

English Reformations

David Aers

Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Nigel Smith

Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Discussing current historiography of the English Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and those movements regarded as its medieval precursors, we decided that a special issue of *JMEMS* could contribute fruitfully to this subject. As its statement of purpose proclaims, *JMEMS* aims to foster “the rigorous investigation of past cultural forms and their historiographical representations, representations whose political dimensions will be of special interest.” It has also sought to overcome distortions of our understanding of the past produced by the patterns of periodization on which our disciplines are made.¹ A special issue on “English Reformations,” we thought, is well suited to these paradigms of inquiry. We are grateful to our contributors for bringing this thought to fulfillment.

We have used the plural noun in our title for a number of reasons. It gestures toward the continuity of the ideologies of reform across the Middle Ages and the early modern period. The commitment to reform the Church and its people was a constituent component of the late medieval church and, increasingly so, of its lay elites.² This commitment could take many different and contradictory forms. Reform could be initiated by leading ecclesiastic authorities (for example, the Gregorian reforms of the late eleventh century, those of the Fourth Lateran Council or, more locally, those of Archbishop Peckham in 1281); sometimes it could be initiated outside this hierarchy but appreciated and ordered by the hierarchy (for example, St. Francis’s movement); sometimes it emerged among clergy and people in ways that led to mortal combat with the authorities of the Roman Church, a combat in which reformers might be classified and persecuted as heretics by the Church and secular authorities (for example, Waldensians or Wycliffites). But however different and conflicting such forms might have been, it is important to recognize that they were sponsored by dynamics of reform intrinsic to medieval Christianity. Who declared, “The Christian faith . . . was once a schism”?³

Our use of the plural noun *Reformations* thus points to a chronological scope that includes both medieval reformations and early modern reformations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁴ We also hope it will work against a tendency of grand narratives to homogenize the religious and political processes transforming English culture in both “the English Reformation” and the Middle Ages: “the synthesis” which broke down, or the plenitudinous altar before it was stripped, or “that sacred world” of “sacramentalism” succeeded by the “secularism” of “modernity.”⁵

The current historiographical situation for writing about the early-sixteenth-century English Reformation has been shaped by the triumph of what is often called “revisionism.” This triumph can be observed in a shift from a field whose chief authority was A. G. Dickens’s *The English Reformation* to one remade by historians such as John Scarisbrick, Christopher Haigh, and Eamon Duffy.⁶ Norman Jones opens his own recent study, *The English Reformation*, with a parodic reflection of a “revisionist” model followed by a Dickensian one:

Once upon a time the people of England were happy Medieval Catholics, visiting their holy wells, attending frequent masses and deeply respectful of purgatory and afraid of Hell. Then lustful King Henry forced them to abandon their religion. England was never merry again. Alternatively, once upon a time the people of England were oppressed by corrupt churchmen. They yearned for the liberty of the Gospel. Then, Good King Harry gave them the Protestant nation for which they longed.⁷

Jones himself builds on the work of revisionists, and in this he is representative of current historiography:

There is broad agreement that, although there were some English people excited about Protestantism in Henry VIII’s reign, there was not much popular support for change. The society portrayed by Eamon Duffy and John Scarisbrick was contentedly, habitually Catholic. The attempts of the reformers to change this seemed, in Christopher Haigh’s analysis, to make very slow inroads into that world of habitual Catholicism.⁸

Yet by 1580 “very few people had clear memories of a time without religious confusion,” and by the late sixteenth century “England was living in a post-Reformation culture that was distinctly different from that of 1530.”⁹ The

revisionist perspective is foundational here: “a nation of habitual Catholics” lived through “the Reformation” and were “turned into Protestants” by people “who imposed Reformation upon them” without consulting them about “their theological opinions.”¹⁰

The consensus here necessarily involves a story about the late medieval church, as Jones’s parodic fables imply. So we will recall its representation in the first part of Eamon Duffy’s book, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*.¹¹ This great work, central to revisionist historiography of the English Reformation, is the most learned, detailed, and eloquent account we have of the religion of orthodox lay parishioners up to the attack on traditional religion initiated by Henry VIII. Duffy provides a beautifully particularized description of the liturgy, of devotion, of the seven sacraments, of parish guilds, of purgatory, and of the people’s substantial material investment in their churches. So, against the Dickensian model, the medieval church is the people’s Church, not an alien and terrifying incrustation on their lives. It is this flourishing Church that was attacked by a tiny coterie of Protestants around Henry VIII and Edward VI using terror and the state apparatus to impose their iconoclastic reformation and its expropriations of immense ecclesial wealth.

