelles, and in theyr spurres. So that theyr spurres be bryghter than the aüters. Of this commeth theyr plenuous wyne presses, and theyr full sellers, bolkyng from thys vnto that. Of this commeth theyr tonnes of sete wynes. Of this be theyr bagges so fyllde. For suche thynge, as these be, wyll they be rulers of the churche. As deacons, archedeacons bysshops, and archebyshops & c." 209

(ii) Clerical Marriage.

Although the circumstances surrounding More's fall may have coloured Barnes's polemic, resulting in a mild, even disappointing work, this sense of restraint was not applied to all of his new section on clerical marriage. Hence his argument was ostensibly directed not against those who like More remained obstinate in their oppotion, but rather against those who objected to clerical marriage out of ignorance of the scriptures. Accordingly Barnes emphasised the sheer simplicity of this matter. Whereas he had written other articles which were hard and obscure and only understood by learned men, this article was so sensible that a morally good layman could accept it with reason and equanimity. 210
From scripture alone Barnes put forward a two-fold argument. Firstly, salvation was in no sense dependent on celibacy. Secondly, marriage was instituted by God as the only remedy for fornication. Paul did not issue a commandment to bind men to chastity, yet the Pope set himself above God in holding men to a condition which is contrary to God's command. The Pope's laws distinguish between the matrimony of laymen - a fleshly carnal thing, and the chastity of priests - a spiritual marriage. Their rationale for celibacy necessarily dishonours the entire estate of marriage, making it a thing unclean. The Pope's persecution of married priests merely confirms his hostility to the institution itself. 211

Whilst scripture determined the thrust of his argument Barnes attempted to reinforce his view that compulsory clerical celibacy was merely a recent innovation, lacking in scriptural or apostolic sanction, by examining both the work of the Fathers and later historical records. Cyprian, Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome were all cited in support of his view, 212 and a list of popes was provided, all of whom, it was claimed, were sons of priests. According to Barnes, compulsory clerical celibacy was only introduced in the West by Pope Nicholas I around 860 A.D., although he was unsuccessful owing to sustained clerical opposition and protest. Likewise the attempts of Pelagius II, Siricius, and Gregory I all failed for similar reasons. Even the decree of Innocent II on the issue had no universal effect. In 1074 however, Gregory VII did succeed in enforcing clerical celibacy. Yet like Swinnerton Barnes saw Gregory as a necromancer who, according to the chronicles, had poisoned four or five previous popes in order to gain the
office. In thus deprecating the personal life of the originator of priestly celibacy Barnes sought to undermine the validity of the institution itself.

As for English history, Barnes claimed that priests were allowed to marry up till 1107, when Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury made a law against such marriages. Here Barnes was guilty of misusing his information and misleading the reader. Fabyan's Chronicle, from whom Barnes appears to quote, merely records the decree, not that the decree ended clerical marriages. In general however Barnes's citation of authorities was marked by a greater accuracy than in the works of either his mentor Tyndale, or his follower Bale.

On the whole Barnes's account of the development of compulsory clerical celibacy was well argued. For the most part he allowed the sources to speak for themselves and he was only occasionally guilty of misrepresentation. In working out the consequences of clerical celibacy, however, Barnes was less scrupulous. At one point he quoted an entire letter of Huldericus to Nicholas I in which the bishop recorded his opposition to the Pope's attempts to enforce celibacy. In the letter Huldericus recalled that Gregory I was forced to abandon his policy of enforcement after he had caught five thousand heads of illegitimate children in his fishing net one day. At least this legendary tale could be located in the records. Elsewhere Barnes employed the more dubious technique of employing contemporary oral reports. He himself, he claimed, knows of a recent case of clerical child murder, and all his readers must still remember the incident in which an honest man lost his daughter because she was killed by a priest who had got
her pregnant. This affirmation on the basis of 'credible' information led Barnes to assert that he could recite more abominations if he were not so ashamed to do so. And yet if the defenders of clerical celibacy sought to attack his article he would retaliate by declaring how some certain contemporary bishops in England "doth let whores to forme vnto priests". In a marginal note the recommendation is proposed that all priests who are known whoremakers should be burnt.216

The consequences of clerical celibacy were seen by Barnes as having even more serious ramifications. If any man emerged preaching the excellence of chastity and the misery of marriage, and exhorting Englishmen to live alone, such a man would be the greatest traitor to the King's grace. If acted upon his preaching would immediately result in the destruction of the royal succession. Secondly his preaching would be disastrous for the commonwealth since it would reduce the population to the point where the King was eventually Lord of no subjects.217

In concluding his article on priestly marriage with a blatant appeal to the interests of the ruler Barnes sought to demonstrate that many of the clerical practices currently employed in the Church were in conflict with the interests of the commonweal. This national appeal received further development in the Supplication itself.

(iii) The Supplication

In his opening section of the revised Supplication Barnes's expressed aim was to show that the clergy had always been a subversive force within the realm. Henry VIII is told a story
concerning a hot headed servant of the Bishop of Salisbury during the reign of Richard II in order to show that the clergy have in the past done open violence, have broken the King's peace and have committed robbery of men's goods. King John, it was alleged, was driven out of his kingdom by the clergy and was forced to buy back his land by paying the Pope and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. When Henry II ordered that no bishops should leave England without permission the bishops got the Pope to declare the act heretical. The author's attention was mainly devoted to the issue of bishops' oaths of allegiance to the Pope, a practice that was seen as having no scriptural or apostolic authority, like so many other "greater matters" of Romish religion such as "to christenynge of belles / to halowyng of churches, to blessyng of candels, to consecratynge of holy oyle / to halowing of chalesses / vestementes / and aulters..."

Many of Barnes's allegations were mere innuendo. If he were able Pope Clement would drown Henry with one word. The annual visits of bishops to Rome are not conducted for spiritual purposes but so that the pope's agents have the opportunity of entering into conspiracy against all rulers. Bishops only pretend to be shepherds of their flock so that Antichrist might "haue a cloke for his treason". Barnes's whole discussion of the question of episcopal oaths sustained this single charge of treason, thereby raising once more the issue of praemunire.

To illustrate the lengths to which the bishops proceed against the laws of Christ Barnes cited his own case. His trial was but a show. He was not told the identities of his accusers, nor was he informed about the nature of his crime.
Such procedure is typical of the justice of all clerical courts. We are called heretics only because we are condemned by bishops whose loyalty is sworn to Rome. The Pope himself is a tyrant, a "caterpillar", an attacker of Kings, a "whores sonne" who maintains harlots. He is as holy as my horse. His deeds are committed "in all whoredome, in all oppressyon, in all sodomyte, in all murder, in all pompe, & pryde...."227

Barnes's use of both historical and contemporary reports and allegations illustrates how he saw historical enquiry as highlighting the continuity of events. The past and the present do not appear very different. Hence the clergy of England in 1534 are held responsible for the actions of their predecessors: "I take you for the auctors, as well as your forefathers".228 Concerning the deposition of rulers Barnes again points out to the clerics that "this is your facte, this is your dede, this is your doctryne, in this lernynge you be promoted to doctours, and vnto this lernynge you are sworne / these bokes be red in your uniuersytes".229 His use of history owed much to Tyndale. Many of the examples of clerical subversion were found in Tyndale's 1530 Practice of Prelates. The second edition of the Supplication saw a considerable expansion of the historical material. Of all the historical references found in the second edition only the episode of Pope Zacharius's deposition of the French Emperor had been included in the original version.230 Possibly Barnes was encouraged to focus so heavily on historical evidence by Cromwell. On the other hand it is possible that he had simply found time to examine the chronicles in detail, an opportunity which was not open to him at the time of writing his first edition. In either event the effect of
this additional material was to make the 1534 work more in keeping with other writings that were produced within England from 1533 onwards which sought to expose the subversive influence of the Roman Church in English affairs. Many of his examples of clerical interference for example could have been taken from Edward Fox's *De Vera Differentia* whilst others could have been borrowed from Thomas Swinnerton's *Mustre*. Whereas in 1531 Barnes blamed both Pope and the bishops for past and present abuses, in 1534 he placed far greater emphasis on the culpability of the Pope alone. In so doing his work became more compatible with official anti-papal literature of the period.

(iv) Theology and Supremacy.

Although the second edition included a good many additions there were significant material omissions from the first edition. In particular many of the distinctive theological articles of 1531 were completely abandoned. According to W.A. Clebsch, Barnes removed from the 1534 tract the points of Reformation thought and action that were regarded within England as specifically Lutheran. Clebsch accounts for these omissions by claiming that between 1531 and 1534 Barnes's theology, following the example of Tyndale, underwent a shift away from a rigid Lutheranism in response to Henry VIII's increasing hold over Church matters. Barnes is alleged to have changed his mind over the two key issues of justification by faith, and kingship.

In 1531 Barnes argued extensively against the apostolicity of the Epistle of James, on attack that was based on Luther's own objections to the book which the Wittenberg reformer had
laid out in his 1522 preface. In according good works a role in the event or process of justification both Luther and Barnes saw the Epistle as contradicting other parts of scripture and denying the very gospel itself. In the revised edition of the Supplication all references to the non-apostolicity of the epistle had disappeared. Augustine was cited as having reconciled discrepancies between Paul and James. Faith justified a man before God, yet works were seen as a necessary fruit of that justification. In turn they fulfilled the function of declaring the individual to be justified before his fellow men.

Whether Barnes's emphasis on a secondary justification before the world constitutes a modification of Wittenberg theology is a matter to which attention will be drawn at a later stage. At this point it is sufficient to make two points of clarification. First, in his own preface to the 1530 edition of the Epistle of James, Luther omitted those phrases which denigrated the letter. Though privately he retained his negative opinion of James until his death, he did not wish congregations to read his hostile judgements. Secondly, from his early work on the Psalms onwards Luther affirmed the validity of the thought of the Epistle of James providing it was seen in harmony with the Pauline stress on sola fides. Works, as the fruit of justification, served to distinguish genuine faith from counterfeit belief.

In claiming that Barnes's position on justification in 1534 signified a momentous drift away from the religious theocentrism of the early Luther Clebsch goes too far. On the one hand he underestimates to the point of ignorance Luther's own emphasis on secondary justification, whilst, on the other hand, he exaggerates Barnes' independence and originality as a
theological thinker. In particular Clebsch claims that Barnes's theology exchanged its conception of autocratic magistracy for one of covenanted society.\textsuperscript{237} The evidence however does not support such a conclusion. In the 1534 Supplication Barnes seldom made use of the covenant terminology which had been introduced in Tyndale's New Testament of 1534. Moreover, the most significant omissions from the 1531 edition were those very sections which could be seen as casting doubts on the recently constituted autocratic magistracy of the Royal Supremacy.\textsuperscript{238}

At the close of the 1531 article on justification Barnes made unflattering remarks concerning Henry's title of "Defender of the Faith". This was simply purchased by the bishops who kept Henry in the dark about what it actually meant. This brief passage which was potentially offensive to the King was cut in 1534.\textsuperscript{239} Of more importance was the omission of the entire article "That men's constitutions bind not the conscience".\textsuperscript{240} Although the article sought to attack the tyranny of the Roman Church it could be interpreted as denying the Royal Supremacy itself. In the article Barnes pointed out that no-one ought to be compelled by force to accept any ecclesiastical traditions or observe any religious practices which did not have scriptural authority. Where the faith of the Christian was at stake men are not bound to obey. The spiritual regiment has "nothyng to do wyth the exterior Justes or ryghtwisnes of the world ād therefore hathe it no power bi ryght & lawe to make any statutes or lawys to order the world by".\textsuperscript{241} Similarly the civil authority "commandeth nothyng as conservynge the consyens / but alonly as conservyng the orderynge- or-worldly-thynges and there fore / it mynistreth a temporalle payne over the body wonly and there wyth
contēt". 242 Should the secular authorities command anything that ought to be left a matter of freedom Christians ought not give their consent. "So that Christen men are bound to obey in sufferyng the kynges tyranny / but not inconstentyng to hys vnlawfulle commandiment / alle ways hauynge a fore theyr yies / the confortable sayng of oure M. christ Fere not them that kylle y boddy..." 243 In so defending the freedom of the Christian from unjust compulsive laws of both Church and State, Barnes's article stood in fundamental conflict with the theoretic conception of royal authority on which the Royal Supremacy was based. It appears to have been suppressed on the grounds that it was potentially subversive. Left standing it could have been interpreted as justifying the form of opposition to Henry's policy that was represented by More and Fisher.

Rather than searching in vain for momentous drifts in Barnes's theology, it is more appropriate to consider the revised Supplication as the product of a mind which had been forced to come to terms with changing political circumstances. The shift which is marked in Barnes's Supplications is from a hostile mentality that was produced in forced exile to an awareness that reforms were being carried out by the King along generally desirable lines. Anything which jeopardised those reforms thereby postponed both the official and the popular acceptance of Protestant theology in England. Accordingly Barnes's emphasis in 1534 on good works appears to have been undertaken in order to demonstrate that Protestant doctrine did not pose a threat to the security of the commonweal. Thomas More, in particular, had argued that the Lutheran view that the elect were justified by faith alone logically implied
an abrogation of all temporal laws. Since God alone gave the gift of faith to those whom he had arbitrarily elected, there was no need for the justified Christian to obey the law. In the context of the type of polemic that was propagated by More Barnes's emphasis on works sought to convince both the king and country that Protestantism provided a persuasive argument for a reformation of morals. The social stability of Protestant theology is demonstrated in the concern of the individual to express his belief in good works.

The omission in 1534 of the remainder of the theological articles cannot be explained on grounds of either political influence or compromise. Possibly they were removed in order to make space for the new section on clerical marriage. Moreover, although Barnes occasionally voiced his misgivings at some of his earlier writings, claiming at one point, for example, that he wished many of his statements had been more charitably written, he does not appear to have regarded the revised edition as undermining or negating the first book. In his reply to More for example the author pointed out that his original article on the Church stated his position far more clearly and in more detail than he now wished to do. In this instance the revised edition was thus seen to supplement rather than to replace the earlier book.

In spite of the alterations and omissions Barnes's 1534 Supplication remained a distinctly, indeed militantly Protestant document. Whatever accommodations Barnes may have made to his theology in the interests of the authority of the secular powers, the book still retained a good deal of discussion of specific Lutheran tenets, some of which, such as the demand
for married priests, remained controversial for some years to come. At the time of writing his revision Barnes was still employed in government service. In June 1534 he arrived in England accompanying a diplomatic mission from the Hanseatic cities of Hamburg and Lubeck. Although the mission failed Barnes participated in religious discussions, possibly on the eucharist, right up till the end of the year. In March 1535 he was back in Wittenberg urging Melanchthon to write a solicitous letter to Henry and in August he was entrusted with the task of forestalling Melanchthon's proposed visit to France.

Whilst Barnes's labours on behalf of the King both advanced his fortunes and afforded him protection from conservatives such as Gardiner there is little evidence that his published writings were instrumental in his promotion. Diplomacy and not polemic paved the way for Barnes's acquisition in 1535 of the status of Royal Chaplain. Unlike St. German's work for example, Barnes's 1534 Supplication, though clearly of some use to the King and his government, was not incorporated into the government's propaganda campaign. Like Swinnerton's Mustre the book remained an independent piece of propaganda. Moreover the book itself was not a great publishing success. Byddell printed no further editions and it was not reprinted until during the reign of Edward VI. Yet despite its relative failure the Supplication remains one of the most able expositions of Protestant theology published within England during Henry's lifetime. Barnes certainly compromised his views on religious liberty, but in so doing he exploited the opportunity to advance Protestant doctrine alongside anti-papal sentiment. In the 1534 Supplication the Lutheran doctrine of the state, with its
sharp distinction between the two regiments, was sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. In his defence however it should at least be stressed that by the end of 1534 Barnes was faced with a fait accompli: the break with Rome and the Supremacy of the Monarch were not mere possibilities but were political and constitutional realities that could not be ignored. Whereas the exilic writers could discuss the divinely constituted authority of the temporal ruler as a possible alternative or counter to the interference of the spirituality in the temporal realm; as a result of Henry's policies, Protestant writers within England were compelled to acknowledge the supreme authority of the King as a fact, even though it constituted in effect a political intervention in the spiritual realm. As a result of Henry's policies Protestant writings within England became far more pragmatic documents than exilic works. In the 1534 Supplication for example, Barnes attempted to place the essentials of reform in their true order. Before widespread Protestant reforms could be carried out papal interference within England must be completely rejected. Anti-papalism had thus become the linchpin of true reform. By the following year Barnes's accommodation to the reality of government policy and propaganda was complete. In August he brought out Vitae Romanorum Pontificum, a book which he dedicated to the King and which expanded the type of scurrilous ad hominem arguments of Swinnerton's mustre into a coherent history. The book was prefaced with lavish praise from Luther who pointed out that whilst he had attacked the papacy from holy scripture others have attacked it from another source, that is from history. By 1535 historical arguments which had come to the fore some
four years earlier as a result of Henry's need to solve his divorce, were fully integrated into the literary structures of evangelical reform.
1. According to Knox, the breach with Rome meant that the reformers and their printers could be much more bold in advocating reformed doctrine, so long as they were, at the same time, outspoken in condemning the papal supremacy. The Doctrine of Faith, p. 148. What Knox fails to consider, however, is that the breach effectively created the conditions in which reformed doctrine in England could be tolerated. England could be tolerated. English Protestant literature prior to 1533/34 was almost entirely an exilic phenomenon. Writers and printers in England did not become more bold as a result of the breach, rather, they were allowed for the first time to actually advance reformed ideas.
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CHAPTER THREE

A TENDENTIOUS ART: PROTESTANT

AND ERASMIAN TRANSLATIONS

C.1530-36.
In many ways Barnes's 1534 *Supplication* typifies the production of English Protestant polemics during the period 1534-39. His book retained distinctive Protestant tenets which could not have been openly propagated only a few years earlier, yet aspects of his work were omitted or altered in order to accommodate the new directives of government policy. In the following chapters it is proposed to follow up some of the conclusions reached in the study of Barnes and Swinnerton by examining in some detail some of the Protestant books that were published in London between 1534 and 1536. The books can be classified as original productions, reprints of earlier exilic works, and translations of continental treatises. In chapter four, our concern lies with the first two categories. In this chapter our attention is primarily directed to the question of translations.

Any examination of English translations of Protestant books raises a good many questions concerning the art or science of translation, many of which can receive only cursory attention in this chapter. Problems of syntactic theory, of morphology, or linguistics, or, indeed, of meaning itself, though central to any analysis of the process of translation, lie outside the bounds of this study. Nor for that matter is it possible in this work to account for such matters as the relation of secular translations to biblical translations, or the various attitudes to the translating art that prevailed during the reformation era. Nonetheless, although theoretical, formal, and semantic elements of the translation process must be largely ignored, any examination of English Protestant translations must take into account at least one central aspect of the science of
translation, namely the role of the translator himself. Since the translator is the focal element in translation, and since complete impersonal objectivity on his part is an impossibility, the role of the translator, as the product of the cultural context in which he lives, is central to the basic principles and procedures of translating. Consequently any study of the inter-language and inter-cultural factors at work in the nature of translation must take into account both the relationship of the translator with the source and receptor languages and more importantly his motives in translating particular works.

Although the motives that lie behind each translation may vary in accordance with the individual involved, in examining any group of writings it is necessary to consider the common aims of the translators. What type of book proved the most popular or most useful source for translating? Why were particular books of specific authors singled out for attention? What did the translator seek to achieve both for himself and for his readers? How far were his motives ideological, scholarly or financial? To what extent did the author sympathise with the ideas that the original books propagated?

As the career of Thomas Swinnerton illustrated, Protestant translators were not necessarily devoted to the production of evangelical literature. Conversely Protestant writings were not always rendered into English by known Protestant activists. For those reasons it is important to consider the relation between Protestant translations and the translations of other polemical writings. Accordingly in this chapter attention is initially directed to some translations of Erasmus's polemical works. The old adage that Erasmus laid the egg which Luther
hatched has at least the value of alluding to a close relationship between the reforming ideas of the humanists and those of the reformers. In recent years several attempts have been made to view the English Reformation from the perspective of a pan-European movement of humanist reform which received its most articulate expression in the work of Erasmus. Furthermore, in view of the bibliographical evidence pointing to the quite massive appeal of his work within England, it is no longer possible to view Protestant ideas and literature in isolation from the books of the Dutch humanist. Even after the doctrinal differences between Luther and Erasmus had received final confirmation in the 1525 controversy over the will, many Protestant sympathisers retained an admiration and an attraction for Erasmus's books, particularly his polemical writings, many of which were brought out in England both in advance of and alongside Protestant controversial works. How far did these Protestant writings share both Erasmus's viewpoint and his techniques of polemic?

The question of the translator's motives is of additional, though, by no means, secondary importance, in that the translator's intent determined his actual treatment of particular books. Hence in the second part of this chapter attention is directed to such matters as the fidelity of English translations to the source languages, and to the alterations (if any) that took place in the receptor versions. To what extent were the ideas presented in the source language omitted in the English, and what was the relation of these omissions to the political and cultural context in which the author lived? In other words, how far did other translators follow the type of accommodations made by Robert Barnes in the second edition of his Supplication?
Translations of Erasmus, c. 1530–36.

The first important use of Erasmus came in 1529 when a Protestant exile, probably William Roy, brought out a translation of the Paraclesis, a book in which Erasmus argued the case for vernacular Bibles. Within England Erasmus’s books were soon valued for their ideas of reform. Around 1530 Thomas Godfray brought out An epistell of y famous doctor Erasm of Roterdam... concerning the forebedynge of eatynge of fleshe and lyke constitutyons of men. The book, anonymously translated from Erasmus’s 1522 De Interdicto esu carniam, was a straightforward plea for reform of some ecclesiastical abuses. In particular Erasmus focussed on the legalistic observance of clerical celibacy and the complexity and severity of the laws of fasting. Godfray’s work was not unsuccessful and a second edition was published some years later.

In 1532 Robert Redman brought out another work of Erasmus which criticised the practice of compulsory clerical celibacy. An Epystle in laude and prayse of matrymony was translated from the Encomium Matrimonii by Richard Taverner, a young Cambridge scholar. In 1529 Taverner had found himself involved in a heresy scandal in Wolsey’s Oxford College and was accused of spreading Lutheranism. In the following year, whilst abroad, he wrote a letter of introduction to Cromwell in which he bemoaned the loss of a former patron and presented his credentials as a student of English law. Through Cromwell’s influence Taverner received a stipend from the Duke of Norfolk. In his dedication to the Epystle-in-praye of matrimoni Taverner recorded his gratitude to Cromwell.
He had decided on the work of Erasmus because "he thought it a thynge full necessarye & expedient, to translate it in to our vulgere tōg, & so vnder your noble protection to communicate it to the people, namely when he considered the blynde superstition of men and women, which cease nat day by day to professe & vowe perpetuall chastyte before or they suffyciently knowe themselves and thinfirmitie of theyr nature...." In the work, originally written in 1498 as a rhetorical exercise for Lord Mountjoy, Erasmus opposed the single life as a "forme of lyuyng bothe barren & vnnaturall". Since the book sought to criticise papal insistence on clerical celibacy Taverner's translation could be interpreted as undermining papal authority, thus lending support to Henry's case in the Divorce issue, particularly his desire to remarry. More importantly, his book, like so many others addressed to Cromwell, was designed to highlight an aspect of religious abuse to which the government should turn its attention. The prevalence throughout the country of the superstition of perpetual chastity led Taverner to "praye our lorde Jesu of his infinite goodnes to prouyde some spedy reformation, whan it shalbe his pleasure". Erasmus's book formed part of a whole series of vernacular translations which were addressed to the moral and religious question of marriage and celibacy.

In addition Taverner's dedication implied that reforming ideas could be more widely propagated if writers and printers could receive some official protection from the hostility of the religious authorities. For the young scholar, Cromwell had come to be seen as a kind of patron of reforming literature. Not all of Erasmus's writings however were so useful
for these advocates of change. Many of his conservative works had been published in England in the 1520s and much of his pietistic and devotional work was brought out in the following decade. Nonetheless, Erasmus's reforming works continued to sell well. Around 1533 Robert Wyer reissued the unknown exile's translation of the Paraclesis. In place of the exposition of Corinthians, which had been included in the exilic work, Wyer substituted An exhortacyon to the study of readynge of the Gospell, taken from Erasmus's preface to his paraphrase of St. Matthew. Almost immediately a second edition was printed. About the same time Wyer also published an anonymous translation of a sermon of Erasmus on the marriage at Cana, in which the author advocated a proper rather than a perfunctory devotion to the Virgin.

The most important use of Erasmus's reforming works in this period was connected with the press of John Byddell, publisher of Swinnerton's Mustre and Barnes's Supplication. On November 15th 1533 De Worde printed for Byddell an English translation of the Enchiridion. Erasmus's manual of lay piety was first printed in 1503 and ran to many editions. In 1518 Erasmus prepared a fresh edition of the work for Froben's press in Basle. In a new prefatory epistle to Paul Volz, abbot of Hugschofen near Schlettstadt, Erasmus drew out the radical implications of his thought. As the title-page of Byddell's edition pointed out, his book included this "newe and meruaylous profytable preface".

In the letter to Volz, Erasmus criticised the prevalence of external religious practice which was compared unfavourably with the true religious life, an inward, invisible piety.
Pardons, pilgrimages, and the worship of saints all received passing criticism. True veneration of saints consists in following their example of authentic belief. The author's sharpest attack was reserved for the clergy. Christ did not die so that worldly goods could be in the hands of priests. Those who wrest Christ's gospel to their ambition, lechery and lust are philistines who endanger the promotion of Christian values, "so that in dede nothynge nowe adayes is more peryllous than to teache trewly Christes lernynge / so greatly haue the philistyens preuayled fyghtyng for their erthe / preachyng erthly thynges for celestyall / and mens ineuncyons for goodes comaunderementes: that is to say / not teachyng those thyngs whiche make for ¥ glory of Christ / but those thynges whiche be for their owne aduaütage / which be pardons / composycions / & such lyke pelfare. And these they do so moche more peryllously bycause they cloke their couetousnesse with the tytles & names of great princes / of the pope of Rome / ye of Christ also him selfe". 26

Erasmus's anticlericalism stemmed from a desire to affirm the legitimacy of the layman's vocation. In no sense can the life of the layman be considered as less authentic before God. Monasticism, once a solitary life of prayer, had now served its purpose. "And now these be called religyous whiche be altogyder drowned in worldly besynesse / vsyng plainly certayne tyranny in worldly matters / and yet these for their aparayle and tytle I can not tell what / dothe chalenge suche holynesse to their selues that they do accompte all other in comparison of them selues no christen men-at-all". 27—Though his attack on monastic religiosity was pursued with great vigour Erasmus
constantly maintained his innocence of the charge that he sought
to undermine true religion. External ceremonies were not seen
as intrinsically bad even though they had been seriously misused
by greedy clerics. Neither was the sheer multiplicity of
ceremonies the main problem. Rather, the fundamental issue
at stake for Erasmus in the Enchiridion was the fact that cere-
monies and ecclesiastical customs had come to be imposed on the
laity as duties and obligations. The Pauline notion of
Christian liberty had been abandoned in favour of a Jewish legalism
that stood in conflict with the axioms of true Christianity.
For that reason, although his work contained revolutionary
implications particularly in relation to his assault on the
clerical monopoly of theology and piety, Erasmus's thought
proceeded from an essentially conservative perspective on
doctrine and ritual. This very conservativism certainly aided
the English publication of the book. Erasmus made no sustained
attack on the papacy, yet his portrayal of the contemporary
corruption of the religious estate served to undermine ecclesiastical
authority in general. Implicit in his argument was the conviction
that the Christian ought not to comply with unnecessary impositions
when these conflicted with divine and natural law. The preface
drew out this radical message more clearly than did the text
itself. As J.A. Gee pointed out, had the book been printed
in England solely as a manual of true Christian living, Erasmus's
polemical epistle of 1518 could have been omitted without much
loss. Yet that loss would have greatly reduced the effect-
iveness of the book as propaganda. Gee goes on to argue that
an English edition of the Enchiridion could not have been published
in the 1520s without engendering the hostility of the ecclesiastical
authorities. Furthermore, to have printed the work after 1525 would have been to identify the work with the more doctrinally radical writings of the Protestant exiles. In short the book would have been regarded as seditious.  

There is however a possible connection between Byddell's English edition of 1533 and the work of the exiles. In 1522/3 William Tyndale made a translation of the *Enchiridion* whilst residing in the house of Sir John Walshe in Sodbury. Was Byddell's edition the missing translation of Tyndale? Critical examination of Byddell's text points to a peculiarly able translator. The first printed edition in England is a distinguished piece of translation, worthy of its original author. Yet neither internal nor external evidence confirms the text to have been that of Tyndale. Moreover even if the translation was his, Byddell wisely refrained from announcing the fact.

More important, though equally circumstantial, are two pieces of evidence which suggest that Cromwell may have known of Byddell's plan to publish the book. *Letters and Papers* record two instances of Cromwell paying accounts either to or for Byddell. This however is too slight to justify the conclusion that the translation and printing of the *Enchiridion* was officially instigated or indeed that Cromwell himself initiated proceedings. The question of who sponsored the printing of the work in 1533 must be left unanswered, though, as Gee rightly concludes, whoever promoted its publication was well aware of the immediate service it could render as a Reformation tract thoroughly adapted to support with impunity Henry's renunciation of papal jurisdiction.

Byddell's entry into the field of publishing was conspicuously
successful. On 1st February 1534 he produced a second edition of the *Enchiridion*. This was a considerable piece of editorial revision, and contained around nine hundred and fifty variants from the first edition. The 1534 translation was however more literal, and most of the changes can be accounted for on corrective and stylistic grounds. Byddell had certainly chosen wisely. The *Enchiridion* was the most popular of all of Erasmus's works in England. In 1538 Byddell printed a third edition which followed the revised 1534 text, and further reprints followed in 1541 and 1544. In all Byddell published and/or printed six separate editions of the *Enchiridion*.

In 1534 he arranged for the printing of two other works of the Dutch reformer. The first, known by the explicit that follows the text as a *dialoge* called *Funus*, was a translation of one of Erasmus's colloquies. *Funus* was one of four new dialogues in Froben's 1526 edition of Erasmus's *Colloquia Familiaria*. Like the *Enchiridion* the work was of some popularity, running to five translations in eight recorded editions prior to Byddell's English version.

In the work Erasmus satirised the extravagance of the Church's funeral ceremonies and attacked the rapacity of the clergy and mendicant orders. His technique was deceptively simple, consisting of two reports of two contrasting death scenes. In the first, two characters, Mercolphus and Phedrus discuss the death of a wealthy soldier named George. George was sympathetically portrayed as a weak-willed victim of clerical opportunism. Throughout his dying hours he was surrounded by begging friars who continually argued among themselves as to their respective status and authority. George's fear of death was overcome not
by a trust in Christ's death and resurrection but through a reliance on the magical properties of the clergy's tokens of grace. Prior to his death the Pope's bull was rehearsed which granted remission from all sins.\textsuperscript{42} His body was assoiled in oils and ashes, and surrounded by candles. At the point of death two friars held up pictures of Francis and Dominic.\textsuperscript{43} Because of his fear of purgatory the clergy persuaded him to bequeath his wealth to religious orders. In his will his wife, youngest son, and two daughters were instructed to go into orders, whilst his eldest son and heir was to go to Rome to be made a priest. With his money George was able to purchase release from purgatory and the illusion of salvation.\textsuperscript{44}

In the second part of the dialogue, Mercolphus and Phedrus compared George's death with that of one Cornelius. Unlike the wealthy soldier, Cornelius made no attempt to hold his wife or his children to any vow, and expressed the hope that his wife would remarry. He had no group of people watching over him and bequeathed nothing to the religious orders. The ringing of bells, trentals and bulls were all rejected, and in their place Cornelius had the scriptures read out to him. In praying directly to God and in trusting in His Word Cornelius forgoes the intercession of a priest. In such manner Erasmus advocates the need for a simple scriptural lay piety.\textsuperscript{45}

As with the Enchiridion Byddell did not print the Funus himself but commissioned the services of a more established printer. In this case he turned to the press of Robert Copland, who, like Byddell, was closely associated with the office of Wynkyn de Worde.\textsuperscript{46} Copland's edition of the Funus was for the most part literal and contained only stylistic omissions and
interpolations, although following the dialogue the printer added a brief section, possibly penned by himself, entitled "A good and godly admonicion or warnynge, very behouefull for every chrysten man to loke vpon". Whoever translated the dialogue was very much aware of the controversial qualities of the writing. In the address to the reader the translator englished the greater portion of Erasmus's specific defence of the work from his De utilitate Colloquiorum. Although some men have argued that the author's intent was to attack the religious estate, the translator aligned himself with Erasmus's chosen task of criticising men rather than the institutions within which they err.

Copland's second work for Byddell was the first English edition of the celebrated Julius Exclusus. Though Erasmus strenuously denied any involvement with the work he remains the most likely candidate for its authorship. The book was probably written in 1513/14 soon after the death of Pope Julius II, and appeared in print several years later. The English edition, entitled The dyaloge be/twene Jullius the seconde / / Genius // and saynt // Peter, did not identify either the translator or the author, although Byddell's second edition of the book claimed that it was made by a "certayne famous lerned man, pleasaunt & fruteful".

As with the Funus, Erasmus's technique consisted of comparison and contrast. The life and doctrine of Julius II was examined in confrontation with the authentic picture of apostolic life as represented by Peter. Much of the writing was no more than a personal attack on Julius himself, an attempt to expose and ridicule his sexual immorality, greed, pride, and malice. At the same time Erasmus made it clear that he saw Julius's own vices as merely a reflection of the faults of the entire
contemporary papacy. Like Julius, popes no longer know any theology but are mere warriors concerned only with the expansion of the Church's material wealth and power. Whereas the man who calls himself Vicar of Christ must approach Christ's likeness, having the greatest power but combined with the greatest goodness, the greatest wisdom but the simplest, in order to serve a Church consisting of the entire body of Christian people bound together by the Spirit of Christ, Julius represents a Church ruled by power coupled with the maximum of malice and the maximum of stupidity. For him the Church is sacred buildings, priests and cardinals, and above all, the papacy itself. 54

In this savage indictment of the papacy Erasmus focussed in particular on the popes' misuse of temporal power. Throughout the dialogue Julius boasts of his success in Battle, and, more importantly, of his constant attempts to provoke Kings to war among themselves. Julius wilfully breaks the promise of his accession to call a general council on the grounds that the council intended to reform ecclesiastical abuse. 55 In allowing Julius to list and condemn the proposals of the council Byddell's edition provided a blue print for reforms within England. Pluralism, episcopal wealth, the promotion of the higher clergy through bribery, and the sexual immorality of the bishops and minor clergy, were all seen as targets for any reforming programme. Moreover Julius claims that the Pope is above a general council and that he alone makes the laws of the Church. Towards the beginning of the work Peter points out that matters such as excommunication with which Julius threatens obstinate Kings were no part of the apostolic Church. 56

Erasmus's view of the papacy was essentially pragmatic. 57
A hierarchic concept of ecclesiastical authority vested in the single figure of the pope was undermined by his emphasis on the Church as the community of believers, all of whom render their own final unmediated account to God. In its discussion of the political misuse of power by the papacy the English edition of the *Julius Exclusus* offered the closest support to the attempts of an obdurate monarch to break with Roman authority. On the surface, the book appeared far more sensitive and relevant than any other of Erasmus's works to developments within England, in particular to the anti-papal legislation of the Reformation Parliament.

In brief conclusion, the publication of Erasmus's reforming treatises was an important contribution to the development of English controversial literature in the 1530s. His works were genuinely popular and stylistically far superior to the often arid propaganda of the government. His books offered a broader plan of reform than was discerned in official polemic, yet much of his work touched directly on matters pertaining to Henry's cause. Two points are of particular importance.

In the first place, Erasmus's books appeared especially attractive to Protestant translators. Wyer's republication of (Roy's ?) *Paraclesis*, Taverner's translation of the *Encomium Matrimonii*, and the printing of an *Enchiridion* possibly translated by Tyndale: all testify to the high regard for his work shown by the Protestant grouping both at home and abroad. Accordingly, the use made by the Protestants of his reforming writings in the early 1530s, or indeed, towards the end of the preceeding decade, suggests that Protestants made no sharp distinction between their own aims and the aspirations of the Erasmian
humanists. Erasmus's doctrinal conservatism, so well publicised after his 1525 controversy with Luther over the freedom of the will, was not seen as a major obstacle. Any theological differences were subsumed under a shared vision of a reformed Church and a purified society. Even from an early date the so-called Erasmian grouping within England contained some men who had turned to Wittenberg for the finer points of their theology.

This in turn leads to a second point. However theologically orthodox Erasmus may have been, the publication of his reforming writings from within England proceeded in a tentative, almost furtive, manner. With the exception of Taverner's work, the remainder of Erasmus's writings here discussed did not identify the translators. This secrecy appears to reflect an uncertainty on the part of printers and translators as to how Erasmus's works would be received by the officials. In bringing them out translators and printers were very much aware of their controversial content.

The translation of the *Julius Exclusus* is particularly instructive. Even though the book appeared well suited to an English audience, either the translator or the printer felt it necessary to amend several passages in the text in order to avoid giving offence. For the most part the translation was faithful to Erasmus's original text and at times was literally accurate. However at three points the translator altered the text. Two of these occur where Erasmus touched on Julius's relations with England. In the first passage, Julius relates to Peter his success in exploiting the rival claims of kings and princes. He had managed to incite the French against the Venetians, and had alienated the Emperor from France, partly
through bribery and partly through rumour. At this point Julius turns to his dealings with England, and in particular to his attitude towards the young King Henry VIII. In the English edition Julius's unflattering picture of Henry is completely omitted.

Soon after Erasmus again returned to Julius's relations with England. Here the translator makes a more subtle alteration to the text.
Tum nulla gens est apud quam minus valeat summi Pontificis auctoritas quam Anglorum (id quod protinus liquebit, siquis diui Thomae Cantuariensis episcopi vitam ac veterum regum constitutiones evoluerit); ea tamen gens, aliqui exactionum impatientissima, passa est propemodum se deglubi. Mirum autem quomodo sacerdotes quoque, qui nobis consueruerant quicquid possunt subtrahere, eo adduxerim vt regi tributum numerarent, haud perpendentes cuiusmodi fenestram regibus in posterum aperuerint; quamquam nec ipsi reges satis animaduertebant quod exemplum induxerint aduersus seipos, nempe vt liceat Romano sacrifico regno mouere quem oderit princem. Et rex adolescens maiori etiam motum rem agressus est quam volebam aut quam iussarem, tamesi malebam in hanc peccari partem.

And furthermore although there be no nacyon that passeth lesse vpon the authoryte of pope of Rome, than ý Englysshe nacyon, as it is open to hym that lyst to rede & merke well the lyfe of saynte Thomas of Canterbury, & the cöstitucions of ý olde kingse. Yet the same prouynce, so impacient of all exactions and taxes, suffred for my pleasure to be shorne to the bare skynne. To speake of ý spirituality of ý realme, it is wonder to se howe they were wonte to wholde from ý pope of Rome all they myght, yet to ayde me in my besines were contented to pay exactions howe paynfull soeuer they were. Not merkyng very diligently what a wyndowe they opened to theyr lorde and kynge, in so doyng. And to speake ý blunte truthe the kynge and his nobylles was not than most cyrcüspecte to suffre suche exactions to be gathered in his realme.

The translator's alterations can only be accounted for on political grounds. In the first passage, the translator was careful to avoid Julius's references to the unpopularity of Henry VII, and to his youthful ambitious son. By 1534 Julius's disrespectful account of the young King could have been interpreted as discrediting Henry's case against Rome. Moreover the translator omitted the reference to Henry's marriage to Katherine of Arragon. The first succession Act of Spring 1534 had made it treason to support the Pope's attempts to contend the second marriage. Though Erasmus's work hardly went that far, Julius's remarks recalled the recent arguments over the Divorce. As such his comments were open to misrepresentation and were potentially embarrassing.

