

A Reexamination of the Development of Protestantism During the Early English Reformation

by

John K. Yost

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

G.R. Elton's recent investigations of the relation between humanist reform and reformist government during the 1530's¹ leave us with no uncertainty about Cromwell's beliefs regarding Protestantism. Elton concludes from an anonymous letter of 1538, which he ascribes to the eminent civil and canon lawyer John Oliver, that "as early as 1531 or 1532, therefore, Thomas Cromwell was thinking along reformed lines and lines of evangelical theology...."² Moreover, he reports how Cromwell "told the prior of Kingswood: by him 'the Word of God, the gospel of Christ, is not only favoured but also perfected, set forth, maintained, increased and defended'."³

Elton's careful analysis of the evidence leads him to believe that Cromwell told the truth when he said he tended towards Protestantism and convinces him of the accuracy of John Foxe's religious assessment of Cromwell.⁴ Furthermore, Elton acknowledges the Protestantism, which he sees as essentially Lutheranism, of Richard Morison and Richard Taverner.⁵ These two men were the most prolific of the humanist writers who served Cromwell. Elton recognized the primary concern of both Cromwell and his humanist scholars with religious and ecclesiastical reform, but his own main aim is to deal with Cromwell as the thoughtful minister of state who fully understood how to bring about extensive reform of the commonwealth by his use and management of Parliament.⁶

It is the significance of Elton's perception of the importance of Protestantism to Cromwell and the humanist intellectuals who served him that leads me to a re-examination of the problem of how the Protestant Reformation developed in England. There are five aspects of this problem upon which I shall touch: 1) the brand of Protestantism in the early Reformation; 2) the impact of the

Protestant movement upon the development of humanism; 3) the effect of the official campaign of religious propaganda; 4) the role of the reformist preachers in the reformation of religion; and 5) the reformers and the changing Christian ideal. First: the evidence of Protestantism in the political and social treatises of Morison as well as in the religious writings of Taverner refutes the position of James McConica that the humanist scholars in the service of Cromwell helped to shape a reformist policy that essentially amounted to an "official Erasmianism."⁷ Nevertheless, McMonica deserves much credit for coming closer to the truth by characterizing the early English Reformation as "Erasmian" than did those historians who used to describe it as "Erastian." Now, though, there is the danger of historians ascribing all of the Protestant tendencies of Morison, Taverner, and even Cromwell to Luther without providing any more detailed documentation and analysis for their Lutheranism than has been done for their Erasmianism.⁸ While the humanist scholars in the service of Cromwell translated works from both Erasmus and Luther, they rarely cited either one in their own writings. It seems to me that it was only because of the common theological ground between these scholars and Erasmus that specific teachings of Luther infiltrated the official Reformation in the 1530's.

No doubt English Protestants accepted Luther's teachings on justification and works, and the same applies to most younger generation humanists who wrote for Cromwell.⁹ But as some of us, most notably William Clebsch and Leonard Trinterud, have tried to show, the early English Protestants substantially modified Luther's teaching by adopting a legalistic religious moralism alien to his doctrinal method. Both Morison and Taverner, I think, reflect the strong emphasis of the early English Protestant reformers on the law of Christ and the moralistic meaning of justification by faith alone. Morison stresses the need to preach and to keep the laws of God in his 1536 *Remedy for Sedition*,¹⁰ and describes the forgiveness of God for David in his *Invective against Treason* of 1539 in terms illustrating his belief that justification by faith alone enables a person to do good works: "He suffereth not God's love to make any end with him, he still increaseth his favour, not so much by any merits, as by praising the undeserved love of god. Love not sold unto him for works, but given him that he thereby might work."¹¹

Best known for the Taverner Bible of 1539, but recognized also for influential translations of Erasmus and important ones from the works of continental Protestant reformers such as Melancton, Sarcerius, and Capito, Taverner summarized his own doctrinal position in his *Catechism* published in 1539, "so-called because it instructeth and bringeth up the young Christian in Christ's law."¹² Taverner's legalistic approach to Christianity in his *Catechism* shows how closely he stood to the doctrinal position of William Tyndale, Robert Barnes, and early English Protestantism as a whole.

