

# William Fulke on Traditions and History in the Identity of the English Church

---

RICHARD A. MULLER

mullri.emeritus@gmail.com

*P. J. Zondervan Professor of Historical Theology, Emeritus,  
Calvin Theological Seminary*

William Fulke (ca. 1538–1589) has received little attention in modern scholarship — despite his prominence in his own time as a theologian and apologist of the Elizabethan Settlement.<sup>1</sup> He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, graduating with the B.A. in 1558. Fulke subsequently studied law at Clifford's Inn. While at Clifford's Inn, he wrote his first major treatise, a work directed against astrology.<sup>2</sup> He returned to Cambridge, completed his master's degree in 1564, and was elected fellow of St. John's. His association with Thomas Cartwright and involvement in the vestarian controversy revealed his Puritan sympathies and led to a brief expulsion from the college. On his return in 1567, he lectured on Hebrew — and was again briefly censured in connection with a dispute over illegal marital unions. In 1569, he became chaplain to Robert Dudley, the earl of Leicester, and accompanied Dudley on diplomatic journeys to France. In 1572, he

---

1. On Fulke, see Richard Bauckham, "The Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke (1537–1589)" (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 1972); see also Bauckham, "Science and Religion in the Writings of Dr. William Fulke," *British Journal for the History of Science* 8, no. 1 (1975): 17–31. Also note the "Biographical Account" in William Fulke, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, Against the Cavils of Gregory Martin* (Cambridge University Press, 1843), i–xi; Edmund Venables, "Fulke William," s.v., in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 20:315–18; and Richard Bauckham, "Fulke, William," s.v. in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 21:129–31.

2. William Fulke, *Antiprognoticon contra inutiles astrologorum praedictiones Nostradami, Cuninghami, Loui, Hilli, Vaghani, & reliquorum omnium* (London, 1560); and *Antiprognoticon that is to saye, an Inuectiue Agaynst the Vayne and Vnprofitable Predictions of the Astrologians as Nostrodame, etc.... Whervnto is added by the author a shorte treatise in Englishshe, as well for the vtter subuersion of that fained arte, as also for the better vnderstandynge of the common people, vnto whom the fyrst labour seemeth not sufficient* (London, 1560).

was awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity and 1578 he was made master of Pembroke College, a position that he retained until his death in 1589.

The beginning of Fulke's interest in identifying traditionary sources for the defense of the Reformation began in the 1560s during the controversy over John Jewel's "Challenge Sermon" and saw early fruit in an unpublished work that gathered quotations from the church fathers by subject. As Richard Bauckham has pointed out, Fulke's apologetic or polemical works divide roughly into two groups: an early series of works published between 1568 and 1571, and a later series, corresponding with his tenure at Pembroke College, published between 1579 and 1589. Fulke's *Answer of a True Christian*, a work written in 1568 but only published in 1577, stands as the partial exception to this chronology.<sup>3</sup> The concentration of major polemical writings in the last decade of Fulke's life parallels his increasing involvement in the official apologetics of the English church. In 1580, he was selected by Richard Cox, bishop of Ely, to argue the Protestant cause against Thomas Watson (ex-bishop of Lincoln) and John Feckenham (ex-abbot of Westminster). The same year saw the publication of Fulke's response to Thomas Stapleton's translation of Bede's history and to its interpretation in Stapleton's *Fortresse of the Faith*.<sup>4</sup> In 1581, Fulke was one of the scholars chosen to dispute the Jesuit, Edmund Campion.<sup>5</sup> The expertise that he demonstrated in these debates led to his appointment in 1582 by the Privy Council to defend the church against Roman polemics, notably, the frontal attack on English Protestant translations of Scripture by Gregory Martin written in tandem with the Romanist translation of Scripture, the Rheims New

3. Bauckham, "Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke," 140–41.

4. Bede, *The History of the Church of Englande. Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman*, trans. Thomas Stapleton (Antwerp, 1565); and Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of the Faith First Planted Amonge vs Englishmen, and Continued Hitherto in the Vniuersall Church of Christ. The Faith of Which Time Protestants Call, Papistry* (Antwerp, 1565), published with the translation of Bede.

5. See Alexander Nowell and William Day, *A True Report of the Disputation or Rather Priuate Conference Had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581. Set downe by the reuerend learned men them selues that dealt therein. VVhereunto is ioyned also a true report of the other three dayes conferences had there with the same Iesuite. Which nowe are thought meete to be published in print by authoritie* (London, 1583). Fulke was involved principally on the second and third days of the four-day disputation. On Campion and the disputation, see Peter Lake and Michael Questier, "Puritans, Papists, and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context," *Journal of Modern History* 72, no. 3 (2000): 587–627. Note also William Whitaker, *Ad rationes decem Edmundi Campiani Iesuitae quibus fretus certamen Anglicanae exxlesiae ministris obtulit in causa fidei, responsio Gulielmi Whitakeri* (London, 1581).

Testament—printed in France and smuggled into England. Fulke's response was published in 1583. Fulke's final polemical work, *De Successione ecclesiastica*,<sup>6</sup> responded to the last book in Stapleton's massive treatise on the doctrinal principles of the "true church."<sup>7</sup>

The following essay examines Fulke's contribution to the debate over tradition in the latter half of the sixteenth century, noting both his backgrounds in the earlier, detailed works of Thomas Cranmer and John Jewel on tradition and the use of the church fathers, but focusing on two ways in which Fulke elaborated and nuanced the issue in the context of a polemic that had advanced in detail and content beyond the stage identified by Cranmer's and Jewel's efforts. First, against Stapleton, Fulke developed a unique argument for an indigenous English tradition based on his reading of Bede's *History of the Church of Englande* and the *Anglo-Saxon Homilies*, turning Stapleton's argument against him based on historical argumentation. Second, Fulke elaborated on the basic Protestant polemic against human traditions but nuanced it in response to issues of New Testament interpretation raised by polemics against Protestant translations of Scripture, most notably in Gregory Martin's arguments in favor of the Rheims New Testament.

### The English Church and Tradition: Cranmer and Jewel

Recourse to patristic argumentation in order to demonstrate the absence of a solid traditional rootage for Roman Catholicism, in particular for the Mass and transubstantiation, was characteristic of theological and apologetic stance of the early modern English church of the Elizabethan Settlement.<sup>8</sup> This is not to claim, in line with an older Anglican scholarship, that a fundamental difference of confessionality obtained between English

---

6. William Fulke, *De Successione ecclesiastica et latente ab antichristi tyrannide ecclesia liber contra Thomae Stapletoni Principiorum fidei doctrinalium librum decimum tertium* (London, 1584).

7. Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica. Per controuersias septem in libris duodecim tradita in quibus ad omnes de religione controuersias diiudicandas sola & certissima norma, & ad easdem semel finiendas sola & suprema in terris autoritas, via, & ratio demonstrantur* (Paris, 1582).

8. See Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford University Press, 2009); and Quantin, "Perceptions of Christian Antiquity," in Anthony Milton, ed., *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, vol. 1: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520–1662* (Oxford University Press, 2017), 280–97; and K. J. Walsh, "Appeals to Antiquity in the Making of the Elizabethan Settlement" (PhD diss., Australian National University, 1971).

and continental Reformed theology—rather it is to note the clear parallel and mutual interdependence of the English with the continentals.<sup>9</sup> The assumption of Reformed Protestants, whether English or continental, was that their teachings were representative of the catholic tradition and that it was the papacy that had deviated from the catholic faith by the addition of “human traditions,” some directly contrary to Scripture, others either arbitrary or temporally conditioned, and commanded their observance as necessary to faith and salvation. In the case of transubstantiation, the Protestant polemic was not only shared across virtually the entire spectrum of Protestant churches, but it was also rooted in a long historical background of alternative explanations of the Lord’s Supper prior to the declarations of IV Lateran in 1215 and a significantly more recent background of arguments against the doctrine in the late Middle Ages. The Protestant polemic, then, was not against tradition in general but against the oppressive and abusive use of specific human traditions.<sup>10</sup> As John Foxe argued, the “oppression of the bishops of Rome” and ultimately the schism with the Eastern Church demonstrated that Rome had “lost the benefit of universal consent, so also she lost the name of ‘Catholic.’”<sup>11</sup>

Foxe’s views belong to a Protestant narrative of decline that identified the later Middle Ages as an era of increasing distortion of and departure from the truths of the gospel and that supported the fundamental conservatism of the Reformation as a return to biblical truth.<sup>12</sup> This return, however, did not entail an attempt to leap over all of the intervening centuries as if all

9. See Mary Morrissey, “The ‘Challenge Controversy’ and the Question of Authority in the Early Elizabethan Church,” in Helen L. Parish, Elaine Fulton, and Peter Webster, eds., *The Search for Authority in Reformation Europe* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2016), 147–69, here 147–48; and Quantin, 1–21, 31; setting aside the view of Anglican distinctiveness present in his earlier essay, “The Fathers in Seventeenth Century Anglican Theology,” in Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, 2:987–1008; and also found studies such as H. R. McAdoo, “The Influence of the Seventeenth Century on Contemporary Anglican Understanding of the Purpose and Functioning of Authority in the Church,” in G. R. Evans, ed., *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Oxford University Press, 1988), 251–77.