In the second passage, the translation lost much of the force
of Erasmus's original. Julius's comments on how he created the opportunity within England for Popes to remove obstinate monarchs were abandoned. Furthermore the English edition dropped Julius's boast that the King had gone further in his foreign policy than Julius had originally intended. In both this and in the preceding passage the translator seems to have attempted to avoid the notion that Henry was the Pope's lackey. In an earlier section of the book however the translator came very close to propagating this very idea.

In the passage Julius explains to Peter how he gave kings titles in order to appease them. In the original the passage reads: "Nos illos magnificis titulis decoramus, etiamsi sint sceleratissimi hunc "catholicum" appellantes, illus "serenissimum", alium "illustriissimum", alium "augustum"; omnes "dilectos filos" nominamus". In Byddell's English edition however the translator wrote: "For sometyme we paynte and set out the great princes of the world wt gloryous tytles, callynge hym defender of the chyrche, an other defender of the faythe, though it be nothynge so, & al suche as wil ayde vs, our welbeloued sones". In referring to Henry's title of "Defender of the Faith", the translator, like some Protestant writers, appears to have regarded the title as a mere fabrication; a gift of the papacy made for selfish and material reasons. He does not appear to have intended to deride Henry's authority. Rather the translation seems designed to illustrate more graphically how Henry and England have been abused by the papacy. After all, an educated reader would have been well aware that Henry did not receive the title Defender of the Faith from Julius II, but had been given it in 1521 by Leo X, in appreciation of his work Assertio Septem
The fact that the title was given partly for Henry's attack on Luther, coupled with the view of the English edition that it was a mere painted token of the Pope, may indicate that the translator of the _Julius Exclusus_ had Protestant sympathies. In any event, both in this passage and in the other amended sections, the translator attempted to convey the notion that Henry was the passive victim of papal abuse. In his omissions the translator sought to avoid both the view that the King was an active ally of papal aggrandizement, and the notion that his actions towards the Papacy have always proceeded from selfish and ambitious motives.

Byddell's edition of the _Julius Exclusus_ is of importance therefore, not simply for the way in which the book offered tacit support to Henry VIII's policies, but for the way in which the translation was altered in order to avoid giving offence to the King. The work illustrates how even a humanist work that was largely devoid of discussion of controversial theological issues could still be censored according to political considerations. Moreover, the revision was not imposed from above, but was undertaken solely by the translator. None of Erasmus's books that were published within England in the early 1530s was instigated either by the government or by Thomas Cromwell, although it is likely that the Minister knew of the publication of at least some of them. Unlike the work of St German for example, none of Erasmus's writings was incorporated into the government's own propaganda campaign. Like Protestant writings, Erasmian literature was in a sense moulded by editors and translators in order to make it applicable and relevant to the political circumstances of Henry's reforms. Many of the criticisms made
by Erasmus of religious abuse or of the papacy were commonplace, shared both by Protestant writers who longed for a more radical reform of Church doctrine, or by writers such as St. German who sought to draw out the political consequences of Henry's supremacy. From the evidence of the publication of Erasmus's reforming works in the mid 1530s, Erasmianism did not furnish particularly unique ideas about reform; rather it simply contributed to a general outburst of reforming sentiment. Moreover, as both Taverner's dedication of the Encomium Matrimonii and the alterations to the Julius Exclusus confirm, reform was seen as being instigated and directed by England's political authorities. The abuses and traditions of papism were to be abolished by the temporal powers. In the translations of Erasmus's works a hierarchical concept of political authority was imposed upon an essentially laical pattern of reform.

2. Protestant Translations, 1534-36.

Although Erasmus's criticism of Romish religion sprang from a fundamentally positive concern for true religion and morality his controversial books contained a good many negative qualities. In the Julius Exclusus his attack on the immorality and corruption of Pope Julius II was as savage an indictment of the contemporary papacy as any of Henry VIII's official pronouncements. Similarly in the Funus and in the preface to the Enchiridion Erasmus's criticism of covetous and stupid clerics articulated grievances against the spirituality that were maintained both in official books and at a popular level. Not surprisingly some of the Protestant books that were translated
into English at the same time as Erasmus's polemics shared many of the negative themes of his work.

The boke of marchauntes.

In 1534 Thomas Godfray brought out a work entitled The boke of marchauntes / right necessarie vnto all folkes, a translation of the French Le Livre des marchans. The pamphlet had originally been brought out in Neuchâtel by Pierre de Vingle in 1533. Though published anonymously the author's name appeared on some copies of an edition of the work printed in Geneva in 1544. From this and from other evidence the writing has been established as the work of the reformer and pamphleteer Antoine Marcourt. According to Marcourt's most recent biographer, Le Livre des marchans, though adding nothing new, created considerable interest within France. Though prohibited from the North to the South, and condemned by the Sorbonne, it ran into at least twelve editions in 55 years. It was clearly an attractive piece of writing, once which stood in a firm tradition of anti-clerical literature that anteceded the Reformation.

Following a short preface the author launched into an attack on religious merchants for selling what is not theirs to sell, and for hawking goods under false pretexts. The estate of merchants, though honourable in the temporal sphere, is accursed and detestable in the spiritual. Examples of clerical corruption were offered as proof or evidence. The Mass of a canon is dearer than that of a vicar; an abbot's is more than a monk's; a bishop's more than a dean's; yet they all claim that the Mass of the worst of them is equal to or as good as that
of the best. Why then do they devise such prices? Similarly when some poor woman lights a candle in Church they will blow it out and sell it to another. They rob widows, sell the ground in Churchyards, usurp realms, and raise up wars to defend themselves. All is directed to profit. The great Lucifer himself is lord of these merchants who have nothing in common with Christ.

Marcourt's simple and direct criticism of the laziness, low-living and above all, of the materialism of the clerical and monastic estates made many of the points that Erasmus had stressed in such works as the Funus. Nonetheless, though lacking in originality, the book contained several interesting features. The absence of any historical argument is significant, although contemporary references were provided. The work made no attempt to account for the origin or development of ecclesiastical abuse but merely sought to attack its manifestations. There is nothing that the clergy have not occupied, "of mariage / of vestemêtes / shauyng ointinges / arrayinges / of bulles / pardons / indulgences / remissions / bones / relykes..... of sacramentes / and holy workes of god: Of breed / wyne / oyle / mylke / eggs / eggs / butter / cheese / wat / salt / fyre / fumigations / ceremonies / sensynges / songes / melodyes /..." 

There was however some argument from scripture. The Apocalypse was cited on at least one occasion, whilst, more importantly, Scripture was seen to provide descriptions of these religious merchants. "O heavy wolues / wolues insatiable /", of whom it is allegedly written in I Timothy, Ezechiel, Isaiah, I Peter, and Jude. Scripture has been monopolised by the spirituality. Concerning the merchants, " of boks of holy scripture they have
no nede / for to maintayn their mater: but they mātayne it by
strōge hade / as murtherers & theues wold do". Throughout,
this charge of theft and murder was levelled against the clergy.
Emotion was given free rein. The work constantly and consciously
appealed to the self interest of the laity. "Nat for desyre
or affectiō that I haue for to say wrōge or yuell / but to the
entēt that ū shepe of Iesu christ may kepe thē selues from suche
false prophetes." Alongside this was an appeal to the temporal
rulers, who are entrusted with the task of chastisement and who
are threatened with deposition from office by God unless they
act against the merchants. Theology as such rarely enters into
the writing. "These fyne beasts & hooded brethern" were at one
point seen as "merchaūtes of th' good works & merits", quenching the faith and grace of God, though this single reference
is almost lost amidst the tirade of anticlerical abuse. In short
the Boke of marchauntes sought to present as many exaggerated
and violent accusations as possible against the religious estate,
rather than to expose the theological falsehoods of Roman religion.

The Summe of christianitie.

In 1536 Robert Redman brought out a similarly abusive pamphlet
entitled The Summe of christianitie, a translation of the
Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum of the Avignon reformer
Francis Lambert. The book had originated in a series of
theological debates; accordingly it presented a particularly
aggressive and combative form of Protestantism. According to the
translator, the value of the book consisted in its capacity to
confute the synagogue of Satan. Clarity however was often
identical to crudity. Often the expression is blunt and the
arguments contrived. In the *Farrago* vitriolic effusions are the order of the day. Vehemence serves as justifiable rage, and there is little or nothing by way of pathos. Sympathy for either the case put forward or for the author himself vanished in the face of unrelenting scurrility.

The *Summe* consisted of four parts: (I) The epistle dedicatory of the translator; (2) the epistle of the author to Sebastian, Prince of Lausanne; (3) Chapters 1-13; (4) The conclusion. Though the bulk of the work (part 3) was expressed in the form of theses, thereby presenting a concise discussion of theological issues, Lambert sought to provide a comprehensive survey of Protestant theology. No area of doctrinal or ecclesiological significance was omitted. Each thesis was accompanied by at least one scriptural reference. Often an individual thesis was allowed to occupy several paragraphs. Though concise, the work was by no means laconic.

On most issues Lambert displayed a typical Protestant orthodoxy. On the relations between Church and state, he stressed the duties of the secular powers, who may not only constrain outbreaks of destructive radicalism, but who may also actively bring about correction of the Church's abuses. Rulers should choose learned bishops for ecclesiastical courts, for in all things except those belonging to their proper office, bishops and ministers are subject to the temporal powers. "To prynces, and rulers, it belongeth to subuerte all Pompe, & tyrannie of byshoppes, and to refourme them to humilytie, and symplecyte of apostles". In the matter of faith and works Lambert adhered to Luther's teaching. Protestant freedom is not licence but is rather a freedom of the Spirit. Faith is
never without works, although these are always undertaken out of a trust in Christ alone. On penance Lambert saw true satisfaction as lying with Christ, and consisting of a daily crucifixion of the flesh in Faith. Auricular confession was severely condemned as unprofitable, vain, impossible, curious, and damnable, and the invention of the Pope. Purgatory is a deceitful doctrine of devils, of no scriptural foundation. Clerical celibacy is equally false. The institutions of the Church are all worthless. The universities quarrel among themselves. Bulls, jubilees, pardons, and consecrations are deceitful, devilish, juggling, cursed, merchandise. The sacraments have all been perverted. The Mass is truly a memorial. The body and blood are to be eaten through faith by the believer.

As one who dissociated himself from the cloistered life it is fitting that Lambert reserved his most opprobrious epithets for the monastic institutions and for the Papacy. The former are seen as "the well of hypocrisy, the lakes of envy, ydlenes, druknes, grudges, hate, ambyshon, and of all uncleenlynes, the daughter of the bloude, sukker deouryngge althyngs, and alwaye saynge, brynge brynge, and enfacyte depnes of tradycyons of mē stryuyngge euen cōtrarye the worde of god". According to the author, a crucial task of the polemicist was to identify the forces of reaction which have always aligned themselves against the gospel. Essentially this involved a proper searching of God's will in the Scriptures, for, as the author explained, truth always names its enemies. On the basis of selective scriptural citation, lists were compiled to describe a historical and contemporary reality. One such list reads in part: "Wolues / foxes / Beares / lyones / Dogges / Leoperdes / wylde beastses /
false prophettes / pseudoapostles / rotten sedes / vnfaythfull, hypocrites, folishe, werdes, nat bearing the voce of their lorde god, a baren howse, the churche maligneant the synagogge of Satan, the generacio of the lorde's furye, apostaticall gentyles, hauynge the fronte of the greate whore, the fruyte and generatyon of Uipers, the counsell of the wycked, Dragones, the kynde of the serpente Aspis deafe and stopynge theyr eares, the enemyes of the lorde, a wycked couent the tabernacles of synnes, the sede of Chanayme, Egypte, & sodome euyl trees and vnfaiithful, mokers, that say to man sayeng wyll nat you to see / speake pleasaut thynges to our eares take hede of our errours, let holy Israell cease from our syght, the blacke, tayles of smokye bronddes, ydolles, blynde studientes, the generatyon of Cain...."103

Lambert's use of animal symbolism owes much to apocalyptic works. The Book of Daniel was shot through with symbols of conflict, and the apocalyptic literature of the Middle Ages often expressed the conflict between good and evil through concrete symbolic figures. Animals such as wolves, lions, bears and leopards carried in their very ferocity a symbol of the untamed evil which the apocalyptist opposed. In later apocalyptic works monstrous forms such as dragons proliferated.104 In the Summe of christianitie the author attempted to point out that the meaning of this language lay beyond its literal interpretation. "When we cal them wolues, beastes, antychristes we do not sclāder thē, but shewe forthe what the spirite dothe judge of thē, by the testymonye of the scrpytures".105 Using the same category of symbols of conflict Lambert turned to the Papacy. "(Thyrdly) god hath made manyfest to vs, that who so
euer hathe the prymacie of the church of Satane, and is take
for the pope, is aboue al other the sonne of perdiciou, the man
of syn and antychriste". 106 It is heresy to affirm that the "pope,
cardynalles, byshopes, with all his kyngedome, be of the churche
of god, which is all meke all pure and holy".107 The dichotomy
between the true and the false church is complete. Since the
Pope is the Antichrist, "they that do not dyssent frō hym be
also antichristes".108 Those who do offer signs or tokens
of dissent belong to the church of God. Resistance to the tyranny
of the Romish spirituality thus becomes a hallmark of the true
Christian.

The very ferocity of Lambert's attack on the Papacy and on
the trappings of Romish religion made the work relevant to the
English situation. In February 1536 Cranmer preached a sermon
at Paul's Cross as part of the government's propaganda campaign
in which he went so far as to stigmatise the Pope as Antichrist
Worship of images, adoration of saints, purgatory and monasteries
were all attacked, the latter being described as "places and dens
of error / superstition".109 In relation to Cranmer's sermon
Lambert's Summe went no further than government opinion;
opinion that was enforced in the Injunctions of 1536.

Theologically, however, the book was less easily applicable
to England. In particular Lambert's doctrine of history showed
some affinity with the more radical wing of the continental
reformation. For Lambert, history was an unfolding drama of
the conflict between the true and false churches. Paul's
conflicting spirits of God and the world were identified with
the followers of Christ and Antichrist 110 This doctrine of
the two churches was by no means central to the theology of
the English exiles nor for that matter to Luther. Indeed
the Wittenberg reformer's notion of an invisible church made up
of members whose identity was known only by God, presented a
safeguard against an unshackled bipolarity of Church and world.
Only in his later writings did Luther consciously develop a
cohereent theory of the relations between the true and false
churches.\textsuperscript{111} In contrast, Lambert's \textit{Summe}, though acknowledging
the invisible character of the true church, came close to identi-
fying both it and the false church in terms of their social and
organisational embodiments in the past and in the present. In
Lambert's polemic opposition to Rome is apparently no less
valid a statement of true religion as good works that proceed
out of a faith in God's promises.

In thus emphasising the negative aspect of polemic, the
English translation of the \textit{Summe} retained a somewhat alien
theological character, particularly so in that the English
dition was thoroughly faithful to Lambert's original Latin.
Occasionally the syntax was altered to suit English modes of
expression, and occasionally the translator appears to have mis-
read Lambert's rather elusive sentence construction.\textsuperscript{112} For
the most part however, the translation was literal in its accuracy.
Moreover the foreign character of the \textit{Summe} was sustained by the
fact that the translator left untouched a large number of
autobiographical references made in the original. In the first
instance the translator reproduced the author's dedicatory
epistle, in which Lambert made clear that his work was written
against the Augustinian polemicist Conrad Tregor.\textsuperscript{113} Secondly,
throughout the text Lambert referred to his personal life:
to his marriage,\textsuperscript{114} to the places where he preached,\textsuperscript{115} to
other reformers, and to his earlier writings. All these references were retained in the English translation.

The translator of the work, Tristram Revel, was a scholar of Christ's College Cambridge (B.A. 1533). The Summe, as he made clear in the dedication was his 'first fruits' or rather his first taste of literary activity. The works of Francis Lambert presented an appealing choice for a young student to translate for his books were well known amongst Cambridge reformers. In February 1528 the Warden of Wolsey's New College, Dr. London, wrote to Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, concerning the dissemination of heretical books by Thomas Garrett, one of the earliest and most effective of Lutheran propagandists. The list of books was considerable, and included works by Luther, Melanchthon, Huss, Oecolampadius, Wyclif, Zwingli, Bugenhagen, Urbanus Rhegius, Brentius, Bucer, Cellarius and others. Most significantly, Lambert was represented by no less than seven of his works. A second letter from London to Longland written two days later provided a new list of "mischievous books" circulated by Garrett. In this, three additional writings of Lambert are to be found. Anthony Delaber, a colleague of Garrett, relates that he was personally given a copy of Lambert's book on Luke to read. Moreover John Frith was on the staff of New College, and along with Garrett, Delaber, and others, suffered imprisonment in the college for several months.

Lambert's influence on English reformers outlasted the 1520s. According to Foxe, in 1532 Paget presented Raymond West with some Protestant books including Lambert's De Sectis. According to the articles against him, the Benedictine monk, Richard Bayfield, burnt at Smithfield in November 1531, had
works of continental theologians in his library. Lambert was represented by his commentaries on Luke, Joel, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zachariah, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Hosea, and also a Congest of all matters of Divinity. The Statuta et ordinationes praelectorum in concilio provinciali edita proscribed several titles by Lambert, one of which being the **Farrago omnium fere rerum theologarum**. Almost all of Lambert's works seem to have found their way into England. In other words Lambert appears to have been recognised as a significant source of Protestant theology for educated English converts.

Indeed within England Lambert appears to have gained a considerable reputation not all of it favourable. In his *Apology* Thomas More included Lambert alongside Luther, Tyndale, Oecolampadius, and Zwingli as one of those "playn abomynable heretikes". For More, Lambert's marriage was sufficient to put him beyond the pale. Like Luther and Huskin (Oecolampadius) Lambert, "vnder the name of matrimonye" lives in "sacrilege & incestuous lechery".

It is likely that Revel became acquainted with the writing of Lambert whilst at Christ's. He was certainly aware of the fact that Lambert had written many books. Why then was the **Farrago** singled out for translation? In the early part of 1536 Revel wrote asking for help in order to publish the **Summe**. Around Easter of the previous year he had borrowed from a Dr. Leonard, a physician dwelling about the Crossed Friars, a book called the **Farrago Rerum Theologicarum**. He had made a faithful translation of it, translating _word for word_ without addition, 'saving the epistle which was of his own device'. Evidently
Revel was not familiar with the publishing world. First he presented the book to Edmund Cranmer, who in turn showed it to his brother, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Thomas Cranmer then committed the examination of the work to the Bishop of Worcester and to his own brother. Worcester then passed it on to one of his advisers - a monk.

Meanwhile Revel took the book to Latimer, the Queen's chaplain, and asked him to present it to the Queen herself. The outcome of this is not altogether clear. The Queen apparently thanked Revel, but did not trouble herself any more. Hereupon it was committed to Worcester's monk although he gave no answer. According to Revel however, the Bishop appears to have recognised the radical qualities of the writing, claiming that there were two or three points in it that might not be borne. Nonetheless in case it should come before those who had authority to put forth books he would reserve his full opinion of it.

It is not clear whether in fact the book received any sort of official examination. If it did, then it was clearly passed fit. However the government's censorship policies were not as yet fully defined and it is more likely that the publication of the *Summe* proceeded without any official sanction. There is no evidence that Cromwell came into contact with the book, although the consultation of Cranmer and Latimer may have eradicated any difficulties surrounding the book's publication.

In large part Revel's difficulties were of his own making, for anonymous writings or translations were not subjected to this type of investigation. Revel however, was reluctant to present his labours - either anonymously or pseudonymously for two reasons. Firstly, he desired Redman to print the book because
his manuscript was too illegible for presentation to the Queen. Secondly, his father had allegedly pressurised him to become a priest, a course of action to which he was not inclined. He had undertaken the translation in order to avoid this fateful step, in the hope that his labour would secure some exhibition from the Queen. Such dedications for personal profit were not unusual, although Cromwell was a more likely patron than the Boleyns for this type of literature. Yet however much Revel may have been motivated by personal factors he did at least ensure that a work of radical Protestant hue was brought into English. Like Lambert's Summe itself, little was heard of its translator. Indeed Revel's most serious mistake was to appeal to a Queen who was to exert influence and patronage for only a few months more. By May 1536 Anne Boleyn was dead and Revel's hopes of an exhibition had died with her.

A very true pronosticatio.

Revel's translation was not the only book to come under the scrutiny of officials. In 1536 Byddell brought out A Very true pronosticatio with a kalender, which was addressed to the King's Council appointed for the task of examining English books. The translator, John Ryckes, claimed to have found the original work, written by Otto Brunfels, abandoned and neglected in a corner of some library. He believed it to be of some importance, indeed, of especial relevance to England, hence his translation.

Brunfels's work had only a tangential relationship with the literary form of prognostications. At the beginning of the book he counselled against witchcraft and in particular
against human sacrifices.\textsuperscript{141} Elsewhere he was sceptical of traditional elements, claiming that the Word of God destroys all astronomical prognostications.\textsuperscript{142} Protestant sentiments were accorded a prominent place. Everyone who speaks against Christ is Antichrist.\textsuperscript{143} All men must strive to keep God’s Commandments.\textsuperscript{144} Christ alone is needed as a mediator. “He is rightly called ungodly / whiche cōtemmeth goddes worde, whereby fayth cōmeth in to vs, by the whiche onely be we justifyed & saued”.\textsuperscript{145}

Like Brunfels, Ryckes had little interest in the genre of prognostications. Normally such writings are vain trifles which men should leave alone, preferring to ground all truth in the Word of God.\textsuperscript{146} The genre, however, could be used as a means of justifying Protestant ideas. The chief cause of all contemporary problems is the punishment of God; punishment justly accorded because of man’s failure to live according to God’s word.\textsuperscript{147} This concept of God as a scourge was applied in a polemical manner by the translator. Some men have suggested alternative causes for present ills. These however were summarily dismissed. “And not as many bothe do thinke and saye, that these newe lawes & newe lernynges are the causes. Is not this newe lernynge the very trewe word of god? Elles let them cōme and proue the contrarye”.\textsuperscript{148} In seeking to defend Protestantism Ryckes turned the accusation around and placed all blame on the papists. Unless we forsake obedience to the Bishop of Rome and his laws God will punish us as He has made clear in the Scriptures with plagues and sickness.\textsuperscript{149}
The newe Idole, and olde Deuyll.

Between 1534 and 1536 the London press of Robert Wyer issued three separate works of Luther. The earliest of these was entitled Against the newe Idole, and olde Deuyll, and was published in 1534. The identities of neither author nor translator were divulged. The original work had been written by Luther as a protest against the canonisation of Benno of Meissen by Pope Adrian VI in 1523. Together with the solemn display of Benno's relics in the following year, the action was taken in defiance of the evangelical cause within Germany, and, not surprisingly, it resulted in a flood of protest. Luther's polemic was not unpopular. In 1524 at least eight German editions were brought out.

The English edition was a competent, though not literal translation of the original. Much of Luther's invective and scurrility was still evident. On the canonisation of Aquinas, Luther wrote, "der born und grundsuppe aller ketzerey, yrthum and vertilung des Evangeli (wie seyne bucher bewesen), erhaben". With typical verbosity the anonymous English translator rendered the sentence, "the origynall fountayne and sprynge of all Heresye, the pestylence and (as his bokes to wytnesse) y ouerthrower & destroyer of the gospell, was canonysed & made a saynt". On the whole, however, this workmanlike translation did convey the liveliness of Luther's original. Moreover, in presenting a basically faithful rendition, the translator ensured that a large number of references made by Luther to the German situation were retained in the English edition. In the first instance, Luther had made some use of a historical argument, referring to events and circumstances surrounding the life of Benno. In
particular, Luther exploited Benno's involvement in Pope Gregory VII's deposition of the Emperor Henry IV. In siding with the papacy, Benno inherits the faults of Gregory himself, earning the charges of 'thief', 'bloodshedder', and the 'cause of all calamities of Germany'.

The argument from history however is not pursued. More common are the references made by Luther to contemporary events. Indeed much of the attack centres on the actual canonisation of Benno. In contrast with this false papistical saint, Luther sings the praises of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and refers to the recently martyred John van der Esschen and Henry Voss of Antwerp. Similarly Elizabeth of Magdeburg is hailed as an example of a true saint.

As with Revel's translation of Lambert's *Farago*, the inclusion of references to both historical and contemporary events ensured that the English edition retained an essentially 'foreign' character. That much at least appears to be recognised at the end of the edition where it is acknowledged that the work was translated into English. Why then was this brief polemic, which had appeared as a protest against the canonisation of a German bishop in 1524, translated and printed in England ten years later?

Clearly the anti-papal stance of the writing remained attractive. Of particular importance was Luther's attack on the morality of Gregory VII. Anything which depreciated the authority of the papacy was of obvious relevance to the English situation. Thomas Swinnerton's *Mustre* had made the point that the Pope was not infallible by providing examples of papal error and corruption. The close similarity in content between his
translations and Luther's polemic may well suggest that the translator of Luther was both aware of and influenced by Swinnerton's work.

Of more importance however was the assault made by Luther on saint worship. In essence what was being purveyed in the English edition was a theological critique of the cult of saints. In the first place, Luther's argument contrasted on the one hand true sainthood and true worship, and, on the other, false sainthood and idolatrous honouring of God. For Luther, the person who does not receive the gospel is compelled to believe the errors of the devil. True or lawful saints seek the continuance of a lively faith among men. They hold to the Word of God as the revelation of man's duty. From the Old Testament it is seen that God does not allow honour to be given Him unless He himself has commanded it. Indeed Scripture is the mark or guide of true sainthood. True doctrine, faith and charity, and the cross, are the signs of holiness. The false saint however leads men to turn from true doctrine and faith and to extinguish neighbourly charity. By their actions they conspire with Popes against princes, are credited with false and suspect miracles, and reveal themselves to be false prophets.

In focussing on the false cult of saints Luther protests against the papists' concept of the Church. Benno and others are not true Christians, but are mere Romish saints, the fantasy of obstinate and blind tyrants. The pope advances counterfeit saints to condemn the Word of God and to establish his own doctrine. The canonisation of Benno is seen as a deceit of the devil who in this case operated through the greed and ignorance
In setting up false saints the Pope places himself outside the Church. His authority is completely undermined. All he can do is pervert the cause of true religion.

In insisting on scriptural fidelity Luther both undermines the Papacy's authority to determine sanctity, and demolishes the theological rationale for the saint cult. Generally it is seen as an encumbrance, as a thing of no value. If a saint effects a miracle after his death it has no impact on the Christian in society. Since God's judgements are hidden how can we know that God is not testing us by these miracles? This appeal to theological pragmatism is apparent throughout the work. Saints detract from true religion, usurp a proper response of faith and charity, and make a God of themselves. It is better to turn away from the saints in heaven if we wish to make our lives agreeable with Scripture. It is better to give alms than spend money on saints.

Though the English translation presented a Protestant critique of saint worship, and the germ of a Protestant hagiography that would be seminal for later writings, it did not bring any new themes or ideas to the attention of English readers. Both Tyndale and Barnes had attacked in print the traditional concept of sainthood, whilst the attack on superstition was a central theme of Humanist and Protestant writings throughout the 1520s and 30s. Possibly like many of them the translator brought out his work to draw attention to an area that he considered was in need of reform. The Injunctions of 1536 specifically attacked the traditional view of saint worship. In thus attacking 'papistical' saints the work was not in conflict
with shifting official opinion. Yet the influence of this small
treatise of Luther is unlikely to have been extensive. There
are no contemporary references to the book nor did it appear
on any subsequent lists of proscribed writings. Within conserva-
tive circles, at least, the book was never identified as a
translation of Luther.

Treatise of good workes.

The second work of Luther published by Wyer, Here after
ensueth a propre treatise of good workes, differed in many
ways from the writing against the canonisation of Benno. Whereas
the latter had been polemical in intent, the treatise of good
works belongs essentially to Luther's pastoral writings.

In February 1520 Spalatin reminded Luther of his promise to
prepare a sermon on the subject of good works and urged him to
set about it. Towards the end of March, Luther wrote back
saying that the work was likely to grow into a small book.
The rather large book which emerged from these labours entitled
Von den guten werken was a major statement of Lutheran theology.
Between 1520 and 1525 thirteen German editions alone were issued.

In the writing Luther took issue with the prevailing attitude
to good works and approached the subject with the premise that
there is no good work except that which God commands, and no
sin except that which God forbids. The method he adopted
was to examine both good and evil works within the format of
a commentary on the Decalogue. Particular emphasis was placed
on faith as the unique guarantor of all merit. In short, good
works are seen as pleasing to God only for the sake of faith.
Faith makes all things precious which would otherwise be damnable.
Alongside this restatement of the central role that faith occupies in the life of the Christian Luther presented a strong didactic concern. In the first place he outlined areas that were in need of reform. Colleges, abbeys, parishes, and schools should be well ordered places where godly service is kept. Secondly, Luther acknowledged the problems of the weak, those who set store by works alone. These are seen as mere children in the understanding of faith. We must bear with them, since they have been taught by foolish, blind teachers, and should help them rather than despise them. They must be brought little by little from works to faith.

By the beginning of the 1520s the work had found its ways into England and the title De Bonis Operibus appears on at least one list of forbidden books. In what ways then did the English translation attempt to overcome the stigma of proscription?

In the first instance, the translator adopted a limited form of censorship. Luther's name was omitted, as was his personal dedicatory address to John, brother of Elector Frederic. Though the writing retained Luther's occasional bursts of narrative in the first person, there was no mention of the German situation; neither was it acknowledged that the work was in fact a translation. The omission of this material was not intended to make the work less radical. Indeed there is some internal evidence to suggest that the translator deliberately heightened the polemical qualities of the writing.

In place of Luther's dedication, the translator substituted what appears to be original foreword. Much of this, such as the stress on the centrality of faith, was derived from Luther's work itself. At several points however the translator
presented a particularly selective account of the author's theology. In *Von den guten werken* a primary concern of the Wittenberg reformer was to refute the charge that his emphasis on faith led to a depreciation of good works. This was undertaken from a theological standpoint. On the one hand, Luther provided a theological rationale for good works with the maxim that faith is never without works. On the other hand, through an extensive commentary on natural law, which for Luther was identical with the Decalogue, he clarified the moral and practical implications of the new learning. Through a restatement of the relation between faith and works the charge of antinomianism is defused. For the English translator, the accusation is seen less in terms of an attack on the theological propriety of the doctrine of sola fides, as a personal assault on the practitioners of the new learning. Hence the preface opens: "It is not unknownen to all men (good chrysten reader) but that the true & synsere teachers of the infallible truthe of our sauyour Iesu Chryst, ben falsely defamed vnto the unlearned people, & theyr good name defaced to the, no lytel hynderauhce and reproche of the same truth / and y they (as they be borne in hāde vniustly) shulde in theyr wrytynges and sermons, allure and withdrawe the forsayd rude people from penaūce, frō prayer, from fastyng, from watchynge, frō paynes, from labours / & fynally from all good works".

In the English preface, the translator's emphasis is on the polemical weapons that the book provided rather than on the merit of Lutheran theology for the inculcation of good works. Beseeching the reader, the translator wrote as follows: "To take & admyttte all false backe byters & sclaunderers of goddes
true mynysters euermore hereafter as they be, & not to the contrary, but † as they most deadely belye those good men in this behalfe / so they do also in other thynges, as I truste in god it shall more playnly appere / bothe to the (gentyll reader) & thereto to all the worlde in tyme comyng". That the translator saw the work in large part as a defence against back-biters is more clearly seen in his attitude to those who have not yet received the new learning. In place of Luther's patient, pastoral regard for those who lack faith, in the English edition the weak are severely criticised. They likened to Judas, who "lyke an hethen hounde and an unfaythfaull myscreaunt", make God into a liar and a tyrant.  

The dichotomy between those who have faith and those who have not is sharpened and seen in terms of the conflict between the elect and the children of Antichrist. It is to the elect that this work has been sent (from God), so that they may resist untrue allegations. Furthermore, as the translator makes clear in a marginal note appended to the text, it is the papists who allege that the new learning leads to antinomianism. Those who lack faith are not distinguished from those who attack the true preachers. Their intent is, "for the mayntenaunce of the god theyr belyes, theyr ambycyon, theyr symony, theyr pryde, theyr promocyon, theyr treason, theyr trechery, theyr glotony, theyr lecherye, theyr murdre, with all theyr vngracyous-ness". The writing is designed to console the elect and to confute the children of Antichrist.  

Although the English preface was more militant than the body of Luther's work,--the--translation of the treatise was faithful and at times almost literal. Only at one point
was there any significant departure from the original. Where Luther referred to the Cistercian order, the English translator substituted the phrase, "One roñeth in to ſ Charterhowse an other hyther...." With this single example an attempt is made to draw attention to recent developments with the government's assault on the Charterhouse Monks. For the most part however there was no need to give Luther's polemic any direct correlation with the English context. Throughout, his work was peppered with an attack on traditional abuses of religion. Indeed, as Luther pointed out, part of the work was designed to resist all false, perverse, deceivable, erroneous doctrine and heresies, and all the abuse of the spiritual and ecclesiastical power. The spiritual power is ordained to teach, preach, restrain, and punish. Nowadays however the bishops refuse to preach the gospel whilst daily they invent "mo pylgrymages, canonyng of mo sayntes, and sellyng of pdons". The Mass profits nothing when heard without faith. The Pope, bishops, priests and monks "be moche worse than the Turks". However these are the very Turks whom Kings and Princes should invade, not for hope or financial benefit but out of love for the Christian commonwealth.

Throughout, Luther likens the spirituality to a parent who has suddenly gone mad. The nobility, as an obedient child, should deal with the spiritual estate with due respect and authority, but under no circumstances should they allow the clergy to have their way, lest Christendom be destroyed. Moreover Luther was adamant that the matter of reform should not be referred to the authority of a general council. In times past councils have failed to effect change, for the simple
reason that they are effectively controlled by the papacy. The only remedy is that Kings, Princes, gentlemen, cities, and universities should take the matter in hand to reform themselves. Thus in these times of emergency, temporal rulers had the right to initiate reform.

Luther's exposition of the fourth commandment, on the duties of the secular authorities, may have influenced William Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man*. Both works stressed the reciprocal nature of the obligations that lay between rulers and those beneath them. Although the *treatise of good works* allowed temporal powers the right to interfere in the reform of the spiritual realm on the basis of the priesthood of all believers, Luther was careful not to accord the temporal powers a spiritual function. The temporal realm cannot do any real harm because it has nothing to do with the first three commandments. In short it can only injure the body and not the soul. For that reason the temporal power is but a small matter in the sight of God, and too insignificant for us to resist, disobey, or argue on its account, no matter whether the state does right or wrong. Nonetheless rulers must not give way to their own lusts. Every moment of their lives governors have an abundant number of tasks and opportunities to serve God. These works, like all others, should be done in faith, as an exercise of faith, so that in a trust in God's promises a ruler undertakes his duty for the glory of God and for the benefit of his subjects.

In its emphasis on the duty of rulers to initiate reform in a time of emergency the relevance of Luther's work to the English situation becomes clearly apparent. Indeed the accommodation of this work to the England of 1535 is achieved with ease.
Whoever translated the book testifies to the continuing hold which Luther's thought exerted over English Protestants during the period of Cromwell's ascendancy. By no means was Luther's theological influence confined to the work of the early English exiles.

Taken as a whole, the translation of Protestant books between 1534 and 1536 cannot be judged a particularly distinguished enterprise. Of the five works that have been examined only the anonymous translation of Marcourt's *Livre des Marchans* can be claimed as an unqualified literary success. The book contained no significant additions or suppressions, was faithful to the tone of the original, and was eminently readable. By contrast Revel's translation of Lambert's *Farrago* contained several misprints together with a whole number of grammatical errors which made the author's argument very difficult to follow. Moreover, in addition to this literary mediocrity the translations cannot be hailed as major bibliographical achievements. Only Marcourt's work ran to a second edition, although this was a separate and inferior translation that was brought out during the reign of Edward VI.

As for the contents of the books, with the exception of Luther's *treatyse of good workes* none of the works presented a particularly positive account of Protestant theology. Indeed, it proves surprisingly difficult to distinguish these translations from other English works such as those of Erasmus. Lambert's *Summe*, though purporting to be a compendium of Protestant learning, was little more than a one-sided polemic against Catholic doctrine and practice. Brunfels's *Promostication*
owed more to popular literary genres than to evangelical fervour, whilst even Luther's *good workes* read more in translation as an attack on back-biters than as an apologia of Protestant theology. Marcourt's book made almost no use of Protestant categories. Indeed within England the closest literary parallels to the work were the writings of Roy and Barlow, and Simon Fish's *Supplication for the Beggars*, all of which were more concerned with an attack on the laziness and greed of the clergy than with advancing Lutheran theology. 203

In so far as the translations sought to denounce Rome rather than promote Wittenberg the books show some affinity with the pre-Reformation tradition of Lollard polemic. The materialism of the spirituality, the primacy of the Pope, and such Romish practices as the cult of saints were all primary targets of Lollardy. That notwithstanding, the translations did at least purport to have considerable relevance to their age. All of them, for example, emphasised the crisis of the times. In Marcourt's work, rulers must act now against the religious merchants or face deposition from their office. 204 According to John Ryckes, the translator of Brunfel's *Prognostication*, unless the people immediately forsake obedience to the Bishop of Rome God will inflict grievous punishment on the realm. 205 With this strong emphasis on a dual theme of threat and danger the translations presented a quite radical view of reform and reformation. Both Lambert's *Summe* and Luther's *treatyse of good workes* claim to have been designed to confute the children of Antichrist, 206 a confutation that involved a complete and irrevocable break with Romish religion. According to Marcourt the people of Christ must keep themselves distinct from the false
prophets of Rome. 207

Within the context of political developments in England, all of the translations sought to advocate a single position, namely that the political break with Rome must be followed up with a liberation from the trappings of Romish religion. In other words, the process of reform which had begun with Henry VIII's legislation must be continued in an assault on the religious practices of the English people. As with the Israel of the Old Testament, God will destroy the realm unless the people are forced to turn from blasphemy and idolatry. To that extent, the responsibility for the consequences that may ensue lies with the temporal authorities. In these dark times of emergency, the reform of Romish abuse must be undertaken by the temporal rulers.

With this often vague and general commendation of the secular authorities, the translations could be seen as offering support and encouragement to Henry VIII and his government. Unlike Erasmus's *Julius Exclusus*, none of the works contained any politically embarrassing ideas which needed to be suppressed in translation. Moreover, none of the works advocated notions which were unequivocally controversial. In contrast to the works of the exiles, the translations did not espouse the call for vernacular scriptures, nor with the exception of Lambert did they openly assault sensitive doctrines and practices such as the Mass. Ideas concerning theology and ceremonies which were characteristic of exiles such as Tyndale and Frith found no place in these translations. Even the most important of the works, Luther's *treatyse of good workes*, emphasised the moral concern of Protestantism, rather than its doctrinal or ceremonial
radicalism. Indeed the work thus confirms that the interest shown in English religious writing in the question of how the individual was to behave, was not simply a product of Erasmian humanism. As the translations suggest, during the period which followed Henry's break with Rome, Protestantism's value did not lie in its provision of a more radical pattern of ecclesiastical reform than that of the works of Erasmus, but in the fact that it offered ideas of change which did not by and large criticise existing political structures. Like the works of Erasmus, Protestant polemical writing criticised mainly those very institutions - the papacy, the clergy and the monastic regime - which had come under attack from Henry's government. From the evidence of these translations it is not easy to distinguish precisely what Protestantism stood for. The purpose which lay behind these translations was not to supply a statement of the new faith, but was in the main simply to attack the vestiges of papism.

Although the books were not politically dangerous the translations were put out in an almost furtive manner. Luther's books could only be brought out after attempts were made to disguise his authorship, together with the safeguard of omitting the translator's identity. When, as with Lambert's *Summe*, the translator presented his book in an open manner he remained likely to run into political difficulties. Though controversial ideas could be bandied about it was not yet considered prudent to proclaim openly one's sympathies.

