

TWO SIXTEENTH-CENTURY NORTHERN PROTESTANTS: JOHN BRADFORD AND WILLIAM TURNER

by CELIA HUGHES, B.A., B.D., Ph.D.

LECTURER IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

John Bradford (c. 1510-55) was a Manchester man and William Turner (c. 1510-68) was born at Morpeth in Northumberland. Both were educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, though at different periods, and spent the greater part of their lives as laymen. Eventually both were ordained by Ridley when he was Bishop of London in the reign of Edward VI. They shared a common zeal for the Protestant cause, which they expressed by preaching, writing and translating. Both were involved in controversy with a group of Freewillers, who were regarded as heretics by Catholic and Protestant alike. Their careers differ in that Turner's interest in theology began in the 1530s and continued alongside his scientific studies until he died, still protesting the need for reform, in the reign of Elizabeth. Bradford moved between extremes, beginning as a young man seeking his fortune in high places, and ending, as befitted a disciple of Ridley, at the stake.

JOHN BRADFORD

"In Manchester was I born", said John Bradford, and there is a strong local tradition that this event took place in Blackley. His mother was living there at the time of his imprisonment, and he had connections with two local families, the Oldhams and the Beswicks, who had residences there. However, a suggestion that he was born literally within the township of Manchester is to be found in Croston's account of *Old Manchester and its Worthies*,¹ based on the evidence of a deed of conveyance referring to a house in Old Millgate standing "between the tenement of John Bradford and Richard Platt". As the deed is dated 1489, the tenement

¹ *Memorials of Manchester Streets*, R. W. Procter (Manchester, 1874), App. *Old Manchester and its Worthies*, J. Croston.

must have belonged to the father of the reformer, if one accepts the identification. The attraction of this suggestion is that Old Millgate was undoubtedly in Manchester itself, whereas Blackley was then merely a chapelry situated several miles away from the township. On the other hand, there is no doubt of Bradford's close connection with the Oldhams and Beswicks. His sister later married Hugh Oldham's nephew, and both families were prominent in religious and social activities in the sixteenth century, as might be expected of Bradford's friends. Hugh Oldham, Bishop of Exeter, died in 1519, having founded Manchester Grammar School. Under the terms of his Will were various benefactions which were administered by, among others, members of the Beswick family. John Bradford himself was a pupil at the school. Foxe records that he was tall, slender, spare of body, of a somewhat sanguine complexion, and had an auburn beard.² Apart from this and his portrait in Chetham's Library, Manchester, there is little to be known about his early life and personal qualities as a young man.

He entered the service of Sir John Harington of Exton in Rutland, who had command of a section of Henry VIII's army during the French campaign of 1544. When hostilities ended he returned with Harington to London and entered the Inner Temple as a law student in 1547. This was the year of King Henry's death, which brought to a close the period begun in 1540 when the so-called Catholic Reaction took place. After the previous decade, when Henry had allowed the publication of the English Bible and other measures favourable to the Protestant cause, there came the Act of Six Articles, the fall of Cromwell, and the domination of the political and religious scene by Bishop Gardiner and the Duke of Norfolk. A number of prominent figures known for Protestant sympathies, such as Coverdale, fled abroad. Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, resigned rather than accept the Act of Six Articles and his career passed through a period of obscurity—it is known that he was imprisoned in 1546 and released only after Henry's death. In Edward's reign he and Bradford became close friends, and the younger man owed much to Latimer's influence.

² *Acts and Monuments*, ed. 1843-9, vii. 145. Useful references in Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III.i, paras. 142-5, 224, 230. The Parker Society edition of Bradford's works has a biographical note (Vol. I, *Sermons and Meditations* (1848); II, *Letters and Treatises* (1853)). Foxe's account provided the basis for several nineteenth-century biographies of Bradford.

Another friend to be, Nicholas Ridley, was less prominent than Latimer at this stage and was allowed to remain at Cambridge, as Master of Pembroke Hall; but he, too, rejoiced at the change when a new reign began in 1547.

In the autumn of that year Latimer, now released from prison, embarked on his series of remarkable sermons at Court and in London churches. They were notable not so much for their Reformed theology, although this is implicit, as for their social criticism. Neither public morality nor private sin escaped castigation. The nobility and civic leaders were particularly singled out for their indifference to poverty and the failure of the country's economy. Inflation was even more serious then than today. The system of enclosures had impoverished many who had once owned a small-holding. The futile war against France had emptied the treasury. Those responsible for government were hopelessly corrupt, and the clergy were little better. Latimer compared the burgesses of London to butterflies—in fact they were worse than butterflies, which did not cheat, covet, or glory in their own deeds. As for the clergy, instead of preaching the gospel, they indulged in lordly living, dancing in their dominions, munching in their mangers, and moiling in their gay manors and mansions.³ Not surprisingly the law students went to listen to the sermons, which were creating a considerable stir among fashionable citizens as well as humbler folk; and if John Bradford went to scoff he stayed to pray, because his guilty conscience was aroused. Latimer preached on the need for honesty, and urged those who had defrauded their neighbours to make restitution. Bradford felt that the words applied to him particularly, because, as Harington's paymaster during the French campaign, he knew of, and probably connived at, a scheme whereby public funds were diverted into Harington's private purse. A common enough practice, no doubt, but one which now filled Bradford with a sense of guilt. He began to importune Harington to repay the money, and persisted for many months until finally restitution was made. During those months he must have made himself known to Latimer, and became his disciple.

Another influence on Bradford during his period at the Inner Temple was exerted by Thomas Sampson, a fellow-student, later to be Dean of Chichester, who perhaps persuaded him to listen to

³ Latimer, *Sermons* (Parker Society), pp. 64, 67.

Latimer. Bradford began to have doubts about his future career as a lawyer, and, Sampson reported, sold his chains, rings, brooches and jewels of gold, and left London for Cambridge to study divinity. Here he entered Pembroke Hall and earned the regard of its Master, Ridley, who obtained for him a fellowship of the college at the end of 1549. As a tutor Bradford had among his pupils a future Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift. In his Cambridge days also he became a friend of Martin Bucer, who had fled from Strasbourg and passed the rest of his days in the University. Bucer's influence on the English Reformation was considerable, and the friendship must have augmented Bradford's own determination. He and Bucer visited Oxford together, and Bradford began to translate Bucer's works, notably a commentary on chapter 8 of St. Paul's Letter to the Romans under the title *The Restoration of all Things*. Bucer called him "God's prophet and true preacher". When he died in February 1551 Bradford was present and became his executor. Later he wrote of Bucer as "my father in the Lord".⁴

In August 1550 Bradford was ordained deacon by Ridley, who had become Bishop of London after the deprivation of Bonner, and a year later he was made a prebend of St. Paul's. He never took priest's orders, and in his prison examinations referred to himself as *laicus* or minister. The custom of remaining a deacon was not uncommon. Two other remarkable men became prebends at the same time, and all were said by Ridley to be "able, both with life and learning, to set forth God's word in London". One was Edmund Grindal, who became a Marian exile and was Elizabeth's first Bishop of London, later going to York and Canterbury. The other, John Rogers, shared the fate of Bradford in Mary's reign. The last distinction to be achieved by Bradford in these years was that of being appointed a royal chaplain, with the duty of preaching in various parts of England, including "Manchester, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bolton, Bury, Wigan, Middleton, Radcliffe, Liverpool, Mottram, Stopport, Wimsley, Eccles, Prestwich". Elton has commented that "Even conservative Lancashire saw some of its younger scholars embrace Protestantism; though none of them returned to livings in that poverty-stricken part of the church, several—including the zealous John Bradford—came

⁴ i. 355.

back to preach".⁵ In his *Farewell to Lancashire and Cheshire* Bradford recalls that he was in Manchester at the end of 1552, preaching about Noah's Flood, and that on St. Stephen's Day he took the theme of repentance from the gospel for the day, Matthew 23. Tradition at Blackley maintains that he preached there also, and knelt to pray that there would always be true ministers of the gospel there.⁶ John Knox admired his preaching, and Foxe wrote, "Sharply he opened and reprov'd sin; sweetly he preached Christ crucified; pithily he impugned heresies and errors; earnestly he persuaded to a godly life". He is sometimes called the Apostle of Lancashire, but this title is more appropriate for George Marsh, his contemporary, a native of Deane, educated at Cambridge, ordained by Ridley and burnt in 1555. Much of Bradford's time was spent in Kent and Essex as well as in London, where he preached before Edward VI, and it is conjectured that Ridley thought of him as a future bishop.