10. The point can be argued from the statements of various Reformers, notably, John Calvin: see above, chapter 4, “*Traditio* and *Paradosis* vs. *Humanas Traditiones*: Calvin on the Problem of Tradition.”

11. John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, a New and Complete Edition: With a Preliminary Dissertation*, by the Rev. George Townsend, 8 vols. (London, 1837), 2:418–19.

12. Jordan J. Ballor, “Deformation and Reformation: Thomas Aquinas and the Rise of Protestant Scholasticism,” in Manfred Svensson and David VanDrunen, eds., *Aquinas Among the Protestants* (Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 29–33; cf. Muller, *Post-Reformation*

teachings beyond the biblical canon were to be rejected. The Reformers and their successors cited with relative approval both the church fathers of the first five centuries, various early medieval theologians, and a series of “sounder scholastics” or *saniores scholastici* in whose works much solid exposition of Christian doctrine could be found, distinguished from dogmatic and customary accretions, and employed as a resource in theological formulation. In the late sixteenth century Protestant theologians happily posed Aquinas against the post-Tridentine views on the relative authority of Scripture and tradition.<sup>13</sup> More importantly, Protestants appealed to their agreement with the broad outlines of Christian doctrine found in the writings of church fathers and in the four ecumenical councils (Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon) as evidence of the catholicity and orthodoxy of the Reformation, while at the same time recognizing presence of error in all such human productions and rejecting the assumption that Scripture ought to be read under the light of an extra-biblical traditionary norm.<sup>14</sup>

The early Reformation debate over tradition, as inaugurated in the writings of early Reformers like Tyndale and developed in the work of Thomas Cranmer,<sup>15</sup> was typically focused on various traditions in doctrine and ceremony, whether or not they were grounded in Scripture or found among the fathers of the first five or six centuries,<sup>16</sup> and whether in view of their foundation and origin they could be considered as permanent and normative. Most of the comments that Cranmer made with reference to tradition,

---

*Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 1:194–197

13. David S. Sytsma, “Thomas Aquinas and Reformed Biblical Interpretation: The Contribution of William Whitaker,” in Manfred Svensson and David VanDrunen, eds., *Aquinas Among the Protestants* (Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 49–74.

14. Cf. Heinrich Bullinger, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*, trans. H. I., ed. Thomas Harding, 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1849–1852), 1:12–14. Bullinger limits the councils to four, excluding the Councils or Synods of Constantinople of AD 553 and 680 as adding nothing to the orthodoxy of the first four. Also note *Thirty-Nine Articles*, xxi, in Philip Schaff, ed., *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes*, 3 vols., 6th ed. (Harper & Brothers, 1919), 3:500, on the authority of “Generall Councils.”

15. On Cranmer’s life and career, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (Yale University Press, 1996); also Paul Ayris, “The Public Career of Thomas Cranmer,” in *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 4 (2000): 75–125; and note Elliott Maurice, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Bible: ‘Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum,’” in *Churchman* 109, no. 1 (1995): 66–76.

16. Understandings of the duration of “primitive” Christianity varied during the era: see John C. English, “The Duration of the Primitive Church: An Issue for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Anglicans,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 73, no. 1 (2004): 35–52.

much in accord with the thought of other Reformers, are in the plural to “traditions” or to a particular tradition, that, like rites and ceremonies, can exist in the church albeit not in a final or normative manner.<sup>17</sup> Rather than appeal to “tradition” in the singular as having a normative value, Cranmer appealed, as indicated in the title of his *Defensio*, to “the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church.”<sup>18</sup> Yet even in this appeal there remained a qualification. As Quantin points out, this consent “was not the *consensus Patrum* of Tridentine theology.”<sup>19</sup> For Cranmer, the consent, even if it were available with an identifiable uniformity in all points of doctrine, would not have an authority distinct and separate from Scripture, and would require validation on the basis of its grounding in Scripture. Cranmer also recognized that the consent of the fathers was itself hardly uniform, not without error, and, like the Vincentian canon itself, more functional in the negative, ruling out doctrines that were limited in assent, time, and place, than in the positive, attempting to identify an absolutely universal belief. Or, to make the point in another way, a positive relation to patristic doctrine could serve as an argument for catholicity over against doctrinal innovation and as an indicator of the historical connection between the Reformation and Scripture via the early church, but it could not serve as an argument for the truth of one’s doctrine apart from Scriptural attestation.<sup>20</sup> In Cranmer’s case, as

17. Thomas Cranmer, *A Confutation of Unwritten Verities*, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556* (Cambridge University Press, 1846), 7, 22, 27, 52n, 55–60, 63; also idem, *An Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation Devised by Stephen Gardiner*, in *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, relative to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper* (Cambridge University Press, 1844), 19, 209; and cf. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, “Tradition and Traditions in Thomas Cranmer,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 59, no. 4 (1990): 467–78. There are quotations from the fathers that reference the “tradition” of the church in the singular: e.g., Cranmer, *Confutation of Unwritten Verities*, 57, 58.

18. Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concerning the same, grounded and established upon God’s holy word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the church*, in *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed., Henry Jenkins, 4 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1833), 2:275–468; cf. K. J. Walsh, “Cranmer and the Fathers, Especially in the Defence,” *Journal of Religious History* 11, no. 2 (1980), 227–47, here page 236.

19. Quantin, *Church of England*, 55.

20. Cf. William Newton Todd, “The Function of the Patristic Writings in the Thought of John Calvin” (ThD diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1964), 144–53; with John K. Luoma, “The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century: The Anglican-Puritan Debate over Church Polity as Represented by Richard Hooker and Thomas Cartwright” (PhD diss., Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1974),

the title of his *Defence* indicates, a doctrine would need to be “grounded upon God’s word” and received in the church historically by way of the “consent” of its ancient teachers.<sup>21</sup>

Cranmer’s defenses of the teaching of the English Reformation, notably his arguments concerning the Lord’s Supper evidence a balance of Scripture and patristic reference, with Scripture as the prior authority the truth of which had been handed down and expounded faithfully in the church.<sup>22</sup> Against “the papists” Cranmer not only affirmed the biblical basis for his understanding of the sacrament, he also insisted that he was not a lonely or individualistic interpreter: “lest the papists should say that we suck this [doctrine] out of our fingers, the same shall be proved, by the testimony of the old authors, to be the true and old faith of the catholic Church.”<sup>23</sup> The Roman practice of reserving the host and praying to it provided Cranmer with but one example of a Roman or papal innovation that could not be found in the writings of the fathers, not even, Cranmer averred, in the first thousand years of the church, but only in the thirteenth century.<sup>24</sup> Cranmer was also well aware of late medieval objections to transubstantiation and that both Duns Scotus and Gabriel Biel had recognized the doctrine rested neither on Scripture or reason, but on the determination of the Roman magisterium.<sup>25</sup> Accordingly, it was not merely the Pope that Cranmer saw as opposed to the truth of Scripture, but the “very papacy and the see of

---

71–77 (on Thomas Cartwright). Louma contrasted Cartwright with Hooker on the basis of Hooker’s use of traditions not contrary to Scripture in matters of church governance. Arguably Cartwright and Hooker were closer to agreement concerning matters of doctrine related to salvation. Luoma’s argument is summarized in his “Who Owns the Fathers? Hooker and Cartwright on the Authority of the Primitive Church,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 8, no. 3 (1977): 45–59.

21. Also note, Cranmer, *Defence*, 296–97, 320–28; cf. Walsh, “Cranmer and the Fathers,” 236; also see William P. Haaugaard, “Renaissance Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth-Century England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 10, no. 3 (1979): 37–60, here, pp. 41–42, 42n10, 52n52.

22. See Maurice Elliott, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Bible: ‘Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum,’” *Churchman* 109, no. 1 (1995): 66–76; idem, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Papacy: ‘And as for the Pope, I Refuse Him as Christ’s Enemy,’” *Churchman* 109, no. 2 (1995): 132–42; Ashley Null, “Thomas Cranmer and the Anglican Way of Reading Scripture,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 75, no. 4 (2006): 488–526; and Derek Scales, “Thomas Cranmer’s ‘True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament,’” *Churchman* 104, no. 1 (1990): 102–31.