Finally it should be emphasised that the translatorial enterprise remained a somewhat random process. None of the translators had anything to do with Thomas Cromwell, the patron
supreme of reforming literature, and from the evidence available, none of the books was commissioned. However much it was believed that the books could aid Henry's policy, that belief was not directly encouraged by any single government spokesman but was engendered in the mind of each translator by his own reflection and consideration of political requirement. Having said that, political factors should not be emphasised at the expense of the ideological concerns of the translators. John Ryckes, for example, had shown for some years a sympathy with an evangelically based religion together with an opposition to monastic and clerical abuse. As for the other translators it does not appear that any of them lacked the deep hostility to Rome that was shown in his work. Though their efforts may not have reaped much reward or even significantly advanced the reception of Reformation theology in England, the translators certainly succeeded in providing a limited audience with the polemical tools with which the attack on the old religion could be both comprehended and sustained.
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9. A ryght fruteful Epistle devised by the moste excellent clarke Erasmus in laude and prayse of matrmony. STC 10492, Devereux, Checklist, C.47.
10. Taverner, a Norfolk man, was recruited by Wolsey for his Oxford College. In 1530 he gained a Cambridge M.A. According to Wood, he was proficient in philosophy, Greek, and divinity, and studied for a time in a Chancery Inn from which he entered the Inner Temple. Athenae Oxonienses, I, pp. 419-23. C.f. Athenae Cantabrigiensis, I, pp. 338-41.

11. SP I /73 fo. 1439, L & P V, 1762.
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15. McConica assumes that this book sealed the bargain between Cromwell and Taverner. The dedication it is claimed, provides a rare but important clue to the inception of a deliberate policy which helped to place Erasmian thought in the fore as the positive doctrine of the Henrician settlement. "It is impossible to doubt from the preface that this particular work was chosen by Cromwell, or at least in consultation with him". Op. cit. pp. 117-18. The dedication, however, allows no such conclusion. Taverner makes clear that the translation was his own idea, a record of gratitude rather than a work of service. There is no suggestion that Cromwell knew of the work before Taverner's translation appeared in print. Elton, Reform and Renewal, p. 62.
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21. Devereux, Checklist, C.63.3, with C.65.2. STC 10494; entry
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22. A Sermon made: by the famous Doctor Erasmus of Roterdame.
8vo. STC 10508; Devereux, Checklist, C.26. Translated from
Concio, from Liturgia Virginis Laurentanae, Opera Omnia, vol.v.

23. A booke called in latyn En//chiridion militis christiani ///
and in enflvsshe the ma//nuell of the chrvste I ght
replenys//shed with moste holsome pre//ceptes /// by the
famous // clerke Erasmus of // Roterdame // to the whiche ///
is added a newe and // meruaylous pro//fytable pre//face.
8vo, a-c8, A-R8, S10. Imprinted at London by Wynkyn de
Worde / for Johan Byddell / otherwyse Salisbury / the.
xxv. daye of Nouembre. And be for to sell at the synge
of our Lady of pytie next to Flete bridge. STC 10479,
Devereux, Checklist, C.42.1.

24. In addition to the English version the work was translated
into Czech, German, Dutch, Castilian, French, Italian,
Portuguese, and Polish. McConica, p.16, n. 1. During
Erasmus's lifetime over fifty Latin editions of the
Enchiridion were brought out. C.f. F. Vander Haeghen,
Bibliotheca Erasmiana (Ghent, 1897-1908) vol. I.

25. Erasmus Roterdame sendeth gretyng to the reuerende father
in Christ (and lorde) the lorde Paule Volzius / the moste
religycus abbot of the monastery the whiche is comenly
called Hughes courte. Sig. a2-c7(v).
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41. See Allen, p. 6.

42. Erasmus ridicules a mistake in the Latin of the bull which goes unnoticed by the religious. Allen, p. 36.


44. The moral of the tale was expressed with typical restraint. "For yf these thynges be godly whiche I shewe, it is theyr profet that the people do know them / yf they be otherwyse, so many as be good among them, wyll gyue me thankes which haue shewed forth s suche, wherby some correcte with shame, may refrayne lyke deedes". P.39.

Copland's career as a printer-publisher began around 1514 and for some years he appears to have operated on a kind of 'partnership' level in the firm of "my maister" de Worde. Between 1514 and 1527 he printed twenty-six or twenty-seven books, some of which he himself translated from the French. C.f. Duff, A Century, pp. 31-32, Frank C. Francis, Robert Copland, Sixteenth Century Printer and Translator (Glasgow University Publications, David Murray Foundation Lectures, no. 24, Glasgow, 1961). Francis does not comment on Copland's printing of the Funus, nor on his work on the Julius Exclusus for which see below.


The work was immediately attributed to Erasmus by Christopher Scheurl, Luther, Pirckheimer, Conrad Grebel, Guy Morillon, and many others especially within the University of Cologne. Most modern scholars now accept Erasmus's authorship. C.f. especially, J.B. Pineau, "Erasme, est-il l'auteur du Julius?", Revue de Littérature comparée, vol. V (1925) pp. 394-96.
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53. For the most part Erasmus allows Julius to condemn himself. At one point, for example, he notes, "To be shorte, I swarmed all full of the frenche pockes". (Sig. A4(v)). At other times Erasmus uses Peter to pronounce a direct condemnation. "Neuertheles agaynste suche a wretche as ý hast described to me euuen very now. That is to say an open maintener of mischief / a drökerde / a manqueller / a symoniake / a poysoner / a piurer / an extorcyoner / an open buggerer. A cöunsel is not so moche to be desyred, as all the multitude armed w stones to kyl hë, as a cömen pestilence of al the worlde". (Sig. C4(v)).
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59. Erasmi Opuscula, p. 111.
60. Sig. F2(v).
61. Erasmi Opuscula, p. 113.
62. Sig. F3.
64. Erasmi Opuscula, p. 107.
65. Sig. Fl.
67. Appendix C No.4. 8vo, Al-C8 STC 3321."Writte at Corinthe / by your frende & louer (out of Frenche) Thorny / wyld / wedy / harletry the. xxiiii. daye of Auguste. Anno. M.D. xxxiiii".
68. Le livre des marchans / fort utile à toutes gens / pour cognoistre de quelles marchâdises on se doit garder destre tromme. Lequel a este nouvellement reveu et fort augmente / rar son premier autheur bien expert en tel affaire. Imprime a Corinthe / le XXII. Daoust / Lan Mil cinq cens XXXIII. 8vo, A-C. Neuchâtel, Pierre de Vingle.
69. Vingle was a great producer of Protestant books including Herman Bodius's Unio Dissidentium (1531), and a master of forged addresses. C.f. M.E. Kronenberg's article in Het Boek XXV (s'Gravenhage, 1938-39) pp. 257-65, shortened in Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du Protestantism français, XCI(X) (1940) pp. 5-8.

71. Ibid. pp. 149-56.

72. Ibid. p. 156.

73. Sig. A4.

74. According to Marcourt, a thief was one who sold tin and copper under the pretext of gold and silver.

75. Sig. A2(v)-A3(v).

76. Sig. B2(v).

77. Sig. B3(v).

78. Sig. B6(v), B7(v), B5(v).

79. Sig. B4(v).

80. C.f. the way Marcourt exploits the disagreements and fights between the various monastic factions. Sig. Cl.

81. Sig. A6(v)-A7.

82. Sig. B6.

83. Sig. B6.

84. Sig. C5.

85. Sig. Cl-C3.

86. Sig. C5.


88. Promoted in Argent. (Strassburg) apud Hervagium, 1525.

89. Born in 1487, Lambert had joined the Franciscans at Avignon at the age of 15. His calling as an apostolic preacher afforded him the opportunity to acquire a broad and deep knowledge of Scripture. Whilst in the monastery Lambert grew familiar with the writings of Luther, and in 1522 he saw fit to escape the cloistered life whilst on an official visit to Switzerland. That year he engaged in public disputation with Zwingli in Zurich and was "converted" to Protestantism as a result of his defeat over the issue of the intercession of saints. He was active in the reforming cause in Wittenberg and Strassburg, and in 1527 was appointed by Philip of Hesse to the chair of theology in the newly founded University of Marburg. Lambert died in 1530. Biographies of Lambert are listed in the sole English account of his life and work, R.L. Winters, Francis Lambert of Avignon: (1487-1530) A Study in Reformation Origins, (Philadelphia & Pennysylvania, 1938). For Lambert's works c.f. below.
Following lectures that Lambert undertook at Wittenberg under the tutelage of Luther, Lambert arrived in Metz en route to Strassburg. There he produced a series of 116 propositions for an intended theological debate. The clergy of Metz, however, were not yet ripe for religious conversion and Lambert was fortunate to escape arrest and possible imprisonment. On arriving in Strassburg he allied himself with Bucer and the reforming party. Prior to his arrival Conrad Tregor, Provincial of the Augustinians in the Rhine Valley and Swabia, had put forward "One Hundred Theses" on the authority of the Church and Councils. In response to this work Lambert expanded his theses from Metz into 385, which were later published as the Farrago. Both Bucer and Capito anticipated Lambert in replying to Tregor's articles. In turn the Farrago formed the basis for Paradoxa of 1526 which then provided the fabric for the Reformatio ecclesiarum Hassiae, an ambitious reform programme which was condemned by Luther as too radical.


91. C.f. for examples Nos. 15, 105, 109 (misprinted as no.199)
92. C.f. esp. ch. 9, Sig. E2(v)-E5, also sig. D, 6.
93. Sig. E1(v).
94. Sig. B7-B8(v).
95. Sig. F7(v), F8.
96. Sig. G3.
97. "Therefore there is no other purgatorye / or purgatyon / but that which is of faythe in Chryste. Sig. F1(v).
98. Sig. B6(v).
99. Sig. F6, B6.
100. Sig. E6(v).
101. Sig. F3. "Iakes" is a misprint for Lakes.
102. Sig. A5.
103. Sig. A5-A5(v). This is almost a word for word translation from the Latin, although the erratic punctuation is the fault of the translator. C.f. Farrago, sig. A7.
104. Although Lambert's main theological and literary interest was the field of biblical exegesis, particularly that of the Old Testament, his 1528 Exegesis in sanctam Divi Joanis Apocalypsin Libri VII, the first Protestant commentary on the book of Revelation, marks a watershed in Sixteenth Century apocalyptic thought. For the influence of Lambert's work on the apocalyptic writings of John Bale c.f.

105. Sig. B2(v).

106. Sig. A6.

107. Sig. B3(v).

108. Sig. B3(v)-B5.


110. Paul's doctrine of the two Spirits is most clearly expressed in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. 2.

111. For the difference between a Church based on faith and one based on election c.f. Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I, (Tübingen, 1923) p. 229.

112. C.f. the translator's difficulties in the following extracts: "Summa. Non quaerebā tur Episcopi, Apostoli, & Prophetae Dei, sed Antichristis, & synagogae eius, qui possent suis inuentis, simul prouocare ad risum & fletum, uno spuitu: Centum allegationes omnem, decreta & leges hominum, confuetudines & facta multorum annorum, exempla & Somnia uetularum, mendacia Regni Antichristi prodigia, plebeculis inculcare, hypocritae, seductores, mendaces, nō Dei, sed carnis iustitiam statuere uolentes, nō Altissimi gloriam, sed propria, & suae sectae, ac Antichristi quaerentes (omnes enim pro Papa pugnabant....." Farrago, sig. B7(v).

"..... And to be brefe, the bysshopes, apostles, and prophets, of god were not searchyd for. But Antychrists and theire synagogues while with theire inuēcyons with one brethe, can prouoke men bothe to laughe and wepe, vomyte a hundreth allegacions, pratyng and preachyng to the people, decrees and lawes of men, customs and deades of many yeres, examples and dreames, of olde wyues, monstrous lyes of the kyngedome of Antychriste, ypocrites, deceyuers, lyers, nat wylnyng to order the iustyce of god, but the iustyce of the flesshe, and of theire sectes and of antychristes nat sekyng the glorie of god, but theire own glorie (they dyd all stryue for the pope...." Summe, sig. A4-A4-(v).
113. Sig. +4(v).

114. Sig. B6(v).

115. Sig. +6(v).

116. Bucer and Capito are mentioned in relation to the work of Tregor on sig.+7. Luther's influence is clearly stated, "Luther hathe not teachyd me, nother hys wrytynges, these things, the which I haue knowē by the gyfte of god, in holy scriptures", and also, "I know him (Luther) to be the apostle, and ammon of god, that is to say sent of hym". Sig. A2(v). In addition several references are made to John Castellan, martyred in Metz in January 1525. Sig. H3(v) C3(v) where Castellan is called a saint. Winters expounds the significance of Castellan's martyrdom for Lambert, op. cit. p. 52.

117. The untitled work on matrimony dedicated to Francis I King of France mentioned on sig. B6(v) is in fact In Canticarum Solomonis, libellum quidem sensibus altissimum, in quo sublimia sacri Conjugii Mysteria, quae in Christo et Ecclesia sunt, retrahuntur, commentarii, Wittebergae praelecti, August, 1524, John Herwagen, Strassburg, also printed at Nuremberg by John Petereius, 1525. The reference on sig. C5 to an earlier work on the exposition of the rule of Minorities Cap. 15, is to Evangelici in Minoritarum Commentarii quibus palet sit cuild jam de illa quam de alis Monachorum Resulit ibs et constitutionibus sentiendum sit, Wittenberg 1523, also Strassburg 1525.


119. Sig. +5(v).

120. Dated 24th February (1528), Foxe, A & M V, Appendix VI.

121. The short titles of these works are as follows: In Lucae Evangelium Commentarii (1524); In Canticarum Solomonis (1524); Commentarii de Sacro Conjugio (1524); Evangelici in Miniritarum Karulm Commentarii (1523); Commentarii de causis excaecationes multorum saecolorum (1524); In Amos, Abdiam et Ionam Prophetas Commentarii (1525); Commentarii in Eichem, Naum et Abacuc (1525).
122. A & M V, Appendix VI, The new works are: A Letter of Lambert to the King of France (dated August 1524); this was the dedicatory epistle of Lambert's *In Cantica Canticum Salomonis*, the contents of which are listed in Herminjard, op. cit. vol I, pp. 257-62; *Super Nicheum, Naum et Abacuc*; not a new work but same as above, n.121; *In Primum Duodecim Prophetarum nempe Oseam* (1523).

123. A & M V, p. 422.

124. Clebsch suggests that Frith visited Marburg, possibly during the colloquy between Luther and Zwingli in 1529, following his flight from England, hence Frith may have met Lambert, and through his instigation, come to translate Patrick Hamilton's *Common Places*. Op. cit. p. 81. Though the hypothesis is interesting, particularly in its suggestion of a possible literary connection between Lambert and Frith, it is unfortunately without evidence. Equally attractive yet equally groundless is the view that Tyndale also visited Marburg and came into contact with Lambert. Mozley, op. cit. p.125.

125. A & M V, p. 60.

126. A & M IV, p. 684f. It is likely that the Congest of all matters of Divinity refers to the *Farrago*.


129. Apology, p. 93. Cf. the *Confutation* (CW 8) p.212. Lambert had married on July 23, 1523 in Wittenberg, the first religious to do so.

130. *Summe*, sig. +4(v).

131. The petition is printed in *L & P X* (1536) 371, and is dated 29th February. It is not clear as to whom the "Doubtful Divinity" Revel was writing. L & P merely states: "The Deposition of Tristram Revel late scholar of Christ's College Cambridge, touching the translation of the book called the *Sum of Christianity*".

132. Ibid.

133. There are omissions in the account given in *L & P* possibly due to the poor condition of the manuscript.
Ibid. The two or three points of difficulty for Worcester possibly refer to Lambert's views on the sacraments and his doctrine of the Church. Though the work was referred to a monk for examination there are no reasons to think that Lambert's attack on the monastic life went too far in the eyes of Worcester and the conservative episcopacy. The government's attack on monasteries was already well under way by 1536, and popular polemic against the religious estate was long standing and equally biting as that of Lambert. As is clear in William Marshall's translation of the Strassburg Preachers' book on images, attacks on the Mass were not greatly welcomed within England in the 1530s. Lambert's sacramentalism thus remains the most likely cause of offence to Worcester.

Only two works have survived which were dedicated to the Queens. 'Lambert's Summe and Marshall's treatise on Ypres, STC 26119. Cf. Below, ch. 5.

Appendix C no. 6. STC 3943, 8vo, A1-D7(v).

Sig. A1(v). At the end of the book it is claimed that "This treatyse or pronosticacion is seen, redde, and examyned by me John Hylsey bysshop of Rochester". Sig. D6(v).

Brunfels, d. 1534, entered the Carthusian order only to leave and become a follower of Hutten. He was preacher at Steinheim, Neuenberg in the Bressgau before moving to Strassburg to study medicine. Brunfels was a friend of Luther and Carlstadt, but was especially close to Bern. For his activities in Strassburg see F. Wendel, L'Eglise de Strasbourg, sa constitution et son organization, 1532-1535 (Paris, 1942) p. 39f.

Sig. A1(v).


152. According to legend Benno was born in Hildesheim (Germany) in 1010 and died c. 1106. The son of a noble Saxon family, Benno was canon attached to the imperial collegiate church in Goslar before becoming bishop of Meissen in 1066. Between 1075-76 he was imprisoned by the Emperor Henry IV, although in 1077 when Henry was excommunicated and deposed by Gregory VII, Benno was released and took part in the election of Rudolph of Saxony as the German King. For this and other deeds he was removed from his see by the prelates of the imperial party at the Synod of Mainz in 1085. Three years later however he was restored on the recommendation of the antipope (Clement III) Guibert of Ravenna. Benno earned the title "Apostle of the Wends" for his preaching to the Slavonic tribes in his diocese. His cult was established in 1285 and many miracles were recorded at his tomb. For full details of Benno's life see the articles by O. Langer in Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Meissen, 1, 3. (1884) pp. 70-95, and A. Bigelmair in Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques, ed. A. Baudrillart et al (Paris, 1912-) vol. 7, pp. 1363-65.

153. On the attitude of the continental reformers to saints in general c.f. Polman's comment, "Aussi fut-il particulièrement hostile aux images miraculeuses et aux pèlerinages; qu'on se rappelle ici son opposition à la canonisation de Bennon, évêque de Meissen, qui, dans la querelle des investitures, s'était rangé du côté de Grégoire VII". L'Élément Historique dans la Controverse Religieuse du XVIe Siècle, (Gambaloux, 1932) pp. 51-52.


155. WA 15, p. 184.

156. Sig. a5(v).

157. Sig. a6(v)-b3.

158. Sig. a4(v), b1, b3(v)-b5(v), c4.
159. Sig. a5-a5(v). John van der Esschen and Henry Vos were Augustinian friars from Antwerp who were burnt at the stake in Brussels on July 1st 1523. Luther had commented on this event, which made them the first Protestant martyrs, in a letter of August 1523 to the Christians in the Netherlands. WA 12, pp. 73-80.

160. Sig. e7(v).

161. Sig. a2.

162. Sig. a3.

163. Sig. c2(v).

164. Sig. a3-a3(v), b1, b6, d4.

165. Sig. a2-a3.

166. Sig. a4(v).

167. Sig. d4.

168. Sig. c7-d1(v).

169. Tyndale in fact writes of the canonisation of Aquinas in much the same way as Luther. C.f. Practice of Prelates, in Wholes worke of Tyndall, Frith, and Barnes, ed. Foxe, fol. 361. For Barnes's attacks on saints c.f. the section, "It is against scripture to honour images and pray to saints", in his 1531 Suppllication, fols. Cxxxiii-Clii.

170. The prevalence of traditional views can be seen in a sermon allegedly preached by one Friar Arthur, a grey friar of Canterbury, at Herne on Easter Sunday 1535. Whilst attacking the innovators he made an interesting defence of gifts to saints. "I say, he that gives or offers one penny to St. Thomas's shrine, it is more meritorious for the soul than he had given a noble to poor people, for one is spiritual and the other corporal". L & P VIII, 480, quoted in Elton, Policy and Police, p. 16.

171. Appendix C, no. 8. STC 16988, H & L H41


173. WA 6, p. 196.

174. WA Br. 2, p. 75, also WA Br. 2, pp. 101, 103.

175. WA 6, pp. 197-276
In addition to the German editions, four Latin editions, one Dutch, two French, and one low German edition were printed before that of Wyer. Benzing, Lutherbibliographie, nos. 633-54.

It is not clear from which edition the English translation is derived. The mistaken reference to Matthew ch. 16 (really ch. 19) on sig. a7 shows that if the work was translated from the German then the translator must have consulted either the first or second (Wittenberg) editions since the mistake was rectified in subsequent versions. Whilst the earliest Latin edition of 1521, published in Leipzig, retains the incorrect reference the editor's schematic presentation of Luther's argument bears little relation to the format of Wyer's version. If the Wittenberg Latin edition of 1521 was used then the translator omitted Melanchthon's Forward to the work, C.f. WA 6, pp. 196-201.

The following is representative of the translator's style:

"Die weil ausz Rom zu unsern zeiten nichts anders kompt, dan ein Jarmarcht geistlicher gutter, die man offentlich und unvorschampf kaufft unnd vorkaufft, ablas, pfarren, kloster, bistum probstey, pfrund und alles was nur yhe gestifft ist zu Gottis dienst weit und breit". WA 6, p. 257.
191. Sig. r6. C.f. WA 6, p. 264, "Und Leufft einer ynsz Carthusz, einer hie...

192. Sig. h2(v). C.f. WA 6, 228, "Desselben werks ist auch, widder zustreben allen falschen, vorfurischen yrrigen, ketzerischen, leren, allem misprauch geistlicher gewalt".

193. Sig. o6(v).

194. Sig. I6. C.f. Sig. d1, "So they oughte to moue all other to caste away this great pompe with Bulles, sealles, baners, & pardons / wherwith the myserable people be moued to buylde temples, to gyue and founde abbayes, and suche lyke, and in ý meane tyme faythe is suppressed, and put to sylèce, yea rather utterly oppressed".

195. Sig. p8(v)-Q1(v).

196. C.f. Cargill Thompson, "The Two Regiments" op. cit. p.23

197. Sig. q3.

198. Sig. r2.

199. The translation of the work together with the attack on Benno may have been the work of William Marshall. C.f. below, ch. 5.

200. The translation, for example, retained a reference to "Maister Brandon the kynges iuggler", and also mentioned the abuses of St. Renault of Paris, Sig. B1, C8. In addition the original edition made a number of allusions to the work of Rabelais, whose Pantagruel was first brought out in 1532. The vast majority of these references were retained in the English translation, although all mention of the character Panurge disappeared. Was his popularity not enough in England? C.f. Berthoud, op. cit. p. 141. For English awareness of Rabelaisian motifs c.f. H. Brown, Rabelais in English Literature (Cambridge, Mass., 1933) N.H. Clement The Influence of the Arthurian Romances on the 5 Books of Rabelais (Berkeley, 1926).

201. The English translator even displays a capacity to play on words, C.f. sig. A7, "patrykes / patriarches / I wolde say /". On the style of the work see Berthoud, p. 142.


203. The works of Roy and Barlow are discussed in Clebsch, pp. 229-40. C.f. his comment on Roy and Fish. "Their libeli voiced popular protests against the worldliness, the secular power, and the earthly riches of the Catholic Church in England". P.251. On criticism of the materialism of the clergy c.f. H.C. White, Social Criticism in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century (New York, 1944).
204. Sig. Cl(v)-C3.
205. Sig. D6.
206. Summe, sig. +4(v), treatyse of good workes, sig. a6.
207. Sig. C5.

208. According to Wood, Ryckes’s translation of Brunfels's Prognostication was dedicated to Cromwell. Athenae Oxonienses, i, p. 101. There is however no mention of Cromwell in the work. Wood's error was the result of a misreading of his source John Bale. "Ioannes Ryckes, pius ac placidibus senex, relicta Minoritaru observatiu papistica secta, Euagelij luce libes apprehedit, & in Anglica lingua scrisit Imaginem diuini amonis, Contra Papistarum Blaphemias. Transtulit item ad Dominum Thomam Cromvelum, Othonis Brunsfelij Prognosticon Aliaq secit multa. Obijq Londini anno salutis 1536. "Script. Ill., 2, pp. 102-03.

209. In 1525 a book of Ryckes entitled The image of loue, translated by John Gough, was brought out by Wynkyn de Worde. (Dated 7th October; STC 21471.5, formerly 21473. In a revised edition edited by Anthony Munday and published in 1587, the authorship of the work was attributed to Adrain Savorine, a Dominican friar, STC 21801. No known evidence supports this statement. C.f. H & L Y3) Though the image of loue was not a product of Lutheranism the book was interpreted by the religious authorities as sharing the same spirit. De Worde and Gough were summoned before the Vicar General and ordered to return all the volumes that they had sold, of which sixty had been distributed to the nuns of Sion. C.f. A.W. Reed, Early Tudor Drama, Medwall The Rastells, Heywood and the More Circle (London, 1926) p.166. In 1532 the work was brought out again by de Worde for Gough, this time under licence. STC 21472.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE LEGACY OF THE PAST:

REPRINTS, PRIMERS AND POLEMICS,

1534 - 36.
In the years immediately following Henry's break with Rome English Protestant printers and writers made extensive use of material which was produced in advance both of the development of the doctrine of royal supremacy, and of the emergence of a more tolerant attitude on the part of the government to evangelical literature. Translations from the works of continental reformers account a large bulk of Protestant literature. That is not to say, however, that the literary and theological reformation in England was simply a transplanted growth from the European continent. In the process of translation, many writings underwent considerable redaction. Occasionally the polemical tone of the translation was heightened; more often the discussion of specific controversial issues was suppressed. In a large number of these works, additional comments were made which referred the reader to specific English events. In no work was there any sustained hostility or opposition to the notion of royal supremacy.

In addition to translating the works of continental reformers, Protestants in England made strenuous efforts to edit and republish material which was of native origin. From the middle years of the 1530s Lollard writings were revised and updated, and works of the formerly exiled Protestants were reprinted in London. For these works it is important to ask the same questions that featured in the previous chapter. What significance did their editors attach to political and religious developments in England, and how far were they subjected to a policy of censorship? Was the republication of previously prohibited material an attempt to promote a genuinely positive reform of religious and moral affairs, or were the books simply
aimed at providing polemical ammunition with which the bastions of Romish power and influence could be demolished? Finally, what was the relation between the reprinted writings and the books which the evangelicals and other reformers wrote and published after the break with Rome?

Unquestionably, it must be said that both writers and editors made considerable attempts to present the positive dimension of their faith. Moreover, many of the books brought out from 1534 onwards sought to reach a wide and popular audience, thereby disseminating Protestant ideas far beyond the normal academic and political confines. Popular propaganda went hand in hand with distinct didactic aims. The reader was to be instructed in the value of Protestant ideas and encouraged to accept these as his own.

Like the translators of continental writings, English writers were careful for the most part to ensure that their published works made no outright criticism of the doctrine of Royal Supremacy. Although English Protestants were by no means united in their attitude to specific theoretical aspects of the doctrine such as the 'plenitudo potestatis' of the King, they were on the whole willing to accommodate their political ideas to the practical reality of Henry's governance. Almost without question, Henry's supremacy over the Church was seen as offering a unique opportunity for implementing evangelical reform. Unlike official or quasi-official writers such as St. German, however, Protestants were often reluctant to explore the precise significance of the role of the King in the affairs of the Church. Henry's supremacy was almost universally acknowledged by English Protestants; whether it was fully understood, however, is
open to question, For most Protestant writers of the 1530s, Henry's supremacy was accepted because of the way it was used to facilitate reform. Only when the King turned away from policies which could be interpreted as reformist, did Henry's role in the affairs of the Church come to be re-evaluated.
I. The Lollard Legacy.

Whilst the ideas of academic theologians and historians both at home and abroad provided the potential for religious change, that very dynamism was only created within England once their ideas satisfied both the demands of officials and the needs of a popular audience. It has long been recognised that the survival of Wyclifite ideas within Lollard sects provided particularly fertile ground upon which the ideas of Luther and the English reformers could be sewn. The Lollard emphasis on such matters as sola scriptura, sacramentarianism, anti-papalism and anticlericalism, ensured that reforming opinion within England was not solely dependent on outside influence but could draw upon a native tradition. In the 1520s and 1530s there were numerous contacts between Protestants and Lollards. Miles Coverdale, for example, seems to have owed some debt to Lollard thought and was closely associated with a Lollard sect at Steeple Bumstead, whilst Strype records a meeting between Robert Barnes and a group of Lollards in which attempts were made to entice the reformer to propagate Lollard writings. Tyndale's New Testament seems to have sold especially well in traditional Lollard areas. Indeed, it was with the circle of academic Protestant evangelicals that Lollard ideas gained respectability.

By the early 1530s the Protestant exiles in Antwerp had begun to bring out books which belonged specifically to the Lollard tradition. The earliest of these was printed by Hoochstraten and entitled A proper dyaloge betwene a Gentillman and an Husband man. The book, often known by its subtitle
An A.B.C. to the spiritualte, was a collection of miscellaneous writings put together by Jerome Barlowe, co-author of the celebrated Rede me and be nott wrothe. The proper dyaloge blamed all present ills on the ravenous clergy. The spirituality, who were attacked throughout in an impersonal manner, thus became the scapegoat for all contemporary economic problems. The author frequently appealed to the Lollard past in order to demonstrate that there had been Christian brothers who had read the Scriptures and who had been persecuted for this and for their denunciations of the clergy. For part of the work, Barlow replied on an old, incomplete Lollard tract, which probably came from the pen of Wyclif himself. Around the same time the same press issued a separate work entitled A compendicus olde treatyse shewynge howe that we ought to haue the scripture in Englysshe. This short tract consisted of a mid-Fifteenth century version of an English Lollard redaction of a Latin treatise composed by Richard Ullerston. The sixteenth century editor, probably Barlow, modernised some of the language and added anticlerical passages. Both the proper dyaloge and the olde treatyse were also published either simultaneously, or more likely later, in a composite volume.

In the same year, 1530, Hoochstraten also brought out another compendium of two Lollard tracts, The examinacion of Master William Thorpe ... and The examinacion of syr Ihonn Oldcastell. The editorship of these works has been attributed to Tyndale, largely on the testimony of Bale. Thomas More, however, thought that the editor was George Constantine who was later to find himself imprisoned in More's household. Like Jerome Barlowe, the editor, of the tracts sought to emphasise the importance
of Lollardy as precedent. The Church has always made its examinations in secret and has thus always ruled unjustly. Though useful to reformers Lollardy, however, was by no means latent Protestantism. The book contained few references to faith, presented a particularly corporeal doctrine of the eucharist, and, in the case of Oldcastle, affirmed a belief in purgatory. Much of content of the examinations was therefore inconsistent with the doctrines of the Protestant exiles. The importance of the tracts lies not in their advocacy of Protestant ideas but in the way in which they helped further an English Protestant martyrology. In 1544 John Bale expanded the figure of Oldcastle into a crypto-Protestant saint.

In the early part of 1531 Martin de Keyser brought out yet another Lollard work, *The praier and complaynte of the plowman vnto Christe*, which was probably edited by Tyndale. Within England this recycling of Lollard material was not unattractive. The library of the condemned heretic Richard Bayfield, for example, contained both the *A.B.C.* and the *examinacion of Thorpe*, and both works were condemned by Bishop Stokesely in 1531.

By the mid 1530s English printers began to show interest in publishing Lollard works from within London. Around 1535 Robert Redman brought out a book entitled *The Lanterne of Lyght*. The book was originally composed between 1409-15 at a time when the Lollards encountered increasing opposition and persecution. By the mid 1530s many of the passages of the book had gained a new significance: "The well, the begynnynge, and the cause of all ruine and myschefe is the courte of Rome".
Of all the English printers of the 1530s Thomas Godfray showed the greatest interest in printing Lollard literature. Though unfortunately reluctant to date his work, it appears that his first work was a reprint of *The praiere and complaynte of the ploweman*, in which he gave Tyndale's initials above the preface. Around 1536 Godfray printed a work known as *The Plowman's Tale*, an anonymous poem apocryphally attributed to Chaucer. The work consisted of a report by the ploughman/narrator of a conversation between two birds: A Gryphon "of a grymme stature", who pleads the Pope's cause and a Pelikan "withouten pride", who supports the "lollers". The argument is overwhelmingly biased in favour of the Pelikan. His speeches are allowed to flow uninterrupted for several pages at a time. At the end of the work the Gryphon demands of his opponent an immediate and total recantation of his heretical opinions of the Church and the papacy. When this is not forthcoming, the Gryphon flies off to gather his predatory army of birds. Meanwhile the Pelikan leaves the scene, only to return as a Phoenix who wreaks an appropriately savage vengeance on the Gryphon and his followers.

The bulk of the poem was composed in Lollard circles within a generation on either side of 1400. Nonetheless, much of the book was of relevance to England in the 1530s particularly the Pelikan's attacks on the riches, pride, and wickedness of the Papacy. Successive incumbents of the papal office have been culpably negligent in the appointment of bishops, many of whom are ignorant and inefficient. Though his criticism of the papacy is both sharp and unambiguous, the Pelikan still denies that he rejects the papacy as an institution. If the
popes lived good lives he would not argue against them. This moral reform, however, is seen as such an unlikely possibility that the Pelikan can withhold his obedience from Rome without fear. Scripture, and not the Pope, is the ultimate standard of judgement. In so appealing to scripture as the arbiter of truth, the Pelikan goes a long way to undermining the notion of the visible, institutionalised authority of the Church. There are only two kinds of authority: spiritual and secular, both of which lie outside the control of ecclesiastical persons and institutions. In matters of the soul scripture alone determines what is right and wrong. In matters pertaining to temporal realms Kings and Princes are the upholders of justice. The ecclesiastical authorities have betrayed both kinds of authority. In the first place, they have set themselves above scripture, whilst, in the secular realm, they have come to believe that their authority is greater than that of Kings. Reform was interpreted in a dual fashion. Ultimately all change lay in the hands of God since it is His laws and His church that have been despised. Yet secular authorities have a role to play: "For nowe these folks (the clergy) be wonder stoute; The kyng and lorde nowe this amende". In repeating the word "nowe" the author emphasised the urgency of the situation.

In seeing scripture as an independent standard of judgement, *The Plowman's Tale* offered a close correspondence to later ideas of reform, and also an implicit justification for the rejection of papal claims. In bringing out the work in the mid-1530s the editor sought to highlight the anti-papal qualities of the writing, for at two points he inserted lengthy
interpolations. The first of these was the Prologue itself, in which the identity of the Plowman/narrator was established. The second took place amidst an attack on the priesthood. Those who claim a high authority for the papacy were condemned for their excessiveness and lack of judgement. At this point the interpolator shifted the focus of his attack away from the priesthood to the papacy itself. In the first stanza the editor drew out the conflict between the papacy and the secular authorities:

"Hir heed loveth all honour,
And to be worshipped in worde and dede;
Kinges mot to hem knele and coure;
To the apostles, that Christ forbede;
To Popes hestes such taketh more hede
Than to kepe Christes commaundement;
Of gold and silver mot ben hir wede,
Theyholdeth him hole omnipotent".

In the remaining two stanzas the conflict is seen in terms of the Pope and Christ himself:

"He ordayneth by his ordinaunce
To parish-preestes a powére;
To another a greter avaunce,
A greter poynt to his mystere;
But for he is hyghest in erth here,
To him reserveth he many a poynt;
But to Christ, that hath no pere,
Reserveth he neither opin ne yoyn.
So semeth he above(n) all,
And Christ aboven him nothing;  
Whan he sitteth in his stall,  
Dampneth and saveth as him think,  
Such pryde before god doth stink;  
An angelli bad John to him nat knele,  
But only to god to do his bowing;  
Such willers or worship must evil fele".  

In inserting the three verses the editor emphasised, rather than introduced, the theme of papal abuse of authority. As a result, this abrasive Lollard poem took on the mantle of propaganda. The conflict between the Pope and Henry VIII was examined from a historical perspective, thereby giving Henry's attempts to extricate his realm from papal authority important sanction and support.

Although additions were made to the Plowman's Tale, the argument of the work contained nothing that belonged exclusively to the 1530s. The redactor made no use of any motifs associated with Henry's Supremacy, nor did he refer to changes which resulted from Protestant ideas of reform. In another apocryphal Chaucerian work produced between 1537-39, however, attempts were made to voice criticism of the clergy and papacy alongside a defence of the new learning. The work, known as the Pilgrim's Tale, is an incomplete poem forming part of a generic work known as the Court of Venus. The Court consists of three different fragments of poetical miscellany. The first part known as the Douce fragment included the Pilgrim's Tale along with two lyrics which were probably composed by Sir Thomas Wyatt.
In Bale's 1548 *Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum* the authorship of the Tale was attributed to Chaucer. By 1557-59, however, Bale had changed his mind, and possibly as a result of information passed on by the printer of the Tale, Thomas Gybson, the work was given to the pen of the martyr Robert Singleton. Singleton, a Lancastrian, was one-time chaplain to Anne Boleyn. By the 1530s he had embraced Lutheran ideas, and in 1536 a version of a sermon which he delivered at Paul's Cross was brought out by Thomas Godfrey.

For a Paul's Cross sermon Singleton's was distinctly controversial, so much so that the printer saw fit to add three verses following the title page in which he disclaimed any responsibility for the contents of the book. Any man who found fault in the work was directed to blame the author and not the unfortunate printer. The sermon, on Galatians 4: 21-5: 1, purported to examine and to compare the two testaments of Old and New as represented by the characters Ishmael and Isaac. Attention was largely focussed on the former, or rather, on those who follow Ishmael and live according to carnal worldly traditions. Singleton presented an essentially two-fold attack. In the first place, he harangued the clergy for their wilful materialism. Their 'crime' was that they sold spiritual wares for earthly advantage. And than sell they trétals / psalters / dyriges: masses of Scala celi to delyuer soules out of purgatorie: but nat excepte they gyue syluer or golde / for the nature of that fyre is nat quenched (saye they) but with suche precyouse metall. Were this trade not bad' enough the clergy hide their covetousness under the cover of a show of poverty. "And vnder the pretence of
pouertye / they haue accumulated such abundaunce of ryches / that they haue made shrines of golde / candelstykkes / basons / cruettes and sensers of golde & of syluer / and of precyouse stones: so that this pouerty / vnto whō they say they be pfessed".\textsuperscript{46} Similarly, the clergy's profession of chastity is but a sham. "You princes of Sodom gyue heryng to the worde of god / parcceyue the lawe of god with your eares / you that be the people of Gommor".\textsuperscript{47}

The materialism and worldliness of the clergy, however, were not the principal targets of Singleton's polemic; the clergy's desire for wealth being seen as merely a symptom of a much greater perversion. In elevating the values of earthly traditions, the clergy call into question the sufficiency of Christ's Salvation. Human merits take the place of the Christian's faithful response to God's grace. Indeed, Singleton made it clear that he promoted the doctrine of justification by faith and rejected justification by works, "to withdrawe the abusynge from erthly foundacyons / that we put no suche confyndence nor trust in other mēnes merytes / which is vayne prestigousnesse and iugelynge".\textsuperscript{48} In elevating the human, the clergy reveal that they form no part of the true Church. Like Judas, these men who seek earthly reward are traitors unto Christ's cause. The church of Ishmael "haue distroyed / murthered / and burned all that durst speke in the spyrite of Christ".\textsuperscript{49} Nowadays these wolves are content to burn the sheep of Christ.

Although Singleton's attack on the false prophets and wolvish clergy was wide-ranging, his argument focussed on specific abuses. The profusion of ecclesiastical buildings,
for example, was seen as shameful. Christians should only rejoice in the building of their own parish churches; all others are merely the structural monuments of papism. Idolatrous worship was also singled out, in particular, pilgrimages and the papal canonisation of saints. The issue which received most attention, however, was the abuse of purgatory. Those priests who advocate prayers for the dead perform open mischief. Nonetheless, although scripture does not certify whether our prayers extend to the departed souls, Christians are certain that the command to love compels them to be continual intercessors for the dead. No trust should be placed in the merits of our prayers, however, and no discrimination should be made which allows Christians only to pray for their friends and not for their enemies.