The death of the young king put an end to any such plan, and in August 1553, a month after Mary's accession, Bradford's life entered its final phase. Bishop Bonner was re-instated in London and Ridley was under arrest. Bourne, Bonner's chaplain, also Archdeacon of London, and later Bishop of Bath and Wells, preached at Cheapside denouncing the reforms of Edward's reign, and offered prayers for the dead. A commotion broke out among the audience, and Bourne was in danger of being dragged from the pulpit. Bradford was in attendance, and in an effort to quell the disturbance entered the pulpit beside Bourne. A dagger was hurled in their direction and almost hit one of them. Eventually they got away, and later the same day Bradford preached in Bow church a sermon condemning violence and calling for resigned acceptance of the new régime, which he interpreted as God's punishment for a rebellious nation. However, Bonner, Bourne and others hostile to the Protestant cause made Bradford the scapegoat for the morning's events. He was arrested, charged with sedition, and sent to the Tower, where for a time he shared a cell with Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. Thus even in prison his religious ideas developed and received new impetus. Latimer recalled how "Mr. Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Ridley, bishop of London, that holy man, Mr. Bradford, and I, old Hugh Latimer,

⁵ *Reform and Reformation* (Arnold, 1977), p. 370.

⁶ i. 453.

were imprisoned in the Tower of London for Christ's gospel preaching, and for because we would not go a-massing, everyone in close prison from other; the same tower being so full of other prisoners, that we four were thrust into one chamber, as men not to be accounted of (but, God be praised, to our great joy and comfort), there we did together read over the New Testament with great deliberation and painful study...".⁷

During his imprisonment Bradford was engaged in disputations with several persons who tried to persuade him to profess his acceptance of the Roman doctrine of the Mass. Among these was a Dr. Pendleton, who had been a Protestant in the reign of Edward VI and one of the preachers in Manchester supported by funds from the collegiate church (the college had been dissolved and its revenues diverted to the furtherance of preaching). According to Hollingworth's account, Pendleton and his friend Saunders of Coventry determined to go to London after the accession of Mary and protest against the religious changes. Pendleton, "a fat bigg man, over-selfe-confidently sayd, I will see the utmost dropp of this grease of mine molten away, and the last gobbet of this flesh consumed to ashes, before I will forsake God and his truth, but the issue proved otherwise when they came to London. Saunders bouldly preached Christ, opposed antichrist and sealed his doctrine with his bloud at Coventry. Pendleton, seyth Mr. Fox, changed his tippet, preached popery, and being learned, was a great disputer...".

In January 1555 Gardiner, now Lord Chancellor as well as Bishop of Winchester, secured the re-enactment of the heresy laws repealed under Edward VI, perhaps hoping to frighten the prisoners into conformity and force others into exile. Gardiner's biographer states that "in his Southwark church [St. Mary Ovaries, now the Cathedral], he presided in January 1555 at the first trial of offenders under these laws, and condemned five, Hooper, Rogers, Bradford, Saunders and Taylor, to the stake. This was the only time in the reign in which he took part in a heresy trial".⁸ Foxe suggested that Gardiner should take no

⁷ Latimer, *Remains*, p. 258 f. For Bradford's Prison Conferences see i. 465-556. On Pendleton, Foxe, op. cit., vi. 628 f., and R. Hollingworth, *Mancuniensis or a history of the towne of Manchester* (1658, revised 1839), pp. 65-7.

⁸ J. A. Muller (ed.), *Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1933), Introduction p. xxxiv.

further part because he was discouraged by his failure to make the prisoners retract. No doubt he realised that such a failure resulted in loss of prestige for the Catholic cause; and such considerations probably led also to the opportunities allowed to reformers to leave the country or to escape from prison. Bradford could have done both, if he had wished, since he was frequently allowed to leave prison by day in order to visit the sick. But he always returned, and his letters indicate his determination not to make things easy either for his captors or himself.

The legality of the charges of sedition against Bradford was very doubtful. The anti-Lollard legislation concerning riot and sedition was not revived until two days after his arrest, and, in any case, such charges were not within the jurisdiction of a church court. Since Gardiner presided, along with the Bishop of London and other bishops, one might assume that this was an ecclesiastical court; but as in the text Gardiner is described as Lord Chancellor, it is probable that he was acting in his civil capacity. Nevertheless, Bradford protested that the charges of "sedition and false preaching" were unfounded and had no basis in law. If he were imprisoned on religious grounds the charge was still invalid, because at the time of his arrest his religion had still been legally in force. At his second examination the emphasis was not on sedition but on false doctrine, and Bradford was questioned on his beliefs about the Mass. The interrogation was following the pattern of those undergone by Latimer and Ridley. Gardiner asked if he believed Christ to be present in the blessed sacrament according to his natural body. Bradford replied, "I do believe Christ to be corporally present in his sacrament duly used: corporally I say, that is, in such sort as he would: I mean, Christ is there corporally present unto faith". He went on to reproach Gardiner for failing to give him an earlier opportunity to express his religious views:

"I have been now a year and almost three quarters in prison, and of all this time you never questioned me hereabouts, when I might have spoken my conscience frankly without peril. ... I thank God I now perceive you have kept me in prison thus long, not for any matter you had, but for matter you would have. God's good will be done". Here was now divers telling my lord it was dinner-time: and so he rose up, leaving Bradford speaking, and saying that in the afternoon they would speak more with him.⁹

⁹ i. 481 f.

The third and last examination followed similar lines, except that there was more insistent questioning on the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament and reiteration of Bradford's belief as previously stated. He maintained his position consistently throughout his writings and trial. When eventually he was condemned to the stake, there was a plan to send him to Manchester, as with others who had been sent to the places in which they were particularly well-known. However, it seems that Lord Derby intervened and expressed doubts of the ability of the forces of law and order to deal with the possible riots in Lancashire which might ensue. Thus Bradford was burnt at Smithfield on 1 July 1555.

Of his writings that have survived there are sufficient to fill two Parker Society volumes. He left 101 letters, numerous short exhortations and meditations, two sermons, several translations and treatises, *The Hurt of Hearing Mass*, *A Confutation of Four Romish Doctrines*, and a *Defence of Election*. In most of his works he was dependent on earlier writers and in some cases was acting as secretary, as it were, to a group of his seniors. His most original works are the *Letters* and *Meditations*, where there is greater spontaneity and freedom of expression. He was by no means a theologian of the calibre of his friends Latimer and Ridley, but occupies that important place in every generation of middle-man and communicator of new ideas to the popular mind. The *Meditations* and *Sermons* were printed and ran to many editions. He was an effective preacher, but still more successful in spreading Reformed doctrine to his friends and followers through personal letters and meditations. There are three areas in particular which repay close study: eucharistic doctrine, the doctrines of justification by faith and election, and his spiritual counsel.

As already indicated, the question of Christ's presence at the eucharist occupied a major part of Bradford's examination by Gardiner, and was, he thought, the cause of his death-sentence. His case was similar to those of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, and it is clear that Bradford derived his views from them. He had translated into English the Latin original of Ridley's *Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper* which the author had sent to him from prison. Ridley's position is indicated in an answer to his interrogator in the *Disputation at Oxford*:¹⁰

¹⁰ Ridley, *Works* (Parker Society), p. 213.

Of Christ's real presence there may be a double understanding. If you take the real presence of Christ according to the real and corporal substance which he took of the Virgin, that presence being in heaven cannot be on the earth also. But if you mean a real presence ... according to something that appertaineth to Christ's body, the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to that presence. Wherefore Christ's body, after that sort, is here present to us in the Lord's Supper; by grace, I say as Ephesians speaketh it.

On being pressed, he added:

I do not so straitly tie Christ up in heaven, that he may not come into the earth at his pleasure; for when he will, he may come down from heaven, and be on the earth, as it liketh himself. Howbeit I do affirm, that it is not possible for him to be both in heaven and earth at one time.

Bradford's writings echo such views. Sometimes one detects a touch of originality in the use of a figure of speech, often of a homely nature, a reminder of his skill in communication of abstract concepts. For example, he said, "Who will deny a man's wife to be with her husband one body and flesh, although he is at London and she at York?"

Dependence on Cranmer is also evident in Bradford's answers to his interrogators, and he cites Cranmer's *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament*, published in 1550. He probably derived his use of patristic quotations from this source. No explicit reference is made by Bradford to Cranmer's insistence that the doctrine of transubstantiation was untenable on philosophical grounds (Cranmer followed Luther in this respect, maintaining that according to Aristotle accidents cannot exist apart from substance). However, familiarity with Cranmer's argument must underlie a passage such as this:

But take the bread away, as the papists do, leaving there but the accidents only, which do not feed the body: and then what shall resemble and represent unto us Christ's body broken for the food of the soul?¹¹

On the question of sacrifice, Cranmer's *Defence* distinguished two types: propitiatory sacrifice, whereby, he says, Christ offered himself to God on our behalf once only; and the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, offered by the people to God through Christ and repeated at every eucharist. Latimer argued that there was no

¹¹ *The Hurt of Hearing Mass*, ii. 273.

offering of Christ at the Mass, stating that at the Last Supper Christ did not say "offer" but "take", and then "broke" the bread. Redemption was effected by Christ in his office as High Priest who made offering once for all. Ridley likewise said: "our sacrifice ... consisteth in prayers, praise and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the Cross". The English Reformers also rejected the Roman doctrine that the sacrifice of Christ could be regarded as a merit to be applied by the priest to the Church in general or to a particular person. They maintained that the atonement of Christ is applied to the believer by the preaching of the word, and is apprehended by faith. The sacraments are not the means by which the benefits are applied, but a certificate of the fact that they are received.

