ABOUT 1590, in a little pamphlet entitled _A petition directed to her most excellent maestie_, an unknown Puritan stated very briefly the basic principle of 16th century religious controversy: "Howe trueth should come to light, that is the question." He went on to say with Ecclesiastes that the writing of books is endless and a weariness to the flesh; he could wish for a free national conference, but he feared that the bishops would be not only participants but judges. He advocated another method, "namely priuate conferences by aduised writing, not extemporall speaking, the question agreed of." All arguments, replies, and rejoinders should be set down, and finally the proceedings should be published, "that your Maiestie, the honourable Councellours and Parliament may iudge thereof, that those thinges which on eyther parte are found fautie, may be re-dressed."

Although no one listened to this hopeful author, yet he was voicing an idea very deeply rooted in the thinking of his century. "How trueh should come to light" was always the question, and there was a general belief that written controversy and oral disputation could bring it out. This was another of the medieval legacies to the 16th century, as is shown by the great debates of earlier times between the proponents of papal and of secular claims and by the disputations which played so important a part in university education in the Middle Ages; but the Reformation century was an especially disputatious one because there were so many novelties to discuss. Everyone believed in what Bacon later called "the eloquence of persuasions."
It may be said that the Reformation itself began with a disputation: the Ninety-Five Theses of Wittenberg, on which Martin Luther offered debate with all comers, and Luther was turned into a schismatic by another disputation, in which he gave his enemies definite grounds for urging his excommunication. It appears further that the adoption of protestantism in the Swiss cities was regularly preceded by formal disputation. Thus in Zurich the Great Council sponsored four public debates between January, 1523, when the first was held in the Town Hall, and April, 1525, when the first evangelical communion service was celebrated at the Minster.

During the next decade, disputations were held at Basel (December, 1524), Bern (January, 1528), Geneva (May-June, 1535), and Lausanne (October, 1536), and action followed argument in all these cases. The course of events was similar: the town council decided to hold a conference; a list of theses was drawn up and widely advertised; the clergy were notified and efforts made to induce distinguished disputants for the papal side to take part; prominent champions of the protestant cause, like William Farel, defended the theses; the decision went in favor of the reformers, and the abolition of the mass followed within a few days or weeks.

To some extent, disputation preceded reformation in England also. The reigns of Mary, Elizabeth, and James (to extend our 16th century limits to 1603-4) began with some sort of official religious disputation, and similar debates are to be found in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI.

Thus, between the years 1535 and 1539, negotiations were carried on between England and certain German states, in the hope of establishing a political alliance together with some uniformity of protestant religion. There was an em-
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bassy to Germany in 1535; in 1538, German ambassadors were received in England and held debates with a selected group of English divines. The subjects for discussion were the major doctrinal items of the Augsburg Confession, plus questions regarding abuses in the Church. The conferences were friendly, and essential agreement was reached, although no official action was taken; further negotiations took place in 1539 but amounted to nothing, and the matter was finally closed in 1540 with protests from the Germans over the reactionary character of the Six Articles.

In the reign of Edward VI, in addition to the debate with the old Church, it was necessary to decide what form the new Protestantism should take. A letter from Bartholomew Traheron to Henry Bullinger reported a London disputation of December, 1548, on this latter question. Cranmer, "contrary to general expectation," and Ridley had spoken against the Real Presence, and Traheron concluded: "I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side." Traheron said that this conference was held "in the presence of almost all the nobility of England," and it was presumably the debate in Parliament to which reference was made in King Edward's Journal: "A parliament was called, where a uniform order of prayer was institute, before made by a number of bishops and learned men gathered together at Windsore. There was granted a subsidy, and there was a notable disputation of the sacrament in the parliament house." This disputation prepared the way for action on the new Book of Common Prayer, the bill for which was read for the first time in the Commons on December 19, 1548, and in the Lords on the day following.
During Edward's reign a number of Continental reformers were invited to come to England, and several of them were challenged to defend their views by Englishmen of orthodox opinions. These debates may well be considered together with the 1549 university visitations by royal commissioners. The Commissioners, or Visitors, brought with them statutes, essentially the same for both Oxford and Cambridge, for the guidance of those institutions, and they conducted their inspections over a period of some weeks (May and June, 1549). At Oxford, Peter Martyr had been challenged to defend his views on the Eucharist, and after some demur over time, place, and procedure, he appeared in debate before the Commissioners. Whether or not the Visitors arranged the debate, it may safely be said that they would have been glad to have such a disputation (whose sessions occupied parts of four days) as part of their program. The orthodox theologians, on the other hand, were no less eager, anxious no doubt by this means to present their views to the King's representatives. Therefore this debate may well be considered a semi-official discussion for the purpose of settling doctrinal questions at a time when these were by no means clear. Although this Commission, like the one at Cambridge, was clearly favorable to the reformed doctrines, no decision was given, and afterwards there was considerable controversy, part of it in writing, as to which side had prevailed.