Singleton's moderation was reserved for doctrinal matters; the institutions of the papacy received unqualified condemnation. Although some oblations were seen to work for the good of the individual and the community, papist oblations were regarded as distinctly harmful. This found illustration by a recent event. Through the false miracles of their leader the adherents of the Holy Maid of Kent would have accumulated great wealth were it not that the Word of God, recently emerging from centuries of neglect, had beaten them down. On the whole, however, Singleton was not unduly complacent about recent developments. These are early days and the Church of Ishmael is by no means fully extinguished. The papist bishops and pharisees of servitude must be abrogated and replaced with the bishops of Paul. "And when we be ones ryd of these knightes of the sepulchre / that be hyred to kepe Christ downe with their
sophisticall weapyns / & with all their other craftes that
serue for wages / that we be no more disceyued with thē /
neither with none of their sort". Only when the followers
of Ishmael are rejected will the Church be able to live according
to God's precepts.

Singleton's sermon was then both a forceful apologetic
for recent developments, and a justification for more radical
policies to come. His style was simple, consisting of extensive
scriptural quotation which served as a commentary on contemporary
issues. The Bible was quoted both in Latin and in English,
and references were also made to the *Chronica Chronicorum*. The sermon, however, appears to have had little influence and
only one edition was printed. Yet Singleton's approach to
ecclesiastical customs remains of some interest. In so far
as he rejected the abuses of the purgatorial practice whilst,
at the same, advocating continual prayers for the souls of the
departed on the grounds of the command to love, Singleton
promoted a middle way between the extremes of outright
rejection and whole hearted acceptance of the purgatorial system.
His argument is almost word for word that of the Ten Articles
which pointed out that the order of charity compels prayers
for the dead. Singleton's sermon was delivered over a year
before the publication of the Ten Articles although it was not
printed until some time later. The author thus appears to
have anticipated the official formulary of faith, in particular
its distinction between the essentials and inessentials of the
faith, a matter which rested on 'adiaphoristic principles'.

By 1536 Singleton was in correspondence with Cromwell,
complaining about the activities of one Sire Patrick, a friar. Two years later he wrote concerning a sermon that one Dr. Cottys
preached on Easter Sunday 1538, 62 in which the preacher allegedly misused the scriptures to argue that no man is bound to obey the King's commandments if they went against God. According to Singleton, "the sermon seemed to me to blaspheme against the King and you that be of his Council, and to seduce the people from the Son of Man to the abomination standing in the Holy Place". 63 Singleton's role as an informer was not entirely motivated by a sense of loyalty. At the end of the letter he signed off as follows: "Robert Singleton, lying in Branford at the sign of the Crown, till I can prepare myself to be a suitor to your good lordship". 64 Thus his provision of information was partly designed to demonstrate his usefulness to Cromwell. Clearly the fall of Anne Boleyn had unfortunate repercussions for her one-time chaplain. By 1538 he had become yet another of those scholars who sought an entry into Cromwell's circle of propagandists. There is, however, no evidence that Singleton ever gained official employment as a result of these overtures.

Turning once more to the Pilgrim's Tale, it is immediately apparent that Singleton, if in fact he was the author, wrote the work by consciously archaizing the language. Parts of the book borrowed ideas and expressions from the Plowman's Tale, 65 an indication of the popularity of this type of literature even within educated circles.

The Pilgrim's Tale attacked monastic and clerical abuses, in particular the idleness of the spirituality. The clergy make additions to God's rule, presuming that there can be redemption through their prayers. 66 Moreover, the papists wilfully disobey temporal rulers. Those who identify their errors, through perusal of the scriptures, are hailed as heretics,
yet the clergy, in following the ways of Antichrist, actively incite disobedience and insurrection. This accusation was supported by references to the Pilgrimage of Grace and, more cryptically, to a series of political prophecies.

References to the King's Arthurian origins abound, and extensive use was made of Galfridian prophecies deriving from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Book of Merlin*, in which animals and birds are substituted for men and women. As a result, the poem appears, in many ways, a more curious, archaic work than the *Plowman's Tale*. However in several verses the author instilled into his prophetic criticism of the clergy a distinctly Protestant attitude to salvation. In discussing human merits, for example, the author wrote of his Pilgrim as follows:

"& then he dyd planly confesse
that mans work was wrechydnes.
& to the corintheans he could rehers
that in mans work we shold not reloce
for paull him selue wold haue yet known
that mans work is our own
for whether it be he cephas or apollo
that is our awn what euer we do.
Which is nought than we do best.
exceptyd only our faith in christ.
the thing for good that we pretend.
takis non effect as meritoriuse end.
therefore merit in vs is non.
but in our redemer christ alon".
Further on he emphasised that, "trust I our selue & ovr workes hath vs ouerthrow". 71

Thus the author of the Pilgrim's Tale, probably a close friend of the recently deposed Queen, drew upon a tradition of popular prophetic literature, possibly associated with Lollardy and apocryphally attributed to Chaucer, in order to create an abusive and wide-ranging polemic against the contemporary clergy. Singleton borrowed ideas from earlier writings, wrote in an archaic dialect, and infused his work with a defence of the Protestant attitude to faith and works.

Around the same time that the Pilgrim's Tale was published, the reformist printer and book seller John Gough issued another book that was attributed to Chaucer. The work, Jacke up Lande, 72 consisted of a series of questions posed by Jack and addressed to a friar. The questions, some sixty four in all, were concerned with specific abuses of the clerical and monastic institutions. Again, particular emphasis was placed on the acquisitiveness of the clergy. "Why busie ye not to here shrifte of poore folke, as well as of riche lorde and ladiyes, sith they mowe have more plentee of shrifte-fathers than poore folk may?" 73 Once more the spirituality was accused of selling its religion. What charity is this "to overcharge the people by begginge, under colour of preachinge or praying or masses singing? Sith holy writ biddeth not thus, but even to the contrary; for al such goostly dedes shulde be don freely, as god yeveth him freely". 74

In questions 51-59 the author began each point by asking "What charity is this?" The entry of children into orders, the widespread prevalence of monastic regimes, the suppression
of the scriptures, the ostentation of clerical garb, and the friars' lack of criticism of the wealthy were all seen as contrary to the rule of love. At one point the author asked, "Why have ye exempt you frō our kinges lawes and visitings of our bishoppes more than other Christen men that liven in this realme, if ye be not gilty of traitory to our realme, or tresspassers to oure bishoppes?" For the most part however little reference was made to political questions.

At the end of the work the author summed up his intent as follows: "If freres canne not or mow not excuse hem of these questions asked of hem, it semeth that they be horrible gilty against god and his even-Christen; for which gyltes and defautes it were worthy that the order that they call hir order were for-don. And it is wonder that men susteyne hem or suffer hem live in suche maner. For holy writ biddeth that thou do well to the meke, and geve not to the wicked, but forbid to geve hem breed, lest they be made thereby mightier through you".

The timing of the publication of the book, in the latter half of the 1530s, appears to be connected with the government's attacks on superstition and the monasteries. In so far as Jacke up Lande was purveyed with the belief that it was written by Chaucer, its criticism of the friars gained additional weight and authority. Moreover, in leaving the questions unanswered, the author created a particularly vigorous, if one-sided polemic. In the fifteenth century an answer was written to Up Lande entitled Friars Daw's Reply. By the mid-1530s however, propaganda-demands ruled out the publication of such defences of the clergy and of monasticism.
Jacke up Lande operated on the most simple level in that centuries old criticisms of clerical abuse were merely recycled to add their voice to contemporary polemics. Lollard beliefs were not even advanced as any sort of precedent for Protestant ideas. Unlike The Pilgrim's Tale, there was no attempt to counter popular criticism of the reforming movement itself. Yet Robert Singleton, the author of the tale, was by no means alone in showing an interest in the propaganda potential of prophetic writing. Around 1537 Wilfred Holme of Huntington wrote the Fall and Evil Success of Rebellion, a poem of some two-hundred and sixty-nine eight line stanzas, which sought to examine the political and religious principles at stake in the Reformation. The work put forward an advanced Protestant anticlericalism, which possibly derived from such works as Tyndale's Practice of Prelates and Fish's Supplication for the Beggars. Saints' days were opposed because they detract from honour due to God. Similarly, belief in purgatory was regarded as undermining the sufficiency of Christ's salvation. Auricular confession was seen as unscriptural, as was the custom of unmarried priests. Monastic religion was severely condemned as a "vile abomination" which serves only to "cloke their deeds libidinous and incest fornication". Images were of no value, even though

"Candles are illuminate and set on every post,
Before a gorgious Idol freshe figures and gylt,
And though it maye be suffered, yet thereby hath ben lost
Many a Christian man, and many a soule spylte".

The author Holme was equally severe on the belief in salvation by works
"Nowe beleeving in workes is dispaire and carnalitie,
Their vowes are like Jewes vowes, therefore they be vacuate.
For here is Christ, or ther is Christ, and hope not in him only
Is lyke to the devils faith from hope clereely seperate". 83

Although much of the work championed religious change
along distinct, if militant, Protestant lines, a good deal of
Holme's writing was given over to recent events surrounding
the Pilgrimage of Grace. Indeed, the main argument of the poem
was expressed in the form of a commentary on the rebels' articles
and the King's replies. The last section of the book, however,
saw a shift in the author's argument away from a rational
discussion of recent events to an extended examination of the
Merlin prophecies of Geoffrey of Monmouth. 84 An interest in
Galfridian prophecy was almost an article of faith for many
of the rebels. 85 Among the traditional clergy of the North
the Mouldwarp legend in particular was often identified with an
increasingly unpopular Henry VIII. In 1535 John Hale, vicar
of Isleworth, was executed after declaiming that Henry was the
Mouldwarp of whom Merlin had prophecied. John Dobson, vicar
of Muston Yorkshire, executed in 1538, was alleged to have told
his cogregation that the King would soon be driven out of his
realm, that he who bore the eagle (The Emperor) would rule the
land, that the dun cow (Pope) would restore the Church, and that
Crumb (Cromwell) would fall. 86 These prophecies usually
circulated by word of mouth although occasionally their
dissemination was accelerated by semi-professional prophets and
critics. 87 It was rare for this type of utterance to find
its way into print, and throughout Henry's reign seditious books of prophecy were seized and the activities of Catholic prophets examined and suppressed. 88

Although these amorphous, largely verbal, Galfridian prophecies remained an essentially popular form of anti-government propaganda, often unhindered by attempts at prosecution, some positive steps were taken to countermand the application of the prophecies. In his Exhortation of 1539, the official polemicist Richard Morison sought to counter the Welsh prophecies by providing a pro-royal prophecy based on the book of Esdras. 89 In the Fall of Rebellion Wilfred Holme also resisted attempts to identify Henry VIII with the Mouldwarp. Holme was a loyal supporter of the King's Supremacy. This Hercules who had defined the truth, so that his glory now shines abroad, can hardly be identified with the propheced coward of the Mouldwarp King. Moreover, like Morison, Holme sought to apply an alternative prophecy to the King.

"Ye(a) this is he which hath made al the Romain bels to ring Without pul of hand, their false tongs papistical, Having oil in his lampe he is a maiden King, Though they take it otherwise by their senses carnal, And in the true vale of Josephat the scripture canonical, There is no doubt but his grace is sepelite. For doubtlesse all the English prophesies autentical, Concerning these matters by the King is whole condite". 90

Robert Singleton's Pilgrim's Tale also appears to have been produced to counter anti-government prophecy. Its printer Thomas Gybson was a witness to the will of Clement Armstrong, a
London grocer turned propagandist, who had put forward several reforming treatises on the commonweal. Gybson's own name appeared on a draft bill concerning the use of confiscated monastic lands, the creation of a standing army, and the erection of a court of centeners to administer it. As a printer Gybson was not prolific, producing only a half dozen or so books between 1535-39. In 1537 Latimer wrote to Cromwell recommending that Gybson be entrusted with the task of printing the Bishops' Book. Although Latimer pointed out that Gybson would be inexpensive, the task went to the King's printer Berthelet. Towards the beginning 1537 Gybson himself wrote to Cromwell, offering a compilation of some thirteen prophecies taken from Rymer, Bede, and Merlin, which allegedly proved that Henry VIII was the king chosen by God "to win the Holy Cross and also divers realms." For Gybson, the prophecies were to be understood metaphorically. The sixth, for example, claimed that Ampho, patriarch of Armonie "calleth him the Weste beast; the which shall put down a part of the friar preachers and win a great part of the world and make a free way into the Holy Land, and in that time shall be many marvels of Anti-Christ". According to Gybson, the prophecy has been fulfilled because the King has left none of the Friar Preachers, and has made a free way to the Holy Land by setting the scripture at liberty so that every man can look upon it. The conclusion drawn from all the prophecies is that the King would overthrow the Devil's minister, the bishop of Rome.

On the whole, pro-government use of prophetic literature was very limited. By their very nature the Galfridian prophecies belonged to a conservative, superstitious society; one which
stood in fundamental conflict with the aims of Cromwell's reform. Clearly few anti-government works were allowed to find their way into print. Equally, a prophetic literature that depended on vague, ambivalent utterances in old, esoteric writings was not considered as generally suitable for reforming purposes. Holme's work was not actually printed until 1572/73, and another popular contemporary polemic, The Fantasie of Idolatry, has only survived in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.\(^9^8\) Indeed, it is in many ways to the credit of the official reform directed by Cromwell that so few attempts were made to match like with like. To oppose prophecy and superstition more rational means of propaganda were employed than mere counter prophecy.

Outwith the main currents of official reform, however, there were some moves to come to terms with popular opinion. In the work of Singleton and Holme, attempts were made to impose Protestant categories of faith upon an essentially oral tradition of anticlericalism and anti-Romanism. In another field Miles Coverdale sought to provide biblically based songs to replace popular superstitious ditties. In the field of drama considerable efforts were made to propagate the Protestant message to an illiterate or illeducated populace.\(^9^9\). From the very early days of the Reformation in England plays and interludes were adapted to meet the polemical demands of Protestant writers. Printed books were only one medium for the dissemination of reforming ideas.
2. The Exiles' Legacy.

From around 1534 onwards the continent ceased to be the only place where Protestant books could be printed. As with translations of continental reforming literature, and Lollard works, books which were previously forbidden could now be openly propagated in London. The reasons why printers turned to the works of Protestant exiles is in itself no mystery. Many of the books that were selected for republication had proved best sellers, thereby amounting to a likely source of profit for a new generation of English printers. Economic considerations, however, were unlikely to have been the only factors involved, and an examination of the contents of the books that were selected for printing points to a more profound, ideological concern.

Somewhere between 1534 and 36, Thomas Godfray brought out a work entitled *A Pathway to the Holy Scripture*, an enlarged edition of Tyndale's prologue to his first New Testament. It is not certain when Tyndale actually expanded the prologue. In his *Confutation* of 1532, More mentioned it, apparently as a separate book, though he does not seem to have been aware of Tyndale's authorship. The *Pathway* depended heavily, and at times literally, on the work of Luther. The Old Testament puts forward the law and the New Testament presents the promise. Though there is some interchange, the two cannot be separated and must always go together. The Christian is justified by faith, and although he must continue to do good works, his salvation is not imputed to them.

Godfray's edition of the *Pathway* included three other
The first, "A letter sent vnto a certayn frēde to enstructe hi in the vnderstandynge of the scripture", was translated from an unknown French source. The author followed the distinction of Tyndale and Luther between law and gospel, and gave thanks that the Word of God was now being uncovered from the reason and dreams of men. The writing was clearly Protestant with a particular emphasis on the theme of persecution. The world always attacks the faithful who have the armour of Ephesians as their defence and the Word of God as their sword. There was the occasional polemical point. The papists were asked to justify how they obscured the filthiness of the pope's decrees. Compulsory clerical celibacy, and the laws concerning the eating of meats were seen as contrary to the commandments of God. More seriously, according to the author, the laity have been forbidden to dispute matters of the faith in order to prevent these things from being made known.

The second item, "Of gouernours / as Judges / bayleffes / & other lyke / An information after the gospell", sought to highlight two standard Lutheran tenets: that rulers ought to stand fast with the gospel, and that the laity should not resist oppression through violence. The third part, "The offyce of all estates", consisted of scriptural passages relating to bishops, rulers, commons, husbands, wives and the like, which were taken from Tyndale's 1535 New Testament. The Pathway of Godfray appears to have been designed to accompany the emergence of vernacular scriptures in England by providing a brief discussion of key Lutheran articles. The book ran to a second edition.

Around 1535 the same printer brought out an edition of
Tyndale's Parable of the Wicked Mammon. 110 Robert Redman too showed an interest in the work on Tyndale and reprinted his Exposition vpon the v. vi. vii. chapters of Matthew sometime in 1536. 111 Tyndale composed the Exposition during 1532. 112 According to George Joye, Tyndale merely "powldered" Luther's own exposition without ever acknowledging the source. 113 Certainly Tyndale made extensive use of Luther's work and probably wrote his Exposition with a copy of Luther's writing before him. 114 Yet in no sense did Tyndale simply provide a translation of the Wittenberg reformer's commentary. Rather, he restated Luther's teaching in English in his own words. Thus, although the origin of the work remained Lutheran, the bulk of the book can be claimed as Tyndale's own. 115

The main theme of the Exposition was the need for Christians to fulfil the law. As the full title of the book pointed out, just as the sermon on the Mount restored Moses's law from the corruption of scribes and pharisees, so the exposition rescued Christ's law from the false glosses of the papists. 115 The Christian was never to value his works for their own glory, as means to salvation, and much of the Exposition attacked the papists for this false honouring of merit. The law, however, remained the model of the Christian's life. Faith gave the justified Christian the power not only to heed the law but to
fulfil it. "This is then the sum of all together: works are the outward righteousness before the world, and may be called the righteousness of the members, and spring of inward love. Love is the righteousness of the heart, and springeth of faith. Faith is the trust in Christ's blood, and is the gift of God; whereunto a man is drawn of the goodness of God, and driven through true knowledge of the law, and of beholding his deeds in the lust and desire of the members unto the request of the law, and with seeing his own damnation in the glass of the law".117

Tyndale did not then entirely abandon Luther's view that the law demonstrated man's sinfulness, although this received less and less emphasis. His own 'innovation' was to draw attention to man's capacity to carry out the law, which was expressed in language which may have derived from Swiss theologians. Moreover, Tyndale went so far as to speak of some specific works as necessary to faith. Since prayer, alms-giving, and fasting were commanded by God, no man can be a Christian without performing them.119 Unto these works has God annexed his promise of reward. They function, as it were, as sacraments, as "visible and sensible signs, tokens, earnest obligations, witnesses, testimonies, and a sure certifying of our souls, that God hath and will do according to his promise, to strengthen our weak faith, and to keep the promise in mind.—But they—justify us not, no more
than the visible works of the sacraments do". These essential works must be understood properly free from scholastic gloss, and papist corruption.

Although these works were seen as necessary Tyndale did not regard the external observance of the old law with any less hostility than Luther. The law which the justified Christian could fulfil consisted of the two-fold commandment to love God and to love one's neighbour. In fixing his concept of law on the bedrock of the dominical precept of love, Tyndale avoided any notion of legalism. Indeed Luther's own commentary on the Ten Commandments offered a far more extensive treatment of necessary works than did Tyndale. Moreover the law was to be fulfilled primarily in an internal sense. It should be carried out in a spirit of love which proceeded from a true faith. "He that loveth not, knoweth neither God nor Christ; therefore he that loveth not is not of that kingdom of heaven".

In addition to a consideration of faith and works the Exposition provided the clearest statement of Tyndale's doctrine of the two kingdoms. Every man is a double person under both regiments. In the first, the kingdom of heaven, each man is a person for himself under Christ and his doctrine. He may not hate, nor be angry, and much less fight or avenge, but must follow the example of Christ in humility and self-denial and endure all wrongdoing. "For love is all; and what is not out of love, that is damnable, and cast out of that kingdom".
In the temporal realm a man is not a private citizen but is a person in relation to others. As such he must fulfill the office required of him whether as husband, child, servant, master or whatever. Rulers are compelled to imprison and slay in order to defend their subjects and maintain their office. What however, if the rulers act out of malice and lust? Tyndale raises this argument in the form of an objection. Since the subjects choose the ruler, if he misrules are they then bound to disobey and resist him or even to despose him altogether? Tyndale's answer is unequivocal. God and not the common people chooses princes even though He does so through their agency. Thus, his concept of government excludes the notion of a binding covenant between rulers and subjects. The two clearly have obligations and duties, many of which are mutual. The deposition of rulers, however lies outside the relation between ruler and subject. All that the latter can do is pray for deliverance.

This aspect of Tyndale's political thought was clearly attractive to an English audience in the mid 1530s even though his Obedience of the Christian Man had made the same point in more detail. In affirming the overwhelming duty of the Christian to obey the temporal commands of the ruler, the 1536 edition of Tyndale's Exposition was a helpful confutation of ideas which had been put forward by factions and individuals to the King's policies. Nonetheless, as has been seen, Tyndale did not accord either the monarch or magistrate an absolute authority. In the Exposition he laid particular emphasis on the damnable consequences which would befall if the King were to withdraw himself from the obedience of the
spiritual officer. The King is duty bound to fulfil his obligations to the spiritual realm, to hear his vices rebuked, and to amend them. 128

Redman printed the Exposition without naming either the author or indeed his own press. Yet very few alterations were made from the original edition. The work was not without appeal, and the printer was forced to bring out two further reprints in order to meet demand. 129

In 1534 Redman printed an edition of the Common Places of Patrick Hamilton. 130 The author, a young Scottish exile, wrote his work originally as a doctoral dissertation in Marburg under the tutelage of Francis Lambert, 131 Parts of the work were translated by John Frith and an English version was probably brought out in 1531, after Hamilton's death as a martyr. 132 Frith's translation of the Loci Communes brought into English a succinct statement of the doctrine of justification by faith. The purpose of the law was restricted to the role of revealing man's sin and driving him to faith, a faith which consisted of holding fast to the promise of God. 133

In the following year Redman brought out an edition of another exilic work, The sum of holy scripture and ordinarv of the Christian teaching. 134 Based on a French translation of a Dutch work by Heinrich Bomelius, the English edition was first published by Hoochstraten in Antwerp in 1529. 135 The Sum borrowed much from Luther, although its dependence was selective. The way the author used terms such as 'figure' and 'sign' suggests the influence of the Swiss reformers on his eucharistic theology. 136 Nonetheless, the book emphasised justification by faith, and the belief that justification was witnessed in
the good works of the believer. The Mass was not discussed although attacks were made on the false religious vocation of monasticism.

On the strength of the testimony of Foxe the English translation of the book has generally been attributed to Simon Fish, although the difference in subject matter and treatment between this work and his *Supplication of the Beggars* is striking. In 1530 English bishops examining the work found no less than ninety-two heretical positions and accordingly the work was prohibited by Royal Proclamation in June of that year. Its republication in 1535 thus constitutes something of a triumph for the reform party in England although, as with Tyndale's *Exposition of Matthew*, Redman did not allow his name to go forward in the book. This most comprehensive summary of Protestant teaching went to a further edition in the same year.

Of the exilic works that were reprinted, Tyndale's *Pathway*, *Wicked Mammon*, and *Exposition of Matthew*, together with Hamilton's *Common Places*, and Fish's translation of the *Sum of holy scripture*, all presented a singularly didactic introduction to the new learning. In short, the books attempted to provide brief summaries or commentaries on the key points of Protestant theology. Unlike Francis Lambert's *Farrago* for example, the reprinted exilic books never descended into an abusive attack on traditional belief and its adherents. Although his *Exposition of Matthew* was based on the work of Luther, Tyndale did not see fit to translate all of the Wittenberg reformer's vulgar abuse of Romish followers. Though not always moderate, the reprinted exiles' books were restrained and positive accounts of the Protestant faith.
This didactic thrust centred on two main issues. First, the books all put forward a fairly consistent account of the doctrine of justification by faith. Applied with rather less of Luther's dialectic than with a more ethical emphasis on deeds and works, the books sought to instruct the reader of the need to fulfill the law according to the purpose for which it was ordained. To some extent theology was transformed into morality. For Tyndale, Christ had not come to destroy the law but to restore the works of the law to their proper scriptural and moral value.141

Secondly, the books, particularly Tyndale's Exposition and Pathway, advocated a dogmatic, though not unequivocal position on the question of political authority and power. Godfray's edition of the Pathway contained additional material that was designed to emphasise the duties of temporal authorities. In relation to the magistrate each individual must fulfill the office required of him in scripture. In the face of any abuse of political power the Christian must simply wait and pray for deliverance.

The teaching put forward in the reprinted exilic works, however much consistent with the general principles of the Antwerp reformers, takes on additional significance when viewed in the context of political developments in England. After all, a consideration of the timing of the republication of the works is essential to any examination of their content and relevance. In 1536 the government, under Cromwell's direction, initiated its attack on superstitious religion with the publication of the first set of Ecclesiastical Injunctions.142 The clergy were ordered to teach and instruct the young in the articles
of faith, the Ten Commandments, and the Pater Noster. The people were to be allured away from idolatrous devotion to images and relics, and were to be instructed to apply themselves "to the keeping of God's commandments and fulfilling of His works of charity". Bodily labour, travail, occupation, and provision for families, was more pleasing to God than going on pilgrimages, whilst charity given to the poor and needy was seen as more profitable to the health of the soul than bestowals upon images and relics. Although these Injunctions appear on the surface as a fundamentally secular document, they did embody a programme of spiritual reform, being directed to the moral improvement of the Church of England, the nation in its spiritual aspect. At this stage the intellectual origins of this reform programme need not concern us, although it has been argued that the Injunctions had a distinctive Protestant content, and that the pattern of reform which they proposed owed much to the Protestant-humanist works of Tyndale and his fellow exiles. What is important to note at this juncture, is that the exiles' works, with their heightened emphasis on necessary works, were reprinted within England at a time when the government was attempting to reform the religious practice and morality of its people. In the light of the government's policy, the selection of the exiles' books was not a random decision. Rather, their editors and printers appear to have recognised the value of propagating a summary or expository account of the moral thrust of the new learning alongside and in accompaniment to government policy.

Although the reprinted exilic books attacked the superstitious practice of voluntary works, they all sought to
emphasise a more positive dimension, the need for the Christian to do charitable works as a demonstration of his faith. Moreover, for Tyndale, the task of carrying out reform was seen as dependant on the restoration of Scripture to its central role in both the Church and in society, coupled with a return to its correct meaning. In emphasising the need for Scripture to be used as the only charter of human society, Tyndale thus presented the whole issue of faith and works in terms which transcended the narrow confines of traditional ecclesiology. The Christian's obligation to fulfil the law was to be undertaken not as an ecclesiastical requirement, but as a demonstration of an inner faith. The world, and not the church, was the realm of charitable works. The law was to be fulfilled, as it were, from where the Christian stood in the entire body politic. Morality, understood as the individual's mutual dealings with his fellow men, was seen as an integral part of the salvific event. Though good works did not justify the believer, they were necessary evidence of a faith that was imputed unto him by God. In turn, ecclesiastical reform was a crucial aid to the restoration of true morality, since the restoration of the law was seen as purging the Church of false belief and practice. Scripture thus provides the basis for a full programme of reform, although it does not determine the full extent of ecclesiastical practice. Rather, the return of the law to its proper use results in a purification of the Church, and the restitution of a true morality.
3. Evangelical Literature and the Progress of the Reform

(i) Primers.

The concern of the reformers to restore Scripture to its true meaning and to a central role in the life of the Christian, resulted in a flood of books concerned with the Bible being put forward from within England from around 1534 onwards. Not all of these consisted of mere translations of either individual books or of the complete Bible. Many portions of the scriptures were first brought out in English as parts of composite Primers. In many ways, this very literature of scripture and liturgics was the most important medium for Protestant ideas in England.

The earliest Primer to be published in England was compiled by William Marshall and printed by John Byddell in 1534. According to C.C. Butterworth, fully three-fifths of Marshall's A Prymer in Englyshe with certeyn prayers and godly meditations very necessary for all people that vnderstonde not the Latyne tongue were reprinted from the 1530 Ortulus Animae of George Joye. This was very much a Protestant work; Joye having imported a good deal of continental theology into the body of the writing. The Passion, for example, was taken from a work of Bucer, whilst prayers were derived from Luther and from Brunfels. Throughout the book, however, Joye managed to incorporate his own controversial views. Prayers and devotions addressed to the Virgin were eliminated, along with many saints from the calendar, whilst some scriptural passages were translated into English to be published for the first time.
Joye was not the only source of Marshall's piety, for the remaining two-thirds of the Primer were drawn from the writings of Luther, while the Psalms of the Passion were taken from Joye's Psalter of 1530, itself based on Bucer's work. One of the more important sections of the Primer was the Preface to the reader. Derived from Luther's own preface to his Betbühlein, it opened with a polemical flourish. "Among other innumerable pestilent infections of bokes & learnynges / with the which christen people haue bene pytyously seduced and deceived (brought vp in dyuers kyndes of dyffydence & false hope) I may iudge and that chiefly / those to be pernicyous / on whom they be wont in euery place to pray / and haue also learned by herte / both curyously & with great scrupulosite to make rehersal of theyr sinnes. These bokes (though they abōded in euery place with infynyte errors / and taught praiers, made with wycked folishnes / both to god and also to the sayntes) yet by cause thei were garnished with gloryous tytles and with redde letters promysing moche grace and pardon (though it were but vanite) haue sore deceiued the vnlearned multytude / one is called ἄ gardeyn of the soule / another the paradyse of the soule / & by cause I wyll be short loke thou thy selfe / what dyuerse and glorious names be gyuē vnto thē / wherfore here nedeth sharpe reformation / yea·and many of them be worthy to be vutterly destroied".

Such militance was not confined to the Preface. In "A devout and godly remembrance of the passion", Marshall launched an attack on the false understanding of the Mass. Only at one point did he display any originality. A Prayer for the molifieng and surlyeng of our harde hertes, the
lyghtynge of our blynde hertes and the true coueryng of our
impenitente hertes appears to have been written by Marshall
himself.161 This itself was not entirely free from controversy.
From Proverbs chapter 21 Marshall made a striking position.
"The kynges heght is in thyne handes (Oh lorde) that wher thou
wylte thou mayest inclyne it, for soo sayeth thy scrypature.
Inclynge his herte to this purpose (oh father) that it wyl
please hym to comaunde his prelates of his realme no lenger
to kepe from his people: his louynge subjectes the lyght of
thy worde, the light of holy scrypature, the lyght of the
testament of thy deare sonne our sauyour Iesu christ, the lyght
wherin he † walketh erreth not neyther stumbleth at ony stone
put it in his mynde lorde to comaunde that lyke as thurgh
thy secrete inspyratiō other nations alredy haue: so his People
also by his comaundement may haue in to theyr tonge truely
translated thy holy scrypature wherein they may'learne &
perfytelty know thy godly wyll & pleasure..."162

Bound with the Primer was an Exposition upon the 51st
Psalm by the Florentine reformer Savonarola.163 It appears
that Marshall translated this work because of its connections
with Lutheran literature. In 1523 Luther had highly recommended
its publication in Wittenberg.164

In June 1536 Marshall saw fit to bring out a second
revised edition of the Primer.165 By now the publisher had been
able to procure a license or patent for the new work.166
Apart from the calendar, now put forward in traditional form,
all the distinctive features of the 1534 edition were reproduced,
though not always in the same sequence as before.167 The
phraseology, however, was often altered in a way which demonstrates
Marshall's gradual shift to the 'theological left'. The preface, for example, was revised and the language deliberately heightened. Moreover, there were important material additions. A Litany and Dirge were now included, as were two popular prayers. One item, The office of all estates, taken from the work of Tyndale, suggests a further source of Marshall's theology. The office consisted of a short series of biblical excerpts which were to be applied to various classes of society. Tyndale, not surprisingly, had borrowed the idea from Luther, and had incorporated it into the so-called G-H revision of his New Testament of 1535. Occasionally Marshall altered Tyndale's wording on stylistic grounds. Most of the time he was apparently content to reproduce Tyndale's language.

In 1535 Thomas Godfray brought out five devotional works, one of which was a Primer. As with Marshall's text, Godfray's work derived from Joye's Ortulus of 1530, although he made some use of Marshall's own book. At the conclusion of the commentary on the Lord's Prayer Godfray printed "An exhortation for them that receyeth the blessed sacrament of the auter". Though not printed in Marshall's edition, the section conveyed a similar Lutheran outlook. Again as with Marshall, Godfray probably coupled Savonarola's Exposition of Psalm 51 with his Primer.

Godfray's other works of 1535 consist of a reprint of Joye's Psalter of 1530, The Proverbs of Solomon, newly translated into English, together with The boke of Solomon called Ecclesiastes, again in a version by Joye; a book on the Lord's Prayer, and a work entitled The Fountayne or well of Lyfe. This last book consisted of an anthology of texts
and excerpts from Scripture presented anonymously and without comment, which was taken from the *Fons Vitae*, a Latin compilation printed by de Keyser in Antwerp in 1533.179

Also in 1535 Robert Redman brought out a work entitled *Prayers of the Byble*,180 a selective translation of a Latin compilation made by Otto Brunfels.181 Redman's Prayers on the Psalms were derived from Joyce's second *Psalter* of 1534, whilst material taken from the work of Luther, and not included in Brunfel's original work, was added to the volume.182 Furthermore, there are indications that Redman's work made use of a Wyclifite edition of the Bible.183 If so, then his book published material from two separate strands of heresy - Lollardy and Lutheranism.

In the Spring of the same year Redman brought out an actual Primer, the first in English strictly according to the use of Salisbury.184 Parts of the biblical passages in the book derived from Tyndale's revised New Testament of 1534, although his earlier edition of 1526 was occasionally adapted. In the preface to the book the author wrote of the false veneration of saints. He went on to point out, "For the reformacyon whereof almyghty god of hys eterne prouidence hathe put in the myndes of his electe princes, and true pastours of his flocke to purge the fylthynes of false doctryne out of the hartes of the that haue ben seducyd by blinde guydes / so that noman shall haue cause to erre, but only those whiche are at a poynte to stoppe theyr eares at the trouthe".185 Though more moderate than Marshall's work, the preface remained distinctly Protestant.

By 1536 other printers were becoming attracted to the form of Primers. That year two works designed for England were
produced outside the country. John Gough commissioned a composite work from an Antwerp printer, probably the widow of Christopher Endhoven, which borrowed heavily from the books of Redman, Godfray and Marshall. The most significant aspect of the work was Gough's reprint of the *Common Places* of Patrick Hamilton. The book was taken from Redman's edition of 1534, although Gough provided a new heading, omitted any reference to the author and translator, and simply incorporated the text unannounced into a discussion of the law of God. The second Primer from abroad was altogether a more conservative piece of work. Brought out from Rouen, the book was largely a revision of Redman's Primer. In the following year Redman himself printed a revision of this work.

Towards the beginning of 1537 John Byddell published a brief work on the Pater Noster, the Creed and the Ten Commandments which reflected the government's Injunctions of 1536. At the end of the book Byddell printed three items which were based on official pronouncements. The first, "Thabolysshyng of the bysshop of Romes pretensed & usurped power & iurisdiction within this Realm", was based on the first article of the Injunctions. The second item, "An order and forme of byddynge of the bedys, by the kynges commaundement", derived from an enactment of 1535 which called on worshippers to pray for the King and Queen as well as for the whole congregation of the Church. Part three, "A copy of thacte made for thabrogacion of certayne holydayes", reproduced an act passed in the summer of 1536.

Works on the *Lord's Prayer*, Creed and Commandments were particularly popular. Some years earlier Godfray had brought out a work entitled, *The pater noster spoken of a Sinner*:
God answerne him at every peticyon, which had been incorporated into Gough's Primer. Byddell's work was reprinted apparently in 1538 and six other editions were brought out before 1540. Moreover, Redman's revision of the Rouen Primer borrowed the exposition of the Commandments from Byddell's work.

In 1537 Byddell also brought out a Latin-English edition of Marshall's Goodly Primer, of which the prologue both attacked the Bishop of Rome as the Antichrist and reaffirmed the supreme headship of Henry VIII. The following year he brought out a revision of the Goodly Primer which, curiously, was not modelled on the Latin-English hybrid. That year Regnault and his associates printed at least seven English Primers, whilst at the end of the year Redman printed another edition of his Primer.

This sudden flood of devotional material was clearly stimulated by government policy. The Injunctions of 1536 and 1538 helped to create a market for English Primers which was readily exploited by a large group of printers and opportunists. Although not all of the Primers evinced Protestant leanings, many of them, like the reprinted exilic books, helped to put forward the positive face of the new learning. Traditional practices such as the veneration of saints were attacked and replaced with a biblically centred devotion which laid particular emphasis on meditation on the Psalms and Passion, together with a knowledge and understanding of the Ten Commandments and the Pater Noster. With this strong biblical emphasis the Protestant Primers owed a considerable debt to the work of the exiles. Tyndale's New Testaments and Joye's work on the Psalms formed the bedrock on which much of the new literature
was built. In other words, exilic thought and expression provided the intellectual origins and framework for a nascent literary tradition.

(ii) **Expositions and Polemics.**

In other books which were brought out from 1534 onwards the influence of the exiles was even more apparent. In the summer of 1535 George Joye returned to England. Some months earlier he had put forward his *Apology* in which he defended his New Testament translation from the charges of Tyndale. The book, though of little relevance to English political developments, was printed in London by Byddell. In the same year the same printer brought out a work translated by Joye entitled, *A compendious Somme of the very Christen relygyon*. The original of this work was a Latin treatise published by Grapheus at Antwerp in 1533, under the title *Summa totius sacrae scripturæ, Bibliorum veteris & noui testamenti*. Like Hamilton's *Common Places*, this brief quarto of eight leaves provided a concise exposition of the central doctrines of the reformers. The book covered God-the Creator, original sin, and the law, and expounded in more detail Christ's redemption and the doctrine of justification by faith. The work was faithfully translated by Joye and was moderate in tone, in marked contrast with his previous and, indeed, with his subsequent polemics.

In 1534 Redman brought out an anonymous work entitled, *A proclamacyon of the hygh-Emperour-Iesu Christ*, one of the more unusual Protestant writings of the period. Sufficiently
popular to merit several editions, the attractiveness of the tract lies almost exclusively in the novelty of its form, that of a Royal Proclamation. A monarchical Christ speaks throughout the book, recording the uniqueness of his benefits, determining where many have erred, and re-proclaiming his promises, so that men may turn and make an everlasting covenant with him.

The Proclamacyon was directed to all faithful Christians. Accordingly it was a fundamentally simple tract, largely free from the details of historical example, not encumbered by patristic citation, yet remaining extensively, though not intrusively, scriptural. The theological argument of the book focussed on the breaking of man's baptismal oath of fidelity and obedience to Christ and the means by which Christ restores a proper relationship. The debt to Lutheran thought is considerable. Christ speaks of his justification of man, of his sole mediatorship between man and his true father, and of his righteousness, grace and mercy. However, the author's attempt to locate man's relationship with God within the framework of a covenant suggests the possibility of an alternative influence to that of Luther.

Certain aspects of the Proclamacyon, particularly the emphasis on covenant, promise, and law, appear to echo themes present in Tyndale's writings. Man has not listened to the Word and has cast aside the law. More specifically man is chastised for not fulfilling certain commands. The command to parental obedience has been ignored. Murder, blasphemy, adultery, whorekeeping, breaking the bonds of wedlock, stealing, bearing false witness, and covetousness are endemic. Here the law was not viewed as a pointer to man's depravity, but as
a guide which has been deliberately discarded. The Word is far more than a mere instrument of spiritual comfort. A call is made for Christians to side with their deliverer. "Wherefore gather you together (my deare beloued) and get you quykly vnder my baner". Soon Christ will shortly weed out false juggling, and hypocrisy, every planting that God the Father has not planted. Under the respective captains of Christ and the devil, the author exploited the rubric of eschatology. A holy war is proclaimed, and a call is made to resistance.