Before turning to the revisionary model of the English Reformation, we would like to offer a few words of caution about its version of the ecclesiastic polity and secular power in the Middle Ages. The revisionist model too easily assumes that the medieval church and its polity was free from centralizing powers until the unprecedented attack by Henry VIII. Such beliefs are not confined to historians, and they are present in the recent volume of the *Oxford English Literary History* for the years 1350 to 1547, James Simpson’s magisterial *Reform and Cultural Revolution*.¹² As the author declares:

Despite its size [661 pages], this book has a very simple, central, and consistent theme: that the institutional simplifications and centralizations of the sixteenth century provoked correlative simplifications and narrowings in literature. If literary history and criticism is, as I believe it should be, ancillary to the complex history of freedoms, then this is a narrative of diminishing liberties.

The fundamental observation that drives the argument of each chapter is as follows: in the first half of the sixteenth century, a culture that simplified and centralized jurisdiction aggressively displaced a culture of jurisdictional heterogeneity. (1)

And again:

The political imagination of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries negotiates the needs of both the body and the head of the whole body politic, whereas the sixteenth-century models generate their politics wholly from the top down, in repression of the larger body. (191)

We do not dissent from the view that there are indeed aspirations in Tudor and Stuart regimes to strengthen royal power at the expense of competing powers (whether ecclesial or lay). But we are less persuaded by claims that such aspirations are unquestionably and distinctively postmedieval, a kind of secular version of creation *ex nihilo*. We are unconvinced because any adequate grand narrative must acknowledge that the centralization of power is an integral process in the medieval church and in the formation of the state in late medieval England. It is a marker of *continuity* between the English Middle Ages and those English reformations initiated by the crown in the sixteenth century, reformations in which that medieval institution known as Parliament was a crucial agent. We do well to remember the classic study of English state formation by Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch*. Its first chapter shows how “England’s precocious centralization around a comparatively strong crown limited the ‘parcelization of sovereignty’ typical of feudal polities” as did the “nationally unified system of law.”¹³ The “centralized system” that was emerging in the Middle Ages depended on “local opinion and involvement” (35), a fact that was certainly to remain true in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (35, 38–42). When the authors treat Henry’s “revolution of the 1530s,” they note how the “revolution” was “enacted by statute”: Parliament was “*the* central instrument of Thomas Cromwell’s revolution” (51; original emphasis). So the monarchy that emerged from Henry’s revolution, even in its ecclesial supremacy, “was constitutional rather than in any sense absolutist.” It was a revolution that actually strengthened “the prestige, authority and centrality of Parliament” and of the common law (49–53) while massively diminishing the power of the church in relation to crown and lay elites. Assertions that Henry VIII’s policies were “absolutist” tend to ignore these facts.

But even in light of this massive diminishment of ecclesial power, we do well to remember what G. W. Bernard emphasizes in his recent study of Henry VIII’s reformation: the king inherited a situation in which the church in England was not only part of the Roman Church but “very much

a monarchical church, closely linked to the crown.” As he observes, “Bishops had for centuries been the King’s men,” part of the royal service and committed to the king’s causes.¹⁴ It is no wonder that only Bishop Fisher out of all Henry’s bishops resisted his usurpation of supremacy in the Church of England.¹⁵ It is salutary to recollect “traditional religion” in its episcopal inflection toward the lay sovereign: in 1483 Bishop Russell of Lincoln proclaimed that the sovereign is “as our God” on earth, displaying one of the medieval traditions within which the English people and their ecclesial leaders would receive Henry’s reformation.¹⁶ Late medieval kings presented their powers as sacred and readily appropriated Christological liturgical action to celebrate themselves and their power, celebration blessed by their church. Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.¹⁷ Nor should we forget the long medieval history of intimate collaboration between church and crown in producing legislation against Lollards, in criminalizing Lollardy, and in the use of royal officials (from judges to sheriffs, mayors, and bailiffs) to search out and destroy Lollards.¹⁸