Meanwhile, the five members of the Commission visiting Cambridge had been present at a series of three disputations among university scholars. Nicholas Ridley, head of the Commission and then Bishop of Rochester, presided and afterwards “determined the questions scholastico more,” giving as his opinion that transubstantiation could not be proved by the authority of Scripture or of the Fathers. It
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appears from these events that there was no hindrance at the universities to freedom of speech in religious matters. Nor does it appear that the Visitors ordered any doctrinal or ceremonial changes as a result of their investigations. They brought statutes, which they left with the university authorities, together with further instructions drawn up as a result of their visits. These regulations, however, dealt almost exclusively with academic procedure and instruction and seem to have had the purposes of shaking up laxity and raising standards.

Debate did not end with the visits, for when Martin Bucer came to the Regius Professorship of Theology at Cambridge in November, 1549, he was soon challenged (like his colleague Martyr at Oxford) to a disputation. The heads for discussion are of interest, as showing three of the leading theological questions of the day: 1) the complete sufficiency of canonical scriptures, 2) the immunity of the true Church from error, and 3) the Lutheran doctrine of justification.12

On the accession of Mary, Archbishop Cranmer offered to defend, in a public disputation, the doctrines which had been established in the previous reign. The specific points proposed were that the Prayer Book (1552) of Edward VI was agreeable to the order laid down by Christ, and that the mass had no apostolic or primitive authority. Cranmer's prospectus was copied all over London; the author was summoned before the Council on September 13, 1553, and the following day he was sent to the Tower.13

In the first convocation of Queen Mary's reign a debate was held, ostensibly for the purpose of straightening out religious difficulties and settling the form that the official faith was to have. John Philpot, Walter Haddon, John Aylmer, and a few others disputed with those who wished
to see the old religion restored. Philpot was arrested for his part in the meeting, and in his subsequent examinations maintained that those who took part did so in the belief that they were to engage in a free discussion, questions for debate having been stated by a prolocutor.¹⁴

The first year of Elizabeth’s reign saw another official disputation, also between the old religion and the new. It is obvious that this year would have seemed a critical one for the English Church, and that all parties, Catholic, Anglican, and Puritan, would have hoped that their opinions might prevail.¹⁵ The Council planned this disputation for the Easter recess, 1559, and sessions were held on March 31 and April 3. The fundamental issue was the continuance of the Marian form of worship; the actual questions concerned the use of the vernacular service and the authority of every church to change rites and ceremonies. The Protestant element wanted a written discussion in English, the Catholic an oral one in Latin; both sides wanted the last word; no agreement was reached and the disputation was never finished.¹⁶