If Bradford contributed anything of his own to the eucharistic debate, as distinct from echoing the words of his seniors, it is in the use of another term to describe the action of the sacrament. It is probable that he introduced the term *obsignation* into this context, as in a letter of September 1554 to Richard Hopkins of Coventry: "... The sacrifice of his body and blood whereby he doth give and obsign unto us himself wholly". And in the *Confutation of Four Romish Doctrines*: "This is a sacrament and not a sacrifice: for in this, using it as we should, we receive of God obsignation and full certificate of Christ's body broken for our sins, and his blood shed for our iniquities".¹²

The Oxford English Dictionary defines *obsign* as "to mark, seal, or sign", and the footnote in the Parker Society edition gives the meaning as "to seal or ratify". More significant is the fact that Bradford is the first example cited for the use of the term. Both occurrences are given although the second is wrongly attributed to Coverdale. There are grounds, therefore, for the conclusion that Bradford was the first to use the terms *obsign* and *obsignation* in describing the sacraments.

Bradford's beliefs on the subject are well summarised in his Letter of Farewell to Lancashire and Cheshire. After saying that he is condemned for his beliefs about the sacrament of the altar, he goes on:

In the supper of our Lord or sacrament of Christ's body and blood I confess and believe that there is a true and very presence of whole

¹² i. 395; ii. 289.

Christ, God and man, to the faith of the receiver, (but not of the stander-by or looker-on), as there is a very true presence of bread and wine to the senses of him that is partaker thereof.¹³

In considering Bradford's *Defence of Election* and his attitude to justification by faith, it is necessary, as with eucharistic doctrine, to see him in the context of the other English Reformers, who were, in their turn, modifying the Lutheran position. Cranmer is not so much in the centre of the scene as Tyndale and Robert Barnes, whose writings of the 1530s indicate a gradual change from the Lutheran doctrine towards that of the Swiss and Rhineland reformers. Luther taught that Gospel abrogated Law and insisted on man's utter dependence on God, who alone could justify the sinner, saying "semper peccator, semper iustus". Bullinger, Oecolampadius, and the Rhinelanders also taught justification by faith, but, perhaps reacting to charges of antinomianism, insisted that the justified were to be known by their good works. Their position has been described in terms of a doctrine of "double justification", before God by faith, and before men by good works.¹⁴

Both Lutheran and Swiss influences can be discerned in the English Reformation as it developed between 1530 and 1550. Henry VIII looked to the laity for support against Rome, especially to Parliament and public opinion. The Lutheran idea of the godly prince had obvious attractions for him, and he welcomed the opinions expressed in Tyndale's *Obedience of the Christian Man* (1528). This was closely based on the Lutheran doctrine of the "two realms", and contained the statements that the king was made judge by God in the earthly realm, that only God could judge the king, and that subjects should obey the king as if he were God. Even a wicked ruler should not be resisted unless his commands were in contradiction of the Word of God. This principle formed the basis of much of Bradford's writing in the *Letters and Meditations*, when he accepted imprisonment and death with resignation and would not attempt to escape or free himself by force. Those who hurled the dagger at Bourne and who

¹³ i. 450. Cf. F. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1967), p. 151.

¹⁴ W.A. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants* (Yale, 1964), chaps. 5 and 9-11; B. Hall, *Lutheranism in England*, in *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent*, *Studies in Church History*, Subsidia 2 (Oxford, 1979).

created civil commotion were condemned by Bradford, and, like others, he interpreted the persecution of Mary's reign as divine punishment on a disobedient nation. At the same time, the Lutheran attitude here revealed was tempered by influence from Swiss and Rhineland sources. The doctrine of a national, comprehensive church where there was a double emphasis on obedience to the laws imposed by ruler and magistrate, and on loyalty to the state in secular matters, was closer to the Swiss pattern. Similarly, although Bradford did not use the term "double justification", it is obvious from his writings that he accepted this doctrine; and, indeed, he made frequent reference to the need for good works as the fruits of justification. Such a doctrine was set forth for the first time in England by Tyndale and by Barnes in the revised edition of his *Supplication* (1534). They depicted Christ not as abrogating the Law but fulfilling it, as a second Moses. The covenant of the Old Testament was seen as containing God's promises of salvation, and the work and teaching of Christ made it possible for man to live according to the Law. "Luther could counsel his associates to sin bravely. Tyndale's adherents must bravely avoid sin".¹⁵

Reinforcing the influence of Barnes and Tyndale, and perhaps partly fostering its growth, was another factor of considerable importance in the English Reformation—that of the native Lollard movement, which, despite persecution in the fifteenth century, emerged again in the sixteenth. Like Lutheranism, Lollardy gave enhanced status to the laity, but alongside was a legalism and doctrine of good works characteristic of much medieval piety. Here in solution was a mixture ready to receive the addition of Continental reformed theology, particularly of the Swiss variety. The native sources of the English Reformation have not always been given recognition, yet in the writings of its leaders like Tyndale, Barnes and Coverdale, who translated and transmitted Continental thought, there are passages suggesting that they considered themselves as originators, not borrowers of Reformed ideas. Certainly they were selective in their choice of what works they should translate, and, instead of working on the Lutheran corpus, they chose works by lesser Swiss reformers like Bullinger or Vadianus. While no one doubts that Cranmer and Ridley were familiar with Luther's writings, Bradford could state to his interrogators:

¹⁵ Clebsch, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

My faith is not builded on Luther, Zwinglius, or Oecolampadius in this point: and indeed, to tell you truly, I never read any of their works in this matter [i.e. on the nature of the church, authority, and eucharistic doctrine]. As for their persons, whatsoever their sayings were, yet do I think assuredly that they were and are God's children and saints with him.¹⁶

Turner made a similar statement in connection with the Lutheran *Order of Service* in use at Swäbische-Halle and its use of Latin and of organ music. Therefore we find Bradford to be in the mainstream of English theology with his frequent references to the need for good works and obedience to the civil authorities as well as to the Word of God. In asserting that he had not read Luther or Zwingli he was not admitting ignorance so much as asserting his dependence on Scripture alone as the rule of faith. No Englishman should feel obliged to read Luther, he would probably have said, but everyone should exercise the privilege of reading the Bible in the vernacular and of acting upon such Lutheran—and Lollard—principles as the priesthood of all believers.

It was certainly an English phenomenon which occasioned Bradford's *Defence of Election* during his time in the King's Bench prison. He encountered a group of Freewillers, who denied predestination and original sin. They were accused of being Anabaptists and seditious, hence their arrest, but their views differed in many respects from those usually associated with Continental Anabaptists. Their leader was Henry Hart, whose extant writings certainly uphold the doctrine of free-will, but do not indicate his views on infant baptism.¹⁷ Turner addressed a follower of Hart, Robert Cooche, in the treatise *A Preservative or Triacle against the Poison of Pelagius*, and intended to follow this with a defence of infant baptism. Bradford referred to Hart in the preface to the *Defence of Election* and in several letters to friends. He sent the treatise to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, with the comment:

I have sent you here a writing of Henry Hart's own hand, whereby you may see how Christ's glory and grace is like to lose much light. ... In free-will they are plain papists, yea, Pelagians ...¹⁸

¹⁶ i. 525.

¹⁷ Henry Hart, *A Godly Newe short treatyse* (1548), STC 12887; *A Godlie Exhortation* (1549), STC 10626 (copy in John Rylands University Library); *A Consolatorie for all Christians* (1549), STC 12564.

¹⁸ i. 306; cf. ii. 169 f., 128, 133, 194.

