


Student Edition

*from Tyndale
to Madison*



THE HISTORY OF
RELIGIOUS
LIBERTY

MICHAEL FARRIS

First printing: April 2015

Copyright © 2007, 2015 by Michael Farris. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews. For information write:

Master Books®, P.O. Box 726, Green Forest, AR 72638
Master Books® is a division of the New Leaf Publishing Group, Inc.

ISBN: 978-0-89051-882-3

Library of Congress Number: 2015935281

Cover by Diana Bogardus.

Please consider requesting that a copy of this volume be purchased by your local library system.

Printed in the United States of America

Please visit our website for other great titles:
www.masterbooks.com

For information regarding author interviews,
please contact the publicity department at (870) 438-5288



Photo Credits

All images are from Shutterstock.com; Library of Congress; Wikimedia Commons (PD-Art), (PD-US), (PD-Old), (CC BY-SA 2.0), (CC BY-SA 2.5), (CC BY-SA 3.0), (CC BY-SA 4.0): Page 20 - photo by DAVID ILIFF. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 28: photo by Steve Bennett. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 35: photo by Mjroots. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 43: photo by Johan Bakker. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 44: photo by Mario Roberto Duran Ortiz. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 47: photo by Mehmetkoksal. License: PD-US. Page 54: photo by DAVID ILIFF. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 62: © Bob Collowan, CC-BY-SA-3.0, Wikimedia Commons. Page 70: photo by Ealdgyth. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 79: photo by Kim Traynor. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 80: photo by Histoire. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 84: by Hi540. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 101: photo by Kim Traynor. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 105: photo by Ian A. Wood. License: CC BY-SA 4.0. Page 118: photo by DAVID ILIFF. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 131: photo by DAVID ILIFF. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 135: photo by William Aver. License: CC BY-SA 2.5. Page 178: photo by Chris Nyborg. License: PD-Art. Page 178: photo by Chris Nyborg. License: GFDL / CC-BY-SA. Page 217: photo by Tony Fischer. License: CC-BY-SA 2.0. Page 226: photo by Jrcla2. License: PD-US. Page 246: photo by Jjmusgrove. License: CC-BY-SA 4.0. Page 248: photo by Albert Herring. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 257: photo by Skyring. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 264: photo by John, Flickr: Print Shop & Post Office - Williamsburg. License: CC-BY-SA 2.0. Page 265: Photo by Greg O'Beirne, GFDL / Creative Commons. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 287: photo by CLK Hatche. License: CC-BY-SA 2.0. Page 303: photo by Laurom. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 306: photo by Billy Hathorn. License: CC-BY-SA 3.0. Page 330: photo by Rebecca White. Page 346: © Traumrune / Wikimedia Commons / CC-BY-3.0.

Author's Foreword to the Student Edition

In the spring of 2015, a conflict over religious liberty erupted into a culture war of the first magnitude. Indiana's legislature passed a bill entitled "The Religious Freedom Restoration Act" that was designed to follow a federal law of the same name enacted in 1993.

I was a member of the Executive Committee of the Coalition for Religious Freedom that pushed for the enactment of RFRA in Congress. I served as the co-chairman of the coalition's subcommittee of lawyers that drafted the language of RFRA. In fact, I was the person who suggested the name for the act.

The reason we needed to enact the law was that the Supreme Court of the United States had done great damage to the cause of religious liberty in a 1990 decision, *Employment Division v. Smith*. Although this case involved Native Americans who took drugs for religious reasons, the Supreme Court did not decide the case narrowly. Rather, it overturned decades of precedent by declaring that no one could ever get a religious exemption from a general law.

This meant that parents who believed that God required them to teach their children at home could not get a religious exemption from a law banning homeschooling. It also meant that Jewish parents who wanted to circumcise their sons could not get a religious exemption from a law which banned this practice. There were thousands of other potential applications of this astonishing ruling.

As a consequence, a very broad coalition of all political parties and factions and virtually all faith groups to try to enact RFRA to protect religious freedom for all.

In fact, the reason that RFRA passed Congress (nearly unanimously) was that the religious liberty lawyers from every faith group agreed that this decision was a direct repudiation of our tradition of religious freedom, and we agreed that religious liberty needed to be protected for all — even those with unpopular views.