Throughout the reign of Elizabeth, those who wished further reformation in the Church of England became more and more insistent that they be allowed to present their views in free and open debate. One such proposal has been mentioned in the opening paragraph of this paper. Usually the challenges went unheeded, but one conference was held at Lambeth during the Christmas recess of 1584-5. Religious discussion was unusually animated during that winter, doubtless because of the recent elevation of John Whitgift to the See of Canterbury and his vigorous attempts to enforce conformity. The conference is mentioned by Lady Ann Bacon, and Thomas Fuller apparently has reference to the same debate when he mentions two conferences held in
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1584, concerned with Discipline and with Ceremonies, in which the Archbishop, Bishop Sandys, and Bishop Cooper opposed a group of "unconforming ministers," whose names Fuller could not discover. Lady Ann, for her part, complained that the Puritans had been unfairly treated; she wrote to her brother-in-law, Lord Burghley, asking that it be arranged for certain Puritan preachers to appear before her Majesty or the members of the Council, "and if they cannot strongly prove before you out of the Word of God, that reformation which they have so long called and cried for to be according to Christ's ordinance, then to let them be rejected with shame out of the Church for ever."

In view of earlier precedents, it was only natural that when a new line of monarchs followed the Tudors to the throne there should have been hopes for changes in religion and a new disputation held. The famous Hampton Court Conference of 1604, although it resulted in plans for the King James Version, ended with little satisfaction for the Puritans, but it followed the 16th century tradition of conference and argument before the establishment of the mode of worship to be followed during a new reign.

II

It may be useful to divide the material of 16th century religious controversy into a few major classifications. Under the heading of oral debates, the main types were formal disputations, examinations of and controversies with prisoners, and university exercises, these last both as a regular part of the curriculum and for exhibition purposes. In the category of written material the fictitious dialogues may be included, and finally there was the great body of printed controversial works in which the most important religio-
political questions of the time were given expression.

Of the first category, oral disputation, something has already been said, especially in the field of officially inspired disputation. Although none of these conferences was without bias, a hearing was at least permitted to opposing points of view. There are other instances of religious debates, particularly in the reign of Edward VI, and many more of unheeded challenges to debate, which may here be omitted.¹⁹

The prison debate, an interesting type, took several forms: disputations held to determine the views of a suspect, examinations of prisoners before a board, usually a section of the Court of High Commission, and debates held within prison walls for the purpose of convincing some recalcitrant of his error. Since nonconformists were guilty of disobedience to acts of Parliament, the prosecutions and punishments were, technically at least, for political rather than religious reasons.

The earliest of these prison debates apparently occurred during the reign of Mary, when so many divines were held to answer for their anti-Catholic opinions, and the most famous were those in which Archbishop Thomas Cranmer took part. In April of 1554, the Archbishop and Bishops Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley were taken to Oxford, where were assembled, by virtue of the Queen's commission, a considerable group of divines, representing both Universities and the clergy in general. The prisoners were asked to subscribe to three articles recently adopted by Convocation, all of which stated the Catholic position as to the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, or Lord's Supper. When the prisoners refused to endorse these articles, a stand which must have been expected, they were subjected to further pressure in the form of argument, each one disputing alone
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against a group of opponents. When Latimer said that he was too old to undergo the ordeal, Hugh Weston, the prolocutor or chairman and one of his chief opponents, roused him with the question “Then you refuse to dispute? Will you here then subscribe?” and Latimer, never one to give in without a fight, went on with the debate.

Three days after the close of his own conference, Cranmer was allowed to take part in the oral examination of a candidate for the doctor’s degree, one John Harpsfield, who as luck would have it was to defend the proposition “de vera praesentia naturalis et organici corporis Christi in sacramento altaris.” This individual, brave in the knowledge that the University scholars were on his side, was bold and contentious with Cranmer’s questions; but he soon got beyond his depth and had to be rescued by his seniors, and so this affair turned into another disputation with Cranmer as the central figure.

John Bradford, to cite another example of the many at this time, underwent several examinations and an extraordinary number of minor debates during his incarceration. People kept dropping in on him in prison to try to convince him of his errors. Apparently the authorities did not wish to make a martyr of him, and they had faith in the disputational method to break down his resolution. Twenty-three of these conversations, long and short, are recorded. In the first, Bradford was told that Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley had been completely confounded by their opponents at Oxford and “were not able to answer anything at all.” It appears that Bradford was a man well-liked by the people, and his conversion must have been a matter of considerable importance to the Marian regime. Had Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Bradford been won over, it is reasonable to
assume that resistance to the Marian establishment would almost have ended.