Justification, for Taverner as well as for Tyndale and Barnes, enabled man to fulfill the law. Christ, writes Taverner, "promiseth both to pardon our wickedness, and also to write his law in our hearts. Therefore the keeping of the law is no work of our ability, but of a spiritual power whereby our hearts be purged from their corruption and made soft in the obedience of righteousness." Following the new birth as Taverner conceived it, man worked throughout life to obey the law of Christ. Taverner emphasized that the works of regenerate man are righteous and merit rewards: "So long as these our spots which blemish and stain our works before God, be thus hid and kept close, the Lord considereth in them nothing but high pureness and holiness whereupon he vouchsafeth to give them even righteousness yea and promiseth unto them large rewards."¹³ Thus Taverner and Morison shared the moralistic concept of justification held by the earliest English Protestants. The younger humanists as well as the first Protestant reformers in England used Luther's justification by faith alone to combat superstitious religion in order to stress the need to keep the commandments and to do works of charity.

It distorts reality to categorize the religious beliefs of the humanists who served in the Cromwell administration as either strictly Lutheran or Erasmian. There was certainly no unified movement of Erasmian reform in the Reformation as a whole. The "Erasmians" in England alone were a diverse group ranging from More and Fisher to Tyndale and Cranmer. Nor did there develop in England any strictly Lutheran movement. The doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper became the chief obstacle to the advancement of Lutheranism in England. After Fisher wrote a reply, in 1527, to the 1525 treatise of Oecolampadius on the Sacrament, there was no longer an excuse in England for confusing the Lutherans and German Swiss reformers.¹⁴ Fisher sharply drove the wedge between Oecolampadius and the Lutherans. He clearly demonstrated that Luther's doctrine of the Sacrament was far more "Catholic" than that of his German Swiss opponents. Fisher therefore played a significant and an early role in the division between Lutherans and Zwinglians.

Not only did most early English Protestants modify Luther's teaching on justification by faith alone to stress the importance of doing good works and obeying the law of Christ, but they rejected his doctrine of the Sacrament for one close to that of Zwingli and other Swiss-Rhenish humanist reformers. From Frith and Tyndale forward, it is difficult to find any Protestant reformer in England who consistently maintained throughout his career the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In his discussion of the sacramental controversy, Tyndale rejected the arguments for the Real Presence by the Lutherans as well as by the Catholics. He accepted the position of the Zwinglians, whom he labelled the "third party" because of their spiritualistic

and moralistic understanding of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.¹⁵ Taverner, Cromwell's leading religious writer, published in 1539 "*cum privilegio, ad imprimendum solum*" a translation from Erasmus entitled *Proverbs or Adages*. Taverner concluded that book with the Pythagorean symbolum *Panem ne frangito*, and added three and a half printed pages of his own to the brief commentary of Erasmus in order to stress that Christ is spiritually present in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper only for those who fulfill its demands for unity and charity.¹⁶ Like Tyndale, Taverner sought to promote a Zwinglian doctrine of the Sacrament. It is significant to underline, moreover, that the heresy alleged against Cromwell and his Protestant allies, Barnes and Jerome, in 1540 was not that of Lutheranism but of sacramentarianism. The attainder itself accuses Cromwell, among other things, of having caused the translation into English of books against the Sacrament of the Altar.¹⁷ The Protestantism of the early English Reformation had already moved doctrinally beyond Lutheranism toward Zwinglianism.