A note in the Parker Society edition of the *Defence of Election* states that Hart was probably the author of the treatise to which Bradford was replying; and there is in addition the evidence of other letters, one to "a Freewiller", and another to Robert Cole and Nicholas Sheterden, named as Hart's followers. Finally, Bradford wrote to the whole group a letter of farewell in February 1555. It seems ironical that Hart apparently escaped Bradford's fate. He may have recanted; and he probably died a natural death in 1557. He was older than Bradford, who once referred to him as "father Hart"; and a recent investigation suggests that he earned his living as a carpenter in Westminster. He may have had a following of Freewillers in London, although most of those whose names are mentioned by Foxe were in Kent, Essex and Sussex—counties where Bradford preached. In the *Defence of Election* Bradford quotes extracts from Hart's vanished treatise, so that the latter can be reconstructed. He reports that its title was *The enormities proceeding of the opinion, that predestination, calling, and election, is absolute in men as it is in God*.¹⁹ He quotes six "enormities" and proceeds to refute each one, with many scriptural quotations. It is interesting that he dedicated the *Defence* to his "sister in the Lord, Joyce Hales", whose home was at Tenterden in Kent, where groups of Freewillers are known to have existed. The treatise contains nothing that is new apart from its references to the *Enormities*, and once again shows Bradford as following the mainstream of English Reformed theology of the period. (To what extent he and his contemporaries were familiar with Calvin's teaching on election, in addition to Luther's, is difficult to ascertain). His understanding of the relationship of Law and Gospel is expressed in terms broadly similar to Tyndale's. Men consist of two parts, he said, in a letter to the Freewillers, an outward or old man, and an inward or new man:

The law, with her promises and comminations, tells man what he is, and shews him what he can do: the latter, that is, the gospel and free promises, tell and set forth Christ, and what mercy at God's hand, through Christ, we have offered and given to us.

The goal of the Christian is to "... walk in the right highway unto eternal life, that is, in Christ Jesu, 'the end of the law', and the fulfilling of the promises ...".²⁰

¹⁹ *Defence of Election*, i. 307-330, esp. p. 318 and n. 2.

²⁰ ii. 196f.

The third area in which Bradford contributed to the spread of Reformation principles and practice was that of spiritual exhortation and counsel. Much of his advice concerning personal attitudes and devotion anticipated later Puritanism, especially in the central importance attached to the doctrine of election. Because God was believed to be chastening and purifying his elect, suffering was to be expected and endured. Writing to his mother from the Tower in October 1553 he says:

Now God's children are first chastised in this world, that they should not be damned with the world, for surely great plagues of God hang over this realm.²¹

To Joyce Hales, whose father Sir James had drowned himself in a fit of despair after imprisonment for his religion, he wrote:

My dear sister, forget not your profession made in baptism, which Christ required of all that will be his disciples, namely to deny yourself and take up your cross, which cross you ought so much rather to bear, by how much it is not yours only, but Christ's also, as you were taught before you learned your A B C.²²

He was referring to the custom of teaching children to write a cross before they learnt the alphabet. He went on to tell Joyce Hales that Christians were like stones being hewn by a master-mason to build a king's palace. Like Knox, Bradford had a large number of correspondents, several of them women of substance or with titles, like Lady Vane. Hollingworth cites a letter written to him in prison by a Manchester woman, Elizabeth Longsho, who expressed gratitude for the great spiritual comfort and wise counsel he gave to all who knew him. She herself was evidently in fear of arrest for her beliefs. A postscript requested Bradford's prayers for Alice Sedon, a Prestwich woman.²³

Ten letters were addressed to John Traves, or Travers, who was described by Foxe as "minister of Blackley", though it is doubtful whether he was an ordained priest, since he had a wife and family and his name is not to be found in clergy lists of the period.²⁴ These letters contain some of the most frank disclosures of

²¹ Ibid., p. 42.

²² Ibid., p. 203 f., cf. ii. 351 and i. 264.

²³ ii. 226 ff., cf. R. Hollingworth, *op. cit.*, 73 f.

²⁴ ii. 1, n. 3.

Bradford's spiritual state in the years before his imprisonment; for instance, in December 1549 he confessed doubts as to his own membership of the elect. Later, from prison, the tone was one of calm assurance. To Mistress Honywood he gave advice on a similar theme:

Labour for this certainty of faith through Christ: whensoever you doubt, you heap sin upon sin. ... The cause of his love is his own goodness and mercy: this lasting for ever, his love lasteth for ever. How can you then but be quiet and happy? Use this gear to comfort the weak conscience, and not to unbridle the mighty affections of the flesh or old Adam, which must have other meat.²⁵

As the certainty of death approached, he expressed concern for his mother and friends, trying to convince them that he had no alternative but to submit to his fate:

Die you must once, and when or how you cannot tell. ... You shall see that I speak as I think; for, by God's grace, I will drink before you of this cup, if I be put to it.²⁶

All his writings, and the letters in particular, are full of vivid imagery; for, like most writers of his century, he had the gift of using homely language:

The devil standeth now at every inn-door in his city and country of this world, crying unto us to tarry and lodge in this or that place, till the storms be overpast: not that he would not have us wet to the skin, but that the time might overpass us to our utter destruction.²⁷

To fellow-sufferers in fear of persecution: "The journey is almost past, you are almost in the haven. Hale on apace, I beseech you, and merrily hoist up your sails". To his mother he wrote, mixing metaphors:

Fear not the flail, fear not the fanning wind, fear not the millstone, fear not the oven; for all these make you more meet for the Lord's own tooth. Soap, though it be black, soileth not the cloth, but rather at the length maketh it more clean; so doth the black cross help us to more whiteness, if God strike with his battledore.²⁸

²⁵ Ibid., p. 132.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 48.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 69, 50.

In a letter to friends who tried to help him in prison:

If God ... begin to muck and marl you, to pour his showers upon you, to nip you with his weeding tongs, rejoice and be glad that God will do that in you and with you at once, which a long time he hath been a working in and for others.²⁹

In February 1554 he wrote from the Tower to reassure his mother about the conditions of his imprisonment: "For my lodging, bedding, meat, drink, godly and learned company, books and all other necessities for mine ease, comfort and commodity, I am in much better case than I could wish". And he added characteristically: "God might have caused me, long before this time, to have been cast into prison as a thief, a blasphemer, an unclean liver, and a heinous offender of the laws of the realm".³⁰ He then asked his mother to give his letters to Traves to be burned, and sent messages to his sisters Elizabeth and Margaret. He feared that he would be unable to write again, because if it were known that he had pen and ink he would suffer for it. Nevertheless, he was able to continue to smuggle letters in and out of prison for another year and more.

One of Bradford's outstanding characteristics was the honest admission of his own guilt and the fact that he deserved, no less than the rest of the nation, the punishment—as he saw it—of living under Queen Mary. He had admitted his share of the blame for defrauding the treasury in his days with Sir John Harington, and, though he had made restitution, he remembered the temptations besetting ordinary mortals—"There, but for the grace of God, goes John Bradford". He recognised that he and his fellow-prisoners were being used as an example to deter others from adherence to Protestantism, and, as one who called himself a layman, felt even more keenly the responsibility laid on his shoulders. Yet one must not assume that he would have been an advocate of religious toleration in the modern sense. No one alive at that time considered that religion could be a personal and private affair. Those considered to be in error constituted a public danger, and must be prevented from spreading the contagion, if necessary by force. Bradford's efforts to convince the Freewillers of their errors were limited to written arguments and we do not

²⁹ i. 380.

³⁰ ii. 74 f.

know whether he would have supported the authorities, Catholic or Protestant, who suppressed them by imprisonment and death. The only contemporary of Bradford's to express the view that physical force was useless against heretics was William Turner, whose treatise against the Freewillers contained the statement that the heresy was "ghostly" or spiritual and could be fought only by invisible weapons.

When the day of his burning was fixed, the jailer's wife came running upstairs in great anguish to break the news. His very last letter, like the rest, mingled messages and prayers with practical concerns. He arranged for a secret visit from Latimer's servant, Augustine Bernhere, and warned other friends not to run the risk of being seen in the crowds at Smithfield. Quoting one of his favourite sources of comfort, the Book of Psalms, he said, "I am like to an owl in the house, and as a sparrow alone on the housetop". He was still at work on theological writing, since he mentioned a treatise on infant baptism, still incomplete—no doubt intended for Henry Hart, like that projected by William Turner and also never completed. We are left with a picture of a relatively young man, still only 44 or 45, yet to mature as a theologian and polemicist, aware that he had much work that he could do if permitted to live, but well-tried in adversity and in triumph over it; still full of love for those he had not seen for many months, and hoping for reunion with them in the future life.

What are the riches and pleasures of this life, in comparison of the felicity of everlasting life, which is without all discommodities, perpetual, without all peril and jeopardy, without all grief and molestation?³¹

Two memorials to John Bradford are to be seen in central Manchester. On the front of the Town Hall are stone figures of local worthies, among whom he is one; and in the Cathedral there is a framed illuminated inscription which was unveiled by Professor E. G. Rupp in 1962. His last recorded words were addressed to John Leaf, a young apprentice who died with him on 1 July 1555:

Be of good comfort brother, for we shall have a merry supper with the Lord this night.

³¹ i. 339.