23. Cranmer, *Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation*, 103.

24. Cranmer, *Answer to the Fifteen Articles*, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*, 172.

25. Cranmer, *Defence*, 333–34.

Rome” that had created traditions in which the Word of God was opposed and suppressed.<sup>26</sup>

John Jewel (1522–1571), bishop of Salisbury from 1560 until his death, has typically been identified as the preeminent apologist of the Elizabethan church.<sup>27</sup> At the heart of Jewel’s apologetic was the assumption that the English church had not forsaken the catholic faith—indeed, it held to the true catholic faith “of the apostles and of the holy fathers,” which it believed to be “Noe’s ark” apart from which there is no salvation.<sup>28</sup> Separation from the Church of Rome was not without great reluctance, since once, in another time, the gospel had been preached there. But Rome had departed from the truth and had subjected God’s commandments to the rule of one man. Accordingly, the English did not depart from the church: they departed from error.<sup>29</sup>

Jewel was able to identify several medieval critics of the papacy and a variety of doctrinal views that countered later medieval and contemporary Roman doctrine and practice. There were cautions against papal power and claims of universal sovereignty not only in the works of Gregory the Great but also in the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux.<sup>30</sup> To support his argument, Jewel referred to a letter of Gregory the Great directed against John, the bishop of Constantinople, who had claimed to be “the universal bishop of Christ’s whole church”:

---

26. Cranmer to Lord Lisle, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*, 322; cf. Elliott, “Cranmer’s Attitude to the Papacy,” 135.

27. John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1845–1850). On Jewel’s life and thought, see Gary W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erastian Reformer* (Ashgate, 2006); also Angela Ranson, “‘Because Thy God Loves England’: Bishop John Jewel and the Catholicity of the Church of England, 1535–1599” (PhD diss., University of York, 2013); idem, “The Challenge of Catholicity: John Jewel at Paul’s Cross,” in W. Torrance Kirby and Paul Stanwood, eds., *Paul’s Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England* (Brill, 2014), 203–21; also Wyndham Mason Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Harvard University Press, 1962); and Edward B. Jones, “An Examination of the Anglican Definition of the Church as Expounded by Bishop John Jewel” (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 1963).

28. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology of the Church of England*, in *Works*, vols. 3–4, here, 4:709.

29. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 4:718, 720.

30. E.g., John Jewel, *Bishop Jewel’s Answer to the Second Letter [of Dr. Cole]*, in *Works*, 1:32; *Bishop Jewel’s Reply to the Letter Above Written*, in *Works*, 1:46; *A Reply to M. Harding’s Answer*, in *Works*, 1:94, 164; *Defense of the Apology*, 4:1009.

“If the church,” saith [Gregory], “shall depend upon one man, it will soon fall to the ground.” Who is he that seeth not how this is come to passe long sithence? For long agoe hath the bishop of Rome willed to have the whole church depend upon himself alone. Whereof it is no marvel, though it be clean fallen down long agoe.<sup>31</sup>

The catholic unity of the church, however, does not depend on the fallen church of Rome or on the pope, but on Christ and is signified by the presence of the scriptures as the foundation built on the prophets and apostles. The Roman church subverts the scriptures and, like the ancient heretics, sets up as an authority and a source of unity human “conclusions and imaginations” rather than Christ.<sup>32</sup>

Jewel’s approach to tradition and to the use of the church fathers is neatly summarized in the sermon he preached at Paul’s Cross in 1560,<sup>33</sup> famously known as the “Challenge Sermon.” The sermon rests on the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:23–29). After a brief introduction to Paul’s preaching, the sermon is largely a discourse on the meaning of the text in the early church. Jewel attacks the secretive aspects of the Mass, arguing that the words of institution were spoken in ancient times “to the people, and that in such sort as they might well understand them, and prepare themselves to the holy communion.”<sup>34</sup> Not only were the words of institution meant to be heard and understood by all, but celebration of the sacrament was also open to all communicants: there were no private masses, only one holy communion “which now God of his great mercy hath restored to us.”<sup>35</sup>

Once he had documented these foundational arguments with multiple patristic references, Jewel provided his general rule for use of the church fathers in controversy:

---

31. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 4:730.

32. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 4:748–51, 759–60.

33. John Jewel, *The Copy of a Sermon Preached by the Bishop of Sarisbury at Paul’s Cross, the Second Sunday before Easter, in the Year of Our Lord, 1560*, in *Works*, 1:1–25. Note Mary Morrissey, “The ‘Challenge Controversy’ and the Question of Authority in the Early Elizabethan Church,” in Helen L. Parish, Elaine Fulton, and Peter Webster, eds., *The Search for Authority in Reformation Europe* (Ashgate, 2016), 147–69; and W. J. Torrance Kirby, “Signs and Things Signified: Sacramental Hermeneutics in John Jewel’s ‘Challenge Sermon’ and the ‘Culture of Persuasion at Paul’s Cross,’” *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 11, no. 1 (2009): 57–89.

34. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:19.

35. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:20.

If any learned man of all out adversaries, or if all of the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor, or father, or out of any general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it be clearly and plainly proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ...or that the bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal church; Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christs body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament...or that the lay people was forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue— if any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any clear or plain clause or sentence, either out of the scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old council, or by any example of the primitive church; I promised that then I would give over and subscribe unto him.<sup>36</sup>

Jewel could argue that the heretics of old, like the Roman Church, abused the fathers for their own purposes, but close study has revealed their errors. Scripture remains the final and sole rule of Christian teaching, but the fathers serve as a guide to its reading.<sup>37</sup>

On the specific doctrinal issue of the Lord's Supper, Jewel, like Ridley, could point to the views of John Scotus Eriugena, Ratramnus in the ninth century, an obscure bishop in eastern Europe Theophylact in the eleventh, and Berengarius in the twelfth, all of whom were in accord in preaching a patristic doctrine of Christ's presence, with only Berengarius coming under papal censure. Berengarius, moreover, had been condemned for echoing Augustine.<sup>38</sup> The denial of corporeal presence on the part of English Reformers, accordingly, could be argued as standing in continuity with the teachings of the fathers as mediated by several medieval teachers. When Jewel's opponent, Thomas Harding, echoing the language of Trent, demanded a traditionary connection between Berengarius and the English

36. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:20–21.

37. Jewel, *Copy of a Sermon*, 1:22, 24–25.

38. Jewel, *Reply to M. Harding's Answer*, in *Works*, 1:458, 503, 546; Cf. Nicholas Ridley, *A Conference between Nicholas Ridley [...] and Secretary Bourn*, in *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of London, Martyr, 1555* (Cambridge University Press, 1843), 159; and idem, *Disputation at Oxford Between Dr. Smith, with His Colleagues and Other Doctors, and Bishop Ridley*, in *Works*, 202, 206.

church—“Shew us your succession. Where are your bishops?”<sup>39</sup>—Jewel continued to argue his point against the antiquity of transubstantiation, denying that it was part of any legitimate succession in doctrine, but he did not answer the question concerning the connection between Ratramnus, Berengar, and the English church of the sixteenth century.<sup>40</sup>

### Against Stapleton: Fulke on Bede and the Traditionary Foundations of the English Church

The argumentation concerning the nature and authority of the ongoing traditions of the church found in William Fulke’s later works, particularly in his *Overthrow* of Thomas Stapleton’s *Fortresse of the Faith*, moved quite a distance from the argumentation of Tyndale and More but also a significant step beyond the major apologetic work of Cranmer and Jewel.<sup>41</sup> Tyndale’s early stand on the sole authority of Scripture, accompanied by polemic against “human traditions”<sup>42</sup> was not abandoned by Fulke, but was greatly modified and refined to include comment on the later history of the church and the continuities and discontinuities of its doctrines. Cranmer set a standard for the citation of church fathers as “authors” recognized as doctrinal authorities against arbitrary human traditions. Jewel drew on this standard and expanded polemically on the subject of the church fathers and traditionary catholicity. When Fulke came to his refutation of Stapleton, he prefaced it with a substantial “catalogue” of “popish books” and English replies, in which Jewel’s works are set at the beginning of the list.<sup>43</sup> If Jewel was the preeminent English scholar to affirm the use of the church fathers

39. Thomas Harding, *A Confutation of a Booke Intituled An Apologie of the Church of England* (Antwerp, 1565), Vi (fol. 219v); cf. *Canones et decreta sacrosancti Concilii tridentini sub Paulo III., Iulio III. et Pio IV* (Leipzig, 1866), 15.

40. Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, V, 4:784–85; cf. *ibid.*, II (2:339–40, 344, 348) contrasting succession of person or place with succession of true doctrine.

41. On Stapleton, see Marvin R. O’Connor, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (Yale University Press, 1964); also, Michael Richards, “Thomas Stapleton,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 18, no. 2 (1967): 187–99.