In broader terms, though, the religious beliefs of Cromwell and the humanists in his service, especially Morison and Taverner, brought them closer to the pan-European movement of Protestant humanism that was led in the early Reformation by the German humanist reformers Melanchthon, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Capito, and Vadian. As Wilhelm Dilthey recognized, the Protestant humanists represented "an intersection of coherent tendencies."¹⁸ The label of Protestant humanism does greater justice to the moral and spiritual crosscurrents of the early Reformation in England than does either Erasmianism or Lutheranism, or even Zwinglianism, which comes closer to being a more accurate description than the other two.¹⁹

Second: the evidence of Protestantism in the career and thought of Cromwell and those humanists who performed scholarly services under his direction adds substantially to our understanding of the ideological bases of Henrician policy. It enables us to see the complex interrelationship of Protestant belief and political action in the official Reformation accomplished during the Cromwell administration. Thus we need to reexamine the conclusion of Clebsch that the biblical, covenantal, moralistic Christianity of earliest English Protestantism conflicted with the royal, hierarchical, liturgical Christianity of the early Reformation.²⁰ Likewise, we ought to reconsider the justification for viewing, as A.G. Dickens does, the process of Protestantization and the official acts of church and state in the time of Cromwell as "The Two English Reformations."²¹

The Protestant humanism of Morison and Taverner, moreover, draws further attention to the accomplishments of the humanist scholars in the service of Cromwell, who have been overshadowed for so long by the earlier More group on the one hand and the later Edwardian reformers on the other. The period of English humanism immediately following the execution of More

and Fisher used to be considered its dark age, but the recent scholarship of Zeeveld, Ferguson, McConica, and now Elton has clearly demonstrated that the second half of the 1530's saw the culmination of the movement, particularly in terms of the humanist impact upon society and government policy. Furthermore, I think that it is important to stress that the high point of the humanist movement in England came at least a decade after Protestantism began to spread in that country.

Consequently, it seems to me that traditionally scholars have tended to view the problems of humanism and the Protestant Reformation in England the wrong way round. In attempting to assess the significance of Morison, Taverner, and other younger English humanists, I am attempting to turn the usual question of humanism and the Reformation around. I approach the relationship from the reverse perspective and ask what impact the Protestant reformer had upon humanist culture in the 1530's.

Perhaps the most important thing that happened to the humanist movement in the latter part of the decade was that it underwent a process of Protestantization resulting in a new and more active role in the Reformation for the humanist. Contrary to the standard widely held view, it was in the later 1530's instead of the later 1540's that most English humanists adopted a moderate form of Protestantism. When it came to the decisive doctrinal question of free will, Taverner openly indentified himself with the moderate Protestantism of two humanist reformers, Melanchthon and Sarcerius.²² Finding evidence of Protestantism in the younger generation of humanists points to the more challenging task of charting the Protestantization of humanist culture in the English Renaissance and Reformation that remains to be done. Renaissance humanism and the Protestant Reformation became more closely related in England than in any other country.

Third: Cromwell's Protestantism and the use of Protestant doctrines by his humanist apologist in defense of his Reformation policy shed new light on the nature and purpose of the official religious propaganda campaign of the later 1530's. Certainly the disaffection, disobedience, and disturbances that occasioned many of the humanist pamphlets shows the problem the government had in persuading the people to accept the political and religious changes of the early Reformation. But what impact did this pioneering effort of Cromwell to carry out a governmental campaign through printed books have upon the actual development of the Reformation? The truth is that the circle of Cromwellian humanists was neither as large nor as official as traditionally conceived. Morison, Starkey, and Taverner were the only real productive members of the group. The Cromwell administration recognized that the pulpit was more important than the printing press to its religious propaganda campaign. Concerning the effectiveness of that campaign, Elton considers it unimportant that we cannot determine how many persons read

the pamphlets of the humanist scholars when the contents of their sermons prove that preachers had done so.²³ On the other hand, I think we have good reason to conclude that both the humanist writers and the multitude of preachers derived their ideas of religious reform largely from the works produced by the English Protestant reformers in the late 1520's and early 1530's, prior to the official propaganda campaign of Cromwell. We have already seen some evidence to support this position in regard to the doctrinal similarities between Tyndale and Taverner. The unsuccessful negotiations of Stephen Vaughan in early 1531 to recruit Tyndale for government service did at least thoroughly expose Cromwell to the reformer's proposals. As late as November of 1531, Vaughan sent a copy of Tyndale's exposition of the First Epistle of John to Cromwell, which stressed obedience to the law of Christ as the essence of the Christian life and the basis of religious moralism. At the same time, Vaughan, who had become especially enthusiastic about the reformist ideas of Robert Barnes, forwarded a second copy of Barne's *Supplication* to Cromwell in case the first one had not reached him.²⁴ Vaughan's activities therefore introduced Cromwell to the ideas of reform promoted by the leaders of English Protestantism precisely at the time when he began to favor the reformation of religion.