WILLIAM TURNER

The name of the Northumbrian William Turner is commonly associated either with natural history or with anti-Roman polemic. He is rightly regarded as a pioneer in English botany and medicine, and in his theological guise he is known as the author of *The Huntynge and fynding out of the Romishe Fox*³² and similar works. Both sides of his activity were described by one who shared his double interest, C. E. Raven,³³ in one of the fullest accounts now available. Turner's knowledge of the natural sciences, combined with extensive travel in Germany, Switzerland, Italy and the Netherlands, made him a cosmopolitan scholar of wide experience, and his keen powers of observation sharpened his awareness of the religious climate of the places he visited. In Conrad Gesner of Zürich he encountered one who combined scientific and theological interests, and the Biblicist and rationalist outlook of the Swiss reformers made a special appeal to him. But, long before his travels abroad in the 1540s, he had arrived at the conviction that scripture must be the sole rule of faith and practice, and he maintained the principle, with minor adjustments, throughout his life, until his last work, the *Book of Wines* (1568), which commends wine-drinking for its effect on health and the four humours, with corroborative evidence from scripture. The principle of *scriptura sola* inspired his attack on the Henrician reform in the 1540s, in *The Huntynge of the Romishe Fox*, to which Gardiner replied in *The Examination of the Hunter*. This was largely reproduced by Turner in *The Rescuynge of the romishe fox* and incorporated in *The seconde course of the Hunter at the romishe fox and hys advocate*; and nine years later he published *The Huntynge of the Romyshe Wolfe*, which was re-issued with a preface at the height of the Elizabethan Vestments Controversy.³⁴

³² Pub. Basle, 1543, with the pseudonym Wraghton (STC 24353).

³³ *English Naturalists from Neckam to Ray*, Cambridge, 1947. Short biographies by B. D. Jackson, introduction to *Libellus de re herbaria novus*, reprinted London, 1877; R. Potts, introduction to abridged edition of *The Huntynge of the Romishe Fox*, London, 1851. References in M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, London and Chicago, 1939; P. Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, Berkeley and London, 1979.

³⁴ *The rescuynge of the Romishe fox and the Seconde Course of the Hunter at the Romishe fox*, Zürich[?], 1545 (STC 24355); *The Hunting of the Romyshe Wolfe*, Zürich, 1554 (STC 24356); *The Hunting of the fox and the wolfe*, 1565[?]

There is more to be said about Turner, however, than might be supposed from a cursory glance at the titles of his anti-Roman works. Even in these one can find hints of a more constructive approach, and in his later works are some positive suggestions for church re-organisation and for the maintenance of justice and order in the body politic.³⁵ Nor does he condemn papist practices only. Like more prominent figures of the age he feared and opposed the Radicals and Freewillers. *A Preservative or Triacle against the Poyson of Pelagius*³⁶ is a tract attacking the views of Robert Cooche, a disciple of Henry Hart.³⁷ In his anxiety to steer between the Scylla of Rome and the Charybdis of radical Protestantism, Turner was as deeply committed as any of his contemporaries responsible for the 1552 Book of Common Prayer and the Forty-two Articles. In his attitude to the royal supremacy and the well-being of the body politic, and in his concern for justification before men by good works as a corollary to justification by faith, he continued in the tradition of Tyndale and helped to prepare the way for the Elizabethan Puritan movement.

Turner's writings fulfil the promise of their titles in that they are lively, colourful and never dull. A comparison of his debate with Gardiner and that between Gardiner and Joye³⁸ brings out the point. The latter is a tedious and repetitive series of arguments about abstractions. Turner never conducted a debate for long without interpolating some vivid allusion or analogy to reinforce his point. His knowledge of science and medicine was a frequent source of imagery and reveals the fusion between his various interests. Perhaps he always regarded himself as primarily a physician, as in the preface to the *New Dialogue*:³⁹ "Although it be not belonging unto my profession to dispute in matters of

(STC 24357); Gardiner's tract was reconstructed by J. A. Muller, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 480-492.

³⁵ *A Newe Booke of Spirituall Physik*, Basle[?], 1555 (STC 24361) contains much social criticism.

³⁶ London, 1551 (STC 24368).

³⁷ I. B. Horst, *The Radical Brethren*, Nieuwkoop, 1972.

³⁸ *George Joye confuteth Winchesters false articles*, Antwerp[?], 1543 (STC 14826); *A Declaration of suche true articles as George Joye hath gone about to confute as false*, London, 1546 (STC 11588); *The refutation of the byshop of Winchesters derke declaration of his false articles*, London, 1546 (STC 14827).

³⁹ *A New Dialogue wherein is conteyned the examination of the Messe*, London, 1548 (STC 24363). Extract in R. Potts' introduction to *The Huntynge*, xii. The work is a translation of a treatise by Bernardino Ochino.

Divinity who am a Physician: yet extreme necessity requiring, I am compelled to do in this kind of war, as cobblers, shoemakers, masons, carpenters and all other men of handy occupations, are compelled to do, when their city is besieged, to take weapons in their hands and become warriors, who have had little or no experience of war before". Some of his most telling effects are the result of the use of medical terms, as, for example, in his attack on the practice of blessing water for baptism. Gardiner rested his case for the use of such ceremonies on the royal supremacy, whereby the king could make laws for the church in his realm. Turner was prepared to accept this thesis, but asked by what law was water blessed and left half a year and more in the font until it was stinking? What law required that the priest should "put in the coldest day of all winter a yong tendre infant ... over bothe hede and eares, whereby many childer are loste and many cache such diseases as they cannot claw of as long as they lyve"? This ritual seemed to carry the implication that the water itself removed original sin and reduced the ceremony to a conjuring trick.⁴⁰ Gardiner counterattacked by an accusation that Turner's dislike of ceremonies caused him to labour stoutly from the beginning of grammar to the end of logic. On the arguments adduced by Turner, it would be wrong for a servant to bow to his master, and Gardiner feared that to discourage reverence to superiors was to undermine the social structure. He pointed out the distinction between signs of courtesy or affection and worship of an image.⁴¹ Once more Turner the physician had a ready reply. Popish practices such as the veneration of images were like an infectious disease, or forbidden toys which might cause injury. If a father forbids his son to associate with a servant who has the pox, yet the son argues that he is not such a fool as to catch the pox, and wishes to learn Latin from the servant, is the father likely to commend his son?⁴²

In later works Turner's interest in science and medicine becomes even more prominent. *A Preservative or Triacle against the Poyson of Pelagius* provides an example in its very title. The heresy of Pelagius is described as a monster with seven heads, each

⁴⁰ *Seconde Course*, B iii a-b.

⁴¹ Gardiner's position is discussed by D.M. Loades, *The Oxford Martyrs* (London, 1970), pp. 37-100.

⁴² *Seconde Course*, H iii-iv.

representing a different version of the same error. The monster is said to be "ghostly", a "sprite" against which no earthly weapons can prevail. Hence Turner is led to the conclusion that persecution is useless, since such a monster can be defeated only by spiritual means. His opponent Robert Cooche accused him of treating baptism like a spiritual plaster to be administered to the young as an antidote to original sin—a description which Turner accepted, with the proviso that "Although I am a physician, called to heale mennis bodies ... I never presumed to be an heler of manis soul with any physik but with Christis phisik".⁴³ Elsewhere he spoke of the need for the good physician to follow up the administration of any remedy by prescribing a balanced and nutritious diet.⁴⁴ One of his last works is *A Newe booke of spirituall Physik for dyverse diseases of the nobilitie and gentlemen of Englande*. At the beginning he addresses the heads of leading English families, asking them to undertake the further reform of the church and society. As the clergy themselves are sick, physicians must be found among the laity. The illnesses suffered by the English church are diagnosed as palsy, dropsy, pox or "the Romyshe sore", and leprosy; and he prescribes such remedies as "water and the bitter herbs of repentance", heated on a fire made of Roman decretals. Gardiner is caricatured in this tract (published abroad in 1555) as an undercook in Wolsey's kitchen who graduated to the status of principal cook for the king but served dishes powdered with poison. Later in the same work there is further evidence of Turner's interest in birds and beasts, when he compares those preoccupied with worldly affairs to moles, who have long snouts and eyes but cannot see because they live under the earth. Liberality is prescribed as a remedy for sickness of the spirit, and illustrated by reference to the eagle, who, "when he hath gotten a good pray, and hath tasted a lytle of the best of it, he cryeth and calleth other byrdes to hym, and letteth them eat wyth hym. After the same manner sparrowes, goldfynches, lynettes and such smale byrdes, that flye by flockes together, yf they fynde any sedes that like them, they cal other of the same kynde unto them, because they wolde not eat alone, but have company wyth them".⁴⁵

⁴³ *Preservative*, M iii-iv.

⁴⁴ *Wolfe*, E vi a.