42. See E. Flessemann-Van Leer, “The Controversy About Scripture and Tradition Between Thomas More and William Tyndale,” in *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis*, NS 43 (1960): 143–64.; cf. Richard A. Mullet, “Not of Private Interpretation: Scripture and Tradition in Reformation and Early Modern Protestantism,” *Christian Scholar* 31 (2019): 29–43, here, pp. 31–34.

43. William Fulke, *T. Stapleton and Martiall (Two Popish Heretickes) Confuted, and of Their Particular Heresies Detected* (London, 1580), sig. ¶2 r–v; updating Fulke’s previous “catalogue” of “popish bookes” and replies published in William Fulke, *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and M. Rastel, accounted (among their faction) three pillars and archpatriarches of the popish*

in a cohesive defense of the catholicity not simply of the Reformation but of the English church, Fulke can be seen, evidenced by Fulke's own list of major apologetic treatises, as one of his more significant followers. Indeed, as Bauckham points out, Fulke's treatment of the issue of authority developed past that of Jewel, if only because Fulke continued the controversy, both building on Jewel's work and dealing at length with the substance of later Romanist polemic.

Perhaps the most important contextual difference between Jewel's work and Fulke's is signaled by the event of three publications, Thomas Stapleton's translation of Bede's ecclesiastical history (1565), Stapleton's *Fortresse of the Faith* (1565) which rested much of its case against the English church on Bede,<sup>44</sup> and the publication in 1566, with translation into early modern English, of the *Anglo-Saxon Homilies* by Aelfric, the early eleventh-century Abbot of Eynsham.<sup>45</sup> Jewel, who lived until 1571, did not take on the task of refuting Stapleton. That effort fell to Fulke.

Jewel had argued on several fronts, all of use to Fulke, but none that addressed the historical argument posed by Stapleton on the basis of Bede. Jewel had indicated, first, the positive value of the writings of the earliest fathers, shown them to be worthy of respect and of use to the church of his own day, particularly as correctives to Roman doctrine. Second, he used the fathers as evidence of the fall of the papacy from the united body of the church. And third, he had shown that the fathers could be used to telling effect in debate over both doctrine and polity. In a purely polemical sense, all of these readings of the fathers could form an effective argument for repudiation of Roman church governance as well as Roman doctrines that

---

*synagogue (vtter enemies to the truth of Christes Gospell, and all that syncerely professe the same) ouerthrowne, and detected of their seuerall blasphemous heresies* (London, 1579), sig. C.ii r–v.

44. On Stapleton, see Marvin O'Connell, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (Yale University Press, 1964). O'Connell, p. 55, refers to the *Fortresse* as an "appendix" to Bede.

45. Aelfric, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie Shewing the Auncient Fayth in the Church of England Touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord Here Publikely Preached, and Also Receaued in the Saxons Tyme, Aboue 600. Yeares Agoe* (London, ca. 1566). N.B., the Latin original of Aelfric's work on the sacrament was largely Ratramnus of Corbie's treatise on the Lord's Supper. On Aelfric, see Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, eds. *A Companion to Aelfric* (Brill, 2009); on the medieval and early modern reception of Aelfric, see Hugh Magennis, "Not Angles but Anglicans? Reformation and Post-Reformation Perspectives on the Anglo-Saxon Church, Part I: Bede, Ælfric and the Anglo-Saxon Church in Early Modern England," *English Studies* 96, no. 3 (2015): 243–63; and idem, "Not Angles but Anglicans? Reformation and Post-Reformation Perspectives on the Anglo-Saxon Church, Part II: Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *English Studies* 96, no. 4 (2015): 363–78.

could be shown to be later accretions—and to point to an understanding of catholicity not dependent on Rome.<sup>46</sup>

This pattern of argumentation did not, however, address the positive issue of the English church as a true church that had remained in continuity with the church of the first six centuries and that need not be implicated in the problems of the papacy. This issue arose most pointedly in connection with the historical responses of “Romish” polemicists like Thomas Stapleton, who argued that the English church was dependent for its very existence on the mission of Augustine, sent by Gregory the Great to convert the Angles and Saxons to Christianity. According to Stapleton, it followed from this datum of the origins of English Christianity that the so-called Reformation was an apostasy from the ancient faith that had been maintained for some nine hundred years after Augustine’s mission before sinking into heretical innovations in the sixteenth century.<sup>47</sup>

Fulke finally published his response to Stapleton in 1580 together with his rebuttal of a treatise by John Martiiall.<sup>48</sup> The issue that Fulke confronted was to affirm the accord of the English church with the ancient tradition of Christian doctrine while at the same time disconnecting the English church from the historical path of the Roman see—in short to undermine the claim announced in Stapleton’s full title, *Fortresse of the Faith First Planted Amonge vs Englishmen, and Continued Hitherto in the Vniuersall Church of Christ* by showing that the late sixth-century mission to England of the monk Augustine was not the “faith first planted” and that the papal church was not universal. Fulke addressed the problem through an appeal to ancient English historical sources, notably the *Ecclesiastical History* of Bede and the newly published *Anglo-Saxon Homilies* of Aefric. In the case of both documents, Fulke was responding to publications that had appeared after the publication of Jewel’s *Apology*. Jewel had referenced Bede’s Latin text largely for issues of doctrine and practice,<sup>49</sup> but Fulke was confronted by

---

46. Cf. Jones, “Examination of the Anglican Definition,” 234–37; Angela Ranson, “Redefining Unity in the Jacobean Church: The Legacy of John Jewel,” in Angela Ranson, André A. Gazal, and Sarah Bastow, eds. *Defending the Faith: John Jewel and the Elizabethan Church* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018), 210.

47. Stapleton, *Fortresse of the Faith*, I, fol. 7r–11v.

48. The internal title of Fulke’s response to Stapleton is *An Overthrow to the Feeble Fortresse of Popish Faith Reveived from Rome, and Lately Advanced by Thomas Stapleton*, hereinafter cited as *Overthrow*. Martiiall’s work is *A replie to M. Calphills blasphemous answer made against the Treatise of the crosse* (Leuven, 1566).

49. Cf. e.g., Jewel, *Works*, vol. 1, pp. 301–7.

Stapleton's English translation of Bede's *History* that had appeared from the recusant press in Antwerp in 1565. Stapleton had gone so far as to affix to the translation a list of differences between the faith of the early English church and the doctrines of Protestantism.

Fulke's approach to Bede resonated with some of Jewel's observations,<sup>50</sup> but also had parallels with the apologetic historiography already evident in such works as John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* and Simon Devoyon's *Discours sur le denombrement des docteurs de l'Eglise de Dieu*.<sup>51</sup> Foxe and Devoyon identified a series of medievals including Ratramnus, Berengar, Wycliffe, and Hus, who would be identified by later writers as "forerunners" or precursors of the Reformation. Fulke's response to Stapleton looked in two directions—he worked through Bede's references of historical figures and events to develop a view of the character and teaching of the ancient English church, sometimes critiquing what he found in the narrative, but equally so drawing positively on Bede's narrative to counteract Stapleton's reading.<sup>52</sup> Notably, Fulke was able to show, contrary to Stapleton, that Bede stood against claims concerning the unbroken continuity of papal rule and religion in England: "it is false that the religion nowe called Papistry hath been professed these 900 years," Fulke wrote, "which I have proved by more then 40 differences, gathered out of the historie of Bede, and other monuments of antiquitie,"<sup>53</sup> the latter including prominently Aelfric's *Anglo-Saxon Homilies*. This reading of Bede, established by Fulke, remained a feature of

50. Cf. Jewel, *Works*, 1:206, 300.

51. Simon Devoyon, *Discours sur le denombrement des docteurs de l'Eglise de Dieu: assauoir, tant de ceux qui ont esté dès le commencement du monde (contenus aux Saintes Escriitures) que de plusieurs qui ont puis apres succedé par ordre iusques aujour'd'uy* (Orleans, 1565); in translation, *A testimonie of the true Church of God confirmed as well by the doctrine as liues of sundry holy men, both patriarkes, and prophetes, and also by the Apostles and their true succours. Wherein is manifestly shewed how that God hath in all ages rayseed vp some, yea euen in most horrible darkenesse, which haue beene faithfull stewards, and true dispensers of his will, with a catalogue of their names*, trans. William Phiston (London, 1585).