In my judgment, there is neither internal nor external evidence to support in any way the widely accepted thesis of Zeeveld that Thomas Starkey built the *via media* of the English Reformation from the principle of *adiaphora* that he discovered in Melanchthon's plan for unity among Protestant nations contained in the *Loci communes* of 1535. Starkey's adiaphorism differed greatly from Melanchthon's insofar as he gave the government authority to control *adiaphora*, i.e., the realm of permissible, but nonessential things.²⁵ Melanchthon did not come by means of Starkey to influence the development of English Protestantism. Starkey never fully embraced Protestantism, remaining a Catholic humanist. It is more likely that Starkey learned about Melanchthon's Christian adiaphorism from Cromwell, than the reverse. Cromwell's first exposure to a version of Melanchthon's concept of Christian *adiaphora* may well have come from his reading of Barnes's *Supplication*, in which there were several pages devoted to adiaphoristic religious practice. Barnes considered required *adiaphora* a burden to bear for the purpose of brotherly charity and a peaceful commonwealth. Otherwise, justification by faith alone freed the Christian from bondage to any external work.²⁶ The ceremonies of Mosaic law were, to Tyndale, examples of things indifferent to salvation. Tyndale categorized all ceremonies and sacrifices as *adiaphora*, which he described as things not so necessary to spiritual health that it was sinful to neglect them.²⁷ In his 1533 commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Tyndale stressed the need to practice charity and preserve unity concerning adiaphoristic ceremonies,²⁸ just as Hugh Latimer had emphasized

in his Advent sermons of 1529 that external religion was unnecessary to the worship of God.²⁹ Barnes, Tyndale, and Latimer clearly perceived the significance of adiaphorism for church unity several years before the publication of Starkey's *Exhortation to Obedience*. Concerning the spread of the Reformation in England, therefore, there remains the important task of investigating the relationship between the religious policy of the Cromwell administration and the ideas of the Protestant reformers. There may be, as Elton claims, no need to investigate further the reformist ideas of the humanist thinkers,³⁰ but the reform programs of the Protestant reformers deserve more attention. Historians too often have been more concerned with the derivation of the doctrine of the reformers than with their ideas about the reformation of religion.

Fourth: in the later 1530's, Taverner provided a perceptive analysis of the difficulty in implementing the official Reformation policy, which certainly suggests that the government was encouraging the reformist preachers who were propagating Protestant ideas. As Taverner understood the situation, the problem was popular opposition to reformation policy. The common people were guilty of treason, slander, malice, and ingratitude.³¹ At the root of the opposition to Cromwell's reform program, he saw the conservative clergy who remained papal supporters either out of self-interest or superstition and therefore caused the masses to go astray.³² What made it difficult for the Reformation of the 1530's to establish a new order were the disturbances throughout the country caused by the controversies between the reforming preachers and the traditional clergy. This was the real level of conflict that caused Cromwell problems and created unrest among the parishioners. Taverner blamed the conservative clergy for the widespread discontent with Cromwell's program of religious education that was intended to give parishioners an understanding of the need for reform and halt their superstitious beliefs.³³ Latimer had perceived the seriousness of this problem as early as December 1530, when he accused the traditional ecclesiastics not only of preventing the laity from reading vernacular Scripture but also of keeping them ignorant of true religion with their laws, customs, and ceremonies. Corrupt prelates were contending that vernacular Scripture would cause heresy and insurrection. He claimed that they were willing to risk rebellion only if it was necessary to maintain their wealth. In 1532, Latimer stressed in a letter to Archbishop Warham the need to bring about a "reformation" in the judgment of the common people in order for them to understand that the works of their particular vocations had more value for their spiritual life than did voluntary works.³⁵