This militant emphasis was to be understood metaphorically. As the Christ of the Proclamacyon insisted, "I, not you, shall fight". Negligent rulers are themselves tyrants. Yet we as subjects must tarry patiently till God obliterates them from the face of the earth. Throughout the book the author maintained a rigid polarity between Christ's friends and foes. With the devil lie, "rauynynge wolues, arayed outwardly in sheppes clothynge; that is to saye: spirytuall, deuoute and full of merytes: Pharises, ypocrytes, scrybes, heretikes, Popes, Cardinals, Bysshoppes, Archedeacons, Deanes, Offycyals, Commyssaryes Canons, Prebandaryes, Abbtes, Prouyncyals, Pryours, Monkes, Prestes, Freres, Nonnes, and Sommers, with such lyke deccayuers". This extreme anticlericalism, whereby the whole of the spiritual estate is indicated, was in keeping with the general tone of the work. However the author's criticism of the spirituality was firmly controlled by his theology. His is an attack on the underlying forces of fallen creation. "For it is not agaynst fleshe and bloude that ye must wresise, but agaynst power, and agaynst worldly rulers of the darkenes of thyss worlde / agaynst spyrituall
wyckednes in heuenly thynges". Again the armour of Ephesians was expounded in sermon-type form. The two-edged sword represents the sufficiency of the Word as guide; cloud by day, fire by night. Scripture not only identifies the enemy; it also determines the mode of attack.

In practical terms, the author's stress on the Word centred on his call for vernacular Scriptures. Throughout the book scriptural ignorance was seen as the cause of man's alienation. You have lost the mightiest castle which I gave to you, "which is the faith and trust in to my worde". Without scriptural standards aberrations entered into the Church. Doctrines of men, in short, the vain opinions of their own imagination, were mixed with the faith, and were compelled to be believed under pain and loss of life. Contemporary ecclesiastical malpractice was thus related to the Church's historical abandonment of scripture. Blasphemy has not only undermined the Church's relation to God, but has also violated and disturbed the natural order itself. Physical hardship has ensued. Christ has suffered their enemies to invade their lands, even allowing them to be imprisoned and hanged. Neither was their spiritual hunger abated. You could not find comfort for your soul. No-one has preached the Word until recently. Hence the attacks on the perversions of the spiritual estate, and the call for vernacular scriptures were united within the same religious reforming movement, a movement which was seen as dependant on a proper scrutiny of the Word of God. "Ye must dylygently serche the scripture... and lerne to knowe my wyll".

With considerable skill the author succeeded in incorporating the themes of spiritual alienation and physical hardship
within a loosely historical narrative of the fall of the Church. In identifying the papacy with Antichrist the author made a more radical attack on the Pope than was made in much Henrician propaganda up till 1534. Moreover the format of the work suggests that he was clearly aware of the propaganda potential of Royal proclamations. The fusion of Tyndale's theology with a polemical air that was in keeping with Cromwellian propaganda makes the Proclamacyon an important and attractive piece of Protestant polemic.

The militant anticlericalism shown in the book was also advocated in a work brought out by Godfray in 1535 entitled A Treatise Concernynge Impropriations of Benefices. The author, Francis Bigod, one-time ward of Wolsey, was educated at Oxford, possibly at Cardinal's College. Whilst there he may have encountered the new learning, for, in his later years, the notable Protestant activist Thomas Garrett became Bigod's personal chaplain. By 1534 Bigod was acting as an intermediary between provincial reforming groups and his new patron Thomas Cromwell. In July 1535 he was sent to give Archbishop Lee and Bishop Tunstall the King's instructions for setting up the Royal Supremacy. By then he had become a fanatical Protestant and a fierce advocate of preaching, one who, even as a married man, was unable to suppress his desire to become a priest.

In the Treatise of Benefices Bigod claimed to have focussed on this single issue because of the difficulty of examining the full extent of the captivity of the papists. Nonetheless, "Of all pestylent infections that ever invaded outhre realme or regyon", the abuse of benefices was seen as the "moost pernycyouse and dyemeterly re-
pugnaunte agaynst the blessed ordynaunce of almighty god".

Bigod was by no means an extremist and had no desire for a wholesale dissolution of the monasteries. If these impropriations were taken out of the hands of the spirituality it was possible that the clergy would turn out to be good men. As things stand, however, men's souls are in danger. "Have nat you (I saye) by the glykynge & glenyng, snatchynge & scratchynge, tatchynge & patchynge, scrapinge & rakynge together of almost all the fatte benefyces within this realme and impropriatyng them unto youre selves, distroyed this most godlye & holy provisyon, bereyved the peple of the worde of god, of the trew knowlege of the blessed sacramentes of their trew beleve and faith in god the father, & the blode of Jesu Christ ( ? ).

Bigod's treatise owed much to works such as the Supplication of the Beggars. Throughout, his anti-papalism was both alliterative and highly abusive. His style was direct and forceful, full of rhetorical questions and laden with direct accusations. "For howe can the people have any faith in god withoute preachings? Howe shulde they have any preachynge whan ye have robbed them of their ministers? How shulde the ministers serve them whan ye have robbed them of theire lyvynges? If the peple have no faith how can they have charyte?" Bigod aimed his work at a popular audience, seeing fit to translate his scriptural references from the Vulgate. He made extensive use of popular proverbs and anecdotes and displayed considerable talent for word play. At times he delighted in innuendo, even using St. German's favourite reportial technique. "And some saye that many of our holye fathers spende nat a lytell upon my cosyn Jane, Elsabeth, and Marget, (ye knowe what I meane)...."
At the beginning of the work Bigod claimed that he did not wish to contend with any man and that he merely wished to state his own conscience. Yet throughout this brief treatise, the author was openly aggressive and disputatious, dealing with objections and defences with a rare venom. The papists were challenged to confute his work, not by relying on the arguments of custom and tradition, but by "the wysdome of god lefte in his scryptures".

In the treatise therefore, Bigod displayed considerable talent for polemical writing. According to A.G. Dickens, in its emphasis on the pulpit and on the liberty of the gospel, the book contained a fundamentally anti-Erastian purport which Bigod was to develop in full later. Whether the book did contain the seed-germ for Bigod's subsequent career as a member of the Pilgrimage of Grace is not an immediately relevant issue. However in so far as Bigod expressed his desire for a fully reformed clergy — the institution of a preaching and teaching clergy in the parishes — the treatise provided a pattern of reform similar to that proposed in the original version of Luther's Attack on the Spiritual Estate, and in such works as Tyndale's Exposition of Matthew. In these works, the preaching office of godly men is seen as the linchpin of true reform.

The continuing influence of the exilic ideas in both the Proclamation and in Bigod's treatise necessitates a more considered examination of what was previously described as the second main thrust of the reprinted exilic books, the doctrine of political and ecclesiastical authority. What was the relation between the Protestants' ideas of princely authority
in the Church and the views of Henry's apologists and propagandists?

4. **King and Church: The Royal Supremacy in the Writings of St. German.**

In three works attributed to 1535, Christopher St. German attempted to restate his attack on the spirituality. In *A treatise concerning the power of the clergye and the lawes of Realme*, St. German provided a scriptural defence of Henry's supremacy. The book covered such items as the authority of Kings and princes to order spiritual things, excommunication and the power of Keys, the jurisdiction of King's courts, and the abuses and faults of the clergy. The writing, though not overlong, was a tedious piece of polemic, impaired both by the author's desire to be comprehensive, and by an unduly extensive citation of scriptural and historical authorities. Parliamentary authority remained the linchpin of St. German's political doctrine. "The parlyament ought to be obeyed therin aswel by spiritual men as by temporall". The book touched on religious issues such as ceremonies, and offerings to saints, and, in general, St. German's argument was guided more by expediency than by idealism. Though holy days for our lady, apostles and saints are not grounded in scripture, it is to be preferred that such matters were retained.

In a second work of that year the lawyer examined in greater detail the relation between provincial constitutions and legatines and the King's laws. Again in discussing images, saint worship, and pilgrimages, St. German presented an irenic disposition. "I se nat how it standeth with reason or anye
maner of indyfference / that that shulde be prohibyt". 242

Preaching was accorded a particularly high function, and, for
the author, "Fewe men may do more good than a good precher may
and fewe men maye do more hurte thane an euyll precher maye". 243

St. German's third book, An answere to a letter, can lay
claim to being his most important work. 244 Certainly, in
relation to his other writings of 1535, the Answere presented
a more careful and considered line of argument. The book
was divided into eight chapters. In the first part of the
work St. German examined the respective authority and power of
the King and the Pope. In recognising the former as supreme
head of the Church of England, Parliament has not given Henry
any power which he did not have before. 245 The lawyer made
a distinction between matters which are spiritual in deed,
and matters, which although called spiritual, pertain to the
power of temporal rulers. 246 The King has not taken upon
himself any authority over matters which belong to a purely
spiritual ministry. Nonetheless, were bishops to be negligent
in carrying out the requirements of their office, in the
administration of the sacraments and preaching the Word, then
the King could command them to act. 247 As for the second
area of spiritual matters, St. German argued that the King
could lawfully take this over without offending the Law of
God. Promotions, visitations, sanctuary, and the appointment
of bishops from Rome arose as customs and traditions that are
now retained by the spirituality only by the sufferance
of temporal rulers. 248

In the second chapter, St. German attempted to undermine
the Church's hold over such matters in a frontal assault on the
authority and jurisdiction of the papacy, an attack which was indebted to government propaganda. The disciples and apostles had no more authority in one place than in another. At the Council of Nicaea Rome was not taken for the head of the Church, and it was not until the seventh century when Phocas ordained Boniface III, that Rome's supremacy was fully developed. Phocas, however, limited the primacy of Rome to the episcopacy. The Pope was the head bishop but not the head of the universal Church. It has been to the great harm and shame of the Church that people have believed that the Pope has had such universal authority. His true authority should be confined to his own diocese. Within England he should claim no more influence than that of his predecessors at the time of Nicaea.

The remainder of the work consisted of the author applying his distinction between spiritual and temporal authority to a series of specific issues. Many of these were religious in character. In the third chapter, St. German again examined the question of praying to saints and worshipping them. Initially his argument followed the lines of his previous writings. Prayers to our lady and to the saints are good and should be taken as prayers to God. His conclusions, however, were far more radical than in his earlier works. The Virgin has no power of herself to grant any prayer, neither should she be considered as a petitioner unto God through her own vocal prayer. On the contrary, "our lorde / seyng the deuocyon that we haue to our lady for his loue / and for the grace & vertue that he gaue to her / hereth our petici5s / & some tyme grāuteth our askynge: & so it is he that doth all and grāuteth all / & nat our lady". Prayers to saints are,
on the whole, a much lower degree of devotion than a prayer and complaint made to God Himself, even though they are not to be eschewed altogether. However, the belief that saints will do what is asked of them is a great superstition which should be cast away. Like Protestant reformers, St. German made a sharp distinction between "such saintes as be canonysed by scripture / and the olde auncyent sayntes that haue alway bētaken for holy by a full comen & vnyuersall assent of all the people throughge an inwarde instyncte and speciall workynge of the holyghost in the herts of the people," and between those who "haue bē of late tyme canonyses for saynts at Rome for mony". St. German's criticism of the latter is characteristically indirect. Some men have doubted whether these be holy. He himself would not wish to say that they cannot be holy though, "I wold auoyde the presumptyon of thē / that in suche case take vpon them to iudge them for holy that only belongeth to god to iuge vpon".

St. German's moderation was again apparent in the next chapter, which was devoted to the abuses of the Mass. The lawyer agreed with the view that the Mass was abused, taking care to distinguish criticism of these faults with an attack on the sacrament itself. This was no place, however, to discuss the matter in any depth. The issue however, should be referred to the minds of princes, for "it is not in the power of any other to do it". In chapters five and six St. German turned his attention to the question of pardons, absolutions and restitution.

More interesting material was to be found in part seven, on who has the authority to declare and expound the scriptures.
Some texts of scripture are so open and plain that everyman is bound to give full credence to them. These, which make up the bulk of scripture, should be interpreted literally, and anyone who resists such an interpretation should be ejected from the company of faithful people.\textsuperscript{258} Some texts however, are not so plain. Many of these concern the authority, power, jurisdiction, and riches of bishops and priests. Many men have thought that it was not appropriate to ask the clergy to interpret such passages, since their judgement has been impaired by their love of worldly pleasures. Many of the clergy have thought that the maintenance of their own honour has been a service to God.\textsuperscript{259} Instead, as the author made clear, "if anye doute ryse vpon any text of scrypure / be it playne or nat playne concernyng the fayth or morall lyuïg of the people or nat: orels the honour / lyberty / & ryches of the clergye / or any other thyng whatsoever it be if there fall any varyâce or vnquyetnesse thervpon amõge the people: as if one doctoure or many / & some of the lay people be of the opinyon therin: & other of a nother opinyon / & thervpon dyuersyties of opinycns & vnquyetnesse amonge the people doo ryse / that in all these cases / kings & princes shalbe iudges / & haue power to pacyfye all suche vnquyetnesse".\textsuperscript{260}

St. German anticipated some hostility to this idea. Immediately he raised the objection that kings must only judge temporal things and not things appertaining to the soul. This, however, was firmly rejected as erroneous thinking.\textsuperscript{261} The people should not believe that only the successors of apostles and disciples have the cure of souls. The power of a King, as ordained by God, is to prohibit all things as best he can whereby
his subjects either spiritual or temporal might have occasion to break the laws of God. The ministration of the King is the ministration of power, justice and sovereignty. The charge of the clergy, on the other hand, is to minister the sacraments to the people and to preach and teach them to please God and keep his commandments. If they fail, then the kings and princes are duty bound to command them to do otherwise. This power of Kings is no less than the cure of souls.262

According to St. German, all men agree that the Catholic Church can interpret and expound the Scriptures. If Emperors, Kings and Princes, and their people make up the Catholic Church then they may all interpret Scripture. Since, however, the universal Catholic Church cannot be so easily gathered together, it belongs to Kings and Princes, "whô the people have chosen & agreed to be their rulers & gouernours", to expound it.263 Moreover their subjects are bound by the law of God to follow their exposition. The matter is stated once more. Rulers have two sorts of power over their subjects: Jus regale, a kingly governance which allows them to make laws to bind subjects and to declare scripture, and Jus regale politicum, a kingly and political governance.264 Whoever rules by this may, with the assent of his people, make binding laws provided they are not against the laws of God and reason. This power, which the King has in England, is given by the assent of spiritual and temporal lords and commons in parliament.265 Thus parliament represents the whole Catholic Church in the realm. Why then should it not expound scripture rather than convocation which only represents the estate of the clergy? Neither should anyone imagine that a general council has authority over kings.
At this time a general council would do little good, and would only be beneficial once kings and princes know the full extent of their authority. 266

In such a way St. German replaced the spirituality's absolute monopoly over scriptural interpretation with the equally absolute authority of parliament. The King in parliament was entrusted with a "plenitudo potestatis" which he had not previously enjoyed. An infallible papacy had given way to an infallible parliament. 267 The King's headship of the Church must cover the entire "potestas jurisdictionis", including even the power to declare and expound scripture and to determine doctrine. Marsilius of Padua's Defence of Peace had proposed that all coercive power and jurisdictional power should be treated as secular, and that the Church's claim to these roles was an act of usurpation. In the Answere St. German took this Marsiglian assumption to its logical conclusion, that all such power should be vested in the supremacy of common law and the legislative authority of the King in parliament. 268

In so doing St. German travelled further down the road to political absolutism than many Protestants were willing to go. Clearly the intellectual origins of the lawyer's doctrine of political authority were not necessarily the same as those of the exiles and the native Protestant reformers. Two points are of especial importance. The exiles' works were written some years in advance of the claim to a cure of souls that was made on behalf of Henry VIII. Hence to reinterpret their teaching in the light of subsequent political developments in England is both an anachronistic and futile exercise. In the second place, it cannot be said that the English reformers, or even
the exiles alone, put down an entirely uniform or consistent doctrine of political and ecclesiastical authority. Indeed within the camp of Protestant reformers at least two distinct positions were maintained.

These two positions can be both demonstrated and explained in terms of their relation to continental Protestant thought. On the one hand, lies the view of Tyndale and Bigod, which may be characterised as Lutheran. Like the Wittenberg reformer, Tyndale did not accord the princes any intrinsic power within the Church, although, in times of emergency, they could be called upon to institute reform. The abolition of papal power and the acceptance and dissemination of a vernacular Bible were two ways in which the temporal rulers could help the process of reform. To this extent the sharp distinction between the spiritual and temporal regiments whereby all coercive power is entrusted to the magistracy and all spiritual matters to the appointed religious office-bearers, was blurred. Both Tyndale and Bigod, however, rejected the notion that the temporal ruler had a spiritual office or a cure of souls. In a treatise of 1536 that is unfortunately no longer extant, Bigod expressed his fear and opposition to these very spiritual claims of the King. For Bigod, the head of the Church of England might be a spiritual man such as the Archbishop of Canterbury but not the King, for his primary role was to defend all spiritual men in their right. Bigod's view of the reformed Church reduced the role of the King to the position where he was no more than its secular protector. Fully reformed ecclesiastics and not temporal powers were to rule the Church.

Whilst Bigod and Tyndale represent an essentially Lutheran
position, consisting of a high doctrine of political authority coupled with a rigid demarkation of its function in the church, an alternative position was advocated in the works of George Joye and William Marshall which was much closer to the doctrines of St. German. In his 1533 Souper of the Lorde, Joye entrusted the temporal rulers with the right to appoint true preachers of the Word and to introduce the true form of celebrating the Lord's Super on the grounds that the secular princes were "the very pastors and head rulers of their congregations committed unto their cure". In William Marshall's Goodly Primer the temporal authorities were accorded the right to make any laws whatsoever providing they did not conflict with the commandments of God. The entire realm of ecclesiastical usage could thus be determined by the will of the secular power. Like St. German, Marshall's view of political power may owe something to the theories of Marsiglio of Padua, for in 1535 he brought out a translation of the Defensor Pacis. In relation to Tyndale and Bigod however, both Marshall and Joye show some affinity with the views of the Swiss reformers, of whom both Zwingli and Bucer were inclined to offer the civil authorities some control over ecclesiastical affairs.

The intellectual origins of the two positions on temporal authority are of less importance to a study of Protestant literature within England than the fact that the works show that the early Protestant reformers did not advocate a completely uniform political theory, nor in the case of Bigod did they merely acquiesce in the realities of the English scene. For Bigod, the fact that the King had grasped a cure of souls meant that he had impinged on the essentials of the faith.
In these circumstances rebellion and resistance were justified actions. For that reason the point of difference between the two groups of reformers was not seen to centre on the nature of political authority as such. Both sides agreed that the temporal powers were appointed by God and that the people were to obey them in all matters pertaining to their political office. Rather the issue at stake was the question of ecclesiastical supremacy. To what extent could the King interfere in the spiritual realm? In other words to what extent had the tyranny of the pope been replaced with a princely captivity of the Church?

With the exception of Francis Bigod, Protestant writers in England simply accepted Henry's supremacy as a matter of fact. In discarding Roman primacy Henry had paved the way for what was imagined would result in a full programme of moral and ecclesiastical reform. Certainly few Protestants would go as far as St. German in according the King the intrinsic right to interpret dubious parts of scripture; their emphasis on the laity's access to the vernacular Bible effectively prevented any sort of institutionalisation of the exegetical task. Few, however, would deny Henry the right to depose ungodly bishops and to replace them with true pastors. The King's leadership of the reformation was not simply cosmetic, but was recognised by most Protestants as valid and necessary for effective reform.

In republishing Lollard and exilic Protestant books, editors and printers attempted to select works which would aid the process of reform in England. By and large, English books which were written before the breach with Rome were not
substantially altered to accommodate the new political ideas. Pro-government passages were added to some Lollard works and to some devotional books, whilst a few of the exiles' books gained additional material which emphasised duty and obedience to political authorities. Amendments and substitutions were rarely called for. Unlike Luther, Tyndale was transformed into a supporter of government policy more by a process of selectivity than by one of censorship. The more controversial writings of both the Lollard and exilic traditions - the writings of Wyclif on the sacraments, and the exiles' debates with More - were considered unsuitable for reissue. Books which taught moral reform, or those which sought to expound the scriptures were selected for reprinting.

Although editors and printers and, indeed, writers of Protestant literature in England operated with an eye on government policy, English Protestant writing was not simply determined by official statements. Works such as the Proclamacyon, Bigod's treatise, and Joye's Summe, all of which criticised the superstition of the clergy whilst advocating good works, were published prior to the government's own formularies of faith. Similarity between Protestant theology and official statements cannot be seen as simply the result of the government's initiative. Significantly, Protestant writers seldom singled out the monastic regime for special attention. The dissolution of the monasteries exerted little influence on Protestant propaganda. In general, as in the case of the Proclamacyon, monks were seen as no different in terms of their corruption than the secular clergy.

Though not strictly determined, the scope of Protestant
polemic was heavily influenced by the government's formularies. With the publication of the Ten Articles, English writers, translators, and editors were given, for the first time a clear statement of what constituted acceptable and unacceptable polemic. Henceforth those institutions and doctrines which were under official attack constituted the targets of Protestant polemic. To a large extent Protestant writing functioned as a substitute for the words and deeds of the clergy. The failure of the clergy to effect moral and religious reform resulted in a emphasis in Protestant writing on didactic, expository, pastoral, and devotional works. Writers took on the role of teachers. The positive face of Protestantism, its emphasis on morality and personal reform, was continually put forward as the goal of their attacks on superstition and clerical abuse. The ideas of reform which were enacted in the Injunctions of 1536 were, without exception, endorsed by Protestant writers and editors. Whatever the rationale which lay behind the government's religious policy, its reforming programme was unequivocally embraced as consistent with Protestant beliefs.
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20. Foxe, A & M IV, p. 685; L&P V, app. 18, p. 768. The A.B.C. was also condemned in Statuta at ordinaciones praetorium in concilio provinciali edita, Wilkins, Concilia, 3, pp. 717-21 and both works in A Proclamation for withstanding of most damnable heresies sown by the disciples of Luther etc, Hughes & Larkin, TRP, 1, no. 122, pp. 181-86.
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43. The sermon was delivered on April 2nd 1535. Appendix C, no. 12. STC 22575. MacLure, The Paul's Cross Sermons, p.186.

44. The main part of the apology is found in the first stanza:
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149. Christopher Morris puts the matter more boldly. In the eyes of the Protestant reformers "there was no place for the Church in the actual process of salvation. The only true Church was spiritual, the Church Invisible, a 'kingdom not of this world". Political Thought in England Tyndale to Hooker (London, 1953) p.30.
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234. P. 56.
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236. Dickens, Lollards and Protestants, p. 74.

237. 8vo, Al-I4, STC 21588, H & L T239. Attributed to St. German on the testimony of Bale; "De cleri potestate ex iure". Script. Ill., l, p. 660.
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239. Sig. F2(v).
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242. Sig. F1(v).

243. Sig. E6(v)-E7.
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245. Sig. A3.

246. Sig. A3(v).
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248. Sig. A6.

249. Sig. A8-C1(v).
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252. Sig. C2.
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254. Sig. C6.
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256. Sig. D1(v).
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259. Sig. G1(v)-G2.
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CHAPTER FIVE

PROTESTANT - HUMANISM PERSONIFIED:

THE WORK OF WILLIAM MARSHALL AND

MILES COVERDALE
Although most Protestant writers of the 1530s lacked both the consistency and radicalism of St. German, the majority did not regard the King's intervention in the ecclesiastical realm with the fear shown by Francis Bigod. Indeed, throughout the decade the political views advocated by George Joye, for example, triumphed over those of Tyndale and Luther. In this chapter it is proposed to examine and compare the work of two Protestant writers who broadly supported the government's religious policies, William Marshall and Miles Coverdale.

To a large extent the fame of both men has rested on activities that lie outside the bounds of this study. The importance of Marshall, for example, is generally limited to his translation of the Defence of Peace of Marsiglio of Padua. Similarly, Coverdale's achievement is almost exclusively limited to his 1535 Bible. Both men, however, brought into English a large number of Protestant books, many of which have received scant attention. Coverdale was the most prolific translator of Protestant writing in England in the 1530s, whilst Marshall was responsible for English versions of some of the most important books of the continental reformation. Study of the works of both men confirm the parallels drawn in the previous chapter between government policy and Protestant polemic. Both men showed strong sympathy to humanist ideas - Marshall even translated two works of Erasmus - and both were in correspondence with Thomas Cromwell. Significantly, both writers advanced Protestant ideas, often of radical hue, as offering aid to the government's policy rather than those of the Dutch humanist. Marshall's work, all of which was produced before the Injunctions of 1536, provides further illustration of the lack of direction in early English
polemic. Writings by Bucer and Luther against images, the Mass, and the bishops were translated even though they went much further than existing policy. Moreover, in translation, Luther's views of reform were altered in order to accommodate the hierarchical pattern of reform established by the royal supremacy. By contrast, Coverdale's work, though more accurate than Marshall's, closely corresponded to the Injunctions and the formularies of faith. Like the reprinted exiles' books, Coverdale's translations advocated Protestantism's positive face. In emphasising good works and neighbourly duties - a reformation of morals - Coverdale's translations of continental Protestant books confirm that Erasmianism was not the sole constituent of the popular ideology of the English Reformation. As his work demonstrates, by the latter half of the 1530s a humanist pattern of reform was intimately and successfully fused with distinctive Protestant beliefs.


As with Thomas Swinnerton, another early English reformer, the life and career of William Marshall is shrouded in obscurity. His origins and education remain hidden from view and almost all that is known of his is derived from a handful of letters and from a number of books which he brought out between 1534 and 1536. With the exception of parts of his Primers all of these books were translations. Only one of them however, the non-controversial The forme and maner of subuëtion of the pore people of Ypres, acknowledged Marshall's role of translator. Though it seems likely that he continued to operate as a translator
the remainder of his books make no mention of that fact. 3

The obscurity of his upbringing and his reluctance to provide much information of his activities has resulted in some misrepresentation of Marshall's work. According to Joseph Ames for example, Marshall's main occupation from 1534 was the printing of books. 4 There is however, no record of Marshall having a printing office, nor is there any evidence to suggest that he was engaged in the trade of bookselling. On the few occasions where his name actually appears in books, it is usually with the colophon "Printed for William Marshall". 5 For his printing he employed the services of four separate printers, John Byddell, Thomas Godfray, Robert Redman, and Robert Wyer. 6 As such Marshall operated as a kind of publishing agent or undertaker, one who paid another printer to produce books for him.

As an agent or publisher Marshall's letters indicate that he was often in severe financial difficulties. The publication of his translation of Marsiglio's Defence of Peace, for example, was suspended for some two years until Marshall acquired a loan towards its printing in July 1535. 7 In the eyes of the publisher the book was of particular value. "This worke was wryten in the latyne tonge two hundred & ten yeres nowe fully passed / and nowe prynted in englysshe, for none other entent and purpose (I take God to wytnesse) more to helpe further and profyte the chrysten cömen weale, to the vttermost of my power, namely and pryncypally, in those busynesses and troubles: whereby it is and before this tyme hath ben iniustly molested vexed and troubled by the spyrytuall- & ecclesyastycal tyraunt. And that to the great hurte and calamyte of the same cömen weale,
that by many suche hystoryes of olde men, sette before the iyes and syght of all men: at the last, the very trouthe myght appere and shewe it selfe / and that all darkenesse dyscussed, and put awaye, the same maye come to lyght". Though The Defence of Peace was an important work, Marshall's translation was not a significant event in English publishing. The edition was handsomely presented, marking a departure for the printer Redman from his usual fare of cheap books, yet still the work did not sell well. Marshall, however, hailed the work as the best book against the Bishop of Rome's supremacy. Equally high claims were made for his translation of the Donation of Constantine. "Surely I thinke there was never better boke made and sett forthe for the defasing of the Pope of Rome than this". Both the Defence of Peace and the Donation put forward a scholarly justification for Henry VIII's attack on the papacy, in keeping with government propaganda.

In more popular vein was Marshall's translation of Erasmus's Symbolum Apostolorum. Printed by Redman in 1534, A playne and godly Exposytion or Declaration of the Commune Crede.... And of the. x. Commaundementes of goddes law, brought into English a recent work of Erasmus which had been written at the request of Thomas, Earl of Wiltshire, and father of Anne Boleyn. Along with his Forme and maner of subuFtion of the pore people of Ypres which was actually dedicated to the Queen, the Exposition of the Creed confirms that Marshall sought the patronage of the Boleyn faction.

Marshall presented an accurate translation of the work, which examined the Creed in the form of a dialogue between Master and Disciple. Subject matter was divided into six
sections or 'instructions'. The dialogue flowed without a break into the exposition of the Commandments and of the Lord's Prayer. For the most part Erasmus presented his most conservative qualities. The Church has seven sacraments; pictures and images can be used in the Church as books for the unlearned. The Church has four tokens of authority: (i) the authority of the old synods; (ii) the authority of interpreters and expositors canonised by the Church; (iii) the breadth and scope of Catholic doctrine; (iv) the lifestyle of its members. At the same time, considerable emphasis is placed on faith as the core of the Christian life. "Without faith it is impossible to please God". At one point Erasmus makes the polemical point that nowadays men are kept from reading the Scriptures whereas, "this thing was in olden time a point of most great and highest religion and holiness". As a whole the work is a didactic piece, one that makes considerable use of both Scripture and the Fathers.

In 1535 Byddell printed a second work of Erasmus for Marshall to publish. A lytle treatise of the maner & forme of confession was unquestionably a conservative piece of writing. Though Erasmus claimed, in the introduction, that it was not his intent to discuss the origins of confession, he did go on to state his own belief that it was divinely instituted. Furthermore, he disagreed with those who claimed that confession was "arbitrate" and not essential. Throughout, he made a spirited defence of the practice of the confessional. Errors and abuses, whilst not overlooked, were not examined in any depth or with any great theological acumen. Abuses are largely due to the ignorance of individual priests and are thus open
to correction through a programme of education. Erasmus's position is well summarised in the following statement. "The despisynge of the publyke custome / Which hath so many yeres cotinually ben vsed / & the cōtumacy and disobedience agaynst the tradition of ḡ churche / dothe bothe offende and displease god / & also dothe hurte the tranquilite and quietnes of the christen cōmen weale". 22

In addition to his translations of Marsiglio, Valla, and Erasmus, Marshall was involved with the English publication of three Protestant works: Vadian's Old god'and the new, Bucer's Treatise of images, and Luther's Attack on the Spiritual Estate. Possibly the list can be extended to include the translations of Luther's treatyse of good workes, and the same reformer's Agaynst the newe Idole and olde Deuyll. On the 9th March 1534 Michael Drome of Oxford wrote to one William Marshall of London expressing his hope that someone would put forward a little book on Faith and Law which would emphasise man's inability to fulfil the law. 23 So little is known of the life of Marshall the translator and publisher than one cannot be sure that he is the same man as the William Marshall to whom Drome addressed his letter, 24 nor for that matter is it certain that Luther's treatyse of good workes was designed to fulfil Drome's hopes. As for the internal evidence of the treatyse, there is nothing that points either in favour or against Marshall's involvement as translator. As slender support of his claim, however, is the fact that both his version of the Attack on the Spiritual Estate and the two other translations of Luther were brought out from the same press. 25 Moreover, English translators of Luther were few and far between in the
On these grounds alone Marshall remains the most likely candidate for the translation of the treatises.

The *olde god and the newe* 26

In June 1534 Byddell printed a book for Marshall entitled *The olde god and the newe*, a translation of Joachim von Watt's *Vom alten und neuen Gott, glauben und lehre*. 27 Behind the wide ranging format of the book lay the dominating theology of Luther, traces of biblical humanism, and perhaps most significant of all, an indebtedness to the radical wing of the Reformation's attack on ceremonies.

The *olde god* sought to examine both the origins and consequences of man's fallen state by an elucidation of scriptural and historical sources. According to Vadian, man has worshipped false gods ever since Adam's incredulity. 28 Until the coming of Christ, some two thousand and sixty two years later, the age of superstition went unchecked. Within early Christian history priests of false gods cajoled the secular powers into persecuting true believers. Following Constantine's conversion priests began to sow false seeds in scripture. From this moment, when the age of heretics was hatched, and for the next hundred years, the pastoral offices of the papacy and episcopacy fell into decay. 29

The new idol, under the name of Pope, abandoned the scriptures. The devil had achieved his goal and had made the true kernel of Christian divinity corrupt. To strengthen his creation the devil brought forward the blasphemies of Aristotelian and Thomist divinity, scholastic philosophy and canon law.
Nowadays these seducers, false gods and tyrants continue to rage like madmen, devoid of all scripture and reason.

The second part of the book took a different form. In place of a rambling narrative the author divided his material into twenty points; rules or marks by which men may know what is the old god and what is the new. Throughout Vadian emphasised the centrality of the scriptures as "the mother of the Christian Church", "a worshipful sacrament", and "the canonical and true rule".

Although Vadian briefly examined the development of ecclesiastical ceremonies, particularly in book two, his historical critique of Romish religion was primarily directed to the matter of papal corruption. Indeed the relevance of Vadian's work to England was largely dependent on the way in which his historical narrative of religious abuse was linked with the theme of papal aggrandizement. History was viewed as a conflict between those who adhere to the rules set out in scripture and those who follow the fallible errors of the papacy, a cosmic duel fought by the followers of Cain and Abel. As with that of Francis Lambert, Vadian's argument, though binary and antithetical in structure, was constantly directed to the negative; to those who follow the ways of the devil and the flesh. Satan, as the instigator and source of Anti-Christianity, occupies the central unifying role which makes all events within fallen creation intelligible. Emphasis on the spiritual forces underlying historical events creates a continuity that transcends mere causality. What was unfavourable in the eyes of the author could be explained as manifestations of the Antichrist. Hence for Vadian, opposition to the
Christian life of obedience was not a haphazard process, but was rather a united satanical programme of subversion, a programme directed by the devil and implemented by the Pope and his clergy. Accordingly Vadian's anti-papalism is given added depth with this provision of a supernatural view of historical events.

Whether in the German original or in the Latin version of 1522, the *olde god and the newe* had already exercised considerable influence on English reformers prior to the English edition. Many of the details of papal intrigue in the secular realm were incorporated into Tyndale's *Practice of Prelates*, and Barnes's *Supplication*. Towards the end of 1530 the work *A boke of the old God and newe* found its way onto a list of prohibited books in England. A second list made by Bishop Stokesley in December 1531 included *Liber qui verteri et novicio Deo inscriptur*, whilst the *Statuta et Ordinationes praetorium in concilio provinciali edita* also cited *De veteri et novitio Deo*. Although these lists of prohibited books tended to be cumulative, retaining often inaccurate references to works cited in previous lists, the presence of *the olde god* in three separate catalogues points to the availability of the book in England in the early 1530s. Moreover the fact that the book was condemned by its English title in the earliest of those lists may indicate that the work was available in English by as early as 1530. The *olde god and the newe* is the only published work of Marshall which was certainly not translated by him. The translator was William Turner, a student of Pembroke College, Cambridge. During the 1530s Turner specialised in translating works of continental reformers.
In 1537 his translation of Urbanus Rhegius's *The Comparison beteen the old learning and the new* was printed by the Southwark press of James Nicholson, whilst in the following year he brought out an abridgement of the influential treatise *Unio Dissidentium*. There is no evidence that Marshall commissioned Turner to translate the *olde god and the newe* and it therefore appears likely that Marshall, in arranging for the publication of an English edition of *De Veteri et Novo Deo*, relied on an existing translation.

As translator Turner successfully conveyed Vadian's ad hominem arguments. His work was faithful to the original and his omissions and interpolations are both rare and insignificant. There was no anglicization of the text, and references to the original German context were retained. In many ways no such anglicization was necessary; Vadian's abuse of the pope drew on universally held norms of criticism. The Pope, it is claimed, has shifted so far away from his humble origins that he now stands against them. "Until of a shepe sprange vp a roryng wolfe / of a preacher of euangelycall peace, a lawe maker of all tyranny / of a preest a man of warre / of a pore apostle the moste myghty Cesar and emperour of the worlde". Throughout the Pope is addressed as a fool and his sexuality is condemned as a "hoore cladde in purple". The most common of Vadian's techniques of abuse is direct accusation. "Oh wretched man hoe farre doeth thy madnes procede, which doest make thy seate equall to thy lorde god". Elsewhere in a phrase strikingly reminiscent of Luther, Vadian asks "whether he y now reygneth at Rome / de Antychryst / or els we ought to loke for some other Antechryste hereafter to come..."
Although Vadian's anti-papalism was of obvious value in English there were aspects of his work which did not appear particularly relevant. Much of his analysis of papal usurpation, for example, focused on the translation of Empires, an argument which he developed from scrutiny of French and German histories. Whilst these examples of papal subversion and the misuse of power could be used to demonstrate the falsehood of the belief that the Pope was infallible, they did not in themselves prove the supremacy of secular powers in matters of religion. Nonetheless the secular powers were accorded a significant role by Vadian. "All princes & specially bysshops are bounden under payne of hell, diligently earnestly & sharply, to prouyde, the people be taught none other thynge in sermons, then the gospell and scrypture". When the bishops neglect this requirement of their office then the assistance and defence of the gospel lay with the temporal authorities. Such sentiments were clearly attractive to English authorities, and in part, they anticipated Cromwell's attempts to control preaching. Vadian, however, went a stage further. Should princes be blind to the gospel, then the common people could ignore them on the grounds that it is more fitting to obey God than man. Though his argument was not fully developed, Vadian postulated a situation where the people could refuse to accept the judgement of rulers in religious affairs.

As with the Defence of Peace and the Donation of Constantine, Marshall was only able to publish the work with the financial assistance of Cromwell. The minister's involvement with a work which has been described as the only book of its day to rank alongside the literary accomplishment of Fish and Roy
in presenting a consistent and appealing programme for the revision of English Christianity, thus confirms Cromwell's willingness to sponsor Protestant material. Moreover, the book was brought out at a relatively early date, in advance of the scholarly *Defence of Peace* and around the same time as the complete *Mistre of schismatic bishops of Rome*. As with that book Cromwell appears to have recognised the political capital that could be gained from a historical attack on papal authority.

**The treatise on images.**

In 1535 Marshall brought out a second translation of a continental Protestant polemic entitled *The Treatise on images*. The work was based on a writing of Bucer's originally titled *Das Einigerlei Bild bei den Gotglaubigen an orten da sie verehrt...*, which had been produced in March 1530 to celebrate and defend the completion of iconoclastic destruction in Strassburg. It was soon translated into Latin by Jacob Bedrot, canon of St. Thomas's Church Strassburg, and an important figure in the development of a Protestant education system in the city. This work, *Non esse ferendas in templis Christianorum imagines et statuas*, was published together with Bucer's letter of dedication to his commentaries on the four gospels. The letter was dedicated to the University of Marburg in appreciation of the hospitality that he had received during his stay at the Colloquy of 1529. In this, the first conciliatory writing published by either side in the eucharistic controversy, Bucer discussed the
subject of Church unity and reprinted the Marburg Articles. The English version of the treatise on images though faithful to Bedrot's Latin, contained an important addendum. Towards the end of the book Bedrot included a brief section on the abuse of the Mass. The effect of this addition was to make both the Latin and English editions more radical than Bucer's original work. On the other hand, Marshall limited his translation to the treatise on images. The letter of dedication, with its frank discussion of inter-Protestant strife, was not considered suitable for translation.

As an attempt to justify changes that had taken place, Bucer's treatise presented a polemical though not abusive attack on traditional defences of image worship. Images were attacked because of their material wastefulness, for the way they detract from social aid to the poor, and for the manner by which they delude non-Christians into believing that the Christian faith is merely a matter of stocks and stones. Bucer's main objection, however, centred on the fact that images were forbidden in the first of God's Commandments. Moreover, anything in the Church which is contrary to the Scriptures should be tried and tested and amended by God's word. If images are allowed to remain, faith is overthrown and a window is "opened to all manner of vice & synne."

To support his argument Bucer made some use of Patristic testimony. Jerome, Eusebius, Lactantius, Athanasius, and Origen all condemned images, especially those of the gentiles. Historically images emerged in the Church as a result of episcopal misrule. They came forth, "whan through the sloth fulnesse & neglygence of bysshoppes & theyr vayne curyouse
desyre to wyn the fauour of god / nat only images & pytctures crepte into the churches / but also (which is communely to chaunce) they began to be worshipped of the peple. Since around 450 A.D. when images were first put into Churches, the Popes have taken special interest in their development. With the transfer of the Empire from the Greeks to the Romans, the Pope of Rome, "beyng broker & spokesman", became the chief advocate and proponent of images in the West.