The Indiana version of RFRA did not differ from the original federal version in any material respect — especially as the law had been interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Hobby Lobby case. That case

(which protected the freedom of Hobby Lobby to not fund abortion coverage) was not decided on the basis of the First Amendment, but the federal RFRA.

None of this history mattered to the hysterical voices that attacked the law in Indiana and a similar version of RFRA that was underway in Arkansas. Just because these laws could potentially protect business owners (such as photographers) whose conscience prohibited them from participating in a same-sex wedding ceremony, these RFRA laws were deemed to be "hate laws" that discriminated against sexual orientation. These laws were said to promote intolerance.

During all of these debates, I was on national and local television and radio interviews several times a day. Not only did I draw on my knowledge of history of the enactment of RFRA, I was able to explain to the reporters and the nation important ideas about the history of how we got religious liberty.

From that history I was able to show that "tolerance" is actually a cheap imitation of religious liberty. If our nation rejects liberty in the name of tolerance, we are actually going backward into the days of heresy trials, persecution, and government coercion.

These events in Indiana and Arkansas are not blips on the radar. We are in the battle of our lives to protect religious liberty in this nation. We need to know current events and our Constitution. But we also need to know the stories of courage and sacrifice that led to the original victory for liberty of conscience for all.

There are at least two reasons to know this history. First, it gives us the intellectual foundation to stand in the public square and contend forcefully for liberty. Second, and perhaps more importantly, we see ordinary people who knew Jesus who boldly and sacrificially fought for freedom of conscience for all.

The battle for religious liberty is on us again. May we have the knowledge and courage to fight. Victory is ours when we stand courageously for what is true and what is right.

It is high time we know our heritage in detail.

A Publisher's Note for Parents and Students

You are about to begin an educational course that will challenge you. It is difficult to read accounts of those who were sacrificed for their dissension and unwillingness to modify their faith to the changing whims of royalty or clergy or the prevailing attitudes of the time. These stories are heartbreaking and undeniably tragic. It is sometimes difficult to understand how these things can happen by those professing to believe in God and His commandments, including having love for others.

Yet, without stepping back into this intolerant and brutal history, we cannot truly understand why a tiny fledging country, built by those who were persecuted for their beliefs, fought so valiantly for the chance of freedom. And when that freedom was at hand, they deliberately built into their governmental documents the power to protect everyone in this land from religious persecution.

Consider the following words which begin the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776:

“When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

Please read the passage again. It makes clear that our most basic rights are given to the people by their Creator, a force beyond mortal man and any form of government. It seems clear and ambiguous at the same time. But in other founding documents like the U.S. Constitution, we see our founding fathers go even further and codify important truths and foundational rights through the first 10 amendments to the US Constitution. Among these known as the Bill of Rights, the First Amendment is among the most powerful:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or

the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

Seems very clear, but even that did not go far enough. Consider the little heard Ninth Amendment:

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

This amendment essentially helps keep our federal government from vastly expanding its power. Clearly, it was vitally important to these early American leaders that the people be protected and allowed rights outside of the restriction of government. So as you go back to the troubled times of the Church and the social upheaval of the Reformation, please keep in mind the following:

- Freedom of religion is your right as given by our Creator.
- Reforms are often the result of governmental abuse or periods of terrible oppression.
- It is important to understand why the First Amendment is foundational to our form of government.
- The meaning and scope of the U.S. Constitution as a document is continually being refined by the courts – including those who may take an activist stance.
- Freedom of religion, like any right, is one that must be protected from those who seek in whatever way to diminish or discount it through the legislative, judicial, or executive branches of the US government.

The importance of religious liberty often goes unnoticed until you see troubling news stories here or overseas, or perhaps you - in trying to exercise your rights - become a victim of religious intolerance by those who do not understand or apply the law incorrectly. Too often it is a freedom that is little thought upon since it is a natural expectation for American citizens. Yet, the rise in anti-Christian sentiments over the last 100 years reminds us of the difference between social acceptance and God-given rights. What we choose to believe transcends “mob rule” or popular fads. And we must always be diligent to protect this freedom now and in the future.