Taverner's preface to his 1536 translation of the Augsburg Confession provides not only the clearest statement of Cromwell's direction of the program of religious reformation but particularly of his support for preachers of reform like Latimer. Taverner praised Cromwell by asking

“who cannot unless he be mortally infested with the pestiferous poison of envy most highly commend, magnify and extoll your right honorable mastership’s most circum-spect godliness and most godly circumspection in the cause and matter of our Christian religion which with all indifference do not only permit the pure, true and sincere preachers of god’s work freely to preach, but also yourself to the uttermost of your power do promote and further the cause of Christ and not only that, but also do animate and encourage others to the same.”³⁶

It pleased Latimer in 1538, for example, to be able to report to Cromwell that there had been progress recently in reforming the superstitious worship of Mary in Worcester. As a result, people in Worcester were turning from idleness to labor and from idolatry to godliness. Latimer closed his letter to Cromwell about the reform of religion in Worcester by committing “our whole matter to your goodness... long to continue to such good purposes.”³⁷

The recent efforts of Elton and Christopher Haigh in tracing the enforcement of official Reformation policy essentially confirm Taverner’s perception of the problem and further recognize the crucial role played by the reforming preachers in bringing about religious change.³⁸ The ecclesiastical and secular government in Lancashire, observes Haigh, was too weak to overcome the strong efforts of the conservative clerics to preserve traditional doctrines and practices and to counter the program of official propaganda. Nor did the new religion come to Lancashire by anonymous traders and merchants. Rather, Lancashireborn university-trained theologians worked to propagate the new religious order by converting their friends and relations.³⁹ Elton describes numerous conflicts between innovative and traditional clerics and suprisingly acknowledges that the efforts to change faith and practice “caused even more unrest than the great political readjustment in England’s relation with Rome.”⁴⁰

Fifth: the much neglected religious controversy over marriage and celibacy especially interests me because it provides a good example of how the humanists and reformers sought to reintegrate life style and value system by transforming the medieval Christian ideal. The renunciation of the ethical dualism that exalted virginity above marriage and the repudiation of the rule of clerical celibacy by the reformers illustrates particularly well how far they went beyond the Cromwellian humanists in seeking to break down the old order and to build up a new one. In 1532 Taverner dedicated his English translation of Erasmus’s *Encomium matrimonii* to Cromwell. Taverner justifies his choice of a treatise to dedicate to him by stressing how the *Epystle in Laud and Praise of Matrimony* is “a thing full necessary and expedient to translate it into our vulgar tongue, and so under your noble protection to

communicate it to the people." His main concern has to do with teaching people that celibacy results from the "blind superstition of men and women which cease not day by day to profess and vow perpetual chastity before... they sufficiently know themselves and the infirmity of their nature." In Taverner's judgment, the combination of superstition and inadequate self-knowledge in the practice of celibacy "hath been and is yet unto this day the root and very cause original of unnumerable mischiefs." He concludes his dedication by calling for "some speedy reformation" to remedy the problem of celibacy.⁴¹

Starkey, often considered to have the keenest mind among the Cromwellian humanists, discussed the question of marriage and celibacy during the early 1530's when he dealt with the problem of depopulation in the manuscript known as the *Dialogue between Pole and Lupset*.⁴² Clerical celibacy, according to Starkey, is the principal obstacle to population growth. For a long while, he admits, it has been his belief that the church has greatly impeded the increase of Christians by binding such a multitude of secular priests, monks, friars, and nuns to vows of chastity. Thus Starkey proposes to relax the law of clerical celibacy and explains why:

"Wherefore, except the ordinance of the Church were (to the which I would never gladly rebel), I would plainly judge that it should be very convenient sometimes to release the band of this law, specially considering the difficulty of that great virtue, in a manner above nature; for the which, as I think, our Master Christ did not bind us thereto by his precept and commandment, but left it to our arbitrament whether we would study to strive against nature, whose instinct only by special grace we may overcome. Wherefore it appeareth to me to release this law very necessary."⁴³

Starkey's contentions that chastity is above nature, that overcoming nature depends upon special grace, and that Christ never required celibacy but left it to individual discretion are essential ingredients in the Reformation defense of clerical marriage.