⁴⁵ *Spirituall Physik*, f. 69 b. Turner's principal scientific works are: *Libellus de*

When rational argument seemed to have reached an impasse, or when scripture failed to give explicit guidance, Turner had no scruple in resorting to illustration and analogy. His fruitful imagination and vast knowledge seemed never to fail him in supplying the appropriate imagery, whether its source was fable or scientific fact. In reply to Gardiner's evocation of the standard defence of communion in one kind, he cited patristic evidence for communion in both kinds, and maintained that this had been universal practice until the Council of Constance in 1415. To deny the cup to the laity was robbery. Suppose a father were to send to his son, a student at Oxford, two purses, one white and one red, each containing an equal amount of money. He asks his son to pray for his father when he sees the white purse, and for his mother when he sees the red. But the carrier of the gift places all the money in the white purse and gives this only to the son, keeping the red one for himself. Even though he has not stolen the money, the carrier is nevertheless a thief. So it is with the priests who give to the laity only half of the Lord's Supper—to which Gardiner retorts, "We deny that the supper hath any halfe at all. Then is not all your resonyng worth an half penny".⁴⁶ Examples of Turner's use of popular fables about foxes and wolves abound, as the titles of his anti-Roman tracts suggest. The recurring allegation was that the king had failed to drive out the fox completely. A farmer's wife once thought that she had killed a fox which had been eating her chickens. She tossed the corpse on to the midden, went to boast of her deed to her neighbours, and found on her return that the "corpse" had run away. In a later work the fox has changed into a wolf, and many more of his like have appeared from nowhere, just as worms change into flies, or serpents into dragons; and fish appear in ponds where there were formerly none.

The debate on clerical celibacy proved to be something of a test case for attitudes to the royal supremacy and to scriptural interpretation. Gardiner took issue with Bucer on the matter in 1541, publishing two tracts, in 1544 and 1546, attacking Bucer's views. Joye and Turner were among those who supported Bucer, and they in turn were criticised by Gardiner. Characteristically,

re herbaria novus, London, 1548 (STC 24358); *The names of herbes*, London, 1548 (STC 24359); *A new herball*, part I, 1551, completed 1568 (STC 24365, 6, 7).

⁴⁶ *Seconde Course*, J vi a-b, viii a.

Gardiner argued that the king, as father of his people, had power to forbid priests in his realm to marry—but on this kind of logic, Turner replied, the king might forbid all his subjects to marry. Scripture gave no warrant for the requirement of celibacy from priests or laymen. Then followed a complex discussion on the exegesis of I Cor. vii. 36-38. Gardiner said that he showed this text to Bucer as proof that a father might order some of his children not to marry, and that neither Bucer nor Alesius could answer him. Turner challenged Gardiner to a fresh discussion of the text, and denied that St Paul gave such an opinion as Gardiner claimed. Indeed, I Cor. vii. 25, *De virginibus praeceptum Domini non habeo* implies the contrary. Once more Turner produced illustrations appealing to the imagination. Suppose, he wrote, that a toll of sixpence a year were to be imposed upon the inhabitants of a village whenever they crossed a bridge to enter a nearby town in order to sell their produce in the market. They would have no choice but to pay the toll, but might well ask the servant collecting their money who caused him to do so, and who received the cash. “Even so is it between the Prince and the priests. For by whose autorite do ye require of everyone that cummeth to yow for orders of subdecon, decon and presthode the vow of chastite”?⁴⁷ Or the situation might be compared to that of a besieged city, where the enemy stipulates that if a hundred of the citizens will become his bondmen, the rest may go free. The hundred citizens have no choice but to accept slavery. The debate continued in abstract terms and became rambling and sometimes obscure. Turner accused Gardiner of shifting his ground, at one time resting his case on the powers of the king, at another arguing that priests vowed to remain celibate and could not break their word. In neither case, Turner maintained, was there any scriptural warrant.

In spite of his knowledge of the fact that such opponents as Turner and Joye set great store by the principle of *scriptura sola*, Gardiner failed to take advantage of the weakness of their position by making capital of the variety of interpretation among them. On one occasion in the debate with Joye he showed that he was aware of the possibilities:

You wyll have this broughte againe of the prymatyve church, that our hearers and readers of oure bookes shall say I beleve Joye and I

⁴⁷ Ibid., M ii b - iii a.

beleve Wynchester. *Ego cephe, ego pauli*, but yet to avoyde some parte of that inconvenience, men have devised to say, now I beleve not Luther, nor Melancton, nor Bewcer, nor Swinglius, nor Joye nor Turner ... but I beleve goddes holye wordes, which cannot lye as men do ... but when so many errours are arisen in the sence of goddes holy worde, and the devyll maye and hath transformed himselfe into the aungell of lyght, suche speach in communycacyon is besydes the purpose. For men doute not whether goddes holye worde is to be beleved, but what is the sence of goddes holye worde.⁴⁸

Gardiner did not follow up the implications of this statement in the attacks on Joye and Turner, preferring to rely on the doctrine of the royal supremacy and its corollaries.

One of the most interesting sections of the Gardiner-Turner debate is that about the use of Latin in church services. At one point Turner admitted that he loved the Latin tongue, but would permit its use only by and for those who understood it. As far as the church in general was concerned, Latin was "the Pope's mother-tongue", and should be replaced by the vernacular. Gardiner denied that all Lutheran churches had suspended the use of Latin and of musical settings of Latin canticles. He reported a recent visit to Hall in Swabia, reformed by Johannes Brenz, where he had heard the organ played and the Magnificat rendered in Latin by boys, each singing as loudly as he could "without regarde how he agreed with hys felowes". He continued, "I dout not but god understode them, but of the nombre that sang, I dare say a great meany understode not what they sang. And we could much less mark theyr wordes, other than began the verse and ended it". Turner interpolated the comment, "God understandeth popingiayes, can they then pray with fruite?" Gardiner evidently had no doubt of the validity of the proceedings, and indeed continued in similar vein to tell how the church was asked what edification its organ provided, especially as it sometimes played the wrong "descant". The reply was that formerly they held "Wraghtonis opinion", but now followed "the learned parte of the chirche", which "singeth in a learned tong".⁴⁹

The reformer Brenz, along with Osiander, was responsible for the composition of the *Brandenburg-Nuremberg Order for the*

⁴⁸ Gardiner, *A Declaration of suche true articles*, ff. cliii b-cliv a (edition printed by J. Herford, London, 1546).

⁴⁹ *Seconde Course*, K iv a-vi.

Celebration of the Mass in 1533, a source used by Cranmer for the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. Awareness of Cranmer's plans would be sufficient reason to explain Gardiner's visit to Hall, and it is probable that he did find musical settings of Latin canticles in use. The *Brandenburg-Nuremberg Order* states that Introit, Kyries, Gloria and other parts of the Mass should be in Latin if there are scholars to sing, and that German is to be used only when no one is capable of singing in Latin. Brenz could claim the authority of Luther in the matter, since it is stated in the *Preface to the German Mass* of 1526 that the *Formula Missae* of 1523 is not abrogated, and that the liturgical use of Latin, Hebrew or Greek should continue where these languages are understood. Young people should be taught ancient languages for this purpose.⁵⁰

Turner's reaction to Gardiner's anecdote indicates that he was inclined to Zwinglian rather than Lutheran views on the liturgy, and he is perfectly consistent with his general principle of *scriptura sola*. True worship is in heart and spirit—as Gardiner had maintained when debating the question of the veneration of images. Now Gardiner had been reduced to seeking help from “the gospellers of Germany”, and had come upon “a college of scholars” like those in Strasbourg or Basle, where Latin canticles were sung by the scholars in exception to the general rule. Alternatively, since in Germany no one was compelled to any form of religion, Gardiner might have come upon a Catholic church. It is fairly certain that Turner was still in ignorance of Cranmer's activities, especially as he was abroad until after Edward's accession; and he would not have approved them. His attitude is one of robust independence, and the fact that Osiander and Brenz support the use of organs carries no weight. “What have I to do with Brentius, which am not sworne to Brentius nether to any man, or to any manis doctrine, savyng only to the doctrine of Christe”.⁵¹

The conclusion of Turner's debate with Gardiner did not fall below the standard of his best polemical style. Alluding to Gardiner's recent activities he wrote:

⁵⁰ See G. L. Cuming, *History of Anglican Liturgy* (London, 1969), pp. 327ff.; Luther, *W.A.* 19, p. 74, *L.W.* 53, p. 62. The author is indebted to Dr. E. G. Rupp for drawing her attention to this passage of Luther, and for much help in the study of Turner.

⁵¹ *Seconde Course*, K v b.