Contents

Introduction.....	7
Part I: From Out of the Short Fire	
1. Scripture for Ploughboys	11
2. The King, the Pope, and the Word.....	19
3. War of the Words	29
4. Tyndale's Triumph	41
5. The Bible and the Boy King.....	49
6. Mary's Five Years of Terror	57
7. Debating Freedom inside the King's Bench Prison.....	73
8. Defending a Doctrine, Killing a Man	83
9. At the Icy Blast of the Trumpet.....	97
10. The "Very Wisest Fool in Christendom"	109
11. The Bravest Voices of Liberty.....	125
12. The English Rehoboam	141
13. "The Lord Hath Now Some Controversy with England"	151
14. Called Hither to Save a Nation.....	169
15. Explicit Faith and Spiritual Swords.....	181
16. A Foundation of Paradoxes	193
Part II: An Irrepressible Yearning	
17. Enclosed Gardens of God.....	215
18. Better Hypocrites	229
19. A New Light in Hanover	247
20. Be Ye Separate	263
21. "Very Early and Strong Impressions"	275
22. Free Exercise of Religion.....	285
23. The Rising Sun of Liberty.....	299
24. Battle for the Bill of Rights, Part I	317
25. Battle for the Bill of Rights, Part II	327
Epilogue: The Lessons of Liberty	343
Bibliography.....	348



Religion, or the duty which we owe to our creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and this is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other. From the Virginia Bill of Rights Virginia Bill of Rights, Article 16, June 12, 1776. (westillholdthesetruths.org/quotes/category/religious-liberty)

INTRODUCTION

My own college textbook from a political philosophy class espoused a common view regarding the source of contemporary religious liberty. Enlightenment philosophies, it taught, were chiefly responsible for opening people's minds to the error of religious persecution and paving the way for a society in which "heretics" are not tortured and burnt in town squares.

This conception has not gone away. I recently served as a judge for a national essay contest in which the contestant instructions explained that religious liberty is a concept derived from the European Enlightenment. After all, the general argument goes, devoted Christians have often been the chief persecutors in Western history and therefore cannot be said to have had a positive role in advancing the idea that the civil magistrate should not interfere with matters of conscience. On the contrary, it is said, the forces most inimical to genuine Christian faith — a general religious apathy among the populace, relativism in regard to truth, a growing secularist mindset, and Enlightenment-influenced skepticism among intellectual leaders — were the primary forces behind the triumph of religious liberty in the West.

Examples come from diverse sources. Firuz Kazemzadeh, an esteemed Ivy League scholar who has been appointed and reappointed to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, attributes the failure of Muslim nations to embrace religious liberty to the fact that they have neither "gone through the Enlightenment" nor "developed any of the attitudes that formed the minds of the founding fathers of this country, including deism and a measure of skepticism in matters of religion which permitted the kind of tolerance which we all seek today."¹ Historian Merrill D. Peterson has called the 1787 Virginia Statute for Religious Liberty "the supreme expression of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment," which was driven by "skepticism toward all received truths and of untrammelled free inquiry in the pursuit of knowledge."² The introduction

to the audio edition of Joseph J. Ellis's *His Excellency: George Washington* refers to the United States of America as "the greatest achievement of the Enlightenment."³ Even Larry Schweikart and Michael Allen, who wrote *A Patriot's History of the United States* to counteract the effect of a popular Marxist interpretation of American history entitled *A People's History of the United States*, say that "the overall molding of America's Revolution in the ideological sense" was derived from Enlightenment thinkers Thomas Hobbes and Charles de Montesquieu.⁴ And the colorful 2003 edition of Joy Hakim's *Freedom: A History of US*, which sports a foreword written by President George W. Bush and the first lady, discusses the freedom born out of the Age of Reason, concluding, "And that's when we were lucky enough to be born."⁵

We have to recognize the truth of the claim that professing Christians were indeed the principal persecutors during the relevant era in which religious liberty emerged. But is it necessarily true that the heroes who stood against persecution and brought liberty of conscience to the forefront in America were avowed skeptics and unorthodox secularists? The goal of this book is to answer this question by undertaking a detailed account of the troubling history of religious persecution from the 16th through the 18th centuries, chiefly in England, and by exploring the ideas that brought religious liberty to America.

Today, all Christian denominations embrace religious liberty as an ideal. But it was not always so. It is improper to judge today's adherents of a particular branch of Christianity by the acts of their distant theological cousins. Moreover, it is unfair to denigrate entirely the life's work of significant religious reformers for their failure to embrace religious liberty.