We get a good sense of the relevant medieval assumptions from a sermon in which the priest, joining Luke 11:21 and 2 Maccabees 11:8, develops an allegory representing Henry V as a knight sent by God from heaven to save the church and realm. God’s special grace to Henry has been manifest in the victory over the French at Agincourt and in the king’s killing of Lollards, his sharp sentence “by which they are given to fire and death.” Henry V is “a new Joshua who has lifted the shield of faith through the death of the Lollards, ‘and especially their captain [Oldcastle] who was recently burned.’” In another sermon, the preacher figures church and English nation as “our ship” which has been saved by King Henry V.¹⁹ And here the preacher reflected Henry’s own views. As Gerald Harriss writes in his invaluable study of England between 1360 and 1461, Henry V’s version of sacred kingship went beyond Richard II’s in seeing it not only as “private and personal but also public and political”; “God’s purpose was for the English nation, and this concept of a holy nation, God’s chosen people, was to be progressively developed by royal propagandists.” As Harriss observes, Henry saw himself, defeating French abroad and heretics at home, as “fulfilling his own and his people’s destiny, as the instruments of God’s justice.”²⁰ The church was to empower the crown through its prayer, propaganda, and wealth, while Henry destroyed “heresy” and defended the true faith with sword and fire. He was indeed “a new Constantine” and welcomed as such by the church’s elite.²¹ It would be very odd to deny crucial continuities of

ideology, structures of power, and orthodox theology between this medieval context and a later medieval context, that of Henry VIII, another new Constantine.

This perspective gives support to the suspicion that the use of the term *revolution* in recent work may be misleading in its generality, and perhaps unhelpfully anachronistic.²² It is certainly significant that the *OED* (n. 8a) attributes to More in 1521 the earliest date for the definition of *revolution* “overthrow of an established government by those previously subjected to it; forcible substitution of a new form of government”; but this is notably dissociated from later similar definitions, and More was talking about the activities of a Scottish archbishop—the Henrican situation hardly fits this paradigm. *Revolution* only began to gain its modern meaning of abrupt political transformation during the Civil War and Interregnum era.²³ The Reformation was an ecclesiological and political reformation, one in a line of many, each focused on the central configuration of the relationship of the English crown and its Parliament to the English church, its bishops, and its component institutions. It was also a theological reformation, one made by late medieval Catholic theologians.

Here it is worth recalling John Calvin’s comments on Henry VIII, if only to offer some checks to recent claims that the Reformation and its theologians were totally committed to absolutist forms of centralized power.²⁴ Commenting on the prophet Amos, Calvin laments that in his own day many governments centralize power on kings in order to prevent religious disputes. Here he recalls the English Reformation led by King Henry VIII: “They who at first extolled Henry, King of England, were certainly inconsiderate men; they gave him the supreme power in all things: and this always vexed me grievously; for they were guilty of blasphemy . . . when they called him the chief Head of the Church under Christ.” Calvin also attacks the bishop of Winchester for maintaining that it was in the power of the king to abrogate statutes and institute new rites, including his prohibition of priests marrying and the laity from receiving communion in both kinds. Calvin tells his readers why he finds all this unacceptable: “Because supreme power is vested in the king.” He finds such centralization of power utterly incompatible with scripture. He insists that even though sovereigns may become patrons and nursers (“nutricios”) of the Church, “they are inconsiderate men, who give them too much power in spiritual things, . . . and this evil is everywhere dominant in Germany; and in these regions it prevails too much.” Kings, he stresses, must not be above the Church’s discipline; “To affirm that they *are* may flatter them but it is the flattery of the devil’s song.”²⁵ This, of