Ye cover and set out, nay by force violently thruste into al mennis handes, ye and into the chirche of Christe even up to the pulpit your Popish conjurings, folishe dremes, rotten ceremonies and idle ordinaunces ... I intend not to scold with yow nether to stryve with yow in doggis eloquence, wherein I gyve yow place and take yow for my better ... ye wil teach cambrige men to pronounce Greke, brewers to make bere, taylers to make garmentes, cookes to dress mete, in bruges ye dissuade men from the Doctrine of the Germanes.⁵²

The written sources of Turner's convictions about what he saw as the errors of the Church of Rome can be traced to his two earliest known works, both translations of Continental Reformers. The first, *A Worke entytled of ye olde god and the newe*, from an original in German by Vadianus, or Joachim von Watt,⁵³ physician, scholar and reformer of St. Gall, consisted of sections on idolatry, the history of Rome, and the development of the papacy. The forgery of the Donation of Constantine is mentioned, and it is maintained that there have been no godly popes since Gregory I. The pope has become the new God of the title. Then follows a section on ceremonies, which are said to be potentially good, but not essential to true religion. Finally and significantly, there are twenty rules whereby people may measure what is true religion and know what evils to avoid. The Bible is the sole rule of faith, and the preaching of the word the most important activity of the Church. No other writings, even those of the Fathers, may be given the same authority. Ceremonies, images and relics may mislead the unlearned. Scripture alone teaches Christ and engenders saving faith, which is never separate from hope and charity.

Much of what is said by von Watt had already been set forth by Luther, and he too drew up a list of "popish abuses" for the guidance of the clergy.⁵⁴ But W. A. Clebsch comments that von Watt's work "bore rather the stamp of biblical humanism than of

⁵² Ibid., N iv a, vi a; cf. J. A. Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (London, 1926), pp. 121-134.

⁵³ *A worke entytled of ye olde god and the newe*, London, 1534 (STC 25127), translated from a Latin version of *Von Alten und Neuen Gott*, by Joachim von Watt (Vadianus). Formerly a list of titles in Foxe was misinterpreted, and the translation erroneously ascribed to Coverdale. See W. A. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants* (Yale, 1964), pp. 169-70, 254 n. On Vadianus, see E. G. Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (London, 1969), pp. 357 ff.

⁵⁴ *Exhortation to the Clergy at Augsburg*, 1530; W.A. 30.2, 237 ff., L.W. 34, 9 ff.

Wittenberg theocentrism, since its paradigm for the true church emerging in the Reformation was the pure church of earliest days, and since it discerned in the Bible a standard for everything from ecclesiology to ethics. The anti-ceremonialism of the spiritualist wing of the Reformation permeated the book".⁵⁵ When confronted by Gardiner's account of Lutheran liturgical practice, Turner's reaction was in accordance with such a diagnosis, and it is significant that both Tyndale and Barnes had already made use of von Watt's book before Turner translated it into English in 1534, and were indebted to it for the history of the papacy. Possibly one of them was responsible for recommending the young Turner to undertake the translation. Alternatively, Turner may have become acquainted with von Watt through their mutual interest in medicine. The fact that von Watt was a layman who brought about reformation in St. Gall was perhaps significant for Turner, who himself was not ordained to the priesthood until middle age.

The second work translated by Turner was of similar nature, *A Comparison betwene the Olde learnynge and the Newe* by Urbanus Rhegius, reformer of Augsburg.⁵⁶ As in the case of the first, the attack is directed against the "new", in the form of twenty-two innovations or additions to the "old" gospel made by popes and general councils. Again, scripture is said to be the only rule of faith, and the eucharist is described as "a continual remembrance of the death of the Lord ... a sacrifice once offered". Ceremonies are to be regarded as unnecessary and misleading, except that some may be retained "where they hinder not the study of true holiness, or have no blame or fault", until it can be decided "after what fashion men's consciences should be established and made strong against the gates of hell: and in what things true penance and amending of our living doth stand".

Again one detects the influence of Barnes and Tyndale in the selection of this work as suitable for translation into English. The tendency to codify rules for belief and practice is of special significance, as are the characteristic attitudes which appear in *The Huntynge of the Romishe Fox* and its sequels. Neither von Watt nor Rhegius has Turner's gift of teaching by use of vivid imagery, and

⁵⁵ Clebsch, op. cit., p. 254.

⁵⁶ Southwark, 1537 (STC 20840). Turner produced a later version in 1548, *The olde learnynge and the new compared together*, which was included by Legh Richmond in *Fathers of the English Church* (London, 1807-12), Vol. IV.

one is compelled to fresh admiration of his lively treatment. It is surpassed only by that of the writer of one of the works which he translated: *A New Dialogue wherein is conteyned the examination of the Messe*. The author, Bernardino Ochino of Siena, was well-known for his immoderate style (even when judged by the robust standards of sixteenth-century prose). He was in England for most of Edward's reign, a recent convert from Roman Catholicism and former Vicar General of the Capuchins. The *New Dialogue* is cast in the form of a play, whose leading character, Mistress Missa, argues with Master Knowledge before Palemon the Judge, in the presence of witnesses who represent the populace and the clergy. One feature which emerges clearly is the role of the layman who claims to be qualified to act as judge in religious matters because he is well-versed in Scripture, a theme developed in Turner's later works. A distinction is drawn between the priest who claims to be able to offer the sacrifice of the Mass, and the layman who can celebrate the Lord's Supper. Turner does not, however, draw the conclusion that any layman can preside over the Lord's Supper, since it is clear from the context that he is thinking of the corporate participation of all believers in the eucharist. He refutes the doctrine of the priesthood based on the Old Testament and attacks the use and associations of the term "altar". Significantly the *New Dialogue* was published in 1548, in the earliest stages of Edwardine reform.

The tract of 1551⁵⁷ against what Turner fairly accurately diagnosed as a variety of Pelagianism, reveals a side of the author which off-sets his more commonly-known aspect as an anti-Romanist. He appears as an upholder of orthodoxy against the attack of one Robert Cooche, a follower of Hart the Freewiller. Cooche had heard Turner deliver a sermon at Isleworth in which he attacked those who denied the doctrines of original sin and infant baptism. It has been established that Cooche remained a member of the Established Church and was indeed ordained into its ministry, in spite of being known as unorthodox in his views about baptism and the eucharist. Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich described his eccentric views and character in the year 1574, and called him argumentative. It is not difficult to imagine such a man taking issue with Turner, and it is clear from the *Preservative* that the latter had the measure of his opponent. For instance, he was

⁵⁷ *A Preservative or Triacle against the Poyson of Pelagius* (STC 24368).

aware of his strange views on the eucharist, because when Cooche asked why the sacrament of baptism ought to be administered to infants, when the Lord's Supper was denied them, he retorted that it would be impossible for them to eat the kind of supper envisaged by Cooche. It was well-known to Parkhurst and others that Cooche advocated a full-scale meal at the eucharist, and he persisted in this view as late as 1573 when he wrote to Gualter on the subject. Turner comments that Cooche and his associates consume "befē, mutton, vele, capons and such harde meates, as the pore sucking childer cannot eat: and therefore it were no wisdom that thei shuld suppe with you, untill theyr teeth wer growen". He also accused Cooche of being a papist, "which at last ester, ryght Popishly knelyng, toke ye sacrament, gevyng occasion unto all men to thynke, that ye were a sterke ydolater, and beleved that bread was turned into a God".⁵⁸

Showing concern for the safety of the Tudor state, Turner attacked his opponents as Anabaptists, Donatists and Pelagians, guilty of lawlessness, schism, heresy and sedition. He accused them of destroying Münster and of murdering magistrates in Amsterdam and Friesland, and recounted a meeting with a physician in Antwerp who called him a papist because he upheld infant baptism.⁵⁹ He elaborated a defence of infant baptism on lines similar to those found in other reformers, stating that on scriptural evidence children were acceptable to God in spite of original sin. Property bequeathed to a child is his, even while the child is under age. Baptism, like the mercy of God promised to Noah and Abraham, is offered to all, and when the child comes of age he has "an assurance ... to claim the promises of God by". Baptism, like the preaching of the gospel, should be available to all, and it would be wrong to offer it to all and not to give it to them. "For a man havinge severall groundes ynough of hys owne, oftymes putteth no cattell into the comon: although hys parte is as common unto hym as unto anye other man. Are the feldees no more common unto a man, after that he enjoyeth no longer the profyte of the common feldees?" If baptism may be administered only to the elect, adults would be excluded as well as children, "for

⁵⁸ Op. cit., G vii b, D vi b. Parkhurst described Cooche in a letter to Gualter; see C. Burrage, *Early English Dissenters* (Cambridge, 1912), ii. 7-8. Cooche's letter to Gualter is in *Zürich Letters*, i. 236-7.

⁵⁹ *Preservative*, E viii a-b.

no man can know the harte, nether of olde man nor childe".⁶⁰ Had Turner been able to complete the *Preservative* he would have addressed himself in greater detail to the question of original sin, but, as he explained, it was necessary to interrupt the work in order to complete the *Herbal*, and as far as is known he never returned to the task.