Yet the sad truth is that some giants of the faith were religious persecutors. The story that follows is told with unflinching honesty. However, it must be borne in mind that this book is limited to a discussion of religious liberty. The scope affords no opportunity to praise these

individuals' many other positive achievements. It is similar to a discussion of the founding fathers and slavery: even those who owned slaves and defended slavery, as regrettable as this was, made significant contributions to the founding of this nation. Indeed, the foundations they laid were chiefly responsible for slavery's eventual eradication.

In a similar way, religious liberty arose gradually. Catholics, Anglicans, Calvinists, and Lutherans persecuted each other and other smaller groups of dissenters. It would be erroneous to castigate men or entire movements for their failures without recognizing their achievements in other areas. At the end of the road, an Anglican, James Madison, trained in

liberty by a Calvinist Presbyterian, John Witherspoon, worked with the persecuted Baptists of Virginia to turn a broken theory of religious toleration into the robust experience of religious liberty that has changed America and the world.

We must tell the story of the Christian persecutors so that we can put to the test the claim that people who cared little about faith and religion were the heroes of liberty. The true heroes are not to be found among the salons of the Enlightenment philosophers, but in the cells in King's Bench Prison and tied to the stake at Smithfield.

This is the story of those who lived and died believing that God is the author of liberty.

Notes

1. "Remarks by Firuz Kazemzadeh" in "The State of Religious Freedom," *World Affairs* 147, no. 4 (1985): 246.
2. "Jefferson and Religious Freedom," *The Atlantic Monthly* 274 (December 1994): 113.
3. Recorded Books, *His Excellency by Joseph J. Ellis*, performed by Nelson Runger (Prince Frederick, MD: Recorded Books, LLC, 2004).
4. Larry Schweikart, *A Patriot's History of the United States, From Columbus's Great Discovery to the War on Terror* (New York: Sentinel, 2004), p. 70.
5. Joy Hakim, *Freedom: A History of US* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), introduction.



**THIS IS THE STORY
OF THOSE WHO LIVED
AND DIED BELIEVING
THAT GOD IS THE
AUTHOR OF LIBERTY.**

PART I

**FROM OUT OF THE
SHORT FIRE**



Chapter One

SCRIPTURE FOR PLOUGHBOYS

TYNDALE'S MISSION

*If God spare my life many years, I will cause a boy that driveth
the plough to know more of Scripture than you do.**

~ William Tyndale

There are times when profound ideas are most clearly articulated in the heat of debate. A simple statement, designed to make a small point, suddenly illuminates the mind in a way that changes the course of lives and sometimes the course of civilization.

In the western shire of Gloucester stands yet today a grand stone manor house in the Cotswold tradition, Little Sodbury Manor. It is strategically perched on the edge of a hillside, revealing an idyllic view of the vale of the Severn. The square tower of the ancient parish church in the village of Little Sodbury lies in the near distance. In 1522, an Oxford scholar named William Tyndale secured a position in this home as the tutor for the children of the lord of the manor, Sir John Walsh, and his wife, Lady Anne.

Walsh was an important figure in the county, having twice held the post of high sheriff of the shire, among other important offices for both church and crown. The family's social standing was significant, evidenced by a visit to their home by Henry VIII and then queen Anne Boleyn on the evening of August 23, 1535. Anne Walsh was the sister of Sir Nicholas Poyntz of Acton Court, who was a close friend of both Henry and Anne.

Tyndale, like the Walshes, came to have strong Protestant leanings in an age when religious conformity was



Portrait of William Tyndale, Protestant reformer and Bible translator; *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (PD-US).

* Quoted in Foxe, *Book of Martyrs*.

expected and violently enforced. While living at Little Sodbury, Tyndale had an argumentative encounter with a traveling “learned man,” undoubtedly a priest of indeterminate rank. A theological debate erupted between Tyndale and the cleric, in which Tyndale demonstrated that the priest’s position was contrary to the teachings of the Bible.

To this, the learned man replied, “We were better to be without God’s laws than the pope’s!”