course, was one of the components of Presbyterianism that enraged Queen Elizabeth and her successors and relates to Peter Lake's illuminating essay in this volume. We should be very careful that in our derision for Whiggish narratives of the reformations and their versions of Christian liberty we do not misrepresent the politics of the theologians at the heart of these reformations. There is no doubt that many forms of republicanism, including constitutional republicanism, emerged within Calvinist ecclesiologies and theology or vice versa, as Lake's article shows.²⁶ We look with some skepticism at the claim that Italianate, republican-informed discourse became unpublishable in the mid-sixteenth century.²⁷ This claim may encourage us to ignore scribal publication, or indeed the interest of English and Scottish Protestants and Catholics (whether in or out of exile) in republican writing. Nor is there any reason to forget that the reformations included strands of political theology and ecclesiology that challenged the magisterial reformation throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Anabaptists, Mennonites, Brownists, Baptists—and on to John Milton. Further evidence of the continuity of thought with regard to the significance of the individual's relationship with God, outside of the church's mediation, and between Lollards, mystics, and Tyndale, will be found in Tom Betteridge's article. Furthermore, as Jim Knowles reminds us in his essay, that sense of self in Luther is not one of ego (as Luther's enemies were wont to claim) but, as he saw it, of complete self-abnegation, an area in which he agrees with Langland.

Lastly, we do not want to overlook a Christian reformation in late medieval England that was articulated and lived by people who did not belong to ecclesial or lay elites: fifteenth-century Wycliffites or Lollards.²⁸ They are important both in their vision of Christian discipleship, practiced under the continuing threat of persecution, and in the way they represent the potential of medieval Christianity to generate a reformation fiercely opposed to the ecclesiology and material power of the Roman Church. Here is a Christian movement centered on house churches and small schools, self-consciously pre-Constantinian. Neither orthodox Catholics nor post-Lutheran evangelists, they tend to elicit condescension and scorn from revisionist historians such as Duffy and Richard Rex.²⁹ To use a later ecclesial language, what we find among the Lollards of Loddon or Earsham in the diocese of Norwich is a form of congregationalism.³⁰ Hawisia Moone, confessing to the ecclesiastical judges in her heresy trial, states that she has "ofte tymes kept, holde and continued scoles of heresie yn priue chambres and priue places of oures [hers and her husband's and her daughter's], yn the wyche scoles Y haue herd, conceyved, lerned and reported the errours and heresies" (140). According to

her fellow Wycliffite, Margery Baxter from Martham, Hawisia is the wisest teacher of Christian doctrine (141). What did she teach? A thoroughgoing rejection of the Church's version of the sacraments with the conviction that "the pope of Roome is fadir Antecrist" because true priesthood is compatible only with discipleship manifested in a holy life. Such holiness forbids the invention of "newe lawes and newe ordinances to curse and kille cruelly" (140). Indeed, Christian discipleship means "that it is not leful to slee a man for ony cause, ne be processe to dampne ony traytour or ony man for ony trason or felonie to deth" (140). Such Christian nonviolence would emerge within the sixteenth and seventeenth century, but not, of course, as part of the magisterial Reformation. Hawisia insists that the only image of God that can be revered without idolatry is the human being (140–42; see Margery similarly, 44).³¹ Eamon Duffy dismisses Lollards as stupid, boring, and of no historical significance.³² But many of the artisans and laborers whose views are abjured in the bishop of Norwich's book make such dismissal seem bizarre. Yet such reformation from below would be as unwelcome to the reformed Church of England as to its Catholic predecessor. As Norman Jones observes in his discussion of the proposed new ecclesiastical law of 1551–52, there was "continuity between the evangelical attitude toward heretics and the Roman Catholic tradition." Under the proposed Edwardian canons obstinate heretics, including Anabaptists, would have been handed over to the civil magistrates for punishment.³³