52. Magennis, "Not Angles but Anglicans?" part 1:255–56, identifies Fulke as the inaugurator of the use of Bede to establish the ancient identity of the English church. The English recusant, Lawrence (or James) Anderton, alias John Brereley, argues against Fulke in his *The Apologie of the Romane Church deuided into three seuerall tractes whereof 1. The first, concerneth the antiquitie and continuance of the Catholike Romane religion ever since the Apostles time. 2. The second that the Protestant religion was not so much as in being, at or before Luthers first appearing. 3. The thirde that Catholickes are no lesse loyall and dutifull to their soveraigne, then Protestant. All which are vndertaken and proued by testimonies of the learned Protestant themselves* (S.l.: s.n. [English secret press], 1604), i.1–2 (pp. 2–8).

53. Fulke, *Overthrow*, I. xv (p. 58).

British anti-papal polemic, as evidenced in James Ussher's *Discourse* on the ancient religion of the Irish and the British.<sup>54</sup>

Stapleton had pointed to the absence of miracles substantiating Protestant claims to truth, while Bede's account had indicated many miracles accompanying Augustine's mission to Britain. Fulke countered with two arguments. First, there was a qualitative difference between the revelation in Christ and the church's later testimony to that revelation. Echoing Tyn-dale, Fulke argued that, after Christ, confirmation by miracle was no longer needed in the church.<sup>55</sup> As to the reported miracles of Augustine, Fulke impugned both the account and the character of Augustine: "if," Fulke commented, "by subtill practice miracles have bene feigned to have bene done by him, and reported by a credulous man Bede, it hurteth not our cause: seeing as other writers report [Augustine] to have bene both a proud and a cruell man."<sup>56</sup> In response to Stapleton's argument that Augustine's mission had sought to bring unity to Christ's church, in contrast to the Protestant sowing "infamous dissention," Fulke offered a double response, probably drawing on Geoffrey of Monmouth's history England, where, as distinct from Bede's account, Augustine is identified as missionary to the pagan Saxon invaders, and whose authority was rejected by the Christian Britons and their bishops.<sup>57</sup> Augustine, Fulke noted, had "no desire of Christian unitie" but had only worked to subject British Christians, including those who had held the faith prior to Augustine's mission, "to himselfe and to the Church of Rome" — a truly "Antichristian ambition and tyrannie." Further, "The dissention of the Protestants is not in articles of faith: nor such, but that they are all brethren, that unfeignedly professe the doc-

54. James Ussher, *A Discourse of the Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and the British* (London, 1631), x (pp. 105–117). Ussher does not cite Fulke.

55. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 1).

56. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 1–2).

57. Given the date of the printed edition, Fulke would have needed to consult a manuscript version of which there were several at Cambridge: Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Pontici Virunniū viri doctissimi Britannicæ historiæ libri sex magna et fide et diligentia conscripti: ad Britannici codicis fidem correcti, & ab infinitis mendis liberati: quibus præfixus est catalogus regum Britannicæ: per Dauidem Pouelum, S. Theolog. professorem* (London: Edmund Bollifant, 1585); in translation, *The History of the Kings of Britain. An edition and translation of the De gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britannicæ)*, ed. Michael D. Reeves, trans. Neil Wright (Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 258–61. Geoffrey's account is the one source available to Fulke that offered a negative reading of Augustine: in addition to Bede, William of Malmesbury is quite positive: see his *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum, the History of the English Bishops*, 2 vols., ed. and trans., M. Winterbottom (Clarendon Press, 2007), 5–6.

trine of salvation: although they dissent in the matter of the sacrament, in orders, rites and ceremonies."<sup>58</sup>

Bede's opinion of Augustine was capable of dismissal—but much of what could be learned from Bede's account concerning the early church, Christianity in England, and the power of Rome could stand against Stapleton's use of the history. Where Stapleton claimed that Protestant churches have no proper consecration and therefore no legitimate bishops, Fulke could counter from Bede that

Laurence, the second Archbishop of Canterburie, acknowledgedeth the Ministers of the Scots and Britaines for Bishops, although they were not subject to the Church and See of Rome.... Aidanus, Finanus, Colmanus are judged of Beda for true Bishops, although they were devided from the Church of Rome, and so are such Bishops as were ordeined by them, for they converted the greatest part of the Saxons unto Christian faith; As Northumbrians, Mertians, and East Saxons.<sup>59</sup>

Where Stapleton had acknowledged the presence of these bishops and of valid consecration in Anglo-Saxon England, Fulke was able to argue further—on the basis of what Stapleton had acknowledged—that the English church had ties to the apostolic witness that did not depend on Rome and which had, in fact, existed prior to the mission of Augustine.<sup>60</sup>

Not only does Bede offer evidence of the independence of the English church from Rome, he also indicates the subordination of popes to emperors and the installation of bishops by kings. Even after the mission of Augustine, Fulke argues, the English remained independent of Rome in matters of ecclesiastical preferment: "At Augustines coming and long after, they refused to yeld obedience to the See of Rome, yea among the Saxons themselves, Wilfrid deposed by the king, and absolved by the Pope, could not be restored, but by a Synod of his own countrie."<sup>61</sup> Fulke also notes numerous instances, recorded by Bede, of English kings deposing bishops, of forbidding idolatry, of governing synods, of commanding archbishops to consecrate bishops, and of conferring privileges on monasteries—all

58. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 2).

59. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 13), citing Bede, *History*, II.iv.

60. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 13–14); II. vii (pp. 113–14).

61. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 14), citing Bede, *History*, V. xx. Note here also Eddius Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, text, translation, and notes by Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge University Press, 1927), xiv–xv (pp. 30–33).

of which actions demonstrate an absence of Roman church rule.<sup>62</sup> By way of conclusion to these arguments, Fulke noted that the patristic roots of the English church went deeper than the Roman mission sponsored by Gregory the Great and argued that the Reformation was a return to this older tradition: “The Protestantes are returned to the auncient faith which was in this land before Augustine came from Rome, which did not so much good in planting faith where it was not, as in corrupting the sinceritie of the faith where it was before he came.”<sup>63</sup>

### Fulke and the Anglo-Saxon Homilies

In pursuing this claim, Fulke was perhaps the first apologist for the English church to place stress on the *Anglo-Saxon Homilies* as evidence of an indigenous English theological tradition—using Aelfric’s text together with materials from Bede to create what one modern scholar has called “the myth of Aelfric the protoprotestant [and] the myth of an independent Anglo-Saxon church.”<sup>64</sup> Although Jewel had known of the writings of Aelfric, as evidenced by a letter of early 1568 to Archbishop Parker noting a work that he had discovered in his library, his encounter with the volume had come after the publication of his *Apologie* (1562) and his *Defense of the Apologie* (1567). Jewel refers to the newly found volume as a “hidden treasure... whether it be by Alfricus or no,” and indicates that he had sent it to Parker for inspection.<sup>65</sup> Jewel’s letter raises issues concerning the identity of the book that he mentions and the dating the translation and publication of Aelfric’s sermon on the sacrament: that publication is undated but typically thought to have been printed in 1566 or 1567. To add to the curiosity, the publication is subscribed by Matthew Parker as archbishop of Canterbury

---

62. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 19–21), citing Bede, *History*, I.xxxiii; III.vii, viii; IV.xii, xiii, xxiii; V.xx, etc.

63. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 14).

64. Hugh Magennis, “Aelfric Scholarship,” in Magennis and Swan, eds, *Companion to Aelfric*, 11. Although Fulke’s account of a non-papal, pre-Augustine English church and its tradition is an apologetic construction, it does rightly reflect the presence of Christianity in England from Roman times onward and its distinction in many respects from the forms of Christianity brought by Augustine at the close of the sixth century: see Caitlin Corning, *The Celtic and Roman Traditions Conflict and Consensus in the Early Medieval Church* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

65. Bishop Jewel to Archbishop Parker, 31 January 1568, in Jewel, *Works*, 4:1274.

and Thomas Young as archbishop of York, plus thirteen other English bishops — missing, however, from the list is John Jewel.<sup>66</sup>

In the early modern context — the modern complaint of mythologization aside — Fulke was able to demonstrate the highly fissiparous character of the medieval theological tradition, the absence of a uniform Roman hegemony such as presumed by his Roman adversaries, and the presence of doctrinal formulations alternative to the claims of post-Tridentine Romanism. On the key issue of transubstantiation, Fulke declared that the older, pre-Roman tradition had persisted. From Aelfric's *Homilies*, Fulke could state, "The Church of English Saxons, for 300 yeares after Augustine, did beleve bread and wine to remain in the sacrament after consecration, which the Papists denie, proved by a Sermon extant in the Saxon tongue, translated out of Latine by Aelfrike... and appointed to be read unto the people at Easter before they received the Communion, also by two Epistles of the same Aelfricke."<sup>67</sup> And further, "The Church of English Saxons beleved the sacrament to be the body and bloud of Christ, not carnally but spirituallly; expressly denying as wel the carnal presence as transubstantiation, which the Papists hold. Aelf. Sermon. Pasc. & Ep."<sup>68</sup>

In Aelfric, Fulke not only found a medieval sacramental theology, but also historical evidence, in accord with Bede's *History*, that the English church had preserved its own theological heritage in a path not dependent on the guidance of Rome, and had done so as long as two centuries after the mission of Augustine to Britain.<sup>69</sup> Aelfric, then, represented an indigenous tradition, at some variance with the thought and practice of continental and particularly Roman Christianity, a tradition that flourished in the ninth and tenth centuries. Had Fulke recognized that Aelfric's translation was from the Latin of Ratramnus, it would not have disturbed his argument, given

---

66. Aelfric, *Testimony of Antiquitie*, fol. K.iiii recto-verso. On the recovery of Aelfric by Parker and others, see Magennis, "Aelfric Scholarship," 9–10.

67. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 17); note that Fulke, like various of his contemporaries identified Aelfric of Eynsham with an Archbishop of Canterbury of the same name — a confusion only cleared in the nineteenth century: see Joyce Hill, "Aelfric: His Life and Works," in Magennis and Swan, eds, *Companion to Aelfric*, 35.

68. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 17).

69. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 22); the argument is reflected in Perkins's appeal to Aelfric: see William Perkins, *Probleme of the Forged Catholicisme, or Universalitie of the Romish Religion*, in *The Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ, in the Universitie of Cambridge, M. William Perkins*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1612–1613), 2:562, col. 1, 564, col. 1.

that Ratramnus' teachings had already been identified by Ridley and Jewel as a representative of doctrinal truth against the early medieval papacy.<sup>70</sup>

Given the *Homilies* of Aelfric, particularly on the question of denials of the Mass and of transubstantiation, the English Reformation could be seen as expressing not only agreement with the continental Reformers but also a continuity with its own past: "it is false," Fulke wrote,

that the Popish faith hath had so long continuance. For the Papistes are departed as from many other points of doctrine, so even from the Lords supper, which Augustine planted among the Saxons, unto carnall presence and transubstantiation the contrarie of which were taught by Augustine, as appeareth from the publike Saxon Homely, lately translated into English, and imprinted.<sup>71</sup>

Aelfric also taught, "We receive ghostly, Christ bodye, and drinke his bloude, when we receave with true beliefe that holye housell" — in Fulke's reading, Aelfric stood in agreement with the Protestants, that the wicked and the faithless do not receive Christ in the sacrament, since the true presence of Christ is apprehended and received spiritually, by faith.<sup>72</sup>

According to Fulke, Aelfric also attested to communion in both kinds by the laity as well as the clergy, to an absence of private masses, and to the celebration of Easter in conformity with Irish and Greek custom, rather than after the manner of Rome.<sup>73</sup> In these and in a score of other examples, Fulke identified a continuous theological foundation for the English Reformation: he was able to affirm the value of the first five, even six, centuries of Christian thought, to maintain the Protestant assumption of a fall of the Roman Church, and at the same time to argue that the English church stood in continuity, in its own tradition, with the faith of the earliest fathers.

---

70. Cf. Nicholas Ridley, *A Conference Between Nicholas ridley, Sometime Bishop of Lincoln, and Secretary Bourne, with Others, at the Lieutenant's Table in the Tower*, in *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D. Sometime ord bishop of Lincoln. Martye, 1555* (Cambridge University Press, 1843), 158–59; idem, *Disputation at Oxford Between Dr. Smith, with His Colleagues and Other Doctors, and Bishop Ridley*, in *ibid.*, 202, 206; with John Jewel, *A Replie Vnto M. Hardinges Answer: By perusing whereof, the discreet and diligent Reader may easily see the weake, and vnstable grounds of the Roman religion, which of late hath been accounted Catholique*, in *Works*, 1:503, 546.

71. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 3).

72. Aelfric, *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, 27 recto; Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 18).

73. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (p. 17), citing Aelfric, *Serm. Pasc.*, and Bede, *History*, I.xxvii; II.v; V.xxii.

Thus, in addition to holding a doctrine of the Lord's Supper more ancient than transubstantiation, the "English Saxons" allowed the people to read Scripture in the vernacular and "to search the lawe of God"; so also did they insist on the preaching of the Gospel in English on holy days, and that "al people be instructed in the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the commandments in the English tong" — all of which the papists deny. So also,

The worshipping of images, and the second Council of Nice that decreed the same, was accursed in the Church of God in England and France, & written against by Alcuinus, in the name of the Church of England and Fraunce.... The Papists defend both that idolatrous Council, and their wicked decree.<sup>74</sup>

Rome, therefore, was the innovator and the universal faith identified by the Vincentian Canon — what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all — could not be ascribed to Rome.<sup>75</sup>

Fulke finalized his rebuttal of Stapleton's argument that the English church "must shew a succession from the Apostles; as the Scripture witnesseth the Church to have, and the ancient Fathers exacted of heretics" by noting two fundamental points. First, that

the Scripture requireth no succession of names, persons or places, but of faith and doctrine, and that wee proove, when we approve our faith and doctrine by the doctrine of the Apostles. Neither had the fathers any other meaning in calling upon new upstart heresies for their succession, but of a succession of doctrine as well as of persons. Which is manifest by Tertullian, *De praescript*... succession of Bishoppes even to the Apostles, helpeth not, excepte there be a continuance in the doctrine of the Apostles, which when the Papistes can shewe, we will gladly yield unto them.<sup>76</sup>

74. Fulke, *Overthrow*, preface, (pp. 18–19).

75. Fulke's argument has strong affinity with John Calvin, *Ioannes Calvinus Iacobo Sadoleto Cardinali, Salutem*, in CO 5, col. 392–93; in translation, *Calvin's Reply to Sadoleto*, in *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, ed. Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, 7 vols. (Baker, 1983), 1:35–37.

76. Fulke, *Overthrow*, II.i (p. 73); citing Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, xxxii, in ANF, 3:258; also Fulke, *De successione ecclesiastica*, i, vi (pp. 22, 162); cf. similarly, Calvin, *Institutio*, I.vi.2; vii.3; Theodore Beza, *De veris et visibilibus Ecclesiae Catholicae notis, tractatio* (Geneva, 1579), 16, 22 marg.; Thomas Sampson, *A Briefe Collection of the Church, and of Certayne Ceremonies Thereof* (London, 1581), 22; Bertrand de Loque, *Traité de l'Eglise, contenant un vray discours pour cognoistre la vraye Eglise, et la discerner d'avec l'Eglise Romaine*

And second, that the papal claim of antiquity is false, inasmuch as “the auncient and learned Fathers, never allowed any continuance of the Catholicke Church and faith, but such as has their beginning at Christ & his Apostles, and not such as beganne five or six hundred yeares after Christ, as all the testimonies which [Stapleton] cryeth, do plainely prove.”<sup>77</sup> Since the papacy itself only began some five or six hundred years after Christ, it cannot claim to represent the most ancient church, namely that of Christ and the apostles — not indeed, can it claim to universal, given the Eastern Church and the older English tradition.<sup>78</sup> “Whatsoever therefore Augustine writeth against the Donatistes, for shutting up the Church of Christ onely in Africa, may be rightly applyed to the Papistes, for restraining it onely to a part of Europe.”<sup>79</sup>

### Against Gregory Martin: Fulke on the Problem of Tradition and Traditions

Before his response to Gregory Martin’s attack on the English translations of Scripture, Fulke’s approach to the problem of tradition, evident in his replies to Rastell and Martiall and other earlier works, added little to standard Protestant outcry against “human traditions” that had already been argued by Tyndale, Cranmer, and Jewell. By way of example, in his early polemics, Fulke had responded to the use of Basil and Augustine to support unwritten traditions.<sup>80</sup> To the basic argument of Augustine that universal teachings of the church, if known to have been observed at all times, ought to be understood as belonging to the “tradition of the Apostles,” Fulke responded, “if you bee able to prove, that al these things whereof you speake, the universall Church of Christ, doth, and hath alwaies observed, I will yelde to you, that thei are the Traditions of the Apostles.”<sup>81</sup> If, however, these teachings cannot be shown to have been always held, there is no reason to accept them as apostolic traditions on grounds of the “reason, and authoritie” of contemporary papists. There remains, however, Fulke allowed, a limited place for

---

*et toutes autres fausses assemblées* (Genève, 1577), v (pp. 16–21); Robert Some, *A Godlie Treatise of the Church* (London, 1582), sig. E4r, E5r.

77. Fulke, *Overthrow*, I.xviii (p. 60).

78. Fulke, *Overthrow*, Liii, iv (pp. 28, 29).

79. Fulke, *Overthrow*, Liv, v (pp. 29, 31).

80. William Fulke, *A Confutation of a Popishe, and Sclaunderous Libelle in Forme of an Apologie: Geuen out into the Courte, and Spread Abrode in Diuerse Other Places of the Realme* (London, 1571), fol. 41r–42v.