The attractions of Bucer's treatise to English reformers were considerable. In the first place the writing was unusually brief, consisting of only a hundred or so pages. The author's technique of listing objections and refutations to his programme of iconoclasm, served to create something of the literary character of dialogue. As a result the work provided a polemical armoury for anyone seeking to counter image abuse. In terms of content the treatise was even more attractive. Image abuse was identified as the product of papal and episcopal contumacy. It was, in short, a superstitious waste of the Church's resources. Expenses that ought to have gone on the poor have been bestowed on stocks and stones. It has been believed that images have given answers, have wept, and have worked miracles. Such false belief has been promoted in order to gather riches, "the glotony & pompe of a sort of unthristy idle belyes hath destroyed & wastfully consumed".

More importantly Bucer's work was of interest to English readers because of his suggestions as to how images were to be abolished. Spontaneous action on the part of the individual was discouraged; the lawful ruler alone had the authority to cast out images. They should be broken and
taken away in good order and in the appropriate sentiment of charity. In the long run images were to be banished from men's minds. With this interiorised almost ethical approach to iconoclasm existing alongside an explicit appeal to secular intervention, Bucer's argument anticipated the government's attack on images put forward in the 1536 Injunctions. Within the treatise Bucer emphasised the apparent inadequacy of the preached Word in the task of eradicating superstition. A full programme of reform required concrete action, a transition from Word into deed. For Bucer Scripture functions less as a justification for action taken than as the initiator and instrument of reforming activity. "To plucke down ymages and pictures / and to ryd them quyte oute of churches / is an holye thynge / and ought to be begun accordyng to the commaundemente of god". Since his ideal was of a Christian community in which the clergy and secular powers would join together in order to serve the common good, the Church, as the whole community of believers, together with the secular authorities responsible for the maintenance and protection of the pious community, were commissioned to live by the standards of divine law. Society was to be ruled by the application of scriptural standards preached by ordained ministers but enforced by the temporal magistrates.

Bucer's belief that enforcement of reform should proceed through the agency of temporal rulers thus offered a pattern of reformation far more compatible to England's doctrine of royal supremacy than did the works of Luther and Tyndale, for example. At the same time, however, the legalistic approach of his theology provided the basis for a far more radical and
extensive programme of reform than was considered desirable outside of Protestant circles. This found clearest expression in Bedrot's criticism of the Mass.

Discussion of the Mass arose out of the issue of deposing those altars which had been placed before saints and images. According to Bedrot, the matter would be solved through education. Social acceptance of this aspect of iconoclasm necessarily depended on the common people being taught the enormity of the abuses of the Mass. Typically Bedrot's argument contrasted the institution of the Lord's Supper with the practice of the Mass. The supper was instituted so that Christians could assemble together to receive "that misticall breed / and misticall drinke in comen", and to put themselves in remembrance of Christ's love. As a result their faith and trust in God would be increased and they would be inflamed with hatred of their sins and a love of virtue.

In contrast Masses are undertaken by "popysshe preestes" for "their owne belyes sake", or to purchase some merit before God. Furthermore many aspects of the Mass draw the attention of the communicant away from Christ to the work of the priest. The congregation hear no doctrine or edification in their mother tongue. There is no communion even though the words of the priest make mention of it. As long as the priest alone receives both the bread and the wine the Mass is merely a private meal rather than a common supper. Many things are said in the Mass which are contrary to scripture, such as the trust in the merits and intercessions of saints. Worst of all, the priest boasts that as often as he offers Christ's body to the Father, then he himself obtains the merits of the cross. In
turn these are only offered to them that give money to the priest. 83

Bedrot's account of the Supper and the Mass clearly belongs to the more radical Swiss view of the eucharist. The congregation of the true supper consisted only of those who sought to live according to Christ's doctrine and commandments. 84 The Supper was primarily a memorial, and there was no concession made to any notion of real presence. The phrase 'body of Christ' referred to the relations between the congregation and Christ; a Christ who is seen as reigning in heaven. Moreover the same attitude to image abuse shown by Bucer is applied to the Mass. The Mass itself is an abuse. "There was neuer any supersticyon in tymes passed / which had in it self so gret impiety & wickednes / so gret contempte of god / so gret distructyon of all vertues / as hath the detestable & abhominable abuse of the masse". 85 All remembrance of it is to be taken away. Similarly, since images were to be taken away by the temporal authorities, Bedrot sees the attitude of princes and magistrates to Masses as a touchstone of true belief. "No rulers in anye condityon wylynge their office to be approued only of Christ ought in no wyse to suffre them". 86

Marshall made a typically free translation of Bedrot's Latin edition, 87 although he did not heighten the tone of the polemic. His translation made no significant changes to the work. 88 The publication of a theological treatise in English that was more radical than the work of Luther was hardly likely to have gained widespread approval throughout the realm, and the existance of the book was soon brought to the attention of Cromwell. Thomas Broke, in a letter dated 11th September
1535, wrote as follows. "William Marshall whom you know, has printed a book against the worship of images, wherein every reasonable body knows how to order himself, and specially against the Mass. The people greatly murmer at it. I therefore thought it my duty to send you the same for ye know what Marshall is". 89 Lord Chancellor Audely wrote with more purpose. "Sends a book lately printed touching taking away images. In the parts where he has been there has been some discord and diversity of opinion touching worshipping of saints and images, weeping at cross, and such ceremonies, which discord it were well to put to silence. This book will make much business if it should go forth. Intends to send for the printer to stop them. It were good that preachers and people abstained from opinions of such things until the king has put a final order by the report of those appointed for searching and ordering the laws of the Church. A proclamation to abstain until that time would do much good". 90

In the summer of 1534 Cranmer, newly appointed to the arch-episcopal see of Canterbury, had in fact intervened to arrest the growing controversy about purgatory and image worship, by forbidding any sermon to be preached on the subjects for the next twelve months. 91 His promise to give a ruling within the year on doubtful subjects was not met, however, and it was not until the Ten Articles of July 12th 1536 that the government's view of Christian teaching was made known. In any case Cranmer's attempts to inhibit the spread of controversy did not apply to printed books, and, as the 1536 list of mala dogmata produced by the Lower House of the province of Canterbury indicates, discussion of the issues remained particularly widespread at
Opposition to Marshall's translation was motivated more by social factors than by theological doctrine. The book went further than was considered prudent. The danger was that it could foster disruption. Although books on the Mass were by no means an unusual feature of Protestant literature, the propagation of sacramentarian arguments was not officially tolerated. For Marshall to have brought out from within London a work that was both hostile to the central sacrament of the Church and so radical in its belief, was potentially dangerous. The fact that the book was not suppressed and no action taken either against its printer or publisher indicates how far Protestant ideas could be tolerated in printed form within England in 1535.

The Images of a verye Chrysten Byshop / and of a counterfayte bysshop.

Marshall's third Protestant work was translated from a writing of Luther. Luther's Wider den falsch genannten geystlichen standdes Babst und der bischoffen had a complex origin. Towards the end of September 1521 Luther received news in the Wartburg that Albrecht of Mainz had started up the indulgence trade. In addition, severe measures were being carried out against married priests and against those who expressed their desire to marry, whilst dispensations had been granted to those priests who wished to retain concubines in their parsonages. In a pamphlet entitled Wider den Abgott zu Halle Luther attacked Albrecht's activities in a hitherto unprecedented sharpness of tone. Both Capito and Spalatin
opposed the publication of the work, regarding its contents as a threat to public peace, and the Elector Frederick refused to allow the book to go to press. Luther, however, allowed Melanchthon to make a revision of the work. According to the editors of the Weimar edition of Luther's works, Melanchthon's revision is to be identified with Wider den falsch genannten geistlichen stand des Babst und der bischoffen. Serious doubts have been raised against this identification, and more plausible accounts of the origin of the work have been proposed. It now appears more likely that the work Against the Spiritual Estate was a separate work made entirely by Luther himself. Though based on his attack on Albrecht, the 1522 writing transformed the criticism of indulgence trafficking into a more general indictment of the entire Roman hierarchy.

Luther's work remained both satirical and controversial and provoked a typical response from Jerome Emser. The attack on the spiritual estate, however, was soon printed in various editions and a copy of its Latin translation was found in England in 1528. In translating what was a proscribed book Marshall dropped all references to the author and disguised the title. In English the polemic thus read as a work of contrast and comparison.

As with Vadian's olde god and the newe, Luther's work was focussed almost exclusively on the negative and dark image of the counterfeit bishop. His descriptions of papistical abuse were designed to break the stranglehold which the Roman Church exerts over the laity. Once the bishops are known for what they are they will be forsaken by the people hitherto attached to them. The rulers of the Church are false
prophets, who, through the monstrous tyranny of the Papacy, despise all rulers, contradicting scripture’s command that all men be obedient to princes. For Luther, exposure of the tyrannous regime of the bishops undermines their authority. "For suche as the bysshops are themselues, suche also is theyr doctryne".

According to Luther the tyranny of the Papacy and episcopacy had three main characteristics. In the first place the officers of the Roman kingdom purport to satisfy the surface requirements of a spiritual calling. They do at least strive to keep up the appearance of bishops. This, however, is a feigned spirituality. Theirs is a life hypocrisy and illusion. Under the cloak of a holy life the bishops, "vnder ý apparyell of Aaron doo in very dede playe ý veraye starke tyrauntes". Their appearance serves to seduce the people. They are "mummynge and dysgysed bysshopes". Their tyranny has survived so long because they have veiled their true nature under the "coloured and paynted" appearance of holiness.

Secondly, the true nature of the false bishops is most clearly seen in their utter worldliness. In the economic and political spheres they exercise a presumed authority. In the religious realm their materialism has served only to cheapen and corrupt. The Pope adds to spiritual precept, establishing that "vnryghteous and wycked lawe canonical", the habits of religious orders, sects, beggingsongs, organs, frankincence, smoke, bells, loud noises, bellowings, pardons, satisfactions, indulgences, bulls, and vows. Monasteries and universities are swollen by the wealth and property of common people and kings. This "people of vsurers" direct all to their own riches. "What profyte
cometh of many of the bysshoppes that nowe are, or wherefore sōue they, but onely to lyue in voluptuousnes and pleasures, & to play the ryotours and wantons of other mans labour and swete..."107 The bishops, it is alleged, keep harlots, lust after women, corrupt sons and daughters, are desirous of women's company, commit "sodomytrie or buggerie"; as whoremakers they hold bawds and brothels and defile youths.108

Such materialism was seen by Luther as placing corrupt human traditions before the divine, thus causing the spiritual doctrine of Christ to be forsaken altogether. The Pope's greatest sin is his complete neglect of God's commandments. He thus establishes himself as above God, as a new idol. Unlike the temporal powers who can only hurt the body, the Pope and his men are "wolues and moste cruell murderers of soules", the apostles of Antechryste.109 Luther's identification of the papacy with the Antichrist leads to the final and most terrifying feature of the tyrannous kingdom; its declaration of war on the Word of God, and its persecution of the sons of Christ. For, in giving free rein to the blasphemy of the works of man, the papacy denies the very Christian faith itself, the doctrine of justification by faith. Without faith and the gospel all their institutions are pestilent. They have matched the hypocrisy of "your fathers ſ Iewes". The Word of God is not proclaimed. Instead the bishops seek "with moche greuous thretenynges & with dreadful feares to condempne, to huffe out, to cast out, and to warre agaynst the worde of god".110

The most striking feature of Luther's work was his highly abusive and satirical language. However much he may have toned down his initial attack on Albrecht of Mainz, his indictment
of the false bishops remained particularly savage. Ad hominem arguments were integral to his writing. The more colourful the picture of the counterfeit bishop, the more effective was his criticism. Theological reasoning was kept to a minimum. For this book, virulence, liveliness, scandal, denigration and denunciation were the order of the day. Exposure and not argument was the path which led to enlightenment.

Marshall's translation of Luther's abusive prose sought to convey the tone rather than the precise content of the polemic. At times Marshall transformed Luther's language, often exaggerating it, and often repeating phrases for emphasis. "First these bysshops haue suffred and nowe a dayes do suffre in sted of the worde of god (whiche onely, onely, onely, onely, onely, I saye ought to be preached in the churche) theyr indulgences and pardons to be publysshed and preached, & this thynge is not onely wycked, but also blasphemous & deuylyshe, and full of deathe and hell, it appereth euydentlye ynough euen hereof, seynge that it is agaynst the fyrste precept & comaundemēt of god.\textsuperscript{111} His tendency towards a free translation is more apparent in this work than in any other of his writings. Where Luther spoke of wolves, tyrants, soul-murderers and the apostles of Anti-Christ, Marshall added additional epithets. "Wolues they are, tyrauntes / traytoures / manquellers / mōsters of ṭ worlde / burdeynes of the earthe / the apostles of Antechryste.\textsuperscript{112} Key aspects of Luther's style, such as his sarcastic address of the bishop as 'dear masks', are completely dropped by Marshall in favour of a more direct and less subtle approach. There is some attempt to anglicize the text. At one point in a discussion of monastic immorality Marshall adds
the comment "euen at this day in England". His intent in so doing appears two-fold. In the first place he gives Luther's work a greater relevance to the English context, whilst secondly, he disguises the precise origin of his translation.

At times Marshall was surprisingly faithful to Luther though he rarely provided a literal translation. Throughout the work much of Luther's sarcasm was well conveyed and constant references were made in the English to "these holy pastours, & excellent bysshopes". His English version, however, was distinctly inferior to the original, not least because of his eagerness to expand Luther's prose by adding adjectives and clauses, many of which were redundant, and all of which damaged the rhythm of the writing. Yet, Marshall did no serious injustice to the themes of Luther's work. For that reason the pattern of reform which was proposed in the English edition was for the most part recognizably that of Luther.

Hence the primary directive given to the readers is that they must flee from the tyranny of the papacy as if it were a pestilence. Bishops cannot be persuaded to reform themselves but run on in madness knowing only how to draw souls into hell. Desertion on the part of the Christian has the positive value of undermining the very tyranny of the bishops. The maximum damage that can be inflicted upon them is open rebuke. Extinction of the papistical kingdom is only achieved by the preaching of the Word of God. In elevating the preaching office to the position where it becomes the primary instrument of reform, Luther sees himself as fulfilling the scriptural commission to rebuke sinners. From Paul the lesson is learnt that preachers shall rebuke bishops and primates more
sharply than secular rulers. This has a paradigmatic character. If Paul rebukes priests who were constituted by the law of God, "why then shulde I be affrayed to touche and rebuke these coloured and paynted bysshops". Christ himself is sufficient example to all preachers. Moreover, these are critical times and the matter has become so grave that "no man may kepe silence without abhomynable greate synne / and without open and euydent vnkyndnes & blasphemye agaynst god". Not only is silence innappropriae but toleration and restraint are to be eschewed: "Let no man here speke to me of moderacyon, of somewhat mylder wrytynge, and of suche other vayne tryffles." The peril of lost souls compels the author's protest. In fulfilling the role of "the bedell or common crier", Luther's work justifies both the use of strong language and scoffing words, and also the notion that preachers should deliver the word of God in place of bishops, Where Bucer argued that preaching against abuses was not a sufficient weapon against them, Luther saw the rigid institutionalised corruption of the papacy as being undermined solely through the preaching office of godly men.

From the evidence of Marshall's literary productions what conclusions can be drawn concerning his own theological beliefs? Except in a few instances Marshall displayed no originality of thought and was apparently content to translate and/or publish the works of other authors. Having said that, Marshall must have had some sympathy with the opinions expressed in his books. Even if he did not agree with the precise formulations of doctrine or the lines of argument which they advocated he
still thought it a worthwhile service to go to the trouble of raising money and expending labour in order to bring the books to an English reading public.\textsuperscript{123} Certainly Marshall's choice of books must have owed much to economic considerations. His early works, \textit{The Defence of Peace}, and \textit{The Donation of Constantine}, were designed to complement government propaganda, and, as such they appeared eminently marketable commodities. On the whole, however, Marshall's business career was a conspicuous failure. Neither the \textit{Defence of Peace} nor the \textit{Donation} sold well, and of his Protestant translations only Bucer's \textit{Treatise on images} ran to a second edition. Is there any pattern then to Marshall's literary productions?

One possible unifying factor which testifies to the importance of Marshall the publisher, is the surprisingly high quality of the original books to which he was directed. \textit{The Defence of Peace} and \textit{The Donation of Constantine} need no comment; the qualities of both having long been recognised. In relation to them Vadian's \textit{De Vetrici et novo Deo}, though of less import, was, nonetheless, a work of high order. As a piece of Protestant literature its success is measured by the fact that it was highly regarded by contemporaries. Apart from Turner's English translation, the work was reprinted in Vienna, Wittenberg, Strassburg, and Magdeburg in Flemish, Dutch and Danish.\textsuperscript{124} Years before Marshall's involvement it was a best-seller of early Protestant literature. Similar claims could be made for Luther's \textit{Attack on the Spiritual Estate}. This ran to thirteen editions in Germany in 1522 alone.\textsuperscript{125} Whilst such a publishing success was not untypical of Luther's work it is clear that the writing had a wide circulation and popularity.
before Marshall encountered it. Even the short book by Savonarola on the 51st Psalm which was included in Marshall's Primer had gone into ten editions before 1524. The Strassburg pamphlet Das Einigerlei Bild remains the sole exception to this rule of popularity, or rather to the view that the polemical works had been widely appreciated before Marshall's translations. The only reprint of this work was the Latin edition of Bedrot from which the English translation derived.

Thus in the first instance there appears no great mystery as to why Marshall selected these works for translation and publication. As a result of their circulation on the continent and possibly in England, the books were of some attraction to a publisher on the look-out for marketable commodities. At the same time it is important to examine why Marshall saw these particular writings as being of greater value in English than a whole series of equally popular works. To what extent did Marshall's treatment of them affect their form and content?

In response to criticism of his translation of Bucer's treatise on images, Marshall claimed to have merely fulfilled the office of a translator, faithfully adhering to the sense of the original. To some extent Marshall kept to this role in all his works. His translations, though rarely literal, are seldom inaccurate and his omissions and additions are on the whole relatively few in number. Marshall's works, however, generally make for dull reading, partly as a result of this very fidelity to the original. Unlike Tyndale, Marshall lacked the ability to take over a work and impose his own personality upon it. For the most part he translated from the Latin, though it appears that he knew German. Stylistically, however,
Marshall's works were laboured and involved, abounding in legalistic and pedantic pairs of synonyms.\textsuperscript{129} As a result his works do not always convey the urgency of the originals. Where one word will do, Marshall invariably supplied two. The rhythm of his prose was often contrived and awkward, and, alliteration apart, there was little use made of easily remembered phrases and slogans.

The majority of his omissions were concerned with contextual references rather than with the actual theological content of the original writings. For example, a reference by Luther to the Dean of the Cathedral of Magdeburg was omitted even though Marshall retained the outline of the story.\textsuperscript{130} A similar reference to the pilgrimages to St. James was left untouched, no doubt because it did not draw attention to the German context. Marshall was not always consistent in his editorial policy. At one point he retained Luther's reference to his earlier work on monastic vows,\textsuperscript{131} even though this book had been prohibited in England. Since the author's name was not given, however, the chances of identifying the book with Luther were lessened.

A second category of translatorial interference, the use of substitutions, operated partly out of stylistic considerations. On several occasions Marshall avoided German proverbial expressions. Where Luther directed the reader to "see how they put a fool over the eggs", Marshall substituted, "Se what maner foole theu haue made ruler & ouerseer of so great thynges".\textsuperscript{132} Elsewhere, clues as to the setting of the original work were altered. A reference of Luther's likening attempts to use works in place of the gift of chastity to stopping the Rhine with straw, was transposed by Marshall to stopping "the ryuer of
Thaymes of his course, with a banke made of straw.133 Occasionally he attempted to heighten the polemic by speaking of the Kingdom of the Pope whereas Luther merely spoke of spiritual government in general. At other times his intent was to modify the harshness of Luther's anticlericalism. Luther's claim that it would be better to kill all bishops rather than to let a single soul perish, thus became, "Nay, it were better (for spyrytuall harmes are moste to be wayede) that syxe hondreth tymes all the bysshoppes shulde peryshe for euer in theyr pryde and dygnytie".134

The most important aspect of Marshall's translations consisted of the addition of personal comments and passages. Often his aim was to give the original greater cogency. Where Luther spoke of materialist bishops, gracious princes and lords with pointed hats and fine gloves, Marshall created a more terrifying picture. Now the bishops are those which "bearyng forked myters... vnder ý apparayll of Aaron doo in very dede playe ý veraye starke tyrauntes, & are folowes vnto Nero and Caligula". The bishops of Luther rode on pretty horses. For Marshall they are seated upon "fatte & wel fedde palfrayes and slyke mules".135

In the second edition of his translation of Bucer's treatise on images Marshall added marginal notes. One such note stated, "Wolde god the ymages of walsyngham / cátorbury / yppeswiche / hayles / worcestre, & suche other wer well tryed by scripture to see what article of our faith they haue confirmed".13

In this instance it appears that the translator drew on moves within England to eliminate superstitious attitudes to image veneration. In his attack on papistical bishops Luther called
for the clergy to take wives, and for the establishment of godly bishops. At this point Marshall made a significant addition: "By the kynge our onely supreme hedde of the churche in whom onely the reformacyon lyeth". With this comment, Marshall counsels against presumptuous action by locating all religious reforms within England under the direction of the temporal authorities. Moreover the comment confirms that Luther's work did not offer an entirely suitable reform programme for England in the 1530s. In the book Luther limited the role of the secular powers to the punishment of evil doers. Nothing that they can do can affect the soul of an individual. Left unamended Luther's work posed the same difficulties as the section in Robert Barnes's *Supplication* on men's constitutions binding not the conscience. In comparison, William Turner was far less prone to this type of translatorial interference. In the interests of translatorial accuracy, Turner retained Vadian's oblique, yet dangerous justification for resisting tyrannous rulers. Turner's translation probably predated the full blown development of the Royal Supremacy. By 1535, however, Marshall was compelled to take note of the political and religious situation within England and excise all such thoughts of resistance from his work. His translation of the *Defence of Peace* is particularly instructive.

Marsiglio's preference for an elected monarchy was transformed into praise of a system based on inheritance. Those sections of the work which emphasised the influence of "the people" in the establishment of rulers and the right to condemn them even by deposition were all ruthlessly suppressed from the English edition. Furthermore, Marshall continually stressed
the importance of Parliament as the instrument of all legislation throughout the realm. In the original work Marsiglio's model was that of the Italian commune where the whole body of citizens made the laws. Clearly such a concept was not applicable to a nation state. Accordingly, Marshall limited the role of law makers to "the prynce or his parlyament, or (where it so so vsed) hole vnyuersyte and congregacyon of Cytezens". The realities of the English political situation thus compelled a major revision of Marsiglio's work.

In Luther's work the revision consisted largely of adding comments which ensured that reform was seen as being carried out by the authority of temporal rulers. In an attack on monasticism Luther expressed the desirability of plucking out collegiate churches and monasteries in order to save souls. Again Marshall made a significant interpolation. Such reform was only acceptable, "so it were done by the auctoryte of the hygher powers". In contrast Bucer's work needed no great alteration. However, in a marginal note Marshall saw fit to highlight Bucer's own view that it "belongeth to the chefe rulers to refourme these abuses".

Alongside Marshall's production of distinctive Protestant writings lies his involvement with Erasmian literature. Of the two books of Erasmus which he brought out, the earlier, on the Creed, was the product of a direct commission. As for his translation of the treatise on confession Marshall's motives remain hidden. What is clear is that the book was not brought out either as a piece of government propaganda or in response to government policy. At the time of its publication in 1535 Marshall was not yet in Cromwell's service. Moreover,
unlike his translation of Erasmus's book on the Creed, Marshall made no reference to the work in his letters to Cromwell. As the only openly conservative produce of Marshall's entire publishing career, the treatise on confession was not put forward as an aid to the policies of reform. Clearly humanist and Protestant enterprises could co-exist for Marshall, although tensions and contradictions within the corpus of his literary work often came to the fore. Bucer's account of images, for example, stood in conflict with Erasmus's dictum that ceremonies and ecclesiastical ceremonies were never intrinsically bad. For Bucer both images and the mass were abuses in themselves. Moreover, in view of the fact that the vast majority of Marshall's work points to a belief on his part in the illegitimacy and illegality of many religious ceremonies and practices, it seems unlikely that he translated the treatise on confession out of any sympathy with the author's point of view.

In an addendum to the second edition of the treatise on images Marshall attempted to explain how his translations aided the cause of reform. He had set forth this work, he claimed, for the honour and edification of the Church. He had merely undertaken the office of a translator, but had been continually misreported. Furthermore, he had heard the chief preachers preach against the same abuse in their daily sermons. The authors of the book on images had not spoken against the Mass but only against the abuse of it by the Bishop of Rome. He himself claimed to speak only against abuses and that Mass which was instituted by the Pope and his "popysshe complyces and counsellors". The offence which the book had caused was the result of men's ignorance of his intent. In the addendum
he sought to clarify the matter once and for all. Now he trusted that the writing would no longer give offence except to those in whose hearts popish traditions would always stick fast. 145

Marshall's distinction between Romish masses and true Masses appears to owe more to a desire to avoid further hostilities than it does to a true reading of the authors' intent. Whilst it is true that the Strassburg preachers speak of the masses of "the popyshe preestes" and the abuses committed these "certayne yeres", the model that Bedrot offers for contemporary ecclesiastical usage is that of the holy supper of the apostolic Church. In comparison with this, all Masses, irrespective of their abuses, are seen as intrinsically false. To this extent Marshall's justification of his translation misrepresented the intent of the original authors by his undue emphasis on the anti-Roman and anti-papal direction of the writing. Under the cover of this anti-papal addendum Marshall hoped that his translation could to forward without attracting further opposition.

In addition; the addendum confirms that the translation of the treatise, if not actually commissioned, was certainly encouraged by friends, a possible indication of how Marshall came into contact with Protestant material. The range of his polemical translations was not entirely self-determined. His work was seen as going no further than the attacks made by preachers. Since the government did not fix official guidelines as to the content of religious books until 1536, Marshall's writings were seen by him as but the printed expression of ideas which had been verbally articulated by preachers either in or close to the government. This emphasis on the value of
preaching was an important theme of his work. In his draft of the poor law he included the demand that all bishops should send a sermon to their parsons wherein it would teach the merits of labour and the evils of idleness.\textsuperscript{146} In a letter to Cromwell he even had the audacity to enclose a sermon for his Lordship's edification, whilst pointing out the need to be on guard against seditious preachers.\textsuperscript{147} To some extent Marshall appeared to consider himself as fulfilling through translation and publishing a pastoral role akin to preaching. Possibly he envisaged his task as propagandist as providing information for true preachers. Luther's work on the false bishops emphasised the positive value of information and contained the exhortation to all those who would rebuke "those mummynge and disguysed bysshoppes with wrytynges: that they do it openly, boldly, and playnely / accordyng to the doctryne of the gospell as the apostle Paule / And that they do prouoke them, vnto the lawe of the scryptures, lykewyse as I haue done hytherto".\textsuperscript{148} In translating and publishing the works of continental reformers Marshall highlighted and drew attention not only to the areas where he considered reform was necessary, but also to the means of eradicating the problems. As with Swinnerton and Barnes, history was a useful tool in providing precedents and in determining the causes of contemporary malpractice. Yet the ultimate criterion for Marshall was the need to refer everything to the Scriptures. The fidelity of the apostolic Church to the requirements of the Bible acted as an important secondary paradigm.

Consideration of Marshall's work leads to the conclusion that he should be considered a more important and creative purveyor of reforming ideas than is generally credited. There
is in fact some contemporary evidence for this. Between the 2nd and the 4th of December 1536 the Pilgrims' Council meeting at Pontefract drew up a series of articles of religious grievance. Article 1 provided a list of those men who were considered by the conservatives as heretics, and was probably drawn up from books which one of the Pilgrims, Richard Bowyer, laid before the council as heretical. The article read as follows: "To haue the heresies of Luther, Wyclif, Husse, Melangton, Elicampadus, Burcerus, Confessa Germanie, Apologia Melanctonis, the works of Tyndall, of Barnys, of Marshall, Raskell, Seynt Germayne, and other such heresy of Anabaptist destroyed." Marshall's inclusion in the list testifies somewhat indirectly to the importance of his literary endeavours. To have been considered a heretic in this company was fame indeed. Moreover the list confirms that the writings which bore his name were seen by some contemporaries as being published at his instigation. Indeed Marshall the publisher seems to have been openly identified as Marshall the author.

By 1536 Marshall's works and, indeed, his life, were safe from the destructive designs of religious conservatives, for by then he had entered into the service of Thomas Cromwell. Apart from his printed publications Marshall made some contribution to the development of reforming policy in England. In 1535 he was involved with John Rastell, another of the Pilgrims' heretics, in the proselytization of the London Carthusians, as was able to give away twenty-four copies of the Defence of Peace to be distributed among the monks. Marshall's most important labour, apart from publishing, may well have been the preparation in 1535 of a draft of the poor law. Though
the subsequent act of 1536 inaugurated a new era of poor relief legislation, many of the most important aspects of the draft were discarded. Nonetheless the sheer scope and precision of the plan make it a milestone in sixteenth-century English social thought.

Marshall's labours for Cromwell, with the exception of the unpublished draft, do not seem to have involved literary work. By the second half of the decade a new group of translators and propagandists had emerged all more capable exponents of government opinion than either Marshall or Thomas Swinnerton. One of Marshall's tasks appears to have been the examination of recalcitrant priests. If so, it did not pay well. His son Richard, writing to Cromwell in 1539, pointed out that his father's poverty made it impossible for him to be kept at Oxford. Though materially unrewarding, Marshall's was, however, an impressive career. Many of the proposals expressed in his writings were put into practice. The Ten Articles of 1536 initiated the government's campaign against superstition, images, saint worship, and various ceremonies, and for the most part the reforms which Marshall so fervently desired were quickly realised in Cromwell's policies.
2. Miles Coverdale.

Unlike William Marshall Coverdale emerged as a translator following a prolonged period of study and preparation. Born in 1487 or 1488 in Yorkshire, Coverdale, an Augustinian friar, studied philosophy and theology at Cambridge. There he came under the influence of Robert Barnes who introduced him to the new learning. By 1527 Coverdale had gained the patronage of Thomas Cromwell. In a letter dated May 1st Coverdale proclaimed his new found love of the scriptures and expressed a desire for books to advance his learning. "Moreover as touching my behaviour, (your mastership's mind once known), with all lowliness I offer myself not only to be ordered in all things as shall please your wisdom, but also as concerning the eduction and instruction of other alone to ensue your prudent counsel".

By the following year Coverdale had thrown off his friar's habit and had adopted the garb of a secular priest. According to a report of his preaching in Essex in 1528 Coverdale held that the Mass was to be understood as a memorial, that auricular confession was unnecessary, and that images in the Church were to receive no honour. The espousal of such dangerous views necessitated Coverdale's exile. For much of 1529 he resided in Hamburg. From Easter to December he helped Tyndale rewrite his translation of the Pentateuch, and it is likely that he followed Tyndale to Antwerp.

Certainly it was from Antwerp in 1534 that Coverdale brought out his first work, a translation of the Latin Paraphrases of the Psalms by the Louvainian philologist Joannes Campensis. This biblically-based work served Coverdale well for in 1535 he
was invited by Jacob van Meteren, a Dutch businessman, to translate the whole Bible. The task was completed by the 4th of October 1535, and for this, the first complete English Bible, Coverdale provided a brief dedication and prologue, both of which are important guides to his theological development.

Although Coverdale's Bible was a product of exile the dedication in particular showed a marked awareness of the religious and political climate back home. At several points Coverdale made use of imperial language, addressing the King as "your imperial majesty", and referring to "the imperial crown". Throughout the dedication the nationalist element was well to the fore. Whilst the Pope and his false apostles are seen to have deceived all Christendom, the noble realm of England has suffered most. Following Tyndale, Barnes, and Swinnerton, Coverdale singled out the case of King John as a paradigm for the papacy's dealings with English rulers. Henry VIII was affirmed as the supreme head of the Church, and much of the dedication went over the old ground of providing scriptural proofs for the notion of royal supremacy.

Within the national setting of Coverdale's argument it is possible to identify two strands of anticlericalism one secular and the other religious. In the first place Coverdale attacked the economic hegemony of Rome in line with government policy as directed by Cromwell. He did so, however, with apparent reticence. "I pass over his (the Pope's) pestilent picking of Peter-pence out of your realm; his stealing away of your money for pardons, benefices, and bishopricks..." Alongside this secular criticism Coverdale linked the political destiny of England with her religious reform. The papacy's
"deceiving of your subjects' souls with his devilish doctrines and sects of his false religious; his blood-shedding of so many of his grace's people for books of the scripture..." in short, the whole miserable captivity of the entire English nation has a single cause, namely scriptural ignorance. "For how had it else been possible that such blindness should have come into the world, had not the light of God's word been extinct?" The Papacy persecutes God's Word and, at the same time, resists God's holy ordinance in the authority of his anointed Kings. "Our Baalam calleth defending the faith the suppressing, keeping secret, and burning of the word of faith, lest the light thereof should utter his darkness; lest his own decretales and decrees, his own laws and constitutions, his own statutes and inventions, should come to none effect; lest his intolerable exactions and usurpations should lose their strength; lest it should be known what a thief and murderer he is in the cause of Christ, and how heinous a traitor of God and man, in defrauding all christian kings and princes of their due obedience; lest we, your grace's subjects, should have eyes in the word of God, at the last to spy out his crafty conveyance and jugglings; and lest men should see, how sore he and his false apostles have deceived all christendom, specially your noble realm of England".

Alongside this line of argument Coverdale provided a particularly exalted view of Henry VIII as the agent whereby England is delivered from economic and spiritual bondage. The Bible was dedicated to Henry, "considering your imperial majesty not only to be my natural sovereign liege lord, and chief head of the church of England, but also the true defender
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and maintainer of God's laws. Explicit comparison is made between the King and Josiah. Just as the latter's attacks on false priests, idolatry, and false idols created felicity, prosperity, and health amongst the people of Jerusalem, so Henry's recent recovery and implementation of God's scriptures has caused health to both body and soul.

Coverdale's dedication and prologue were written in exile some six weeks before the printing of the Bible was completed. From the evidence of a letter written towards the end of August 1535 it is clear that James Nicholson, the publisher, attempted to involve Cromwell in the dissemination of the work. Cromwell was asked to help, was expected to sympathise, and was requested to gain royal support for the work. Though the King did permit the Bible to be published, a decision which was made at the time of his negotiations with the German Lutherans, Nicholson's request for a formal licence on the title-page was not granted.

Towards the end of 1535 following the publication of the Bible, Coverdale returned to England. Within a few months he had arranged for the printing in London of a concordance of the New Testament. The most interesting feature of the book is the use of Tyndale's prohibited text. The demand for vernacular scriptures may have been growing, and in part may have been satisfied by Coverdale's Bible, yet overt identification with the work of the heresiarch Tyndale was not an entirely safe measure. As a precaution against any hostile reaction Coverdale did not allow his name to appear in the work.

In addition to Biblical translation Coverdale involved
himself on his return to England with a number of secular translations, the majority of which were brought out from the Southwark press of James Nicholson. Although the importance of his work in the 1530s lies with his translations of the Bible, these other works should not be ignored. Indeed the sheer volume of work that he brought out confirms the view that Coverdale remains a major and too often neglected figure of the English Reformation. Moreover, too broad a distinction ought not to be made between the biblical translations and his other writings. Both activities were designed to inculcate a reformation of morals. In his secular translations traditional piety was supplanted with a biblical, interior ethic, which alone ensured good works and which guaranteed favour with God.

The earliest of Coverdale's non-biblical translations appears to have been a prognostication for the year 1536. As with John Ryckes's translation of Brunfels, Coverdale's work did not entirely fit the category of prognostication. In the first instance the writer counselled the reader against the study of the stars. Astrology stood in conflict both with the scriptures of God and with faith in His word. For the author the work was a piece of 'theological astronomy', and as such, criticism of the clergy together with proposals for reform were couched in the language of the stars. "Mars threateneth a verye euyll and vnfrutefull yeare to dyuerse spiritual prelates, as popish byshops, & popish preistes, & other mo," lest they forsake abuses. Unless reforms were made such as the redress
of whoredom by clerical marriage, the followers of the world will have sickness in body and soul.\textsuperscript{182}

Unlike that of Brunfels, Coverdale's prognostication did attempt to account for the activities of the clergy. With some skill the author employed the literary convention of a devil's letter. Satan discloses his aims in the form of an epistle or directive to his followers the papists.\textsuperscript{183} The clergy refuse to accept the gospel and are willing to hear only what they themselves speak. They teach their own laws, transgress the commandments of God, love the highest seats of power and devour widows' houses.\textsuperscript{184} So deep is their sin that they have no capacity to reform themselves. Accordingly, reform has been entrusted to the temporal authorities. "For god hath put into the hertes of dyuers princes to fulfyll his wyll, and to hate \(\mathcal{Y}\) whore of Babylon, to make her desolate \& naked, to put down her abusions".\textsuperscript{185}

In its use of astral language the writing added a distinctively Protestant message to a popular literary form.\textsuperscript{186} The threat of heavenly punishment was intimately and successfully merged with a demand for religious change. Moreover the prognostication is of some importance in that it was the first book to which Coverdale appended his name. Possibly he felt secure in the knowledge that the genre was an unusual vehicle for the expression of radical opinions and, as such, the work was unlikely to attract hostile attention. After all, the original writing from which Coverdale produced his English edition has never been identified. The book, however, though designed for a popular audience, did not enjoy much success. It was not reprinted until during the reign of Edward VI, although it was condemned and
burnt by Bishop Bonner in 1546.\textsuperscript{187}

A myrroure of glasse for them that be syke & in payne.\textsuperscript{188}

Whilst the prognostication belonged to a popular literary genre, one which exploited essentially superstitious beliefs, Coverdale's translation of the following year emerged from the more sophisticated climes of Humanism. The book was translated from Een trost en spiegel der siecke ende der ghene die in lijde zijn, published in Antwerp in 1531.\textsuperscript{189} Its author, Willem de Volder, or Gnapheus, had, like Coverdale himself, undertaken a thorough humanist education before adopting a Protestant faith.\textsuperscript{190} His most celebrated work, Acolastus, was immensely popular and was translated into several languages. In 1540 an English edition was brought out by John Palsgrave.\textsuperscript{191}

The myrroure of them that be syke was based on a threefold dramatic structure. In the first part, two characters, Timothy and Tobias, discuss the pastoral inefficiencies of the clergy, revealed in the alleged failure of one priest to visit the sick Lazarus, a friend of both men.\textsuperscript{192} In part two entitled, "The declaration and exhortation to suffer all troubles patiently and fruitfully", Timothy visits Lazarus at his bedside whereupon he declares and expounds the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer.\textsuperscript{193} In part three Tobias teaches Lazarus that death is to be desired with a sure faith of the life to come.\textsuperscript{194}

The book opened with an attack on the laziness and corruption of the clergy who were (scripturally) denounced as wolves, painted graves and false prophets.\textsuperscript{195} For the sake of money the services of 'popishness' and Judaism are offered in place of
the Supper of the Lord. In the face of blatant pastoral irresponsibility the Christian layman must himself take on the role of pastor and teacher. In practice, this concern for lay participation finds expression in a brief social plan. A common chest should be set up to aid the poor, and schools and orphanages should be established.

A good deal of the writing expresses an aim common to both humanist and Protestant reformers. In part two Timothy instructs Lazarus to read the Pater Noster in the vernacular. Pilgrimages, miracles, and the worship of saints were unequivocally condemned as was the canonisation of saints by the papacy - "a slecht & vngodly thynge". The full scope of traditional piety was under attack. In contrast with the inward life of the Christian, the papist's religion is all outward, consisting of "myters, crosyers, coapes, albes, crosses, banners, shauynge, anoynyenge, syngyge, readynge, ryngynge, yanglynge, yea in horses and moyles, and other baggage...."