Heresy is a phenomenon that bridges pre- and post-Reformation Europe in an essential way in terms of how it was defined and treated. The last person to be burned under the heresy statute for denying the Holy Trinity was Edward Wightman in 1612, and the last to be executed for blasphemy was Thomas Aikenhead in 1697.³⁴ Undoubtedly, the need for ecclesial and political control of belief preoccupied the ruling elites of church and state until the end of the early modern period. But many of the views identified as heretical in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have no roots in Reformation "fundamentalism," as James Simpson would have it, or in the syntheses of belief promulgated by the various Reformation churches. There are significant figures who finally resisted the reformers but who were influential critics in their time and were often the sources for later heresy. There is no more important a figure than Erasmus in the formation of attitudes of rational critique toward scriptural originals. The entire anti-Trinitarian movement of the seventeenth century may be seen as derived in large part from the Erasmian approach to scriptural critique.³⁵ Two other intellectual traditions closely associated with Erasmus, Renaissance "foolish wit" and its

more generically precise associate, utopianism, had a huge impact on critical thinking thereafter, thinking that was often socially transformative and frequently heterodox. Folly and utopianism empowered the Levellers through the pen of William Walwyn, the Diggers through that of Gerrard Winstanley, and the Ranters through that of Abiezer Coppe, all three deeply indebted to the “Lucianic tradition” channeled by Erasmus and Thomas More.³⁶ We might go further and say that this aspect of European thought is rooted in a long line of scholarly discovery that extends back to the twelfth-century Italian “Renaissance.” The retrieval of lost ancient texts made possible the revival or development of ancient philosophical traditions like Epicurianism and the elaboration of medieval critiques of tyranny. What followed was the transformation of that scholarship into modern, secular philosophy, for instance, materialistic atheism, resistance theory, or republicanism. Free-thinking was transmitted within the ambit of reformed publishing and was often inherently religious in character.³⁷ As Nicholas McDowell shows in this volume, there’s no doubt that the retrieval of Lucretius’s *De rerum natura* in 1417, and its subsequent dispersal and translation, amplified the way in which mortalist doctrines might be apprehended, not merely by alleged atheists but by many more who remained firm Christians.

Within the parameters of heresy, there is, moreover, considerable evidence to show the crossover between learned culture and the worlds of unlearned sectarian activity; Milton would be one late example, but the dramatist and spy, Christopher Marlowe, and the General Baptist, actor, printer, and Leveller, Richard Overton, were others. At the same time, in the seventeenth century, some of the most heterodox thinkers often were also among the firmest believers in authority: Thomas Hobbes, Margaret Cavendish, and Joseph Glanvill, for example. Much of the learned world of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries considered itself beyond confessional division and tried to ignore it: Catholics like Marin Mersenne, René Descartes, Pierre Gassendi, and Athanasius Kircher corresponded with Protestants like Hobbes and Quirin Kuhlmann. Rabelais and Erasmus had many admirers in many different places across western Christendom’s divisions. By the later seventeenth century, and not unlike Milton, Sir Isaac Newton was convinced of the need for a national church with a strong, nonheretical public identity, but he supported an exploratory conviction for private individuals that was inherently heretical. Unfortunately, some recent views, grounded in an admirable desire to reach out of the Middle Ages to later periods, have shown no desire to foreground this history of learning that was so socially and intellectually transformative.³⁸ The history of learning, the history of

humanism, is another story that bridges medieval and postmedieval worlds, and it should not be forgotten.³⁹

Neither is literary form an empty shell for the transmission of ideas or mentalities. Katie Little addresses the continuation of the *Piers Plowman* tradition by sixteenth-century reformed authors, in which labor continues in this genre to signify “works,” quite against Reformation logic. For Protestant theology in England did not entirely disrupt or easily replace the way work and works resonated in the medieval symbolic imagination. The post-Reformation popularity of *Piers Plowman* is evidence not so much of its standing as a proto-Protestant poem but of its ability, especially in the matter of the meaning of rural labor, to voice an aspect of “tradition” that remained a vital issue on account of its very relationship with the new theology. The texts of medieval mysticism, often attached to reform movements within the medieval church, that survived through the Reformation and into the eighteenth century to empower German pietism and its English spiritualist counterpart, together with their complementary early modern Roman Catholic pieties, are concerned with the role of mystical language and devotional practice in enabling believers to reach *unio mystica*. Such language held enormous potential for personal bodily or contemplative experience to be regarded as aspects of divinity.⁴⁰ Luther’s ambivalence toward mysticism (one issue on which he finally split from the Anabaptists) is a measure of the tension in him between heretic and magisterial reformer. No article in this volume is concerned with such materials, but it is germane to the topic of “reformations” and connects with significant new work in this field.⁴¹ Some later mysticism shares vocabulary with the alchemists and Paracelsans. Freed from the cloister, relocated mystical language produced new kinds of discourse about human subjectivity, explaining the presence of God in the natural world and the human body. The result appealed across many parts of the social spectrum, from the royal and aristocratic elites to the artisanal professors of sectarian heresy. Yet as these new discourses were emerging, long-standing traditions in mysticism and alchemy continued to develop.