During the reign of Elizabeth, the same methods were used on the two chief classes of religious prisoners of the time, the Papists (as they were always called by their opponents) and the extreme Puritans, those of both Presbyterian and Congregational opinions. A few accounts of the examinations of Puritans before panels of royal commissioners are preserved, the most vivid account being that of the questioning of Henry Barrow. There was a set list of questions for use on nonconforming persons at this time, but no matter how the examinations started out, they always ended up as disputations.

Efforts were also made to win over the Jesuits and other Catholic prisoners. Edmund Campion, the most famous of the Catholic missionaries, underwent several conferences in the Tower during late August and September, 1581. Campion was at fully as great a disadvantage as the Protestant examinees of the previous reign. He indeed desired to dispute, but rather in a regular way before the scholars of the Universities than in prison and without advance notice. The first conference was a free debate in which Campion and several opponents argued back and forth. The next three conferences were designed to be of the most formal sort; as William Fulke said, in opening the proceedings of September 18, "our purpose is not to deale by discourse, but briefly by logical arguments, according to the order of the schooles." In other words, Fulke and the others of the government side (called, formally, the disputants) were to state a proposition, usually in the form of a syllogism; Campion (the respondent) was to attempt to answer it.

Campion complained that he never had a chance to state
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his propositions first (although inevitably the formal order of procedure broke down in practice), but of course this was not, any more than other examinations had been, a free debate for the purpose of determining which side had the better arguments. Indeed, at the third conference, the Lieutenant of the Tower exhorted Campion “to consider what great favour her Maiestie showed him, that he might haue conference with the learned to reform his errours,” and before beginning his argument on the same occasion, Fulke prayed that God would grant “that we may so defende the trueth, that thou mayest haue the glory, [and] the obstinate heretike may be confounded.”

It is reported, and it may well be believed, that Campion made so able a defense against all comers that the authorities finally put a stop to debate. Nowell and Day, in the preface “To the Reader” of their contemporary report of the conferences, take cognizance of the general opinion that Campion had been victorious in the debates. Naturally they deny this, but the fact that they published the proceedings at all, and especially that the publication came two years after the event, indicates strongly that justification of the official position was considered necessary, Campion had become the hero of poems, doubtless more annoying to the authorities than learned tracts:

“Our preachers have preached in pastime and pleasure,  
And now they be hated far passing all measure.  
Their wives and their wealth have made them so mute,  
They cannot nor dare not with Campion dispute.”

Or, more briefly:

“If instead of good argument  
We deal by the rack,  
The papists may think  
That learning we lack.”
During the Middle Ages, the disputational method was of course one of the chief ways of educating the college student, and a continuation of this custom was insured by the Edwardine Statutes of 1548 and the Elizabethan Statutes of 1570, both for the guidance of the Universities. During his first two years, the neophyte merely studied logic and heard others debate, but as a junior sophister and a senior sophister he was required to break some lances of his own; he took part in at least four disputations, concluding the course with his determination, in which he debated with all comers and summed up the argument. For all the higher degrees it was necessary for the candidate to attack or defend theses in disputations.

It was customary in the 16th century for a university community to show honor to a distinguished guest by a display of learning, which usually took the form of an exhibition debate in which a group of trained scholars or of promising young men displayed their talents. These exercises seem to have been most frequent in the reign of Elizabeth: entirely appropriate entertainment for a well-educated lady who was also peripatetic. One of the most memorable of these show disputations, occupying parts of two days, took place at Cambridge in 1564, with young Thomas Cartwright as one of the participants. The subjects were sufficiently remarkable: "Monarchy is the best form of government," "Frequent change of laws is dangerous," "The authority of scripture is greater than that of the church," and "The civil magistrate has authority in ecclesiastical matters." Cartwright, who had to take the negative of the proposition that monarchy was the best form of government, very sensibly asked the Queen's permission before he began to speak; but nothing embarrassed Elizabeth, who enjoyed the whole performance.
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and frequently interceded when the moderators called time on the disputants. In 1566 the Queen visited Oxford also and heard a number of disputations, some in philosophy, "and one most eminent in Divinity, . . . It lasted in summer time till the candles were lighted, delight devouring all weariness in the Auditours, when the Queen importuned by the Lords . . . concluded all with this her Latine Oration."