The central thrust of Gnapheus's critique, however, is primarily Lutheran. Pilgrimages are condemned because of their legal prohibition in chapter 4 of the gospel of John. Trust in saints is described as a house of all plagues out of which only misery flows. If the saints are worshipped then they reveal themselves as devils. God can only be worshipped in Spirit and is honoured only with those things that He has explicitly commanded. Miracles do not confirm the Word, and those who follow the counsels of 'miracle-gazers' and 'pilgrimage-goers' testify that they are not true believers. Though discussion of the Mass is largely ignored masses for money are seen as a seeking for the spiritual kingdom of God with corrupt
Throughout the book Gnapheus places considerable emphasis on faith as the means by which the sacraments are received; as the hallmark of the Christian in his daily life; and as the guarantor of the life to come. The dialogue between Timothy and Lazarus both reads, and is actually acknowledged, as an attempt to convert the latter, representing the traditional uneducated believer, to a life of faith through the preaching of the Word.

As translator Coverdale made a few changes to the original text. At one point for example, he gave Gnapheus's work a cogent and popular exemplum by referring to "our lady of Walsingham, the blood of Hales, and visions of Tundall". Possibly his reference to these abuses owed something to government policy. By July 1536 the holdings of the shrine of Walsingham had been confiscated. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Coverdale translated the work with the aim of justifying impending reform, as was to be declared in the Injunctions. Certainly he saw the anti-papalism of the work as important. In his epistle to the reader Coverdale asked God to give princes such mind that "the superstiousnes of Baal be roted out by them". He had undertaken this translation for two reasons: so that superstitions were avoided and neighbourly duties propagated. The very same reasons were put forward in Cromwell's Injunctions.

Coverdale's next work, The Ghostly Psalms, confirmed his
desire to inculcate a Protestant piety, and whilst much of the work followed the pattern of moderate Protestant-humanism of his previous works, once more the sources of his translation were of unmistakeable Lutheran hue. Whilst in exile Coverdale developed a full knowledge of early Lutheran hymnology and his *Ghostly Psalms* represents a fair selection of German hymns. The vast majority of the original pieces can be traced to a series of *Enchiridio* published in 1524 and 1525, whilst the latest work belongs to 1531.

As polemic, the last three songs present the sharp edge of what was essentially a pastoral and devotional labour. "Christe qui luix" was a translation from the German "Christe du bist licht" (Rigi'sche Kirchenordnung, 1530), whilst "O heavenly lord" appears to have originated in "O herre Gott" which had been published in Erfurt in 1527. The most notable song was the last one in the collection, "Let go the whore of Babylon". No source has been located for this work and it thus seems likely that the song was penned by Coverdale himself. Certainly the content of the piece was in keeping with the ideas that Coverdale had put forward in his dedication to the 1535 Bible. The main emphasis of the work centred on the Roman Church having recently lost its power, coupled with the corollary notion that the people have been delivered from captivity to a state of grace. The shift from papal to gospel-based religion has not been easily accomplished, and many remain who call the new gospellers heretics for their regard of the scriptures. These backbiters however are the ones who always resist the Word of God.

As in the prognostication Coverdale repeated his conviction
that the false prophet is the follower of Baalam. Once more
the greed of the clergy became a focal point of his attack:

"The gredy prestes of the idol Bel
Wente to moche to eate,
And that privelly, no man did se;
But now the kynge hath spied theyr cast". 218

Throughout he emphasised that the days of Rome were over.
In his conclusion he put forward a hymn of gratitude for the
recent deliverance and called for the reformation to be extended
to the realm of morality.
"Rejoyce with me, thou heaven above,
And ye apostles all;
Be glad, ye people, for Christe's love,
That the whore hath gotten a fall.
Be thankfull now, I requyre you,
Amende youre lyves, whyle you have space.
Let go the whore of Babilon,
And thanke God of his grace." 219

In eleven stanzas Coverdale presented what amounted to
a precis of his own theological position. The repetition of
the phrase "Let go the whore of Babylon", including its variants,
as the penultimate line of each verse ensured that the hymn
would be easily remembered. Yet the style of the piece as a whole
was heavy and didactic. The work can lay only tenuous claim to
the category of a hymn, and is better viewed as a ballad designed
for its capacity to raise anti-Catholic sentiment, rather than
for the inculcation of Protestant belief. Of all the songs
this one failed in the task set out in Coverdale's preface of
giving "our youth of England some occasion to change their foul and corrupt ballads into sweet songs and spiritual hymns of God's honour..." Common ballads are seen as bringing forth wicked fruits, preventing men from entering into the way of godly and virtuous living. Accordingly, Coverdale's intent was to encourage a moral reform through the medium of a scripturally based Protestant hymnology. Once more his capacity for using popular media as means of conveying religious and moral messages was demonstrated to the full.

The Causes why the Germans will not go to the Council of Mantua.

On the 5th March 1537 the German Lutheran Princes published Causae quare synodum indictam a Romano Pontifice Paulo III. recusarint principes, status & civitates protestantes imrerii, the first in a series of works written in defence of their rejection of the proposed Council of Mantua. In translating this work Coverdale brought into English what amounted to a political apologetic for Protestantism.

The objections raised against the Council were both petty and profound. Anti-Italian prejudice was raised alongside discussion of major issues of ecclesiastical authority. According to the Princes, the highest judgement in the Church does not belong to bishops alone, but must incorporate the views of Kings, Princes and other estates, all of whom are entitled to equal membership of the Church. The Bishop of Rome believes that the Council would necessarily have to accord the Pope status of overlordship. "He though he be a parte, wyll be the Judge." Scripture would not serve as sole standard, but would be subject
to the traditions of the papacy. "For that is no true nor lawful Synode, in which the byshoppes of Rome that do oppresse the church with unjuist condenacyon, do iudge the matters, & worde of God". 227

In rejecting, the Council the Princes are not withdrawing from the Church but are fleeing the Bishop of Rome. 228 In his condemnation of true doctrine and in his exercise of cruelty against its defenders, the Pope compels all Christians to dissent from him and his supporters, a dissent that is justified by historical precedent. 229 In concluding the work the Princes called on rulers and readers alike to give no credence to the views of papal adversaries, and commended their stance to other authorities. 230

Coverdale translated the work with typical accuracy making only the obligatory substitution of the phrase "Bishop of Rome" for Pope. He did not however allow his name to go forward on the title-page, possibly because he did not wish to be identified with such an explicitly Lutheran writing. As a result the book appears to have escaped the reaction against Coverdale's books and does not appear in the 1546 list of proscribed material. 231

A very excellent and swete exposition upon the two and twentve Psalme of David, called in Latyn, Dominus regit me, et nihil. 232

Luther's Der XXIII psalm // Auf ein abend vber // Tisch, nach dem Cra//tias, ausgelegt, // durch // D. Mart. Luther, published in Wittenberg in 1536, was, as the German editions admitted, prepared for publication by the indefatigable scribe George Rörer, following its exposition one evening at the dinner
In translating the work Coverdale revealed the influence of Luther's more moderate writing on his own theology. Themes which Coverdale had raised in his own work found confirmation in Luther's exposition. The dual stress upon past deception and recent enlightenment, for example, was a major theme of Luther's work. Through the proper preaching of the Word and right administration of the sacraments, the people may see how shamefully they have been deceived and seduced by the papacy. So perverse was man's viewpoint that he was led to believe that Moses's doctrine was sweeter than Christ's. Christ was seen as a wrathful judge to whom men could only be reconciled with good works, and whose pardon they obtained only through the merits and intercessions of saints. This perspective has proved "the highest blasphemy of the grace of God, a denying of the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, &c., and of all his unoutspeakable benefits, slandering and condemning of his holy gospel, a destroying of faith, and instead therof a setting up of utter abominations, lies, and errors, &c.".

In the exposition there was little sense of the militancy shown in William Marshall's translation of Luther. Persecution was seen as a hallmark of the Christian life, always to be endured. The writing however was by no means fatalistic. Through grace much has been brought to pass, and the sheep of God are constantly protected and defended. History itself provides some comfort. In the past the Jews slew and banished the apostles believing that they had vanquished the Christian faith. God however punished them by allowing the Romans to destroy the Temple. In turn the Romans martyred...
the Christians, yet God suffered Rome itself to be spoiled and the Empire to decay. Contemporary persecution finds explanation and relief in an optimistic view of imminent divine retribution. Comfort of the persecuted consists solely in their participation (through knowledge) in the prospect of divine justice.

Coverdale's accurate translation was very much representative of his work. Though all references to the person of Luther were omitted from the title-page, Coverdale did include Luther's single auto-biographical reference. There was little tampering with the language and, significantly, no alteration or modification of Luther's theology. The polarity between law and gospel, works and grace was faithfully rendered into English. The moderate tone of the work was the result of a sympathetic and accurate translation.

How and whither a Christen man ought to flye the horrible plague of the pestilence.

In 1537 Coverdale brought out another translation which sought through exegesis of the Psalms to offer comfort to the persecuted. The original writing, Wie vnd wo hin ein // Christ die grausame // plag der pestilenz // fliehen soll. // Ein predig / aus dem 91. Psalm, was composed by Andreas Osiander and published by the press of Johan Petreius in Nurenberg in 1533. In this brief sermon Osiander affirmed that the plague was a punishment from God. Whilst other reasons had been put forward, such as the influence of the stars, comets and unfavourable weather, Osiander argued like Brunfels that Christians should see the sickness as a punishment for their transgression of God's
holy orders. The further man departs from loving his neighbour, the more God would castigate the world. What was needed was an amendment of the sinful life. Deliverance from the plague could only be guaranteed through the restoration of trust in God and the increase of Christian charity.

The original and sprynge of all sectes & orders by whome, wha or were they beganne.

Coverdale's next work of 1537 saw a shift in his activities and a return to anticlerical polemic. The original of sects was encyclopaedic in nature, consisting of several series of lists. Part I listed 84 orders and sects that prosper under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. In part two a further 14 sects of Christendom were identified, whilst in part three 15 sects of the Jewish religion were examined.

A brief prologue explained the thought behind the writing. The author pointed out that no age has been without sects; all were brought into being by the Bishop of Rome, and are now as contrary to Christ and the Apostles as false prophets, heretics and pharisees were in times past. The reader was exhorted to trust in Christ alone and to avoid the deceit and false clothing of the papacy. The widespread allegation of Protestantism's divisiveness was thus countered by a demonstration of the sectarian nature of traditional Catholicism.

This account of Catholic sects was deeply hostile. The very first sect listed consisted of the Bishop of Rome, who 'usurpately' calls himself Pope, the cardinals, and the entire spirituality. Though the work was often tedious, occasionally
the author heightened the tone by a light touch of sarcasm. Members of the Wentzelaus order, for example, worship their bellies as their God, whilst the purpose of the Carmelites is to "drynke wyne and to begyle the people with much bablynge". At other times the author contrasted the life of the religious orders with true Christian vocation. The life of a Christian is in the world, to be a light unto others and to teach and to help. The life lived otherwise is a life that is totally unacceptable to God, even though this heretical existence has apparently flourished.

Throughout the book the author showed some interest in what might anachronistically be termed comparative religion. In part two he examined the faith of the Greeks, whilst in part three, the orders and superstitions of the Jews served as comparison with Romish sects. As the devil is, ultimately the cause of all division the sects of the Jews are no different from those of Rome. All sects are but a "fonde Jewyshnesse". All that is done without faith and obedience "is playne synne which yf it were done in fayth and obedience were iustificacion".

The most unusual feature of the book consisted of the final section entitled "The fayth of the Indians, euen as one Mathew the embassadoure of Presterias dyd vtter it before Emanuel kynge of Portingale. Anno. M. D. xiii". The account of Prester John and the 1514 embassy of Matthew the Armenian to Lisbon on behalf of the Negus of Ethiopia was well known to English readers. Prior to Coverdale's work, at least two accounts of the embassy had been brought out in English. The inclusion of the work in Coverdale's encyclopaedia is puzzling. Some of the practices of the
Indians that were discussed were unlikely to meet with Protestant approval. Holy oil was regarded as a sacrament; images of saints were kept in their Churches and bells and vestments were used in their services. Much of the work, however, sought to establish the orthodoxy of the Indians' faith and the almost reformed manner of their ecclesiastical practice. The Indians receive the sacraments in both kinds and do not allow the Mass to be said for any lucre or advantage. Their religious communities do not beg but labour for their keep. Priests are selected after a diligent examination of their ethical standards and behaviour. Most significantly, the priests are allowed to marry although the patriarch himself remains celibate. Furthermore, although the Indians are aware of the head bishop of Rome, they do not accept his jurisdiction.

This section on the religion of the Indians does not feature in the table of contents of the book. It thus appears likely that the writing was merely appended to the treatise of sects and orders and formed no part of the author's original intent. Possibly the account of the embassy was designed to show that a more worthy account of the Christian life could be found amongst barbaric communities than within the schismatic and divisive kingdom of the papacy. If so, then the author showed a tolerance that belied his more vigorous anti-Romanism, a tolerance which points to Erasmian foundations.

Although the form of the treatise marked a departure for Coverdale, the writing had the same practical goals of all his literary enterprises. In demonstrating the plurality of popish sects the work provided an idiosyncratic but nonetheless forceful critique of monastic piety. As such the message of the work
could be seen as offering justification and support for the government's campaign against monasteries.

A goodly treatise of faith, hope, and charity.\textsuperscript{259}

A further work of 1537 saw Coverdale return to more typical pastures. As with the dialogue of Gnapheus, the treatise of faith, hope and charity had a Dutch origin; the original work, Een proflec en troostelic boexten vande gheloove en hoope,\textsuperscript{260} having been published in Antwerp in 1524. The work consisted not of one but of two treatises. The first dealt with faith and hope, whilst the second examined love and charity.\textsuperscript{261} Much of the work presented the moderate Protestantism so common to Coverdale's translations.

The opening of the writing, for example, emphasised the certainty of faith.\textsuperscript{262} Death was not to be feared. Faith does not consist of mere belief, such as is necessary to know that Christ was crucified, but involves an existential dimension. It is not sufficient to believe as the Church does, or even as one's elders believed; each man must believe for himself. Much of the book was occupied with a discussion of the need for the means to good works. Though a strong ethical tendency was apparent throughout, there was no substantial departure from the faith / works distinction as laid down by Luther. The Law is accorded a single function, to give knowledge of sin.\textsuperscript{263} By the standards of the Law all men are utterly damned. Law is no means to justification.\textsuperscript{264} Where good works are done they are undertaken not out of any compulsion that the Law exercises over the justified Christian, but because God moves the heart of the believer through his inestimable love. Faith must declare itself
by deeds of charity, though these works are not an occasion of righteousness. 265

Only occasionally did the author break out of this repetitive message. At one point anticlericalism was allowed to rear its head. "The Byshoppes, Pharisees, Prestes, and Lawers thorowe theyr owne wysedome wold not submitte them selues to the humble, and meke fayth of CHRISTE, but rather drewe the other people from the fayth of CHRISTE..." 266 At other times the author expressed a revulsion of the world and a disdain for wealth. Covetousness is the root of all evil. The rich will be humbled and the poor exalted. 267

It appears, however that the moderation of the work attracted Coverdale to it. In the preface, the translator explained to the reader that he would perceive the power of faith by the scriptures alone. Out of gladness and joy the Christian breaks into deeds of charity, "wherby he declareth his inwarde gyft of fayth". 268 He had translated the work in the hope that its brevity will attract the reader. Whilst many utter words of faith hope and charity few declare them by their deeds. Words, however, are an inadequate expression of an inward state of being. "To speak diuinite maketh not a diuine, but to lyue diuinite". 269


At the end of 1537 Nicholson printed The books of Salomõ, namely: Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Sapientia and Ecclesiasticus of Jesus the sonne of Sirac, which, though anonymous, were reprinted from Coverdale's 1535 Bible. 270 The following year
Coverdale's New Testament was published.\textsuperscript{271} The work had a complicated origin and appeared in three editions.\textsuperscript{272} For the first, printed by Nicholson, Coverdale provided a dedication to the King in which he voiced some criticism of the hostile reaction within England to Protestant biblical activities. Out of malice they call loving and faithful people "heretics, new-fangled fellows, English biblers, coblers of divinity, fellows of the new faith, etc., with such other ungodly sayings".\textsuperscript{273} The King is needed as a protector and defender of Biblical translations.\textsuperscript{274}

It was in the prologue, however, that Coverdale gave free rein to his emotions, turning his attention to the wealthy. The rich must weep in fear of imminent retribution. "For certainly ye have great cause so to do; neither is it unlike but great misery shall come upon you, considering the gorgeous fare and apparel that ye have every day for the proud pomp and appetite of your stinking carcasses, and ye be not ashamed to suffer your own flesh and blood to die at your doors for lack of your help. O sinful belly-gods! O unthankful wretches! O uncharitable idolaters! With what conscience dare ye put one morsel of meat into your mouths? I speak to you, ye rich niggards of the world, which as ye have no favour to God's holy word, so love ye to do nothing that it commandeth. Our Lord send you worthy repentance!"\textsuperscript{275} The temporal authorities were charged with the task of providing for the poor and educating the young.\textsuperscript{276} The 'crime' of the wealthy was that in failing to help their neighbour, they deprive God of praise. Social obligation thus took on for Coverdale the character of religious expression.
Upon receiving a copy of Nicholson's edition of the New Testament, Coverdale identified a large number of mistakes in the text. By November he had arranged for a corrected edition to be printed by Francis Regnault in Paris. Nicholson, meanwhile, proceeded with a reprint of his edition, which clearly benefited from the government's Injunctions of 1538 which called for all clergymen to acquire a copy of the New Testament in both Latin and English for study. On hearing of Coverdale's displeasure, however, Nicholson obliterated all reference to the translator, and claimed that the work was translated by his assistant John Hollybush.

The Exposition upon the Magnificat

Around the same time Nicholson brought out Coverdale's translation of Luther's Exposition of the Magnificat, again with the acknowledgement that it was translated by Hollybush. There is however every reason to agree with the judgement of Foxe that the work was englishted by Coverdale. In content the work was in agreement with Coverdale's previous work for Nicholson, whilst much of the language echoed his own idioms.

Luther Exposition was moderate in tone and emphasised such standard Protestant tenets as the certainty of faith and the experience of justification. There were, however, a few polemical intrusions. The false humility of the religious is revealed, "whereby it is come that some prelates, and specially the Antichristes do call themselues humiles or lowly". Hypocritical clergy were roundly denounced. "For suche holy
and learned men are not proude in clothyng and behaueoure, they prayse, faste, preache, study, saye masse off, they go doukyng with theyr heades, and thynke nomā to be a greater enemy vnto the pryde, couetousnesse, orhypocrisy than themselues..."283 The religion of the clergy is all outward, a preoccupation with external rites and ceremonies.284

Coverdale's reason for translating the work is unlikely to have been polemical, for the Exposition as a whole presented the temperate face of Lutheranism. Elements of anticlericalism appeared in the English edition only as a result of Coverdale's fidelity to the original. Though all references to Luther were dropped from the title-page, the author's dedicatory address was included without any alteration.285 In addition, Coverdale retained a reference made by Luther to a previous work, The Treatise on Good Works,286 whilst he inserted a reference to "̴ the treatyse of orders & sectes" which he had brought out the previous year.287

The quarrel between Coverdale and Nicholson over the printing of the New Testament does not appear to have soured their business relations for long. In 1539 Coverdale wrote to Cromwell asking that Nicholson be given the King's privilege for a number of years. In the letter he pointed out that Nicholson was printing and had been paid for composing "a part of our postils, or ordinary sermons", which had been corrected by Cranmer and seen by the King. No copy of the work, however, has survived.288 Two other lost works of Coverdale belonging to 1539 may also have been printed by Nicholson.289 Coverdale's main work of 1539 however was the Great Bible, which was brought out by the printers Grafton and Whitchurch in 1540.290 In the
first half of that year Coverdale brought out a Psalter or book of Psalms. It was to be his last work in England for some time. By the summer his patron Cromwell was dead and Coverdale, by now a married priest, fled abroad for a second term of exile.

In contrast to the works of William Marshall the original material that Coverdale selected for translation was not characterised by its high quality. Of all his books, which included hymns, sermons, a dialogue, a prognostication, and even a dictionary, only Luther's Exposition of the Magnificat can be hailed as a major achievement. For almost all of the two dozen editions of his works that were brought out his original sources proved to be undistinguished and largely insignificant. Though of less literary importance, however, Coverdale's translations presented a far more coherent and positive account of Protestantism than did Marshall's. In many of his works key themes constantly recur. Tensions and contradictions in the various theologies that he translated are both few and insignificant.

All the works were seen as complementing the task of Biblical translation. Both scriptural and non-biblical translations shared the same thematic concern to teach Christians their duty both to God and to their fellow men. Secondly, there were distinct linguistic connections between his biblical and secular translations. Coverdale knew only German and Latin and made no use of Greek or Hebrew. Much of the language of his non-biblical works consisted of the idioms of his 1535 Bible. The English edition of Gnapheus's Mirror, for example, used such Germanisms as "church goings", "service saying", and "devil martyrs", whilst the Treatise of Faith, Hope and Charity
included "cheerfulness", "long suffering", and "unoutspeakable". The main reason for his inclusion of these new compounds was his general accuracy of translation. Unlike Marshall, he includes few embellishments or amendments in his work. His anglicization is very limited, and references to the German context were often retained. In general Coverdale presents faithful, plain translations, which, though not always literal (his sense of rhythm is too good for that), never misrepresent the thought of the original.

Such accuracy is not always advantageous. Often his books make for dull reading. Both his biblical and secular works were markedly inferior to those of Tyndale, and his plain unadorned style is far less vivid than that of his mentor. Metaphor and humour were rarely employed, whilst unlike Marshall, little use was made of alliteration and word-play. Moreover, Coverdale's writings are characterised by an absence of abuse. The most intemperate expressions in his entire body of writings between 1534 and 39 were directed against the wealth rather than against the papacy or the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Whilst there are some instances where he employed bestial language, often scripturally based, in order to denounce the clergy, he rarely resorted to sexual abuse. Most surprisingly, in view of his association with Tyndale, is the complete absence of ad hominem arguments. At no point does Coverdale become involved in personal controversy. Even his condemnation of those who object to biblical translations is vague and impersonal. It was not until 1541 in response to John Standish's attack on Robert Barnes that Coverdale found himself embroiled in personal debate. The acumen which he displayed in his Confutation of
Standish\textsuperscript{296} indicates that he deliberately restrained both his abuse and his arguments in his earlier writings.

Indeed the great strength of his early work lies in his capacity to restrain the destructive elements of controversy. In contrast to Marshall, reform as advocated in Coverdale's writings was seen in fundamentally positive terms. In essence, reform was seen as a moral change. Translating the scriptures ensured that a realignment of ethical priorities could take place. Secular translations complemented this activity. Osiander's sermon, for example, was both written and brought into English for a single purpose, so that all men would be counselled to reaffirm their calling to serve their neighbour.\textsuperscript{297} Unlike Marshall or Latimer, Coverdale rarely elaborated the nature of such service. True he reiterated standard calls for schools and orphanages and for a common chest for the poor, yet he was far less concerned with the details of aid than with changing the conditions that inhibit neighbourly duty. This found clearest expression in Gnapheus's \textit{Mirror}. Since the clergy have failed to carry out the requirement of their office, and indeed have betrayed their calling, the laity must take on a pastoral role. To do so the laity must have free access to the scriptures which teach preeminently the duties and requirements of Christian living. In the scriptures the Christian can discriminate true duties from both those that can be ignored, and from those which are to be eschewed altogether. The clerical monopoly of the Bible is seen as the means by which false duties and hence false religion are maintained.\textsuperscript{298} Scripture releases the Christian from what were once imposed as compulsory duties, but which in essence have no hold. To
learn true piety the Christian must return to the 'purified' sources of his faith, which in themselves are seen as reforming. "Seeing then that the scripture of God teacheth us everything sufficiently, both what we ought to do, and what we ought to leave undone, whom we are bound to obey, and whom we should not obey; therefore, I say, it causeth all prosperity, and setteth everything in frame; and where it is taught and known, it lighteneth all darknesses, comforteth all sorry hearts, leaveth no poor man unhelped, suffereth nothing amiss unamended, leaveth no prince be disobeyed, permitteth no heresy to be preached; but reformeth all things, amendeth that is amiss, and setteth everything in order. And why? because it is given by the inspiration of God, therefore it is ever bringing profit and fruit, by teaching, by improving, by amending and reforming all them that will receive it, to make them perfect and meet unto all good works".299 Thus in seeking to reform the morals of men by the application of scriptural precepts, Coverdale gives evidence in all his works of what has been described as the central thrust of Christian-Humanism.300

The basic characteristic of the life of the Christian was that it was to be lived within the world. His calling is to be a light unto others, a teacher, a helper, a pastor, and a counsellor. This emphasis on neighbourly charity involved as a matter of necessity a critique of the existing structures or channels of moral and religious obligation. Erasmus's criticisms of traditional piety as put forward in his Enchiridion represent the starting point for Coverdale's own polemic.301 The Church had lost sight of the moral imperatives of the Bible by institutionalizing the means of grace. The cult of saints was
attacked as a popish intrusion. Pilgrimages did not aid one's neighbour and images were mere stocks and stones. Such practices were mere superstition that rested on a false understanding of God. In place of the laws of God the clergy have substituted the standards of the flesh. They have sought only their own comfort and power and have no thought of others. The Christian is commanded to hate the world and all worldly lusts even though by his nature he is provoked unto vice. The clergy, however, feign a hatred of the world by opting for monastic seclusion. In so doing they reveal themselves as the children of the devil. Through the agency of "shaulė Madianites" the devil seeks to stir up wars, breed sedition, and encourage treason. A life lived outside the world is at root a spiritual deviation that serves to destroy the entire body politic.302

Coverdale's theology clearly contains a strong ethical dimension. How then did he see the relation of Scripture to the issue of faith and works? Essentially, works were to be undertaken because of the fact that they were commanded in Scripture. Yet, at the same time, adherence to the legal commands of Scripture must proceed only from an appropriate standpoint, namely from a right understanding of God's dealings with men. Whereas the papists fear God and attempt to appease him by carrying out superstitious rites,303 the Christian perceives the power of faith, that he is justified and made righteous, through the Bible alone. Only then does he undertake charitable deeds, "whereby he declareth his inwarde gyft of fayth".304

For Coverdale, the papists, in emphasising necessary works, changed the Christian life so much that the gospel was transformed
into a Jewish spirituality. The Christian's fulfilment of
the law proceeds from a joyous spirit of freedom. The law
has no compulsion over the justified Christian though God moves
his heart through His love to fulfil it. In thus locating
works within a process of sanctification which emerges only
once faith has been given, Coverdale reveals the influence
of Protestant theology upon his humanist programme of moral
and spiritual reform. To this extent he echoed the work of
other English reformers. In particular his views show a close,
though not exact, correspondence with the thought of his former
mentor, Robert Barnes. In the 1534 edition of his Supplication
Barnes retained the notion that faith could justify a man before
God, but added the corollary that works, as a necessary fruit
of that justification, made an outward declaration of righteousness before the world.305. Barnes certainly found his notion
of 'double justification' in the work of Tyndale, and it appears
likely that Tyndale's theology exerted decisive influence on
his former pupil Coverdale. Having said that in so far as the
works that Coverdale brought into English, such as the Treatise
of Faith, Hope and Charity reflected this some strong ethical
concern, it is possible that the sources of his theology were
more numerous and complex.306

English theology had a long tradition of writers who em-
phasised the ethical dimension. Colet, for example, viewed
that justification is the infusion of sanctifying grace.
Justification involves reforming men to an inward righteousness.307
The same concerns were prevalent in the Augustinian theology
which both Barnes and Coverdale encountered in their formative
years. Dom David Knowles suggests that Coverdale was influenced
by Lollard beliefs, in particular a zeal for scripture, a hatred of images, and a disbelief in the monastic life.\textsuperscript{308} There is in fact external support for the claim. As a secular priest Coverdale appears to have assisted Richard Fox, a Lollard Chaplain in Steeple Bumpstead. His association with Lollard sects indicates the extent to which essentially popular grass-roots opinion could influence academically trained humanists.\textsuperscript{309}

By the middle of the 1530s Coverdale's attitude to ecclesiastical ceremonies certainly owed more to humanist ideas that it did to more radical views. He could condemn masses for money, but unlike the early English exiles, he refrained from attempting to expose the theological errors of the mass. From a position of outspokenness in 1528 on the issues of the mass and auricular confession, Coverdale had retreated to one of silence. Indeed, he seems to have inclined towards the view that all ecclesiastical ceremonies were adiaphora. It is quite simply not enough to be baptized and to know off by heart all the articles of faith. The Christian must also "expresse them in hys lyuynge".\textsuperscript{310}

Coverdale's ethical emphasis contained strong strands of individualism. Yet moral reform was seen as having overwhelming social ramifications. Obviously good works were to the general benefit of the entire commonweal; yet Coverdale's social concerns went much further than that. Reform of morals was seen as being carried out on a national of even international scale through the policies of temporal government. The monarch was entrusted with the task of rooting out superstition and with restoring the uncorrupt faith of God's Word. Old Testament examples and paradigms provided justification for Coverdale's view of princely reform.
In ascribing such a central role to the monarch in the direction of ecclesiastical reform, Coverdale had moved far closer to the thought of Barnes and to native writers such as Swinnerton and Marshall than to Luther and Tyndale. In many ways, however, he was less interested in questions of political authority than any of his mentors. Unlike Tyndale, Coverdale showed little interest in employing key tenets of Lutheran political thought. The doctrine of the two kingdoms, for example, receives no consideration whatsoever. Like Marshall, Coverdale did advocate some intervention on the part of the monarch. The King should command that the law of God be read and taught unto all the people, and set the priests to their office in the Word of God. Moreover, Coverdale even went so far as to express approval of the practice of rulers actually deposing priests in an emergency.²¹¹ In his writings in the 1530s Coverdale answered the question of how reform was to be implemented by affirming, often tacitly, the legitimacy of the policies currently being carried out by Henry VIII and Cromwell. At no point did Coverdale advocate measures that were more radical than those pursued by the government.

There is, however, no evidence that Cromwell commissioned Coverdale to translate any of his non-biblical works. Rather the motivation for his work stemmed from his own awareness of the developments of government policy and its future requirements.²¹² The Injunctions of 1536 and 1538 instructed the clergy to eliminate superstitious elements in religious practice and to advocate doing good works of charity in their place. All of Coverdale's work sought to encourage and to reflect upon this attempt to reorientate popular piety. His
most unusual writing, *The original and sprynge of all sectes & orders*, appeared in print after the Act for the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries, and seems to have been published in order to support government policy. The translation of *The causes why the Germans wyll not go to Mantua* complemented a whole series of official writings that were produced to counter the council. One such work, *The epistle of Johan Sturm*, was translated for the government by Richard Morison. As with Coverdale's work, the epistle illustrates the value of continental treatises to the official apologetic.

As with William Marshall, translating was not the only way by which Coverdale sought to serve the government's reform programme. In the early part of 1539 he directed the attention of Cromwell to innumerable sorts of popish books which, he claimed, were both incorrect, and which served to keep the people in error. He particularly opposed books which had been produced against the King's Acts concerning the Bishop of Rome and against Henry's policy to devalue the cult of Thomas Becket. In his letter to Cromwell Coverdale asked for permission to correct the books. A second letter of 1539 confirms this picture of Coverdale as an unofficial censor of anti-Protestant and anti-government material. Writing to Cromwell once more, Coverdale pointed out that the stationers of London were not ashamed to sell primers which corrupted the King's subjects. Many had been brought to him at Newbury as had many other popish books. With Cromwell's authority he could collect many more which he could burn at the market Cross. Cromwell's decision is not known although Coverdale did receive the sum of 10s, possibly to cover the cost of purchasing these books.
The issue of papist propaganda, however, was not confined to printed matter. In the same letter Coverdale reported that a stained-glass window depicting Becket was allowed to remain in a church at Henley. Beams, irons, and candlesticks, upon which tapers and lights were once set up to images, had not been taken down. As a result the simple people believed that the old practices would return and that they would be allowed to place candles before images once more. As to who was responsible for maintaining these abuses Coverdale was clear. The Bishop of London, he argued, has been negligent in the performance of his duty. Elsewhere in the diocese, he fears, things are even worse.

Thus by 1539 the poacher had turned gamekeeper. Coverdale, the former exiled heretic, had become an informer, a paid servant of Cromwell, entrusted with a visitation to an area that was slow to implement reform. Apparently Coverdale was charged with the task of reporting to Cromwell why the Injunctions of 1538 were not being put into practice in Newbury and its neighbouring areas. As with Marshall, Coverdale's work moved from translation to policing. In the 1530s the careers of both men followed strikingly similar patterns. In the first instance, the translatory activities of both men were motivated by a concern to advance the reformation by giving literary support to the programme of reform that was being carried out by the government. As a result of this work both men were singled out by Cromwell to establish how well the government's reforms were being implemented.
To a large extent the work of both translators reflected the tenor of the religious reforms laid out in the two sets of Injunctions of 1536 and 1538. Each translator responded to the government policies with different techniques and with his own distinctive emphases. Marshall, it must be said, put forward all his work prior to the publication of the first set of Injunctions. Accordingly, his translations in the first instance were designed to justify not the religious policy but the anti-papal legislation of the Reformation Parliament and in particular the doctrine of Royal Supremacy. Only then did Marshall's translations, especially his Protestant work, attempt to advance concrete reform proposals that could be carried out by the government in the 1536 Injunctions. His was an intensely pragmatic view of reform, being directed at such institutions of Romish religion as monasteries, piety, and worship. For Marshall, it was necessary to abolish the practice of Romish abuse before true reform could take place. That is not to say, however, that Marshall presented an entirely negative view of reform. In his provision of liturgical primers and most importantly in his draft of a poor law Marshall attempted to provide constructive alternatives to traditional practices. In his translation of the three continental Protestant writings, however, this positive dimension rarely surfaced. All three works were geared to the destruction of Romish religion, as a supplement to the abolition of Roman primacy, rather than to the inculcation of new values and morals.

Coverdale, in contrast, though no less hostile to the vestiges of Romish religiosity, was far more concerned with replacing the traditional channels of devotion with a piety
that was based on a restoration of the scriptures to their central role in the life of the Christian. In other words, Coverdale attempted to chart the distinctive contours of a Protestant morality, a reformation of the individual's dealings with his fellow men. At root the work of both reformers mirrored the dual theme of the Injunctions of 1536. Marshall sought to encourage the people to banish images, relics, pilgrimages and other superstitions from their minds, whilst Coverdale sought to declare that works of charity were more pleasing to God than a blind faith in the empty traditions of Romish religion. Consequently, although William Marshall translated the work of both Luther and Erasmus, in as much as Coverdale sought to restore the scriptures as the only basis for morality, it is he, rather than his fellow translator, who fully earns the epithet of Protestant-humanist. In keeping with both Tyndale and Erasmus, Coverdale's secular translations were merely an accompaniment to or commentary on the scriptures; an attempt to direct the reader to the practical results of bible study, namely the fulfilment of good works. Of the two translators Coverdale was by far the more profound thinker although Marshall the more realistic and politically astute. Whereas Coverdale's work was a result of exilic experience and the intellectual influence of his mentors Tyndale and Barnes, Marshall's activities owed more to purely political developments within England. In his translation of Marsiglio's *Defence of Peace* he carried through the type of argument put forward in the work of St. German into a coherent political theory or parliamentary supremacy. In his translation of the work of the Strassburg preachers he attempted to adapt what was a
justification for action already undertaken into a programme of iconoclasm for his native land. Marshall's works had far more alterations in them than those of Coverdale. Continental reforming tracts were not allowed to undermine the political realities of the English scene.

Though each man responded differently to the government's policies of reform, the translatory activities of both men confirm them as being important figures in the development of Protestant literature in the 1530s. Irrespective of the different emphases of their work, both men responded to the government's reforms with outright enthusiasm and approbation. Implicit in all their work is a recognition of the merit of Cromwell's direction of the reform. Although in the long run the fame of both men lies outwith their secular translations of Protestant books, in bringing into English foreign publications as aids and stimuli to Cromwell's policies, the works of Marshall and Coverdale are important testimonies to the literary relations between the continental and English reformations.
1. Marshall corresponded with Thomas Cromwell from around 1533. In a letter of Thomas Bagarde to Cromwell, dated 28th May 1534, the author points out that Marshall was "much waiting upon your mastership". L & P VII, 722. At the same time Marshall seems to have courted the patronage of Anne Boleyn. DNB XXXVI, p. 250.


3. In a letter to Cromwell Marshall claimed to have expended both labour and money on a work of Erasmus, an indication that he actually translated the work. L & P VII, 422. Elton has corrected the order of Marshall's letters in L & P and claims that they were written at perhaps a few weeks interval before 1st April 1534. Policy and Police, p. 186, n.2.


7. In a letter to Cromwell Marshall wrote, "Whereas you promised to lend me 20L towards the printing of Defensor Pacis, which has been translated this twelvemonth, but kept from the press for lack of money, in the trust of your offer I have begun to print it". L & P VII 423. The colophon of The Defence of Peace reads as follows: "Printed by me Robert Wyer, for Wylyam Marshall, and fynysshed in the moneth of Iuly in the yere of our Lorde god a. M. CCCCC.xxxv". Appendix C. no. 25.

8. The Defence of Peace (STC, 17817) sig. A2(v).

9. McConica wrongly assumes that the book was commissioned by Cromwell, op. cit. p. 168. Nowhere in the correspondence of Marshall does it appear that the work, though certainly financed by Cromwell, was anything other than the product of Marshall's own initiative. Both Philip Hughes and Pierre Janelle accord the work an authority which it simply did not have. C.f. The Reformation in England, vol. I, pp. 331-35, L'Angleterre Catholique, pp. 252-56

10. L & P VII, 422.


12. L & P VII, 422.
13. Opera Omnia, vol. V.

14. STC 10504a, H & L Pl17, Devereux, Checklist, C. 72. 1.

15. In fact only two books were dedicated to Anne: STC 26119, and 15179, for which see above, ch. 3. F. B. Williams Jnr., Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641. (London, 1962) p. 5.

16. Sig. T2f.

17. Sig. O3f. The standards are discussed in McConica, pp. 137-38. His conclusion that in its content the work was entirely apposite to the needs of the government is not proven, though there is nothing in the book likely to give offence save possibly the reference cited below, n. 19.

18. Sig. A4(v).

19. Sig. O8(v).


21. Sig. A8(v).

22. Sig. E3(v).


27. B. 1484, d. 1551. Von Watt was educated at the University of Vienna studying under Conrad Celtis. In 1514 he was crowned Poet Laureate by Maximilian I. As a humanist known by the name Vadianus, he wrote commentaries on Pliny's Natural History, and also studied law and medicine. In 1518 he was appointed city physician of St. Gall, and in the following year he led the introduction of Protestantism into the city. Throughout the decade of the 1520s he corresponded with Zwingli and with Luther, participated in eucharistic debates, and engaged in controversy with the Anabaptists. In the 1530s he gave his attention to history, eventually producing in the work Grosse Chronik der Aebte des Klosters St. Gallen (St. Gall, 1575-79, 3 vols.) a historical apologia for the Reformation. C.f. Walter Näf, Vadian und seine Stadt St. Gallen (St. Gall, 1944, 57, 2 vols.) and E.G. Hupp, "A Sixteenth-Century Dr. Johnson and his Boswell, Vadianus and Johannes Kessler of St. Gall", in his Patterns of Reformation (London, 1969) pt. 4 ch. 22, pp. 357-78.


29. Sig. F2-G2 where Vadian sees the relations between Phocas and Boniface III as a watershed in the history of the papacy. The dating had emerged in Hussite circles and was later used by Luther himself. C.f. J.M. Headley, Luther's View of Church History (New Haven and London, 1963) p. 193.