Tyndale swiftly declared, “I defy the pope and all his laws.” The famous martyrologist Foxe notes that Tyndale went on to assert that “if God spared him life, ’ere many years, he would cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scripture than he did.”¹ (In the original versions of Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments* — now known as *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* — he uses third-person pronouns to describe Tyndale’s statement, but it is clear that Tyndale is speaking of himself.)

With these few words, Tyndale not only declared the central purpose of his own life, but also unknowingly set into motion a long chain of events that would ultimately lead to the religious liberty of the American people.

Impediments to Biblical Literacy

For Tyndale to achieve his goal of giving the Bible to ploughboys, the worlds of religion, law, and politics would all have to dramatically change. The Bible was essentially unknown in a nation where the Roman Church was so dominant that the pope’s annual revenue from England was comparable to that taken by the king.² Even the clergy were largely scripturally illiterate. Tyndale made a practice of conversing with everyone from archdeacons to children about matters of faith, and his simple and plain explanations of passages of the Bible frequently revealed the error of even the most learned. Despite everyone’s common acknowledgment of Tyndale’s “virtuous disposition” and “life unspotted,” some began fervidly to resent him.³

After a while, clamoring on the part of area priests led to charges of heresy and a trial. The official in charge of the proceeding railed viciously against Tyndale. Yet none of the priests in attendance would stand as his accuser, and Tyndale was able to return to the Walshes after his examination. “This I suffer,” he said, “because the priests of the country be unlearned.”⁴ And indeed they were — at least in the Scriptures. Even 30 years later, when the bishop of Gloucester surveyed the knowledge of the 311 priests, deacons, and archdeacons in the diocese,



Portrait of Thomas Cranmer, painted by Gerlach Flicke, 1545 (PD-US)

168 were unable to name the Ten Commandments (nine didn’t even know how many commandments there were); 39 did not know where the Lord’s Prayer appeared in the Bible, and 34 were unable to name the author of the Lord’s Prayer.⁵

Around the same time that Tyndale was at Little Sodbury, Thomas Cranmer, who would later become the first Protestant archbishop of Canterbury, introduced a radical new practice at Cambridge University that demonstrated the breadth of biblical illiteracy even among those at the top of religious society. Those who were being examined for a doctorate in divinity at Cambridge would now, thanks to Cranmer’s innovation, be examined on the Bible. Cranmer’s 1694 biography, written by John Strype, describes the situation:

For he used to examine these Candidates out of the Scriptures. And by no means would he let them pass, if he found they were unskillful in it, and unacquainted with the History of the Bible. So were the Friars especially, whose Study lay only in School-Authors. Whom therefore he sometimes turned back as insufficient, advising them to study the Scriptures for

some years longer, before they came for their Degrees, it being a shame for a Professor in Divinity to be unskilled in the Book, wherein the Knowledge of God, and the Grounds of Divinity lay. Whereby he made himself from the beginning hated by the Friars.⁶

The impediments for a ploughboy or any other layman to obtain Bible knowledge in Tyndale's day were daunting. As a result of the Constitutions of Oxford of 1408, it was illegal to translate any portion of the Bible into English without permission from a bishop. This enactment also prohibited anyone from owning such an English Bible. Violation of the law was considered heresy, a crime traditionally punishable by being burned at the stake. It had been passed in reaction to the efforts of John Wycliffe to translate the Bible into English for the people of the nation. In addition to these formidable legal barriers, a ploughboy would simply not be able, for practical reasons, either to obtain a copy of the Latin Bible or to read it if he could. Moreover, Cardinal Thomas Wolsey issued a general prohibition on May 14, 1521, against any books that proclaimed the doctrines of the Reformation.⁷

Common literacy, a free press, and the free exercise of religion would be needed before an English translation would be practical. All were utterly out of the question when Tyndale declared his purpose to help ploughboys know the Scriptures. Yet he apparently still believed that all these barriers could be overcome and the Bible be made available to all the people of England.

Tyndale's Quest

Tyndale ultimately left the employment of the Walsh family in pursuit of this goal. He went to London to seek an audience with the bishop of London, Cuthbert Tunstall, to obtain permission to translate the New Testament from the original Greek into English. Schooled on the continent and highly admired by some contemporaries as a man of learning and charity, Tunstall was a close friend and supporter of the man whose work had made a fresh translation possible: the great scholar Erasmus.