The fictitious dialogue, a hybrid of oral and written debate, was a form very popular in the 16th century. These simulated controversies dealt with social questions, often humorously, as well as religious, although the latter subject was the one most frequently treated.

By way of example among many possible illustrations, it may be remarked that Sir Thomas More's greatest works make use of this style. The Dialogue of Sir Thomas More, Knight, is his first and strongest attack on Luther and Tyndale; in it he represents himself as sitting in his study, reasoning with and ultimately answering the objections raised by a representative (called the Messenger) sent by one of More's friends who has been somewhat taken with the new Lutheran ideas. The Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation and the Utopia, while not works of religious controversy, make use of the dialogue form to gain interest and verisimilitude.

Christopher St. German, More's chief opponent next to Tyndale, also followed the current style in his Dialogue betwixt two Englishmen, whereof one was called Salem and the other Bizance. St. German also wrote the well-known dialogue, briefly called Doctor and Student, a handbook for law students which went into many editions and was used for three centuries after its author's death.

Some of the best dialogues are from the Puritan side during the religious controversies of Elizabeth's reign. Anthony
Gilby's *A pleasant dialogue between a soldier of Berwick and an English chaplain* (1581) is one of the most vigorous and interesting works of the century; another which should be mentioned is John Udall's *The state of the Church of England, laid open in a conference between Diotrephes a bishop, Tertullus a papist, Demetrius a usurer, Pandochus an innkeeper, and Paul a preacher of the Word of God* (1588).

III

Throughout the century the fight between Catholics and Protestants runs like a fire, breaking out into frequent bitter controversies and sometimes flaring up into violence and persecution. The issues change from time to time and include all the points upon which the two groups could disagree. At first the main issue is Faith and Works; then it is Transubstantiation; sometimes it is clerical celibacy, or the wearing of vestments; throughout run the questions of obedience to the sovereign, the Royal Supremacy, and the issue of loyalty and treason. Many polemical works were issued, some being printed surreptitiously in England, some being smuggled in from abroad, but whatever their origin, for every statement by one side there had to be an answer by the other. This led to written controversies of great length and many ramifications, the most important of which may here be briefly examined by way of illustration.

Henry VIII himself replied to Luther's *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520) with *The Assertion of the Seven Sacraments* (1521). Luther came back with *Against King Henry of England* (1523), and this work was immediately answered by Sir Thomas More, writing under the pseudonym of William Ross. John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who had already published two anti-Lutheran works, likewise stood
up for his king in the *Defense of the Assertion* (1525); in the same year Luther tried what he may have thought would be a conciliatory message, the gist of which was that the original *Assertion* was so full of errors that it must have been ghost-written for Henry, who was therefore not to blame, but this rather thorny olive-branch was rejected by the King in *A Copy of the Letters, etc.* (1526).\(^3^3\)

The first great English controversy of the century was that between William Tyndale and Thomas More, running from 1525 to 1533. Tyndale's anti-Catholic doctrines, centering in the Faith and Works question, were set forth in the marginal notes to his New Testament of 1525 and in his *Parable of the Wicked Mammon*; More replied to these in his *Dialogue* (1529), Tyndale wrote his *Answer*, and finally More his *Conjunction*. In the last, More included an answer to part of Robert Barnes' *Suplicatyon*, thus bringing another early Protestant into the discussion. Meanwhile Sir Thomas, the busiest controversialist of his time, had answered Simon Fish's *Suplication of the Beggars* with the *Suplication of Souls* and had exchanged thrusts with Christopher St. German. St. German took a somewhat reasonable tone which earned from More the epithet "pacifier." Indeed, throughout the century, neutrals and peace-makers were attacked with special acerbity from all sides; better an honest heretic than a tolerant bystander.