Starkey's sense of historical perspective enabled him to understand the process of change and the importance of analyzing problems in relation to time and place. Thus he repeats the argument attributed to the humanist Pope Pius II that while there was great reason in the beginning of the Church to establish the law of clerical celibacy there is now greater reason to repeal it. Starkey's own sense of historical perspective in regard to clerical marriage articulates an important principle of humanist reform: "For this is the nature of all man's ordinance and civil law, that according to the time, person, and place they be variable, and ever require prudent correction and due

reformation, wherefore in this matter I think it were necessary to temper and at least to give and admit all secular priests to marry at their liberty, considering now the great multitude of them." Starkey therefore concludes that permitting secular priests to marry will remove a great obstacle to population growth. On the other hand, Starkey thinks it is "a thing very convenient and meet" for all well-ordered commonwealths to have monasteries and abbeys to which chaste persons can withdraw for a life of prayer, study, and contemplation. He opposes the elimination of monasteries and abbeys from "Christian policy" because of the comfort they provide for people oppressed by worldly vanity.⁴⁴ While he proposed clerical marriage as a solution to the problem of depopulation, Starkey never directly attacked the celibate ideal or repudiated the rule of clerical celibacy.

The Protestant reformers were the ones who fought to abolish clerical celibacy and monastic vows of chastity and to establish clerical marriage as a religious and ethical norm essential to the well-being of the social order as Protestantism conceived of it. In 1531 Tyndale responded to the charge made by More that it was heresy to consider marriage as pleasing to God as celibacy. Under Christ's rule, Tyndale contends, neither state makes a difference spiritually except insofar as it helps a person to obey the commandments and serve one's neighbors. The belief that virginity in itself pleases God leads to the kind of false sacrifice that belongs in the tradition of pagan idolatry. Marrying for pleasure serves God as well as abstaining for displeasure. The spiritual value of marriage, celibacy, and all other deeds depends only upon keeping the law and serving one's neighbor.

No human law can bind Christians where God frees them, asserts Tyndale, except when love and the needs of a neighbor require service. Love for neighbor provides the principle for interpreting all human laws. For example, people who vow chastity but cannot control their passions should marry. The only justification he finds for vowing chastity is to serve one's neighbor or to devote oneself to prayer and study. Conversely, reasons of personal health and service to the commonwealth or neighbor justify breaking a vow of chastity. Tyndale repudiates the rule of clerical celibacy for two principal reasons. First, those who vow chastity do so because they think it will bring them greater heavenly rewards than their neighbors. Second, the papacy has never permitted priests who could not control their passion to marry but has allowed them instead to keep whores. Because the papacy has deprived priests of the natural remedy provided by God for concupiscence, Tyndale advocates clerical marriage by explaining that "to resist and cry unto God for help, and to suffer, is a sign that thou lovest God's laws: and to love God's law is to be sure that thou art God's child, elect to mercy...."⁴⁵

Barnes vigorously argued for legalized clerical marriage in his 1534 *Supplication*, urging the pope to give his clergy the liberty granted by Paul in

regard to marriage. He contends that the pope cannot find proof in Paul that prayer and sacrifice require priests to live celibate. Marriage neither defiles prayer nor contaminates sacrifice. Concerning prayer, moreover, the New Testament makes no distinction between clergy and laity. Because Scripture contains no such promise, Barnes cannot accept the position of the papacy that God has bound himself to grant priests the gift of chastity for fasting and watching. Many good men have prayed and fasted without receiving the gift of chastity. Moreover, it makes no sense to him why prayer and fasting could help clergy but not laity to obtain the gift of chastity. He therefore questions: "Why be priests more bound to pray for the gift of chastity than other Christian men be?" the Scripture makes no distinction between clergy and laity or between celibacy and marriage.⁴⁶