81. Fulke, *Confutation of a Popishe, and Sclaunderous Libelle*, fol. 57r.

extra-scriptural traditions. Scripture itself has “determined of all necessarie articles of faith, and against all superstitious opinions,” but, as Augustine indicated, the church may legitimately institute “variable Ceremonies” and promulgate “particuler decrees” that are not “prejudiciall” to the truths of Scripture.<sup>82</sup> As to human traditions that are contrary to Scripture, these can hardly be identified as apostolic: the apostles “did not deliver one thynge in wrytyng, and a contrary thynge in Tradition.”<sup>83</sup>

Gregory Martin’s publication of his *Discouerie of the Manifol Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures* in 1582, paired with the publication of the Rheims New Testament,<sup>84</sup> marked a significant juncture in the Counter-Reformation polemic against English Protestantism, as it called into question the validity of Protestant Bibles, specifically of Beza’s Latin New Testament and *Annotationes* (1556), the Geneva Bible (1562), and the Bishops’ Bible, printed between 1577 and 1579. These, Martin contended, were “Heretical translations” that bred the doctrinal heresies of Protestantism.<sup>85</sup> The Geneva Bible has been described as a revision of the Tyndale-Coverdale tradition as lodged in the Great Bible (1539) and of Whittingham’s New Testament (1557), carefully compared the Hebrew and Greek texts and with Beza’s Latin *Annotationes*. The Bishops’ Bible (1568) was largely a revision of the Great Bible, made with attention to the Hebrew and Greek originals.<sup>86</sup> Martin’s attack on the Protestant Bibles received two extended responses, the first by William Fulke and the second by Fulke’s contemporary Thomas Cartwright, with Fulke’s work appearing, in very short order,

82. Fulke, *Confutation of a Popishe, and Schlaunderous Libelle*, fol. 57v–58r.

83. Fulke, *Confutation of a Popishe, and Schlaunderous Libelle*, fol. 59v; similarly, William Whitaker, *An Answer to a Certaine Booke. Written by M. William Rainolds Student of Divinitie in the English Colledge at Rhemes, and Entitled, A Refutation of Sundrie Reprehensions, Cavils, &c.* (London, 1585), 17.

84. Gregory Martin, *A Discouerie of the Manifol Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of Our Daies Specially the English Sectaries, and of their foule dealing herein, by partial & false translations to the aduantage of their heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorised since the time of schisme* (Rheims, 1582); and *The Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated faithfully into English, out of the authentical Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred vvith the Greeke and other editions in diuers languages; vvith arguments of bookes and chapters, annotations, and other necessarie helps, for the better understanding of the text, and specially for the discouerie of the corruptions of diuers late translations, and for clearing the controversies in religion, of these daies: in the English College of Rhemes* (Rheims, 1582).

85. Martin, *Discouerie of the Manifol Corruptions*, sig. b verso.

86. H. W. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible: A Historical Sketch of the Successive Versions from 1382–1885*, 2nd ed. (E. P. Dutton, 1902), 187–97, 217–23; cf. David Norton, *The History of the English Bible as Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 36–41.

in 1583, followed by subsequent printings in 1617 and 1633.<sup>87</sup> Fulke also followed his treatise against Martin with a full-scale demolition of the Rheims New Testament.<sup>88</sup> Publication of Cartwright's *Confutation* was delayed: Cartwright's answer to Martin's preface appeared in 1602,<sup>89</sup> and the complete *Confutation* only appeared in print in 1618,<sup>90</sup> leaving Fulke's work as the main defense of the Elizabethan Church against Martin's polemic and its companion, the Rheims New Testament.<sup>91</sup>

What concerns us here is Fulke's understanding of tradition, both substantively in relation to the theological debates of the era and linguistically in terms of the meaning of the text and the task of translation. Martin had accused the Protestant translations of denying traditions among the

---

87. William Fulke, *A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holie Scriptures into the English tong, against the manifolde cavils, frivolous quarels, and impudent slaunders of Gregorie Martin, one of the readers of Popish divinitie in the trayterous Seminarie of Rheims [...] Wherevnto is added a briefe confutation of all such quarrels & cauils, as haue bene of late vttered by diuerse papistes in their English pamphlets, against the writings of the saide William Fvlke* (London, 1583); August Matthews, 1633); also note, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, Against the Cavils of Gregory Martin* (Cambridge University Press, 1843). Citations are taken from the 1583 text.

88. William Fulke, *The Text of the Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated out of the vulgar Latine by the papists of the traiterous seminarie at Rhemes. With arguments of bookes, chapters, and annotations, pretending to discover the corruptions of diuers translations, and to cleare the controuersies of these dayes. VVhereunto is added the translation out of the original Greeke, commonly vsed in the Church of England, with a confutation of all such arguments, glosses, and annotations, as conteine manifest impietie, of heresie, treason and slander, against the catholike Church of God, and the true teachers thereof, or the translations vsed in the Church of England* (London, 1589).

89. Thomas Cartwright, *Sun Qevw en Cristw. The Answer to the Preface of the Rhemish Testament* (Edinburgh, 1602). On the politics of the delay, see Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright*, 202–4.

90. Thomas Cartwright, *A Confutation of the Rhemists Translation, Glosses and Annotations on the Nevv Testament so farre as they containe manifest impieties, heresies, idolatries, superstitions, prophanesse, treasons, slanders, absurdities, falsehoods and other evils. By occasion whereof the true sence, scope, and doctrine of the Scriptures, and humane authors, by them abused, is now given. VVritten long since by order from the chiefe instruments of the late Queene and state* (Leiden, 1618). See James David Rich, "Thomas Cartwright and His Confutation: From English Presbyterian Gadfly to International Calvinist Propagandist" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2015); on Cartwright's life and work, see A. F. Scott Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535–1603* (Cambridge University Press, 1925).

91. The controversy with Martin is analyzed by Bauckham, "Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke," 325–405; and surveyed in Norton, *History of the English Bible*, 40–44, 49–52.

apostles—a “matter” that he identified as of great “importance.” He argued specifically that, where the New Testament spoke of Jewish traditions as contrary to the Word of God, the Protestant translations consistently rendered the Greek as “traditions,” but when the text spoke of apostolic traditions, the Protestant translations rendered the Greek as “ordinaunces” or “instructions,” obviously, in Martin’s view, to suppress the positive use of the word and argue that no traditions were “allowable.”<sup>92</sup> Along similar lines, Martin complained that the Bishops’ Bible had wrongly rendered *dogmatizesthe* in Colossians 2:20 as “burdened with traditions,” when elsewhere the word *dogmata* had been suitably rendered as “ordinances” or “decrees.” Once again, the English Bibles and Beza were guilty of a heretical suppression of the text’s meaning, identifying tradition solely as a problem or an error.<sup>93</sup>

In response, Fulke began by outlining the problem traditions in general, written and unwritten. Fulke readily acknowledged the “importance” of the issue, given that if Martin and his Rhemist colleagues had their way they would take advantage of the positive references to tradition in Scripture in order that all manner of “unwritten traditions” might be “thrust upon” the church and “the written word of God shall serve no purpose at all,” being insufficient “to teach all truth necessary to salvation.”<sup>94</sup> Like the Valentinian heretics, Fulke opined, Martin held Scripture to be uncertain of meaning apart from his extra-scriptural traditions, many of which are actually contrary to Scripture. Further, the Roman Church picked and chose which traditions it would observe, including many that, as John Jewel observed, were unknown to the church in its first six centuries. The earliest church did, certainly, insist on keeping the traditions of the apostles, as is evident from the epistles of Ignatius—but as Eusebius commented of Ignatius, “he exhorted them straitly to kepe the tradition of the Apostles, which testifying that it was now for assurance committed to writing, he thought necessary to be plainly taught.”<sup>95</sup> Protestants strive to follow this tradition of the apostles, as preserved in the “undoubted writings” of the apostles in the canon of Scripture.

92. In Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (pp. 73–74). N.B., for convenience, all citations of the debate are taken from Fulke’s *Defense*, which reproduces nearly the whole of Martin’s text in numbered paragraphs followed by Fulke’s refutations.

93. Martin, *The Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated faithfully into English*, col. 2:20, in loc. (p. 541).

94. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (p. 74).

95. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (p. 75), citing Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, III.xxxv.