Looking at the rest of Europe in 1523, Tyndale saw that England stood alone in its lack of a vernacular translation of the Bible. (Wycliffe's earlier translation from Latin was in a form of English so archaic that it was virtually unreadable in the early 16th century.) The first vernacular translations were printed in Germany in 1466, France in 1474, Italy in 1471, and Spain (Catalan) in 1478.⁸ All these were translated from the Latin Vulgate into the local tongue, but Luther's 1522 New Testament in German was the first translation to be based on the Greek text produced by Erasmus. Erasmus had recently published a New Testament with the original Greek and a new Latin translation in a side-by-side format. His purpose was to provide a new Latin translation of the Bible to replace the venerable, but error-ridden Vulgate translated by Jerome in the fourth century. To prove the accuracy of his *Novum Testamentum omne*, Erasmus placed the Greek text alongside the Latin. This Greek text would enable Tyndale to work from the original language into English.

Tyndale's request to Tunstall for permission to translate the New Testament exemplified a certain naiveté that would ultimately prove disastrous.⁹ He often approached matters as if all others would make decisions as he did — by simply looking at the Word of God and applying its clear directives to the situation at hand. Tyndale often acted in apparent obliviousness to the



"Wyclif Giving 'The Poor Priests' His Translation of the Bible", painted by William Frederick Yeames, date unknown (PD-Art).

political realities of his situation. Tunstall's friendship with Erasmus might have given Tyndale hope that the bishop would be favorable to his request. The Tyn- dales were also a highly respected and wealthy family of nobility, while Tunstall himself had no such back- ground. These were but few positive factors against so many to the contrary.¹⁰

Three powerful reasons made it highly unlikely that Tunstall would approve Tyndale's proposition. First, the stigma of the Wycliffe translation was not completely forgotten. Twenty-two Lollards, the followers of Wycliffe, were burned at the stake between 1506 and 1519.¹¹ Rather than fading from memory, the ashes of the Lollard martyrs were still warm. Second, Tyndale's rep- utation as a troublemaker in Glouces- tershire may well have reached the bishop's ears. Even though he had survived the heresy proceeding, Tyndale had still been charged and was likely viewed as a poten- tially serious menace to the peace. The third obstacle was the most important: Luther's translation of the New Testa- ment had quickly become syn- onymous with heresy. Giving sanction to an English Luther was an idea simply not to be countenanced by the Catholic bishop of London.

By the time of Tyndale's request, Luther was considered the arch-heretic in England. In April 1521, Henry VIII began work on a book denouncing Luther. (The king seemed to have an equal passion for intel- lectual pursuits and frivolous pleasures and was always as eager to read Aquinas or write his own discourses as he was to make merry with the youths in his company.¹²) Henry's book was called *Assertio septem sac- ramentorum* (i.e., *A Defense of the Seven Sacraments*) and was published that July. Although

he likely completed a large part of the work himself, some portions were written by scholars such as Thomas More, who acknowledged a minor role.¹³ The book contains scathing personal attacks on Luther, as well as a defense of the Catholic Church's infallibility, the pope's authority, and the claim that ceremonies and practices based on the oral traditions of the church were from Christ Himself.

Henry wrote of Luther:

The most greedy wolf of hell has sur- prised him, devoured and swallowed him down into the lowest part of his bel- ly, where he lies half alive and half dead in death: and whilst the pious pastor calls him, and be- wails his loss, he belches out of the filthy mouth of the heathen wolf these foul in- veighings, which the ears of the flock detest, dis- dain and abhor.¹⁴

The pope was pleased with Henry's attack, awarding him the title *Fidei Defen- sor* — defender of the faith. The title is still used by the British monarch today, with the abbreviation F.D. appearing on modern coins of the realm.

