The hierarchical ideal of Tudor social order was refined in a time of crisis or perceived crisis. Historical debate on whether there was a crisis (relative or absolute) during the reigns of Edward VI and Mary has become known as the Mid-Tudor Crisis debate. The debate is summarized in D. M. Loades, *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545–1565* (1992). But see also J. Loach and R. Tittler, eds., *The Mid-Tudor Polity, c.1540–1560* (1980).


The Tudor Revolution in Government debate is largely over the nature of Henry VIII's rule. Was Henry a despot, ruling by fiat? Was he a ham, play-acting his way through the reign, but leaving day-to-day decisions to his chief ministers? If the latter, did Cromwell, as Elton has argued, remodel the relationship between king, bureaucrats, and Parliament so as to begin a shift from medieval to modern government? A. F. Pollard once suggested that Henry was in full control after the fall of Wolsey and directed the Reformation government. But Elton argued that (a) Wolsey was never fully in charge before 1529; and (b) Cromwell had a much greater role in creating and implementing policy after 1529; see, for example, Elton, “King or Minister?: The Man behind the Henrician Reformation,” History 39 (1954). Elton sees the king actively working with Cromwell, who best realized the advantages of working with and using Parliament. Elton debates G. L. Harriss and P. Williams over the extent to which the Cromwellian reforms in government can really be said to issue in a modern, bureaucratic government, in P & P 25 (1963), 29 (1964), and 31–2 (1965). Elton's thesis has also been questioned by J. J. Scarisbrick, in his biography Henry VIII (rev. ed., 1997); and J. Hurstfield, in “Was there a Tudor Despotism after All?,” TRHS 5th ser., 17 (1967). In an interesting debate, captured in Lamont, Scarisbrick sees Henry as toying with monarchy, and unable to extend beyond the basic medieval idea of the king as the show-piece for pageantry, hunting, warring, and the central progenitor of a dynasty. Still, he argues that Henry, not Cromwell, originated policy. G. W. Bernard has also recently argued that Cromwell was more the king's servant, in History 83 (1998).

Revolution Reassessed, ed. C. Coleman and Starkey (Oxford, 1986); and A. Fox and J. Guy, eds., Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform, 1500–1500 (Oxford, 1986), particularly Guy's essay on the Act in Restraint of Appeals, which shows that the Henrician Revolution involved far more than solely Henry or Cromwell.
HISTORIOGRAPHY FROM CHAPTER THREE


Overall, historians of the English Reformation can be divided as to whether they believe the major impetus for reform came from above or below, and whether they think the Reformation came quickly or was long resisted. A. G. Dickens was one of the first to use the rich provincial records on the Reformation in his *The English Reformation* (1964; 2nd ed., 1989). His view that the Reformation swept England quickly, pushed by anticlericalism and real grassroots Protestantism among the populace, became the standard. Dickens summarizes his argument in “The Early Expansion of Protestantism in England, 1520–1558” (1987, reprinted in Marshall); and he responds to the revisionist argument that the English people rejected official reformation from above in *JEcclH* 36 (1985). D. M. Palliser, “Popular Reactions to the Reformation, 1530–70,” in *Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I*, ed. F. Heal and R. O'Day (1977) synthesizes the pre-revisionist view.


A post-revisionist examination of popular Protestantism, while acknowledging a popular Catholicism, might be said to emerge in the work of D. MacCulloch. See, for example, his brief survey, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*, 2nd ed.


Essays by P. Collinson, S. Adams, and P. Williams, reprinted in The Tudor Monarchy, ed. J. Guy (1997), detail the ideology, the favorites, and the business of the Elizabethan court. For the construction of Elizabethan politics, see N. Jones, “Elizabeth's First Year: The Conception and Birth of the Elizabethan Political World,” in The Reign of Elizabeth I, ed. C. Haigh (1984). The brief S. Bassnett, Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective (Oxford, 1988) is one of a number of similar studies, although it is hard to imagine not gendering study of a monarch whose own officers complained (though not, of course, to


---


While no work discusses all Tudor and early Stuart rebellions before the Great Rebellion of 1642, Wall, “Rebellion,” in Power and Protest in England, illuminates the


The formal Church is examined in useful essays in K. Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church* (1993), especially Tyacke's “Archbishop Laud” (which you might contrast with Sharpe's “Archbishop Laud,” *HT* 1983, reprinted in Todd). It has been suggested that what Calvinist consensus existed in the early Stuart Church was undermined not only from without by Arminianism but also from within by Puritan, even Antinomian, fissions. See, especially, P. Lake and D. Como, “‘Orthodoxy’ and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of ‘Consensus’ in the London (Puritan) ‘Underground,’” *JBS* 39, 1 (2000). For the Catholic community, see chapter 4, and articles mentioned there; and C. Hibbard, “Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions and Re-Revisions,” *JMH* 52 (1980). C. Hill's important “Puritans and the ‘Dark Corners of the Land,’” in his *Continuity and Change in Seventeenth-Century England* (1974) shows either a continuing attempt to reform those who did not want Reformation, or the tendency of the hotter sort of Protestants to always view themselves as a beleaguered minority whatever their success.


The role and intentions of Oliver Cromwell in the 1640s and 1650s continue to excite interest. Students approaching this question for the first time should consider C. Hill, God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution (New York, 1970); B. Coward, Oliver Cromwell (1991); and, still useful, C. Firth, Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England (New York, 1903); as well as articles in J. Morrill, ed., Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution (1990); and in I. Roots, ed., Cromwell: A Profile (New York, 1973), especially H. R. Trevor-Roper's “Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments.”


After all is said and done, was it a revolution? Hill has never had any doubt. His “The Word ‘Revolution,’” in *A Nation of Change and Novelty*, rev. ed. (1993) suggests that contemporaries did use the term in the modern sense of a radical, abrupt political change (as opposed to what has been taken to be the usual early modern sense of cyclical change). But a revisionist critique is found in J. Morrill, “Christopher Hill's Revolution,” in *The Nature of the English Revolution*. And there is an introductory debate by J. Morrill, B. Manning, and D. Underdown on “What Was the English Revolution?,” in *HT* 34, 3 (1984). G. E. Aylmer, *Rebellion or Revolution?: England from Civil War to Restoration* (Oxford, 1986) and A. Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625–1660* (Oxford, 2002) are, despite the titles, analytic narratives, but none the worse for that.


The “public sphere” coined by Jürgen Habermas of coffeehouses, newspapers, and commensality has become a growth industry for study of Restoration political culture. See B. Cowan, “What Was Masculine about the Public Sphere?: Gender and the Coffeehouse Milieu in Post-Restoration England,” *History Workshop Journal* 51 (2001);