The contributions of the Protestant reformers seem to have had a much greater impact upon the process of religious change in the early English Reformation than did those of the humanist intellectuals who served Cromwell. While the theologians and preachers did more to disturb conventional order than to achieve positive renewal, we need to give more attention than has been customary in recent research to the importance of disestablishing the old order as a necessary first step in developing a new one.

Notes

¹ G.R. Elton, *Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal* (Cambridge, 1973), Ch. 2. For his most recent statement on this matter, see his "Thomas Cromwell Redivivus," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 68 (1977), 196, where he concludes that Cromwell "probably grew more Protestant as the decade advanced." Furthermore, he claims, that Cromwell "had become convinced that only a form of Protestantism could serve the kind of polity he was building." Thus Elton clarifies once and for all the role of Cromwell in religious reform, as well as the question of whether he was an Erasmian or a Protestant. Treatment of these two issues in recent major works on humanism and reform in early Tudor England have lacked clarity and documentation. W. Gordon Zeeveld, *Foundations of Tudor Policy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948); Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance* (Durham, N. C., 1965); James K. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford, 1965); W. R. D. Jones, *The Tudor Commonwealth: 1529-1559* (London, 1970).

² Elton, *Reform and Renewal*, p. 28.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 36. Moreover, Elton tends to regard Cromwell's Protestantism as specifically Lutheran. On p. 43, he claims that after reading letters from Stephen Vaughan about Tyndale and Barnes, Cromwell "came increasingly to favour Lutheran ideas and propagandists." In "Cromwell Redivivus," p. 202, he maintains that "Cromwell's sympathies for Lutheranism, muted though they remain, are too well attested to ignore...."

- ⁵ Elton, *Reform and Renewal*, pp. 35, 61 n. 74. See also his *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 204. The most extensive treatment of Morison's Protestant ideas and the question of his dependence upon Luther is Cissie R. Bonini, "Lutheran Influences in the Early English Reformation: Richard Morison Reexamined," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 64 (1973), 206-223. On Taverner and Protestantism, see John K. Yost, "German Protestant Humanism and the Early English Reformation: Richard Taverner and Official Translation," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 32 (1970), 613-625.
- ⁶ Elton, *Reform and Renewal*, pp. 64-65.
- ⁷ McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics*, ch. 6.
- ⁸ Neither Elton, *Reform and Renewal*, chs. 2, 3 nor Bonini, "Lutheran Influences" provide any specific evidence to show that Cromwell and his humanist writers adopted a distinctively Lutheran brand of Protestantism.
- ⁹ Trinterud, "The Origins of Puritanism," *Church History*, 20 (1951), 37-57; William Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants* (New Haven, Conn., 1964).
- ¹⁰ Morison, *A remedy for sedition, wherein are conteyned many thynges concernynge the true and loyall obeysance, that commens owe unto their prince and soverayne lorde the kynge* (London, 1536), sigs. E2-E3.
- ¹¹ Morison, *An inuective ayenste the great and detestable vice, treason* [London, 1539], sig. A4.
- ¹² Richard Taverner, *Catechisme or institute of Christen religion* (London, 1539), sig. A3.
- ¹³ *Ibid.* sigs. D7-F1.
- ¹⁴ *Joannis Oecolampadii de genuina Verborum Domini, Hoc est corpus meum, juxta vetustissimos authores, expositione liber* (Strassburg, 1525); Fisher, *De Veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia* (Cologne, 1527).
- ¹⁵ Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises*, ed. Rev. H. Walter (Cambridge, England, 1848), pp. 368-372.
- ¹⁶ Taverner, *Proverbes or adagies* (London, 1539), sigs. H1-H3. He describes the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a "symbole and argument of excedyng unities and brennyng charitie" and concludes that "we be breakers and not eaters or (to speake more truly) we be unworthy eaters of this mystical breade not discernynge the lordes bodye." The same year Taverner stressed the unitive meaning of the Sacrament in his *Catechisme*, sigs. K7-K8 where he underlines the need for contemplation of its spiritual meaning and urges self-examination before taking it in order not to profane it and bring about damnation.
- ¹⁷ J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (Berkeley, Calif., 1968), pp. 379-380.
- ¹⁸ Wilhelm Dilthey, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Leipzig, 1927), VII, 135.
- ¹⁹ For an excellent brief survey of the problem of Zwingli's influence, see G. W. Locher, "Zwingli's Einfluss in England and Schottland-Daten und Probleme," *Zwingliana*, 14 (1975), 165-209.
- ²⁰ Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants*, p. 317.