The execution of Robert Barnes in 1540 provoked a new wave of controversy. Barnes' confession of faith, issued just before his death, was attacked by John Standish, who was answered by Miles Coverdale. Bishop Stephen Gardiner, who had been instrumental in bringing about Barnes' condemnation, stated his side of the case in a list of articles. George Joye, who had opposed More in the earlier series, replied to
the Bishop, was answered by Gardiner, and wrote a final rejoinder (1546). Gardiner, who was in the thick of most religious controversies in the 1540's, engaged in written debate with Martin Bucer on the question of clerical celibacy and in two other controversies of considerable length. In one of these he wrote *The Examination of a Proud Praesumptuous Hunter* in answer to William Turner's *Hunt of the Romish Foxe*. This provoked answers from both Turner and John Bale (*Yet a Course at the Romythes Fox*) and finally, in 1554, Turner's *Huntyng of the Romythes Wolfe*. The other great Gardiner controversy, running into at least ten works, was over the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Gardiner opened it in 1546 with his *Detection of the Deuils Sophistrie*; he was assisted by two books from the pen of Richard Smith and was opposed by John Hooper, Anthony Gilby, and Archbishop Cranmer.

Although there were no major written controversies during the Marian period, the English Protestant exiles on the Continent issued a number of polemical works important in the history of political theory. John Knox's famous attack on female rulers in general and Mary in particular, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstruous Regiment of Women*, was answered in very timely fashion by John Aylmer (*An Harborowe for Faithful Subjects, against the Late Blown Blast*), writing soon after the accession of Elizabeth. Elizabeth never forgave John Knox his slights upon her sex, but Aylmer later became Bishop of London.

After Elizabeth's accession, the debate between Catholic and Protestant continued in the two voluminous Jewel-Harding controversies of the 1560's. These are exceptionally important because of the number of writers engaged on either side and because they form the basis of and often exercise
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direct influence on the later controversies of the reign. The first was the Challenge Sermon Controversy; in a sermon, three times delivered in 1559-1560, Bishop John Jewel of Salisbury offered to turn Catholic if his opponents could satisfactorily answer certain propositions which he set forward. The challenge was promptly taken up by Thomas Harding, who was later assisted by Thomas Stapleton. Naturally the Bishop was not won over, although his respondents were able writers, but this controversy and its companion must have been of the first importance in fixing and publicizing the doctrines of the Church of England in this transitional period.

As off-shoots of this controversy, we find Thomas Cooper answering an anonymous work, *The Apologie of Private Mass*, which had also taken up the challenge, Stapleton answering Cooper with his *Fortress of the Faith* (1565), and finally, years later, William Fulke's *Overthrow of Stapleton's Fortress* (1580). The Jesuit John Rastell also answered Jewel's sermon and was himself answered by Fulke in 1579. Another Catholic who replied to Jewel was Thomas Dorman; his *Proof* provoked Alexander Nowell's *Reproof*, his own *Disproof of the Reproof of the Proof* followed, and after another thrust and parry Dorman apparently had the last word.

Jewel's great *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* appeared in 1562, with an English translation in the same year, and he and Harding entered into a brisk controversy over it; Harding wrote two attacks and Jewel two defenses. This was the second of the major controversies of the period and is easily confused with the first, since both have the same principals, deal with much the same subject matter, and run concurrently. The Apology Controversy also has a number of offshoots; without going into detail, it may be noted that Nicholas Sanders, Thomas Heskyns, and John Rastell attacked the
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Apology, while Nowell and William Fulke defended it.35