One could go on. The survival of fourteenth-century prosody into the sixteenth century suggests another pattern of continuity and successive transformation, like the others we have been indicating. It is our view that we cannot adopt or revert to a “good Middle Ages, bad Renaissance” any more than we can sustain its opposite. To do so would, at the very least, be at odds with the broadest gathering of available evidence. The reformers of the later Middle Ages and the early modern period were a very subtle group

of thinkers, and there is a vast array of viewpoints, arguments, and interpretations to be considered together. But there is very much to be gained from persistent attention to the continuities that may be observed between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, on the one hand, and the sixteenth and seventeenth on the other. This does not mean that we should be denying historical change. It does, however, mean, we submit, that we have in this approach a more historically accurate and sensitive basis for understanding that change.



Notes

- 1 The *JMEMS* statement of purpose is published inside the front cover of each issue.
- 2 On this idea of Reformation, see Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), part 1 together with the epilogue, 773–76. We do not think Taylor’s “Reform Master Narrative” is illuminated by his assimilation of a Weberian narrative of “disenchantment.” Not surprisingly in a book of such immense range, there is a lack of specification and detail. For the period relevant to this special issue, see especially the materials and analysis in Majorie K. McIntosh, *Controlling Misbehavior in England, 1370–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Frank Rexroth, *Deviance and Power in Late Medieval London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- 3 John Milton, *Areopagitica*, in the *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, vol. 2 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1959), 529.
- 4 *JMEMS* published a special issue along such lines once before but with the focus rather more on medieval matters; see “From Medieval Christianities to the Reformations,” ed. David Aers, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27.2 (1997).
- 5 The sentence alludes to language in the following recent works: Louis Dupré, *Passage to Modernity: An Essay in the Hermeneutics of Nature and Culture* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1993), 174–89; Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (1992), 2nd ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005); and Regina M. Schwartz, *Sacramental Poetics at the Dawn of Secularism: When God Left the World* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2008), chap. 1, esp. 8–17; and chap. 2, esp. 18–19. We should note that Christopher Haigh used the plural noun, albeit with different purposes, in *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993). Duffy expresses one of the differences nicely in his comment that Haigh’s reformations are all imposed by the crown yet did not change much in people’s lives and worship (*Stripping of the Altars*, xxxiii).
- 6 For Duffy’s account of Dickens, see *Stripping of the Altars*, xvi–xvii, 524–25.
- 7 Norman Jones, *The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 1.

- 8 Ibid., 2.
- 9 Ibid., 3. This view now seems consensual.
- 10 Ibid., 2.
- 11 See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, “On the Structures of Traditional Religion,” as part 1 is called (chaps. 1–10).
- 12 James Simpson, *The Oxford English Literary History, Volume 2, 1350–1547: Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); references are given in the text. See the special issue dedicated to discussion of this volume, edited by David Aers and Sarah Beckwith, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 35.1 (2005).
- 13 See Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985); further citations are given in the text. Also relevant to this topic is James Campbell, *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London: Hambleton, 2000).
- 14 G. W. Bernard, *The King’s Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007), 43 and 172–73; see, too, Gerald Harriss, *Shaping the Nation: England, 1360–1461* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), esp. chaps. 3 and 15.
- 15 Contrast the clarity and courage of the bishops in the Marian Counter-Reformation Church; see Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009), 194–97. Of course, one could cite Becket as a lonely forerunner of these Marian bishops.
- 16 See S. B. Chrimes, *English Constitutional Ideas of the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 173; and see 168–78.
- 17 See especially examples in Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). A classic text is provided by the Carmelite Richard Maidstone, sacralizing Richard II and his entry to a “reconciled” London after the conflict of 1392; see *Concordia: The Reconciliation of Richard II with London*, trans. A. G. Rigg and ed. David R. Carlson, TEAMS Middle English Texts Series (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 2003).
- 18 See David Aers, “Altars of Power,” *Literature and History* 3 (1994): 90–105, at 95–97; with Duffy’s reply, *Stripping of the Altars*, xxi–xxii. Relevant here is Paul Strohm, *England’s Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399–1422* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998); and Ian Forrester, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
- 19 Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 371–72, 375.
- 20 Harriss, *Shaping the Nation*, 589.
- 21 Ibid., 590. See, too, Jeremy Catto, “Religious Change under Henry V,” in *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship*, ed. G. L. Harriss (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 97–115. Catto argues that Henry V “had begun to act as supreme governor of the Church of England” (115).
- 22 This term plays a central role in Simpson’s *Reform and Cultural Revolution*.
- 23 Ilan Rachum, “The Meaning of ‘Revolution’ in the English Revolution,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 195–215.