Among several other interesting aspects of the *Preservative*, one in particular must be included; the modification in his attitude to scripture and its interpretation. Others before him had found ingenuity necessary when expounding the scriptural basis of infant baptism, and, following their example, Turner argued that the absence of an express command from Christ himself did not imply that a practice was wrong. When Christ blessed the children and commanded his followers to become like them, he referred specifically to their humility. He did not say that children were without sin, just as, when Christ commended the unjust steward, he meant that we should learn of the steward's wisdom but did not mean that he was without sin. Furthermore, St. Paul commanded his readers to imitate him, yet confessed himself to be sinful. Driving the point home, Turner said to Cooche, "Christe never commanded yow to were a ryng on your finger, and because it shuld not be smothered under your glove, to make a wyndow to let the ayre cum in to it, I dare not say that it myght be sene, nether commanded he yow to syng in his church, Christe never commaunded any pypyng, pryksong or any besy descant: therefore ye offend to be a curious musician. ... God never in his worde expressedly commanded his Apostelles to suffer suche tal men as you bee to lyve syngle: therefore your curate doth wrong to suffer yow to lyve syngle ... Christe never commanded any Christen man to differ the baptym of theyr chyldren unto the xiii yere of their age, you do therfore wrong to differ the baptisying of chyldren unto the xiiii yere of their age".⁶¹ Such opinions as Cooche held were the counsel, not of the spirit of God, but of "the wode sprite [i.e. Hart] who taught yow your divinitie and the gift of doggis eloquence".

A few years later appeared the first edition of *The Huntynge of the Romyshe Wolfe*,⁶² cast in the form of a conversation between

⁶⁰ Ibid., J iii-vii.

⁶¹ Ibid., K vii a-b.

⁶² Zürich, 1554 (STC 24356).

the Hunter (Turner), the Forester and the Dean. There is reference to Gardiner's recent release from the Tower, suggesting that the work was written very soon after the death of Edward, when Turner had left England once more. The Forester was on his way to Parliament, and the Hunter says that he was a member of the Lower House for five years, and "Yf that ye have no better order in your house now than we had then, ye may as well go home againe, for any good that ye shall do there". Whether Turner in fact was an M.P. is doubtful, as under Somerset he had held a living bestowed on him by the Archbishop of York, and had then become Dean of Wells. On the other hand, a passage in the *Spirituell Physik* describing the duty of "gentlemen" to uphold true religion implies that the writer had first-hand knowledge of Parliament, gained "when I was a burgess of late, of the lower House"; and if Turner did not receive priests' orders until the end of 1551, it is possible that he did spend some months as an M.P. during Edward's reign.⁶³ Jackson suggests that he perhaps referred to his membership of Convocation, as in the section that follows: "I have sene a Wolfe within these fewe yeares in the Tower, I have sene many in divers Cathedrall Churches of Englande. But there are no where mo than are in the Convocation house, in the parliament tyme".⁶⁴

The fox of earlier tracts has now changed into a wolf, and the Dean supports Gardiner and suggests that Wyclif, Hus, Luther and Zwingli and "the new preachers" are wolves, but very soon is silenced. The Hunter develops a spirited attack on lazy and negligent clergy, comparing them to quack doctors who take fees but cannot heal the patient, and ineffective watchmen who utter warnings only in Greek or Latin which cannot be understood by the citizens. In terms similar to those of Latimer's sermons he denounces "the Wolfe of Winchester, the loyterer of London, the dreamer of Durram", who allowed Henry VIII and the lords of the realm to take many wives. Anne of Cleves was a virtuous woman who should not have been divorced. The persecutions of Henry's reign are referred to several times, and much of the responsibility attributed to the "wodde wolfe" of Winchester. Parliament should enact legislation designed to drive out all the

⁶³ See R. Potts, introduction to *The Huntynge*, vi-vii, and B.D. Jackson, introduction to *Libellus de re herbaria novus*, 17.

⁶⁴ *Wolfe*, A v a-b.

wolves—Turner does not wish to kill them, though some would kill him.

Towards the end of the *Wolfe* Turner outlined proposals for the reorganisation of the church, and the use of its wealth for education and welfare. He advocated the abolition of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and its replacement by a type of presbyterian system under the authority of the sovereign and parliament. The unit of organisation was to be the shire, and each year the clergy therein should elect at least four “bishops” from among themselves. These should be “honest learned men”, preachers and graduates. Their duties should be like those of the apostles, to examine and admit elders, who would share with them responsibility for admission of ministers, discipline among ministers and laity, and the suppression of heresy. The right of excommunication would be in the hands of the pastor and elders of each parish. Admission to the ministry, as in the primitive church, should be by the votes of the congregation, for “the comon people which is baptised in the name of christ, and hath the spirit of god, is more like to chuse an honest shephirde, than a blinde bishop or covetous carle, that wil let no man have the benefice, except he paye muche for it”. The promises of God were made to the whole church, not to bishops and lords only.⁶⁵

The wealth of the church, much of which had been seized by covetous laymen, must be restored and re-directed to charitable ends. Similar use must be made of the wealth of the bishops, which must be divided into four portions. The first quarter should be devoted to increasing the stipends of parochial clergy, for if the pastor cannot support himself, “a well-learned man, which hath cost his father and other frendes very muche money, and hath taken large and great paine for his learning, will lever be a carrier or a couter, than a poore beggarly parson or vicar, and not to have wherewith to bye him bokes, and to finde him and his householde withal”.⁶⁶ One quarter should be devoted to the establishment of schools and university scholarships, another to the maintenance of church buildings and public highways, and only one quarter to bishops’ stipends. There was vigorous criticism of cathedrals; “as they are now used, they are nothinge els but dennes of theves, nestes for owles, styes for hogges”. They should appoint and

⁶⁵ Ibid., E viii b.

⁶⁶ Ibid., E vi b-vii a.

maintain six, eight or even twelve preachers and devote more money to education.

All these reforms would require the support of the country's leading laymen and of Parliament. It is significant that Turner dedicated the *Wolfe* to "the lordes and yonge gentylmen" of Somerset and other counties throughout England, and the *Spirituall Physik* to the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk and several earls. Unless such leading laymen were willing to surrender their rights of patronage, there could be no means of initiating his proposals by lawful means or carrying them through by a constitutional process. The clergy are sick and the laity must heal the church; but the sickness is not confined to the ministers alone. The greed of the landlords has led to abuses such as the sale of livings, the neglect of church repair, the enclosure of common land, and the failure to support the infirm and poor. Again the fury of Latimer's sermons is echoed in the *Spirituall Physik*. Henry VIII is accused of drinking up "all the monkries, freries and nunries in England" and the tenth part of all spiritual men's livings. The realm suffers from a form of leprosy caused by "stertuppes, or selfemade gentlemen, and lordely byshoppes". The former are those who have acquired church lands and have social pretensions; and "ydle belly bestes" who steal and cheat in order to maintain their position. A true gentleman is educated in the humanities and the scriptures, and recognises his responsibility to set forth and maintain the Word of God. Turner wished to have a royal proclamation requiring the restoration to the church of wealth acquired by "Syr Mathew Muckforke" and his like. If "the true nobility", presumably those to whom the work is dedicated, see any "stertup" who lives like a lord but has less than twenty pounds a year that is truly his own, they should take him to the nearest market town and deal with him as did the birds in Aesop's fable with a crow, by plucking him and tearing off his clothes!⁶⁷ Towards the end of the book is a recital of the iniquities of popes and bishops throughout the history of the Church, much of it based on von Watt's work, and Turner refers the reader to Tyndale's *Practice of Prelates* for more information.

Turner had been appointed Dean of Wells in 1550, but went into exile until 1558. Eventually in 1561 he returned to Wells in spite of the opposition of the former holder of the office, but

⁶⁷ *Spirituall Physik*, ff. 83b-85b.

before long displeased his bishop, and was deprived for refusal to conform in 1564. His bishop complained in a letter to Cecil that in the pulpit "he medleth with all matters, and unsemelie speaketh of all estates, more then is standing with discretion".⁶⁸ In July 1566 Turner wrote to Bullinger, deploring the latter's support of the bishops in the Vestments Controversy. Hearing Bullinger's verdict that vestments were "things indifferent", not sufficiently important to warrant leaving the church, Turner took him to task, courteously but firmly. He named the wolves who would harm Christ's flock, and it is significant that he included Lutherans in the list. His letter concluded, "I have written these things to you with the greater boldness, that you may the better ascertain my feelings towards you, while I am anxious for the honour and integrity of your character, and for the freedom of your doctrine from any suspicion of error".⁶⁹ One is reminded of the stout repudiation of dependence on Osiander and Brenz at an earlier stage—here is the confidence of the Puritan that he knew the mind of Christ and the state of the primitive church. If Turner's health had not failed he would have played an important role in the Puritan activities of the 1570s; but his death before the age of sixty spared him further anger and frustration. As for his programme for a new church order, Knappen makes the appropriate comment: "The first of a long line of proposed Puritan disciplines for the English church... it raised great questions, but it was a blast blown out of season".⁷⁰

⁶⁸ *Zürich Letters*, i. 206n.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, ii. 124-6.

⁷⁰ M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939), pp. 113-4.