The debates just referred to also serve as an introduction to the works of William Fulke, probably the most indefatigable controversialist of a century when no one willingly let an opponent have the last word. Most of Fulke's writing was done in the late '70's and early '80's, but he by no means confined himself to contemporary opponents. He apparently kept a list of all controversial books, and when he found a Catholic work to which no direct reply had been made, he set himself to write one; thus, as noted above, we find him winding up one after another the off-shoots of the Jewel-Harding controversies of some fifteen years before. As a foreword to one of his works he made a list entitled "A catalogue of all such popish books, either answered or to be answered, which have been written in the English tongue . . . since the beginning of the queen's majesty's reign." A list of thirty-eight works follows, after which he adds, "if the Papists know any not here reckoned, let them be brought to light, and they shall be examined."36

William Fulke also crossed swords with the two greatest Catholic controversialists of the 1570's, Nicholas Sanders and Richard Bristow. The Visible Monarchy of the former, and Motives of the latter, were evidently extremely influential for years after publication. All the controversies in which Sanders and Bristow were involved, and they were many, led up to the great Campion controversies of the 1580's. Edmund Campion was not allowed to live long enough to write much himself, but his brief writings and his execution touched off three major controversies. A letter which Campion wrote to "the Lords of the Council" was attacked by William Charke and Meredith Hamner and defended by Robert Parsons, going into eight books back and forth. A
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second controversy, begun by Campion's *Ten Reasons*, had William Whitaker and Lawrence Humphrey on the Protestant and John Drury on the Catholic side. The third and most important was concerned with the question of whether Campion had suffered for his religion or whether, as the official charge had it, he had been guilty of treason. This question provoked many statements, replies, and rejoinders, although most the works deal with the central issue and are not answers to any single opponent.

The Campion Treason Controversy deserves special notice because it shows the interdependence of the most important works of controversy. One of the anonymous works in the dispute is entitled, in part, *A particular declaration or testimony, of the undutifull and traiterous affection borne against her Maiestie by Edmond Campion Iesuite*. To prove the Jesuits traitors, the author quotes from the examinations of Campion and twelve other apprehended Catholics and also from Sanders' *Visible Monarchy* and Bristow's *Motives*. Further, the author indicates that these prisoners were frequently asked, as a test question, whether or not they subscribed to the views set forth in these books. But both Sanders and Bristow had been carrying forward the main Catholic-Protestant dispute of the 1560's, and indeed Bristow's *Motives* contains many references to both the Jewel-Harding controversies, although it is not a direct answer to any work in them. Looking in the other direction, we find Archbishop George Abbot in 1594 and in 1604 replying to two Catholic works and charging that the author of the first took many arguments from Sanders and that the author of the latter used "much of the forme and manner, and almost all the matter" of Bristow's *Motives.* Abbot says that his opponents also used Bellarmine, Campion, Parsons, and
Stapleton, and so we have here a lineal descent of all the major Catholic controversialists of Elizabeth’s reign, with the exception of Cardinal William Allen.\textsuperscript{38}

Further ammunition for the fight was supplied, in 1582, by the rather grudging publication of the Rheims New Testament, the first Catholic-sponsored English translation. This version was even more plentifully supplied than other contemporary translations of the Scriptures with polemical notes and comments, and these at once provoked replies from Protestant spokesmen. At least six animadversions were soon issued upon it, written by Thomas Bilson, Edward Bulkeley, Thomas Cartwright, William Fulke, John Prime, and William Whitaker. Whitaker also included an attack on a work by Sanders, and this was answered in turn by William Rainolds, who mentioned Whitaker’s part in the Campion Ten Reasons Controversy and also Whitaker’s revival of Jewel’s Challenge. Cartwright’s work is of special interest, for it was suppressed during the author’s lifetime by Archbishop Whitgift and did not appear until 1618; it was feared that many of Cartwright’s anti-Catholic arguments might be applied with equal force to the Anglican Church.\textsuperscript{39}

Of equal importance, although they may be more briefly treated here, are the controversies connected with the efforts of a group representing many shades of opinion, loosely called Puritans, to effect further changes in the Elizabethan Establishment. The first important series of writings in this field was in the Vestiarian Controversy of the 1560’s, with many arguments pro and con as to the advisability of English clergymen wearing vestments which were considered by many to savor of the Church of Rome.