As to the pattern of Protestant translation against which Martin complained, Fulke argued that it is linguistically justified in addition to its salutary purpose. Martin, by way of example, commended the Roman practice of translating *paradosis* as “tradition” in Matthew 15:2; 2 Thessalonians 2:15 and 3:6 — whereas the Bishops’ Bible had understood the *paradosis* of the Pharisees in Matthew 15:2 as “tradition,” but the *paradosis* of the disciples in 2 Thessalonians as “instruction.” How, Martin complained, could these varied translations of one word be explained other than by the heretical intention of the translators to attach the church’s tradition. He demanded that the Protestants attempt to justify themselves, “either out of Scriptures, fathers, or Lexicon.”<sup>96</sup>

From a linguistic perspective, Fulke pointedly criticized Martin’s approach to the translation of *paradosis* uniformly as “tradition” as failing to recognize the lexically identified range of meaning of a word and the need to determine a translation by the context of a usage. The Greek word *paradosis* can mean “tradition,” as something delivered or handed down, but it can also mean the specific “doctrine delivered” or an “ordinance,” an “instruction,” or an “institution” — the latter term commonly used in the early modern era as a synonym for a formal instruction.<sup>97</sup> Scripture clearly has both positive and negative references to *paradosis*, sometimes referring to doctrine that is grounded in Scripture, other times identifying false teaching as *paradosis*.<sup>98</sup> The context, then, of the positive or negative use of the term would require variation in the translation, “because the English word as it is used by [Martin] is not so indifferent, to signifie the doctrine of God delivered out of the Scriptures: as to signifie doctrines of men devised beside the Scriptures.” Fulke cites examples of qualification of the terms “paradosis” and “tradition” from the fathers, noting in particular Jerome’s varied renderings of *paradosis* as “tradition” and as “precept.”<sup>99</sup>

From the theological perspective, Fulke noted a specific problem with the uniform translation of a term, later echoed in Cartwright’s *Confutation*,<sup>100</sup> given that “traditions” as used by Rome referred to secret transmissions by word of mouth, unrelated to the teachings of Scripture and the identifiable *paradosis* of the apostles and the earliest church, therefore lacking biblical

96. Martin, *Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions*, ii.2–5 (pp. 26–29).

97. Note the definition of *traditio* as “a delivering or giving, a teaching,” s.v., in John Veron, *A Dictionarie in Latine and English* (London, 1584).

98. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1, 2 (pp. 75–76, 77–78).

99. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.5 (p. 82).

100. Cartwright, *Confutation*, 531.

authority. Translating the Greek indiscriminately as “traditions,” would lead “the simple” into the error of viewing even unbiblical traditions positively and concluding that the Holy Spirit would command the church to believe or observe things that the Spirit himself had not “committed to writing.” The Protestant translations, therefore, render positive usages of the Greek *paradosis* in such texts as 2 Thessalonians 2:15 and 3:6 alternatively, but quite correctly, as “ordinances,” “instructions,” “institutions,” or “the doctrine delivered.” “Tradition” or “traditions” is the “Papist” choice to identify teachings “delivered beside the word of God written” — which, then, on the papists’ own terms, leads to a proper translation of Pharisaic *paradosis* as “tradition.” Accordingly, the Protestant translations distinguish the false traditions from the true, the latter being *paradoseis* conformed to the Word of God and suitable for use as “ordinances” or for “instruction,” and to be understood as valid “doctrine delivered” to the church. Otherwise, Scripture might be taken to be imperfect and as not conveying all truth necessary to salvation.<sup>101</sup>

Even so, in Colossians 2:20, there is not so great a difference in meaning between “ordinances” and “traditions” to justify complaint about the linguistic accuracy of the translation of *dogmatizesthe* as “burdened with traditions.” But negative implication of the biblical text itself requires translation as “burdened with traditions” inasmuch as “those *dogmata* against which the Apostle writeth, were according to the precepts, & doctrines of men” such as “the Scripture calleth traditions, Matth 15.”<sup>102</sup> The translation itself, then, is justifiable both linguistically and theologically: it identifies the problem of *dogmata* that are actually false human traditions. And then there is the case of 1 Corinthians 11:2, where even the Vulgate had rendered *paradosis* as *praecepta* — perhaps, Fulke adds, to teach Protestants alternative terms for use in translation. And, directly to Martin, “do you not perceive that while you rail upon us, you revile your owne vulgar Latin translation”?<sup>103</sup>

Fulke notes further that it ought to disturb the consciences of Romanist theologians who have to know that many things that they identify as traditions have no foundation in Scripture.<sup>104</sup> In 2 Thessalonians 2:15, the apostle Paul references traditions delivered in part by preaching and in part by his epistle. The text does not intend, therefore, a tradition delivered

101. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.1 (pp. 75–76).

102. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.5 (p. 81); cf. Cartwright, *Confutation*, p. 513.

103. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.2, 6 (pp. 77, 83).

104. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.2 (pp. 76–77).

only by word of mouth—nor can it be proven that the traditions delivered by word of mouth by the Apostle were not elsewhere stated expressly in Scripture.<sup>105</sup> To Martin's insistence that the apostles did convey traditions by word of mouth, Fulke responds that, certainly, the apostles taught by word of mouth, both "preaching and teaching,"

but that they preached, taught or delivered any doctrine, as necessarie to salvation, which they proved not out of the holy Scriptures, and which is not contained in the new Testament or the old, this is not yet proved, neither ever can it be proved. Such matters of ceremonies, order, & discipline, which are mutable, no man denies, but they might & did deliver, but yet in them nothing but agreeable to the generall rules set down in the Scripture.<sup>106</sup>

As Bauckham rather nicely pointed out, the rift between the Reformation understanding of Scripture and tradition represented by Fulke and the understanding found in his Romanist opponents "was not the result of the controversy pushing the contestants into extremist positions." Rather it was the result of "a fundamental difference over the nature of revelation," with the Protestants finding the living Word of God in Scripture alone but also listening to it as conveyed in the preaching and sacraments of the church, and the Romanists finding the living word of God ultimately in the *magisterium*, "with no necessary reference to Scripture."<sup>107</sup>

## Conclusion

William Fulke came to the defense of the orthodoxy and catholicity of the English church at a time when the use of patristic sources was well established—one might even say, catalogued—by such predecessors as Thomas Cranmer and John Jewel. He also was the recipient of a view of tradition or, more correctly, traditions, reaching back to Reformers like Tyndale and Calvin and incorporated into the confessional foundation of the English church—a view of traditions that had distinguished between lawful traditions concerning ecclesiastical practice that conformed to the Scriptures, and human traditions, whether written or unwritten, either lacking biblical warrant or standing in contradiction to Scripture, traditions created and mandated on human authority alone. Like many of his Protestant predecessors, Fulke could also argue historically against the Roman claims of

---

105. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.2 (p. 77).

106. Fulke, *Defense*, ii.3 (p. 78).

107. Bauckham, "Career and Thought of Dr. William Fulke," 188.

ecclesial universality, of an unbroken line of papal and episcopal succession, and, indeed, of the origins of the papal claims to supremacy during the first five hundred years of the church. Fulke also insisted on the distinction, common among Protestant works of the era, between the church's theological tradition understood as the "succession of doctrine" and a "succession of persons" in the church: against Roman apologists, Fulke insisted that the legitimacy of the latter depended on their adherence to the former—and that the former, "succession of doctrine" was lacking in the case of Rome's unwritten traditions.

Beyond this, Fulke's work moved the terms of this debate significantly beyond the earlier formulations of writers like Cranmer and Jewel on two fronts, both reflective of the different adversaries with whom he engaged. In his polemic against Martin, Fulke's defense of the English translations of Scripture both clarified the distinction latent in the biblical text between the negative use of *paradosis*, characteristic of Jesus's complaint against the Pharisees, and the positive use of *paradosis* found in the Pauline epistles and drew on a theory of translation that rooted the meaning of a word or term in its literary context and thereby justified rendering one word with a variety of terms. That theory had been implicit in the exegesis of those texts and in the translations, but Fulke made it explicit.

Second, Fulke identified what would loosely be called the tradition of the English church, namely the historical trajectory of doctrine and practice, identified as the "succession of faith and doctrine," similar to the concept of a body of historical precedent identified as tradition in the Roman sources of the era, but disconnected from the Tridentine appeal of a normative written and unwritten tradition supporting the claims of the Roman Church. Contrary to Trent and its defenders, Fulke argued the connection of English Protestantism to a medieval succession of faith and practice without declaring the succession to be normative alongside of Scripture. Where Stapleton had used Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* to claim that the church of the English Reformation had departed from the doctrine and practice of the ancient catholic church, Fulke was able to argue from Bede, supported by evidence from Aelfric's *Anglo Saxon Homilies*, an alternative line of teaching and practice in the English church that was ancient, indigenous, and not subservient to the doctrines and ceremonies more recently dictated by Rome. In short, what Rome claimed as an unbroken tradition simply did not exist for transubstantiation, the practice of communion in one kind, the installation of bishops, and various other doctrines—certainly not on English soil.