In 1522, Luther replied to the king, somewhat intemperately himself, call- ing the king "more a triv- ial buffoon than a king," among other *ad hominem* attacks.¹⁵ Thomas More was given the task of replying to Luther, and he set to work on this task in early 1523. More's replies to Luther were vicious, though some- times expressed in humor- ous mocking, and laced



The Martin Luther window at St. Mat- thew's Lutheran Church in Charleston, SC (CC BY-SA 3.0).

with scatological attacks that sound more like a 21st-century comedian too filthy for network television than a 16th-century saint:

Since he has written that he already has a prior right to bespatter and besmirch the royal crown with s***, we will not have the posterior right to proclaim the bes****ed tongue of this practitioner of posterioristics most fit to lick with his anterior the very posterior of a p***ing she-mule until he have learned more correctly to infer posterior conclusions from prior premises.¹⁶

C. S. Lewis rightly described More as almost obsessed with harping on Luther's "abominable bichery" to the point where he "loses himself in a wilderness of opprobrious adjectives."¹⁷

In this atmosphere, there was no chance that Tyndale's request, made in the spring of 1523, would be granted. Tunstall turned Tyndale down with some formal courtesies but little warmth. Tyndale later wrote:

And so in London I abode almost a year, and marked the course of the world . . . and saw things whereof I defer to speak at this time and understood at the last not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England, as experience doth now openly declare.¹⁸

Tyndale left for the continent, intent on finding a place to translate the Bible into English in order to send the printed Word of God back to ploughboys, laborers, merchants, and even the clerics of England. The first stops on his journey are not known with certainty, but he ended up in Cologne, Germany. The details of his early work in translating the New Testament are also obscure, but Tyndale was engaged in the actual printing of the first 22 chapters of the Book of Matthew during the summer of 1525. After receiving a threat from a Catholic spy, he and



Old St Paul's before 1561, with intact spire, Francis Bond, *Early Christian Architecture*, 1913 (PD-US).

an assistant were forced to leave Cologne immediately with their printed sheets and manuscripts. This was no mere act of paranoia but a response to a genuine danger. Escaping to Worms, Tyndale successfully completed and printed his first translation of the New Testament early in 1526. Copies of Tyndale's work were openly sold in London by February of the same year.


Book Burning and Heretic Hunting

On February 11, a large anti-Luther demonstration was held at St. Paul's Cathedral, complete with the burning of Luther's books and copies of his translation of the New Testament. The books had been seized in a raid led by Thomas More on a German section of London. More arrested three heretics on the spot and returned the following day for further searches.¹⁹ Sometime in March, officials became aware that a new source of heresy was in circulation: Tyndale's English New Testament printed without any of the traditional indicia of the translator or publisher. Cardinal Wolsey, who as vice-regent often seemed more in charge of the nation than Henry VIII, convened the bishops that summer to consider the new threat. Unsurprisingly, they concluded that the "error-ridden" translation (of Tyndale) should be burned. Orders were issued to booksellers to stop selling the work. In connection with a public burning of copies of the English New Testament, Bishop Tunstall preached a sermon at St. Paul's on October 26 denouncing the translation as having more than two thousand errors — a highly unlikely claim given the

painstaking and thorough process Tyndale endured throughout its preparation as well as the esteem with which later scholars have viewed his work.²⁰

At first, officials seemed content to find books and burn them. But it would not be long before the 150-year tradition of hunting, arresting, and burning the Lollards began to be applied to the Lutherans and others coming to a new form of Christian faith after reading the New Testament in English. The first notable arrest was that of Thomas Bilney in November 1527 in Cambridge. Bilney, a scholar trained in both civil and canon law, renounced his newfound faith but was nevertheless imprisoned in the Tower of London for 12 months starting that December. In the words of David Daniell, the highly esteemed Tyndale biographer, Bilney's arrest "heralded an onslaught," and Tunstall's prisons were full beyond capacity by March.²¹ Many of those arrested recanted their heresy; and many, like Bilney, seemed genuinely confused since still they held to many central Catholic doctrines, including the doctrine of transubstantiation and the authority of the pope.

John Tewkesbury, a leather seller (according to martyrologist Foxe) or a haberdasher (according to 17th-century historian Strype), was one of those arrested in this wave of heretic hunting. In April 1529, he was twice examined by Tunstall and subsequently taken by Thomas More to his house in Chelsea, where he was so badly tortured at the rack that he was nearly unable to walk. He recanted his new faith but later abjured and was burned at the stake. Foxe reports that this tradesman was so well versed in "the doctrine of justification and all other articles of faith . . . that Tunstall and all his learned men were ashamed that a leather-seller should so dispute with them, and with such power of the Scriptures and heavenly wisdom, that they were not able to resist him."²² With a boldness reminiscent of that of Peter and John when they stood before the religious authorities of their day, Tewkesbury caused his persecutors to marvel. This episode demonstrated that Tyndale was already suc-



A page from the Book of Acts in the 1536 edition of Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. *The Newe testament yet once agayne corrected by William Tyndale*; courtesy of Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, Douce N.T. Eng. F. 1536, image 212.

ceeding in his mission to train the common, laboring class to be superior to the professional clerics in scriptural understanding.