30. Sig. K6-K7(v).

31. Sig. O8(v)-R8.

32. "For what cause I do reherse these hystories, thou shalt anon perceiue / for they are profytable and necessarye / but y thou mayest gette out of the very treuthe what the pope is". Sig. G8-G8(v).

33. Sig. B6. Vadian saw the principle of historical enquiry as entirely complementary to the standards of sola scriptura. Within the threefold ages of Nature, Moses and Grace, profound divisions that would be exploited by Luther, were united in Vadian's work through a legalistic view of Scripture and a polemical use of history which focussed on the negative side of creation. All three ages were seen as Law. Sig. B7.
34. The theme of conspiracy is sustained by a "poetic" description of the devil disputing with himself. "Wherefore experience doth teach me" ... "as my capitall & deadly enmy Esaie dothe saye in the 40 chapitre". Sig. G8r. The fact that the devil is allowed to speak and reveal his awareness of truth and falsehood provides a dramatic and effective example of self-condemnation. Elsewhere Vadian attempted to give examples of papal testimony contradicting itself. C.f. sig. F3(v), I4, I7. In addition he made use of recent exposures of papal abuse such as Valla's Donation of Constantine. Sig. D7,F4.


39. Clebsch, p. 266.


41. STC 20840, 20840.5, 20841.

42. Bale, Script. Ill., fol. 697. No copy of the translation has survived.

43. Turner's translation was taken from Hartman Dulichius's Latin version. See sig. A1(v).

44. Sig. 05.

45. Sig. R7(v), also A4, "that strumpet clad in purple".

46. Sig. K2, C.f. Sig. 04(v) "What wycked deuyll hath possessed you prestes and bysshopes: that you sholde be wyllinge all of you to be secular prynces and kynges".

48. C.f. Sig. F8-G4(v), I2-I6(v).


50. Sig. Q3.

51. Sig. Q3(v).

52. L & P VII, 423.


54. Appendix C, no. 28, STC. 24238.


58. Item Epistola Martini Buceris in evangeliatarvm enarrationes nuncupatoria, ad praecclaram Academiae Marturgenae, in qua quid Haeresis, qui haeretici, & quatenus cum dissentientibus societas Christi servanda sit, disseritur. Excutiuntur quaeque articuli conuentus Marpurgen. Taken from the second edition of Bucer's commentary, Stupperich, no. 28, Mentz, no. 24a.

60. Non esse ferendas..., sigs. di(v) - dii(v). Bedrot later complained about the treatise because he was included among those in whose name it was published. C.f. T. Schiess, Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer 1509-68 (Freiburg, i. Br., 1908 ff.) p. 209.

61. Sig. F4f.

62. Bucer attacked five main defences of image worship: the notion of Biblia Pauperum, "that ymages are the bokes of laye men" (sig. B4(v)-B5), the argument that images recall Christ's death and hence our salvation (sig. B6(v)-C2), the adiaphorist protest that images are not unlawful (sig. C2(v)-C3), the protest that images do not hurt the ignorant and do not offend the wise (sig. C3-C3(v)), and the objection that prohibition of images on grounds of their abuse should also apply to the sacraments (sig. C6(v)-C8).

63. According to Bucer the idolatrous worship of images serves to inhibit both the Turks and the Jews from becoming proselytes. Sig. C6(v).

64. Sig. A5.

65. Sig. C7.

66. Sig. B1(v), B3(v), B4.


68. Sig. E4(v).

"For the popes & bisshops (I wot nat whether through euyll wyll orels through a certayn pride) began with toth & nayle to defende the vse / or rather the abuse of Ymages agaist the greke emperours". Sig. E8(v). Bucer gives some attention to the development of images in the Eastern Church, in particular to the attempts of the iconodule Empress Irene to abandon the iconoclast policies of Constantine V at the Council of Nicaea in 787. Irene's character can be guaged, according to Bucer, from the fact that she is supposed to have dug up Constantine's body, burnt it, and then thrown it into the sea. In addition she plucked out her son's eyes. Sig. E8(v)-Fl. Irene's role in the iconocasty controversy is discussed in G. Ostrogorsky, History of the Byzantine State, tr. Joan Hussey (Oxford, 1956) pp. 156-61.

Interestingly, Bucer made use of a philosophical argument which he lifted almost word for word from Athanasius, Oratio Contra Gentes. The argument runs as follows. "How does God respond or is he made known through these Images - through the matter of which they are made or through their form? If it is through the matter, what is the need of the form, and why did God not reveal himself through any matter at all before they were fashioned? It is but in vain that they built their temples enclosing within walls a stone or piece of wood or bit of gold, when the whole world is full of such stuff. If, however, the form imposed is the cause of the divine manifestation, what is the need for the matter, the gold and other things, and why does God not reveal himself rather through the natural beings whose forms the statues reproduce"? Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione, tr. R.W. Thompson (Oxford, 1971) pp. 54-55. This use of a Church Father for his reasoned, non-biblical argument is unusual. Normally patristic citation rested on the assumption that the Fathers breathe the spirit of the Bible and not philosophy. C.f. S.L. Greenslade, The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church (Oxford, 1960) p. 7.

In the preface to the book Bucer pointed out that the Senators of the city were compelled to decree that images were removed because they saw that the evils caused by pictures were not sufficiently taken away by the exhortations of the preachers. Sig. A2.

79. Bucer's own attitude to images became increasingly radical throughout the 1520s. In 1524 he argued that images must be destroyed only when there is a danger that they might be worshipped. No overt action should be taken until the people were convinced by the Holy Spirit that it was necessary. C.f. Eels, Martin Bucer, pp. 37-38. By 1530, however, he insisted that once images have been forbidden in scripture, they are always to be eschewed. Sig. A6f. The whole argument of the treatise was that it was impossible to retain images without abusing them.

80. Sig. F4f.

81. Sig. F5(v).

82. Sig. F5-F5(v).

83. Sig. F5(v)-F6(v).

84. Bedrot insists that only "holy meō or nourysshed with christ the meate of lyfe". Sig. F5-F5(v), (my emphasis).

85. Sig. F6(v)-F7.

86. Sig. F7. C.f. sig. B4-B4(v) where Bucer argues that the Kings of Israel were approved or not on the basis of their attitude to images.

87. C.F. Marshall's rendering of Bedrot's introductory sentence to the section on the abuse of the mass:

Postremo de submotis, aris, his, qui Missae impietam agnouerunt, satisfieri nullo negotio potest: Qui minus, ne multis quidem placari possunt, nisi, quanta sit apud Deum abominatio missa, antea doceantur. (sig. Dl(v)).

Finally as converynynge the takynge downe and puttynge awaye of alters/ erecte and dedycate vnto images or sayntes/ they which haue knowe the wicked abusyons of the masse/ may and wyll be sone satisfied & contented without any gret busynesse: but they whiche do nat knowe the sayde abuses/ can nat be lightly pacifyed: vnlesse Thei be fyrst taught howe gret the abuses of the masse ar in the syght of God. (sig. F4(v)).

88. There are no examples of anglicization in the translation, a fact that resulted from the absence of 'continental exempla' in Bucer's work. The one exception is a reference to images at Lauretum which is retained in the English. Sig. D4.

90. Summarised in L & P IX, 358.


92. Wilkins, Concilia, 3, pp. 804-07, nos. 15, 16, 38, 39, 42, 55, 60; especially no. 5: "All ceremonies accustomed in the church, which are not clearly expressed in Scripture, must be taken away, because they are mens inventions".

93. C.f. STC 11381, 24445, 24468.

94. Appendix C, no. 29. There has been considerable uncertainty over the relation of the work to Luther. STC 16983.5 claims that the book does not appear to be a translation of any known work by Luther, whilst D.E. Rhodes has argued against Luther's authorship on internal grounds, "William Marshall and His Books", pp. 219-31. The boke of the counterfett bysshopp is however rightly identified as the work of Luther by Bale in Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe, (1543) STC, 1309, sig. G5. See H & L 112.


96. The pamphlet is no longer extant.

97. WA, 10, ii, pp. 93-98, on the evidence of an autograph fragment of a German text in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The text, in Luther's handwriting, shows corrections (possibly in Melanchthon's handwriting) which alter direct references to Albrecht of Mainz and substitute general statements. A printed text apparently identical to the corrected text is available in Luther's attack On the Spiritual Estate... falsely so called, WA, 10, ii, p. 105ff.


99. Wyder den falschgenanten Ecclesiasten und warhafftigen Ertzketzer Martinum Luter, Jan. 23rd 1523. Luther left the pamphlet unanswered.
100. Martinus Lutherus adversus falso nominatos episcopos. Foxe, A & k V, Appendix 6. Two Latin editions were published in 1523. C.f. WA, 10, ii, pp. 96-100, Benzing Lutherbibliographie, nos. 1211, 1212. It is probable, though not certain, that Marshall translated from the Latin.

101. Although his writing was loosely structured Luther examined the false bishops under a series of headings relating to their properties or virtues. Firstly, the bishops offer pardons and indulgences instead of the Word (Sig. I4(v)-I7, secondly, the bishops apply the doctrines of men to lucre (I7(v)-K3(v), thirdly, the Pope has usurped his authority (K5f), fourthly, the bishops present an empty promise of remission of sins in papal bulls (L5(v)f.), fifthly the papacy's use of dispensation from vows is selective and prejudicial (Fl(v)f.).

102. Sig. D4(v)-D5, D7-D8.
103. Sig. N8.
104. Sig. M8.
105. Sig. S7(v).
106. Sigs. D1(v)-D2.
107. Sigs. B8(v), C1, D2, H1, K1.
108. Sig. N8.
109. Sig. L8(v).
110. Sig. C1.
111. Sig. I4(v), C.f. WA. "Sie lassen predigen an statt gotlichs worts des Bapsts bullen unnd Ablap. Wie eyn unchristlich, wolffisch, verfurisch stuch das sey, beweysset sich daraup, Das widder gottis erst gepott istg, Da er gepotten hatt, man soll nit mehr denn seyn gottlich wortt predigen unnd yhm allein die ehre lassen, das er unBer gott, lerer unnd meyster sey, wie er spricht durch Isaias...."(10, ii, p. 133, l. 14-18).

112. Sig. L8(v), C.f. WA. "Wolff, tyrannen, seelmorder unnd Endchristis apostoll sind sie, die wellt züvorterbeen". (10, ii, p. 138, l. 30-31)

113. Sig. G3(v).
Vortzeyten war der Bischofhut
eyn heylig gewip zeychen. Die
zwo obstern spitzen bedeuft
die zwey testament das alt
und new, wilch eyn bischof
aufl dem heubt seyns seelen,
das ist ym verstand, trug,
unnd, war gelerit ynn der
heyligen schrifft, wie S.
Paulus Tit. I. gepeutt.
Die zwen bendel frey auff den
rucken hangend bedeuteten
seyen predigampt, darynn er die
selbige schrifft new unnd
allts testaments frey ynn das
volck gehen ließ unnd yhn nach
solgen leret, gieng er für an
mit dem leben. Wenn aber izt
eyn bischoff seynen hut auff
setzt, Was mag es deuttenn?

In the olde tyme the bisshops
mytre was a certayne mystycall
sygne & token. The two horns
in the toppe of it dyd sygnyfy
the two testamentes, the olde
& the newe, which the bysshops
dyde beare in the top of his
mynde, ý is to say in his
vnderstandynge / & he was
cünynge & well skylled in ý holy
scryptures in the fyrste epystle
to Tymothe. And the two
fyllettes or labelles hangynge
downe behynde at his backe, dyd
betoken the offfice of preachynge,
by whiche he dyd frely & boldly
pronounce & declare the scrypture
of both testaments amongethe
people, and goyng hym selfe
before theym to coûterfayte &
folow hym. But now a dayes when
we do se ý bysshops wearynge
those cappes w horns, I beseche
ý what shall they sygnyfy.

115. C.f. sigs. S7, D2(v).
116. Note for example Marshall's inclusion of the word 'thefe'
in the following quotation:

Sie Creutzigen Christum und
lassen Barrabam lop. Wehe,
wehe yhn! (WA 10, ii, p.
153, l. 4-5)

They crucyfye chryste, & let
Barrabas thefe go at lybertye.
Wo, wo, wo, be to them, onles
they amende. (Sig. S7 ).

117. Sig. H.5.
118. Sig. S8.
120. Sig. I4, citing Acts 23: 3f.
121. Sigs. Q1(v)-Q2.
122. Sig. Q2.
A123. An examination of the careers of other publishers both in England and on the continent often points to a close relation between evangelical fervour and printing. In France the works of the celebrated printer Robert Estienne were largely motivated by his religious concerns, whilst Pierre de Vingle's publication of the work of Antoine de Marcourt illustrates the theological beliefs of the printer as well as the author. C.f. Elizabeth Armstrong, Robert Estienne, Royal Printer, An Historical Study of the Elder Stephanus (Cambridge, 1954). For Vingle c.f. Berthoud, op. cit. In England the work of John Byddell and James Nicholson suggests that the two printers were motivated by Protestant sympathies.


A125. Benzing, Lutherbibliographie, nos. 1196-1208. The section Dy Bulle Des Ecclesiasten tu Wittenbergk wider Dye Pebatisch Bischoff was also printed in two separate editions in 1522 and 1523. Nos. 1209, 1210.


A128. The translatoure of this lytel treatyse oute of Latyne into Engelvshe to the indyfferent reder, appended to the second edition of the treatise (STC 24239) 1535?, sig. G2.

A129. Butterworth suggests that Marshall trained as a lawyer largely on the grounds that his style reflects that employment. Primers, p. 56.


A132. WA 10, ii, p. 113; Marshall, sig. B5.


A134. "Es were besser, das alle Bischoff ermordet ..." WA, 10, ii, p. 111; Marshall, sig. B8(v).


A136. STC 24239, sig. D8(v).

A137. Sig. O4.

139. The Defence of Peace (1535) fo. 138.

140. WA ii, p. 111; Marshall, sig. B8(v).

141. STC 24239, sig. F7(v).

142. E. J. Devereux seeks to account for the publication of the work by claiming that it was brought out in conjunction with the conservative reaction that began with the Articles of 1536. "English Translators of Erasmus", pp. 54f. Yet, as the colophon confirms, the work was published in 1535, since it is known that the printer Byddell moved from his address "at the sygne of Our Lady of Pity" towards the end of that year. C. F. Duff, *A Century*, p. 20. J. K. McConica rightly points out that the appearance of this conservative treatise demonstrates the difficulty of attempting a simplifying or sectarian analysis of the government's religious position in the period 1534-36. McConica, however, rashly assumes that the spectrum of opinion established in three of Marshall's works of 1535, *The forme and maner of subuention, The Treatise on Confession, and the treatise on images*, is no wider than Erasmus's own opinion. *English Humanists*, p. 170.


144. In the absence of any statement of Marshall's intent the most likely reason for his publication of the work may well be the most prosaic. His translation of Erasmus on the Creed had proved a popular book, running to an immediate reprint. In view of this, coupled with the fact that his translations of Marsiglio, Valla, and his publication of the *old god* had all failed, it is at least possible that Marshall translated the work on confession in order to capitalise on the popularity of Erasmus's writings in England and thus gain for himself some financial reward.


147. L & P X, 1536.

148. Sig. S7-S7(v).


152. C.f. L & P XIII, ii, 403(2).

153. L & P XIV, ii, 758.


155. Barnes returned from Louvain around 1522. On his return he created an interest in the study of classical Latin authors, in particular Terence, Plautus and Cicero. Barnes did not show any interest in contemporary humanist thought and his writings reveal no trace of either Greek or Hebrew. For his influence on Coverdale c.f. A & M V, pp. 414f. In 1526 Coverdale accompanied Barnes to London and helped in the preparation of Barnes's defence before Wolsey. C.f. Clebsch, op. cit. cit. pp. 44-49.

156. Possibly as a result of his involvement with Barnes's trial. By 1527 Coverdale had taken the degree of Bachelor of Theology.


159. The recantation of Thomas Topley, an Augustinian friar, recounted in a table of persons abjured in the diocese of London under Stokesley (1532-33). Foxe, A & M V, p. 40. Significantly Topley referred to Coverdale using the works of Erasmus as instruments of propaganda.

160. The work is attributed to Coverdale by Bale, Script., Ill., i, p. 721. No copy of the first edition has survived, although in 1535 it was reprinted from the press of the widow of Christopher Endhoven in Antwerp, together with a translation of Campensis's Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes. C.f. Mozley, op. cit. Appendix E, Coverdale's Works, p. 324.
161. Possibly Meteren was prompted by English merchants in Antwerp. His intense zeal for reforming doctrines got him into trouble in 1535. That year he visited England to make arrangements with James Nicholson, a printer of Southwark, for the sale of Coverdale's Bible. From this visit it is presumed that Meteren returned to the continent with Holbein's design for the title-page. For the complicated background to the publication of the Bible see Mozley, pp. 65-67 and especially S.L. Greenslade, Introduction to the Facsimile Edition of The Coverdale Bible 1535 (London, 1975) pp. 10-13.

162. STC, 2063, C.f. also Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525-1961, revised and expanded from the edition of T.H. Darlow and H.F. Moule, 1903, by A.S. Herbert, (London, 1968) no. 18, Henry Guppy, Miles Coverdale and the English Bible, (Manchester, 1935) and Francis Fry, The Bible by Coverdale MDXXXV. Remarks on the titles; the year of publication; the preliminary; the watermarks, etc., (London, 1867).

163. All references to the dedication and prologue are taken from Coverdale, Remains, pp. 1-22.

164. Ibid. pp. 8, 10. Imperial language received official sanction in the opening clause of the Act in Restraint of Appeals of 1533. "Whereby divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that the 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...." (1533, 24 Henry VIII, c. 12), reprinted in Elton, The Tudor Constitution, no. 177. The notion that England was an imperial realm had a longer history and was used by Henry himself in a conversation with More in 1521. See William Roper, The Life of Sir Thomas More Knight, ed. E.V. Hitchcock, (London, E.E.T.S. or. ser. no. 197, 1935) p. 68, quoted in R. Koebner, "The Imperial Crown of this Realm", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. 26, (1953) pp. 29-52. For the importance of imperial language see Scarisbrick, op. cit. pp. 498 ff.

165. Coverdale, Remains, p. 5.


167. The distinction is derived from Scarisbrick, pp. 319-21.
168. Coverdale, Remains, pp. 8-9
169. Ibid. p. 9.
170. Ibid. p. 5.
171. Ibid. pp. 9-10.

172. Although Coverdale lavishes much praise on Henry he reveals himself to be no mere sycophant. In dealing with the Pope's donation of the title "Defender of the Faith", Coverdale makes clear the papacy's real motives. It was given "only because your highness suffered your bishops to burn God's word, the root of faith, and to persecute the lovers and ministers of the same..." Ibid. p. 4. In the 1550 and 1553 editions of the Bible the sentence was altered to read, "The blind bishop of Rome... gave unto your grace's most noble progenitors this title Defender of the Faith, only because they suffered the bishops to burn God's word...etc". The 1537 quarto edition published by Nicholson, however, made no changes to the original in this regard. Coverdale does point out that the title "Defender of the Faith" was earned by Henry when the King allowed "no dreams, no fables, no heresy, no papistical inventions, but (only) the uncorrupt faith of God's holy Word" to prosper. Ibid. pp. 3-4. C.f. the dedication to Barnes's 1535 Vitae Romanorum Pontificum, where it is argued that Henry VIII will truly deserve the title only when he has punished clerical tyranny. Sig.A7(v).

173. L & P IX, 226, quoted in full in Mozley, p. 111.
174. On Henry's negotiations c.f. especially Tjernagel, op.cit. pp. 120-204.
175. STC 3046, Bale, Script Ill., i, p. 721.

176. In spite of intense ecclesiastical censorship Tyndale's text was the only one readily available, and as Coverdale points out in the epistle to the reader, the Concordance was designed, "that yt shall serue for all translacions in the Englyshe tong". Quoted in Lupton, op. cit. vol. 11, p. 90.


179. STC 20418.5, Appendix C no. 30. All references are to the 1547 reprint of the work, published by J. Herford f.R. Kele, STC 20423.

180. Sig. A2. There was, however, some indulgence with the language of prognostications. Christ was identified with the Sun, and the gospel with Mars. The enemies of the gospel were seen as the followers of Mercurius (the world) sig. A.4.

181. Sig. A7(v).

182. Sig. B1(v).

183. Sig. B6-B7. The technique of satanical disclosure has already been touched upon in consideration of Joachim von Watt's *Olde god and the newe*. Foxe, following Flavius Illyricus, gives a brief account of the development of this literary convention in the late Middle Ages. *A & M III*, pp. 189-93, and appendix. Between 1520 and 1524 at least five such letters were published in Germany. Within England the practice was found in the work, *A commission sent to the bloodye byshop of London, and to al convents of Frers By the high and mighty prince and king, lord Sathanes the deuill of hell*. According to John Fines internal evidence suggests that this book was published prior to 1536 and was written either by Tyndale or by one of the other early Protestant exiles. According to STC the work was printed in 1586 although Fines suggests a date of 1589. The work has been reprinted from BM. Stowe MS. 269. C.f. J. Fines, "An unnoticed Tract of the Tyndale-More Dispute", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. 42 (1959) pp. 220-230. For examples of the "Devil's Letter" in English sermons c.f G.R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. A Neglected Charter in the History of English Letters & of the English People* (Cambridge, 1933) p. 243, and *Preaching in Medieval England. an Introduction to the Sermon Manu- scripts of the Period c. 1350-1450* (Cambridge, 1926) pp. 248-49.

184. Sig. C3-C4.

185. Sig. B6.


187. Bonner's list of books is in Foxe, *A & M V*, pp. 566-68. Coverdale is represented by no less than twelve of his books.
There were at least two Dutch editions of the work. C.f. W. Nijhoff & M.E. Kronenberg, Nederlandsche Bibliographie van 1500-1540 no. 1010. The first edition was published by Niclaes van Oldenborch.

Willem de Volder or van de Voldersgraft, known by the Latin Fullonius or the Greek Gnapheus - a pun on Volder - was born in the Hague in 1493. He received his education from the Brethren of the Common Life, and from the Universities of Louvain and Cologne. By 1522 he had become Principal of the Grammar school of his birthplace, but forfeited a safe and profitable stay by proclaiming his sympathies for the Reformation. He was twice imprisoned by the Inquisition in 1523 and 1525, the second time for his flagrant disrespect of the cloistered life. In 1528 he left Holland and subsequently took up teaching appointments in Elbing, East Prussia, and later at Königsberg. For the last twenty years of his life up till his death in 1568 Gnapheus served as secretary to, and tutor of the children of Anne, Countess of East Friesland.


Typically Coverdale anglicizes the text and writes of reading the Pater Noster in English.

The instruction is derived from John ch. 4, vs. 23-24.
203. Sig. F3.

204. Sig. G4. At the end of the dialogue Lazarus secures Timothy's promise to return and discuss the Mass, sig. H7(v)-H8. The promise, however, is not carried out.

205. Sig. C1(v).

206. Sig. F4, F5(v).


208. L & P. XI, 165.

209. Criticism of the shrine at Walsingham was particularly widespread throughout the 1530s. In 1526 Erasmus produced a celebrated colloquy ridiculing the shrine entitled A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake, first printed by Johannes Froben in Basel. In 1536-37 the treatise was brought out in English by an anonymous translator and unknown printer under the title A Pilgrimage of Pure Devotion. STC 104.54, Devereux, Checklist, C21, discussed in McConica, pp.189-90 C.f. The Colloquies of Erasmus, tr. C.R. Thompson, pp.287-312. In addition William Marshall made a direct correlation between the Strassburg Preachers' book on images and the Walsingham cult. C.f. supra, p.259.

210. Sig. A 2.

211. Sig. A2.

212. Appendix. C.no. 32. STC 5898. Bale claimed that Coverdale translated Cantus usuales (or cationes) Wittenbergensium. Script. Ill., i, p. 721. All references are to Coverdale, Remains.

213. C.f. in particular the Erasmian quality of Coverdale's preface. "And if women, sitting at their rocks, or spinning at the wheels, had none other songs to pass their time withal, than such as Moses' sister, Glenhana's wife, Debora, and Mary the mother of Christ, have sung before them, they should be better occupied then with hey nony nony, hey troly loly, and such like phantasies". Ibid. p. 537.


216. C.f. especially the opening two verses:

"Let go the whore of Babilon,
Her kyngdorre falleth sore;
Her merchauntes begyne to make theyr mone,
The Lorde be praysed therfore.
Theyr ware is naught, it wyll not be bought.
Great falsheed is foude therin;
Let go the wore of Babilon,
The mother of all synne.

No man wyll drynke her wyne any more,
The poysone is come to lyghte;
That maketh her marchauntes to wepe so sore,
The blynde have gotten theyr syghte.
For now we se God's grace frelye
In Christ offred us so fayre:
Let go the whore of Babilon,
And bye no more her ware". Coverdale Remains, p. 586.

217. Ibid. p. 587.

218. Ibid. p. 588.

219. Ibid. p. 538.


221. "Yea, would God that our minstrels had none other thing to play upon, neither our carters and ploughmen other things to whistle upon, save psalms, hymns and such godly songs as David occupied withal!" Ibid. p. 537.
222. Appendix C no. 33. STC 17262.5.

223. The Papal bull *Ad domini gregis curam* of June 2nd had summoned a general council to meet in Mantua the following year. The Bull called upon all bishops, abbots, and other prelates to appear in person and requested the Emperor and other rulers to attend if possible or to send representatives. According to the Bull, the purpose of the Council was to extirpate errors and heresies, reform morals, restore peace in Christendom, and prepare for a great expedition against the infidel. C.f. Hubert Jedid, *A History of the Council of Trent*, tr. Dom Ernest Graf (London etc., 1957) vol. 1, p. 312.


225. The Princes argued that the Italians were notably hostile to Lutheranism, having slandered their writings and having forbidden Lutheran apologetics to be read. Moreover they themselves could not be guaranteed safety. Far better for the Council to be held in Germany. Sig. A2(v), A5(v), A7, B4-B4(v).

226. Sig. A8, B1.

227. Sig. A4.

228. The Princes did not only object to the temporal and spiritual claims of the Papacy but also to the doctrine and worship of the Roman Church. Till recently Christian doctrine lay underfoot, oppressed with the darkness of "wycked worshippynges, Monasticall ceremonies, doutfull questions, and cauillacyons". Owing to the influence of a few men much light has been shed on the issues of faith and penance. Sig. A4(v).

229. The Princes cite the refusal of Maxentius, Bishop of Jerusalem, to attend the Council of Antioch, and Athanasius's withdrawal from the synods of Tyria, Seleucia, and the Councils of Nylane and Ariminum. Sig. B4(v).

230. Sig. B5-B6.

231. Coverdale translated from the Latin with perhaps some use of the German. Mozley, op. cit., p. 325. The identification of Coverdale as the translator of *Apologia adversus conciliü Mantuae* was made by Bale, *Script. Ill.*, i, p. 721.

232. Appendix C no. 34. STC 16999. Printed by Nicholson for John Gough. All references are to Coverdale, *Remains.*
Whilst Luther does not mention himself by name he does speak in the first person singular, and uses his own response to suffering as an example to others. "After this same manner have I also, through the grace of God, behaved myself these eighteen years: I have ever suffered mine enemies to be wroth, to threaten, to blaspheme and condemn me; to cast their heads still against me, to imagine many evil ways, and to use divers unthirsty points.... This is all my harness, wherewith I have defended me hitherto, not only against mine enemies; but also through the grace of God brought much to pass, that when I look behind me, and call to remembrance, how it hath stood in the papistry, I do even wonder that the matter is come so far. I would never have thought that the tenth part should have come to pass, as it is now before our eyes". Ibid. pp. 313-14.

Unlike many other treatises that were written at times of the visitation of the plague, Osiander's work offered little practical advice. No-one was to flee. For outbreaks and responses to the plague in Nuremberg c.f. Gerald Strauss, Nuremberg in the Sixteenth Century (New York etc., 1966) p. 193.

Annexed to Nicholson's edition was a brief homily of four pages entitled A conforte concernyng howe wyse chylde and other frendes shal be conforted the husbonde beyng dead. In 1538 Osiander's sermon was reprinted, appended to a second edition of Luther's exposition of Psalm 23 (STC 17000). This edition added marginal notes which were completely absent in the first edition, and included another short tract, How they ought to be comforted that are in bodyly sycknesse or trouble. The original source of both of these brief homilies is not known. Seebas merely lists the first homily as Trostrpredigt für Kranke. For the title-page of the 1538 edition see McKerrow and Ferguson, op. cit. no. 41.
STC 1884.9. The original work has never been located. 
H & L 072.

244. Sig. A1-F2.

245. Sig. F2(v)-G1.

246. Sig. G1(v)-H4.

247. Sig. *i(v)-*2(v). Probably written by Coverdale. 
Certainly the preface echoes many of Coverdale's themes: 
"Shute not thou the at a wronge marke but holde the vnto 
Christ, and to th6 vnite of his doctrine, of his fayth 
and of his religion, that thou mayest hare be fre from 
all false hypocrisy, and not only knyt vnto him here 
in this world, but inheritour also of his ioye in 
heauen". Sig. *2(v).


249. Sig. E2(v), C3. At the end of the section the author 
clarifies his use of humour. Addressing the reader 
he claims to have praised some sects, "Wherfore counte 
many thynges to be spok5 Ironice (that is not earnestly 
& of a cotrary nreanynge) and then shalte thou ý better 
perceae the truth, and not my good meanynge of iudge-
ment wrytten agaynst the B. of.Romes heretykes, orders 
and Popish saynts". Sig. D 7.

250. Sig. A2(v).

251. Although the author approves the Orthodox Church's denial 
of purgatory, the filioque clause remains a stumbling 
block. In their belief that the Holy Ghost proceeds 
from the Father alone and not from the Father and the 
Son, the Greeks make the third person of the Trinity 
a mere creature. Sig. F2(v)-F3(v).

252. Sig. H4, G6.


254. In 1520 John of Doerborowe brought out Of the new lades 
and of ye people founde by the messengers of the kynge 
of portysale (STC 7677), whilst in 1533 Rastell published 
a translation by John Kore, son of Thomas, of Damiao 
De Goes' The lecaye or embassate of prester John unto 
Emanuelli, Kynze of Fortynscale (STC 11966). Translated 
from Laratio lagni imperatoris Presbyteri Joanis ad 
Emanuelem Lusitaniae regem, Anno Domini MDXIII, published 
by Gapeheus in Antwerp 1532. This writing combined an 
account of the Christian kingdom in Ethiopia with an 
appeal to Catholic Christendem by the exiled Archbishop 
John Magnus of Upsala, who had been forced to flee 
from Lutheranism in Sweden. The work reflected upon
the disintegration of Christian unity with exhortations
to tolerance of the inessential differnces of observance.
Clearly Erasmian in Outlook, it is likely that the
writing reflected, however obliquely, the fears and
aspirations within England of a conservative humanist

256. Sig. H6(v).
257. Sig. H7(v).
258. Sig. H7.
259. Appendix C no. 37. STC 24218. There is no external
evidence ascribing the work to Coverdale, although the
style of the piece is typical of his work. Mozley, op.
cit. p. 326.
260. Ned. Bib. 440, H & L G89. The author has not been
identified.
261. "Here ende the two frutefull treatyses, namely, of fayth
and hope, and of loue and charite". Sig. L8(v).
262. Sig. A3-A4(v).
263. Sig. B8.
265. Sig. D1(v)-D3.
266. Sig. F6(v).
267. Sig. K4-L6(v).
268. Sig. A2(v).
269. Sig. A2.
270. STC 2752.5, H & L B83. The work included a preface on
the value of the books and an epilogue on the Old
Testament meaning of the word "fool". Mozley, p. 237.
272. STC 2816, 2817, 2818. References to the Dedication
and Prologue are taken from Coverdale, Remains, pp. 24-31
273. Ibid. p. 25.
274. Again Henry is referred to in imperial language, C.f. p. 25.
275. Ibid. p. 30.
276. Ibid. p. 31.
277. The work was printed by Ragnault and was published by Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, STC 2817. Coverdale's dissatisfaction was conveyed in a letter from Grafton to Cromwell dated 1st December 1538. L & P XIII, 972. In place of the dedication to the King Ragnault's edition substituted a dedication to Cromwell. Remains, p. 33.

278. STC 2818. The conclusion is reached from the evidence of a few copies of this edition which retained Coverdale's name, and from the fact that the Hollybush title-page is a cancel-leaf pasted into the book, forming no part of the sheet to which it is attached. Mozley, p. 187. There is considerable uncertainty over the identity of Hollybush. According to Duff, Hollybush is Hans van Ruremond, brother of Christopher van Ruremond or Endhoven, the printer of Tyndale's 1526 New Testament. Hans van Ruremond appeared in England and was brought before Tunstall in 1528 for selling New Testaments printed in Antwerp. Mozley casts doubt on this connection, though S.L. Greenslade's most recent study sides with Duff. Whilst the evidence is hardly conclusive Duff's hypothesis is the most reasonable interpretation of the facts. C.f. Duff, A Century, p. 141, Mozley, op. cit. pp. 188-89, S.L. Greenslade, The Coverdale Bible 1535, p. 10, n. 9.

279. Appendix C no. 38. STC 17536.


281. A & M V, 566. In addition, the work shows a characteristic fidelity to the Latin version from which it was translated. In view of his involvement with the 1538 New Testament such fidelity was not a hallmark of Hollybush's work. Mozley, Appendix F.

282. Sig. C4(v).

283. Sig. G6.

284. In Romish services the people focus their attention upon "ryngynge, vpon the stone worke and tymber of the temple, vpon the censoure, vpon the burnynge of the lyghtes, vpon the blessynge, the golde, the syluer, the whyte clothes, the pearles, the vestimentes and surplyses, the chalice, the pyxe, the organes & tables, the procession and stationes, and that mooste of all is, vpon the bablynge and talynge wyth God vpon hede stones". Sig. H 6.
"To the renowned and moost noble prince & lorde Jhon Frederyke, duke of Saxony, county of Durynge and marques of Mysen my gracious lorde and defender". Sig. A.2.

Following the Exposition three short works were appended. Solomon's prayer from I Kings 3 was merely Englished from the Latin edition of Luther's Exposition; the songe of Zachary called Benedictus was partly derived from Luther; the confutation of Salve Regina was taken from an anonymous Dutch work Refutacie vant Salve regina. (Ned. Bib. 1787, 3788). Mozley, p. 327.

The letter is reprinted in Coverdale, Remains, p. 498. Possibly Taverner's Postils (STC 2967) may have been partly written by Coverdale C.f. below: Ch. 6.

Full bibliographical description is given in Darlow and Moule, op. cit. no. 46. C.f. Mozley, pp. 261ff.

The Psalter or boke of Psalmes both in Latyn and Englyshe. Printed by Grafton, 1540. Darlow and Moule, no. 56; STC 2368. C.f. Darlow and Moule no. 55.

The date of Coverdale's marriage is not known although in October 1540 Coverdale together with his wife, Elizabeth, nee Acheson, stayed in Madame Calvin's house in Strassburg. Lupton, p. 148.

Between 1521 and 1534 the work ran to seven German editions, one Low German, one French, one Dutch and two Latin editions, in addition to Coverdale's English version. Benzing, Lutherbibliographie, nos. 855-67.


STC 5888.

Sig. A2.

Sig. B1.

Dedication to the 1535 Bible, Remains, p. 10.

301. C. F. Erasmus's argument in the *Enchiridion*. "Do not tell me therefore that charity consists in being frequently in church, in prostrating oneself before signs of the saints, in burning tapers, in repeating such and such a number of prayers. God has no need of this. Paul defines love as to edify one's neighbour, to lead all to become members of the same body, to consider all one in Christ, to rejoice concerning a brother's good fortune in the Lord just as concerning your own, to heal his hurt just as your own..."

302. C. F. Gnapheus's view that the Christian life is not a life of ceremonies or church-going, but a life of the spirit. *A myrour for them that be syke*, sig. B2(v).


304. A treatise of faith, hope and charity, sig. A2(v). Faith can be better felt inwardly than it can be expressed in words. Faith is experienced rather than known. It is not enough to believe all that is spoken of Christ in the Scriptures. Such a faith, in effect merely historical, does not occasion salvation. True faith, one that is experienced within, is guaranteed only when it is an occasion to actions. "All that is done without faith & obedience, is playne synne, which yf it were done in faith and obedience were justificacion". The original of all sectes, sig. G6, *A treatise of faith*, sig. A2, *A myrour*, sig. C3(v).


306. The influence of Luther should not be underestimated. In a series of disputations and examinations which he produced in the mid-1530s Luther clarified his view of the law. It was to be fulfilled as God's holy will. The justified Christian knows that he can fulfil it, for as long as he is still 'flesh' and 'old man' the law is not abrogated. The law thus has a place both before and after justification. The Christian must abide by the apostolical imperatives of the New Testament and by the commands of the Decalogue. Only in this way could a consensus of ethical judgement be preserved in Christianity. Possibly Luther's attention was directed to the question of the law as a result of contact with English theologians. On August 29 1535 he brought out theses concerning faith and law that were designed for the doctoral examinations of Nikolaus Medler and Hieronymous Weller. Luther's choice of theme may have been influenced by the impending visit of the English legation and by the exchange of views conducted during Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. Moreover, Robert Barnes may even have attended the graduation ceremonies of Weller and Medler. *WA* 39: i, pp. 44-62, c.f. *LW* 34, p. 108, also *Die Promotionsdisputation von Palladius und Tilleman*, *WA* 39: i, pp. 202-57. For an
excellent account of Luther's view of the law c.f.
P. Althaus, The Theology of Martin Luther, p. 271.

307. c.f. Leland Miles, John Colet and the Platonic Tradition

Coverdale's work in the 1530s, however, shows the fallacy of
Knowle's claim that he was one of the "earliest and
most consistent 'puritans' of the first generation of
reformers".

309. A & M V, 40. Lollard influence in Steeple Bumpstead
is examined by John Davis, "Joan of Kent, Lollardy and
the English Reformation", Journal of Ecclesiastical History,
pp. 137-38, where it is pointed out that Barnes too
had contact with this Lollard sect.

309. Treatise of fayth, sig. A\(\pi\)(v).

310. c.f. Dedication to the 1535 Bible pp. 6-7.

311. Lewis Lupton has argued that the translation of Osiander's
sermon on the plague was directly commissioned by
Cranmer on the grounds that Cranmer was the nephew of
Osiander through marriage, and was influenced by his
work. There is no evidence of Cranmer's involvement in
the work, however. Though the Archbishop knew of
Coverdale's work as a translator he does not seem to have
formed any partiality towards him. In a letter to
Cromwell in 1537 he claimed that the Matthew Bible was
"better than any other translation heretofore made".
Cranmer, Works, ed. J.E. Cox (Parker Soc., Cambridge,
1844) vol. 2, pp. 344-47. Moreover, Cranmer appears
to have been kept in the dark concerning Cromwell's
dealings with Coverdale. c.f. Jasper Ridley, Thomas
Cranmer, p. 129. Whilst Cranmer would not have been
displeased with the translation of Osiander he cannot
be credited with its commission. It is, however,
possible that Nicholson, the printer, sought to curry
favour with the Archbishop by bringing out a work of
his uncle. In view of Nicholson's strenuous attempts
to gain the King's privilege for his Bible the trans-
lation of Osiander's sermon may have been intended to
gain the support of the Archbishop. In any case the
German original of the sermon had been particularly
popular in 1533 during the time of Coverdale's exile
and had run into at least six editions. It is highly
likely that the translator acquired a copy of this work
and others at the Frankfurt fair of April 1537. C.f.
Lupton, op. cit. vol. 11, p. 104, Seebas, op. cit. nos.
22.1.1, 22.1.2, 22.2, 22.3, 22.4, 22.5.
Significantly, Coverdale's work was far more temperate than Henry VIII's own statement on Mantua, a protestation that neither his highness nor his prelates is bound to come to Mantua (STC 13090) in Foxe, *A & M V*, pp. 138-44.


*L & P XIV*, ii, 782.

*L & P XIV*, i, 444.