- 21 A. G. Dickens, *The Age of Humanism and the Reformation* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), pp. 172-181.
- 22 Taverner, *Common places of scripture orderly and after a compendious forme of teachyng set forth*, sigs. A5-A6: "Agayne other goyng in the meane between these extremes, as Melanchthon and this Sarcerius, with many other excellent clerkes, have denyed frewyl onely in spirituall mocyons and that also in such persons as be not yet regenerate and renued by the holy ghost, and yet in the mean season they take it not so awaye, but that they leve them also in spiritual mocions a certeyn indeavour or willing, which indeavour neverthesse can fynnishe nothinge, onles it be holpen by the holy ghost. This (after my pore judgement) is the ryghtest and truest way."
- 23 Elton, *Policy and Police*, p. 211.
- 24 *Letters and Papers. Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.* ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, R. H. Brodies (London, 1862-1932), V, 553.
- 25 W. Gordon Zeeveld, pp. 128-156. On Melanchthon's adiaphorism, see also C.L. Manschreck, "The Role of Melanchthon in the Adiaphora Controversy," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 48 (1967), 165-181.
- 26 Robert Barnes, *Whole Workes*, ed. John Foxe (London, 1573), see pp. 298-300 and pp. 309-339 for his adiaphoristic approach to the problem of clerical marriage.
- 27 Tyndale, *Exposition and notes Together with the Practice of Prelates*, ed. H. Walter (Cambridge, 1849), p. 327.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 113: "For he that knoweth the intent of the law and of works, though he observes a thousand ceremonies for his own exercise, he shall never condemn his brother, or break unity with him, in those things which Christ never commanded, but left indifferent."
- 29 *Sermons by Hugh Latimer*, ed. G.E. Corrie (Cambridge, 1844), pp. 3-24.
- 30 Elton, *Reform and Renewal*, p. 4.
- 31 Taverner, *The Second booke of the Garden of wyesdome*, (London, 1539), sig. F6.
- 32 Taverner, *Common Places*, sigs. A3-A4.
- 33 *Ibid.*, sigs. A4-A5.
- 34 Latimer, *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester*, ed. Rev. G.E. Corie (Cambridge, Eng., 1845), pp. 297-302.
- 35 *Ibid.*, pp. 353-354.
- 36 Taverner, *The Confessyon of the fayth of the Germaines in the councill, together with the Apologie of Melanchthon* (London, 1536), sig. A-2.
- 37 Latimer, *Sermons and Remains*, p. 404.
- 38 Christopher Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge, 1975).
- 39 *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117, 163, 170.

⁴⁰ Elton, *Policy and Police*, p. 34.

⁴¹ Erasmus, *A ryght frutefull Epystle in laude and praise of matrymony*, trans. R. Tavernour (London, 1532), sigs. A2-A3.

⁴² Thomas Starkey, *A dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset*, ed. Kathleen M. Burton (London, 1948).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

⁴⁵ Tyndale, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, ed. Rev. H. Walter (Cambridge, Eng., 1850), pp. 157-164.

⁴⁶ Barnes, *Whole Workes*, ed. John Foxe (London, 1573), pp. 334-339.