In addition to his heresy for possessing and knowing the Bible in English, Tewkesbury was also closely examined on Tyndale's second important work, a book entitled *The Treatise of the Wicked Mammon*. This treatise expounds upon the central Reformation doctrine of justification by faith, warning readers that many "philosophers and worldly wise men" have arisen who hold to the "belief that they shall be justified in the sight of God by the goodness of their own works and

have corrupt[ed] the pure word of God to confirm their Aristotle.”²³ *Wicked Mammon* was printed in Antwerp (where Tyndale had moved) on May 8, 1528, and was distributed in England soon thereafter.

Two Men and Their Missions

In that fateful year of 1528, Henry’s highest officials were vigilantly engaged in the discovery, arrest, prosecution, torture, and imprisonment of heretics. Six years earlier the king had intemperately castigated Luther, but now Lutheran heretics suffered from far more than a war of words. Some of Henry’s officials — particularly Thomas More — sincerely believed they were serving God as they brutalized religious dissenters.

Henry began to be distracted. A young woman entered the swirl of court life who captured the king’s complete attention. For several years she had lived in the French court as an attendant of Henry’s sister, Mary, the wife of Louis XII. The attendant’s name was Anne Boleyn.

Tyndale was on a mission to educate all men in the rich truths of the Bible so that they would know God; Henry was on an entirely different mission — one driven by ego and hormones. The well-known story of his lust and power had an incredible impact on the role of the Bible in England and the Western world. As



Anne Boleyn, artist unknown, c. 1533 (PD-Art).

when Joseph’s brothers sold him into slavery in Egypt, however, evil may have been intended, but God caused the good ultimately to prevail.

Notes

1. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments of Matters Most Speciall and Memorable*, 982.
2. Bobrick, *Wide as the Waters*, 36.
3. Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiasticall History*, 1224–25.
4. Tyndale, “To the Reader,” [4].
5. Daniell, *William Tyndale*, 78; Bobrick, *Wide as the Waters*, 90.
6. Strype, *Memorials of . . . Thomas Cranmer*, 1853.
7. Moynahan, *God’s Bestseller*, 89.
8. *Ibid.*, 83.
9. Monahayan convincingly argues that Tyndale was naïve in his later dealings with representatives of the crown; see *God’s Bestseller*, 45, 229–34. Daniell defends the reasonableness of Tyndale’s request to Tunstall; see *William Tyndale*, 85.
10. Daniell, *William Tyndale*, 11, 92–93.
11. Moynahan, *God’s Bestseller*, 12.
12. *History of . . . K. Henry VIII*, 24–25.
13. Some historians assert that the entire book was written by Thomas More. More’s biographer and defender, Peter Ackroyd, writes on page 226 of *The Life of Thomas More*, “It is not at all certain that Henry himself composed every word.” He ascribes a relatively modest role to More. The viciousness of language used against Luther is one reason to suspect More’s greater involvement. However, since the viciousness lacks the additional quality of vulgarity, More either restrained himself when writing for the king or was less involved than some suggest.
14. Daniell, *William Tyndale*, 255.
15. *Ibid.*, 254.
16. *Ibid.*, 258, quoting R. Marius, *Thomas More: A Biography*, 281; Marius also coedited *The Complete Works of Thomas More*, vol. 8 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973).
17. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama*, 175.
18. Tyndale, “To the Reader,” [6].
19. Moynahan, *God’s Bestseller*, 91.
20. David Daniell has given us unparalleled analysis to understand the excellence of Tyndale’s work. In addition to his superb biography, Daniell’s massive treatise, *The Bible in English*, thoroughly documents the overall accuracy of Tyndale’s translation.
21. Daniell, *William Tyndale*, 177–78.
22. *Ibid.*, 171.
23. Tyndale, *Wicked Mammon*, [Avir]; spellings have been modernized here and wherever needed for clarity’s sake throughout the book.

King Henry VIII statue,
King's College, Cambridge