- 24 Here we refer not only to James Simpson's *Reform and Cultural Revolution* but also to his later book, *Burning to Read: English Fundamentalism and Its Reformation Opponents* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007); see, too, Greg Walker, *Writing under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 416–17.
- 25 Calvin's *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*, trans. John Owen, 5 vols. (Edinburgh, 1846–49), 2:349–51.
- 26 Still extremely useful on Calvinist politics is Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), vol. 2, pt. 3, "Calvinism and the Theory of Revolution."
- 27 This claim is Simpson's in *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 243. See Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- 28 For the lay Wycliffism we have in mind here, see the following: Walter Brut, discussed, with references to text and critical literature, by David Aers, *Sanctifying Signs* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), 67–82; Norman Tanner, ed., *Heresy Trials in the Diocese of Norwich, 1428–1431* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977); Norman Tanner, ed., *Kent Heresy Proceedings, 1511–12* (Maidstone: Kent Archaeological Society, 1997); and Pamela Gradon and Anne Hudson, eds., *English Wycliffite Sermons*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990–96).
- 29 See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, xx–xxxii; and Richard Rex, *The Lollards* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
- 30 For the Lollards of Loddon and Earsham, see Tanner, *Heresy Trials in the Diocese of Norwich*. References to Hawisia Moone and Margery Baxter are given in the text.
- 31 See for comparison, e.g., Milton, *Paradise Lost* IV.292, 472, 567.
- 32 Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, xxii–xxv, xxvii–viii. This is close to Richard Rex's disdain of Lollardy.
- 33 Jones, *English Reformation*, 102.
- 34 Ian Atherton and David Como, "The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy, and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England," *English Historical Review* n.s. 120 (2005): 1215–50; Michael Hunter, "'Aikenhead the Atheist': The Context and Consequences of Articulate Irreligion in the Late Seventeenth Century," in Michael Hunter and David Wootton, eds., *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 221–54.
- 35 See now Peter G. Bietenholz, *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus: Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).
- 36 See M. A. Screech, *Ecstasy and "The Praise of Folly"* (London: Duckworth, 1980); Nicholas McDowell, *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003).
- 37 Martin Mulsow, *Moderne aus dem Untergrund: Radikale Frühaufklärung in Deutschland, 1680–1720* (Hamburg: F. Meiner, 2002); Michael Allen Gillespie, *The Theological Origins of Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).
- 38 See, for example, Simpson, *Burning to Read*, 17–19. Simpson's seventeenth century is directly connected to "Luther's first public challenge to Papal religion" (17).
- 39 For an exemplary recent investigation, see Feisal G. Mohamed, *In the Anteroom of*

Divinity: The Reformation of the Angels from Colet to Milton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).

- 40 Leszek Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église: La conscience religieuse et le lien confessionnel au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969); Burkhard Dohm, *Poetische Alchimie: Öffnung zur Sinnlichkeit in der Hohelied- und Bibeldichtung von der protestantischen Barockmystik bis zum Pietismus* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2000).
- 41 Steven E. Ozment, *Mysticism and Dissent: Religious Ideology and Social Protest in the Sixteenth Century* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973); Niklaus Largier, "Mysticism, Modernity, and the Invention of Aesthetic Experience," *Representations* 105 (2009): 37–60.