In the next decade, the dispute was broadened to include
Religious Disputation in Tudor England by many points of church polity and ceremonial, and here the most prominent antagonists were Thomas Cartwright and Bishop John Whitgift. Theirs was one of the great controversies of the century, an exchange of solid books and closely-reasoned argument. Later other authors took up the fight: William Travers and Dudley Fenner on the Puritan side, Richard Bancroft, Thomas Bilson, and John Bridges on the Anglican. In one sense this debate has no end for many years, for Cartwright’s arguments were still recalled by Puritan controversialists of the 17th century. In another sense it ends, at least temporarily, in the 1590’s, with crushing legislation against Puritan utterance and the publication of Richard Hooker’s *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Although a few people had the temerity to raise objections even to this great work, it was so reasonable and definitive a statement of the Anglican position that it seems, for a time at least, to have held the field.

A serio-comic off-shoot of the Puritan-Anglican controversy came in the remarkable Martin Marprelate tracts of 1589-1590. The redoubtable author of this series remains anonymous to this day, notwithstanding the earnest efforts of Elizabeth’s officers to apprehend his person and those of later scholars to find out his name. Martin’s style was breezy and familiar; he defended Cartwright (who was rather shocked at the tone the controversy had taken and disowned the alliance) and attacked Aylmer, Bridges, Whitgift, and many other Anglican dignitaries. But despite the contempt in which the authorities affected to hold this whimsical writer, they did not retire into chill silence. That was not the 16th century way, and many rejoinders, some serious, some far more scurrilous than Martin’s, were arrayed against him.
One or two additional points must be mentioned, whose importance is not measured by the brevity of their notice here.

The great touchstone of all arguments in the 16th century was the Bible. The Church Fathers were well known to all scholars and were frequently quoted, but no one could be convincing if he slighted the Scriptures.

Although this paper has been concerned mainly with religious controversy, it must be emphasized that in the 16th century a separation of the religious and the political is impossible. The Protestants always maintained that Mary Tudor was both an illegitimate and an illegal ruler, and the Catholics said the same about Elizabeth; the suppression of extremists became therefore a state matter. When the Puritan-Anglican controversies moved from matters of vestments and ceremonies to questions of church government, the authorities were obviously worried. They feared that individual interpretation of the Bible (where bishops in the Anglican sense were not to be found), the insistence on much preaching, and the ideas about the election of pastors by the congregations were leading straight to levelling and popularity, Elizabethan terms for dangerous democratic doctrines.

In the 16th century there was a confluence of factors, all promoting the Controversial Method of searching out the truth. Prominent among these factors, in addition to human nature itself, were the survival of the scholastic idea of education by disputation and the wide diffusion of printed matter and particularly the Bible in English, with the resulting stimulus to attacks by the reformers on what they called "men's traditions." In addition there was the tradi-
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tional belief in religious uniformity, unable yet to conceive of toleration, much less of religious liberty, confronted with the new and uncomfortable fact of diversity, both national and sectarian.

Implicit in the whole movement is the firm conviction that the truth must be sought out, and that it would appear if given a chance. This would account for such a fact as that, although Puritan Thomas Cartwright's books were rigidly prohibited in England, Anglican Bishop Whitgift reprinted them almost complete, each paragraph with his own refutation following. There were indeed more examples of debate than of persons converted by debate, and the outcome was usually predetermined, but the contestants were not hypocritical. They wished the truth to prevail, and each side knew that it possessed that truth. And there were always the people in the middle of the road, the moderates and those indifferent, to be won over.

One should not close without recalling the famous disputation between the brothers Rainolds, John the Catholic and William the Protestant. The story is thus concluded by Thomas Fuller: "Providence so ordered it that, by their mutual disputation, John Reynolds turned an eminent Protestant, and William an inveterate Papist, in which persuasion he died."

HARDIN CRAIG, JR.
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33. The titles of these works, most of which were in Latin, have here been translated and somewhat abbreviated.
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