THE INFLUENCE OF THE DOMINANT TUDOR WILL ON THE STATE RELIGION OF ENGLAND

By

Sister M. Edith Hodapp, S. S. N. D., B. A.

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School, Marquette University, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

July, 1937

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer of this thesis wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to Reverend Father R. N. Hamilton, S. J. under whose able guidance and direction the work was accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

English historians recognize the power and strength of will in the Tudor rulers--Henry VIII, Mary Tudor, and Queen Elizabeth. Tudor stubbornness and persistence is reflected in every important enterprise of their reigns. During these years Parliamentary subservience is remarkably evident. Its roll was simply to shield the masters. Tudor rulers spared themselves many griefs by having their arbitrary measures sanctioned by parliament. They carried out their own will; yet, always with the consent of parliament, on which they frequently brought undue pressure. Parliamentary acts formed the shell, as it were, within which could be found the will of the ruler. Under the subterfuge of legality the sovereign's will became the law of the land. If the laws of the Church would interfere with the personal designs of the sovereign, the authority of the Church was substituted by the personal authority of the ruler. As long as an English statesman carried out the wishes of his sovereign, he was secure; but if he failed in any particular to carry out the will of the ruler, he lost his position and influence, or was even put to death for treason.

Although Henry VII was the first of the Tudor rulers, we shall exclude him in the development of this paper because his influence was not remarkable in bringing about religious changes. The purpose of this paper is to show how Henry VII's successors developed, through their dominating will power, the heritage they had received from Henry VII--how these Tudor rulers exercised their will in influencing

religion, and managed to keep their power in spite of all opposition.

We shall see how Henry VIII in wanting to marry Anne Boleyn overcame every obstacle to attain his object; how he forced England out of the Church to get his will; how he influenced his Parliament to pass laws that he might possess supremacy in spiritual matters; how, when he met serious opposition he robbed and murdered to accomplish his purpose. We shall furthermore see how this will overcame much resistance on the part of the statesmen who were inclined to Protestantism--how Henry clung to the old faith in doctrine; but, because he could not recognize the Pope of Rome as head of the Church and still have his own will, he made himself pope in England.

We shall pass over the reign of Edward VI very quickly because he was a mere boy and did not dominate the realm himself. The changes in religion during this reign were brought about through the work of statesmen rather than through the influence of the will of a Tudor.

Queen Mary, however, in her short and turbulent reign so successfully carried out her wishes in reestablishing the Catholic religion that in the short period of five years, the entire nation had practically been reunited to the Church. Her methods were medieval in character. Times had changed, the world had passed into the modern era. Mary, nevertheless, set herself to her task as one might have done in the ages of faith. Without subterfuge she punished protestants as

heretics had been punished of old. Councilors advised against the method, but her Tudor stubbornness made her heedless of their advice with the result that history has long blamed her for killing for conscience sake; while her craftier father and wily half-sister, who put more people to death for conscience sake than she, are excused because they did it under the cloak of treason.

When Elizabeth came to the throne, the realm was Catholic, and Elizabeth might have been willing enough to remain Catholic had she not wanted to rule. Her position was precarious indeed. As a Catholic, she would not be recognized as a legitimate heir to the throne because her father's marriage to Anne Boleyn was not recognized by the Church. Hence, to maintain her power, she would be obliged to take up the new religion and to persecute the members of the old faith. She too, like her father, chose able statesmen to guide the realm and to carry out the sovereign's will in bringing about the settlement of religion in England. She was very careful to have every action sanctioned through parliamentary enactment; thus maintaining the good will of the nation as a whole, and at the same time, dominating the religion of the realm by force of her will.

The influence of the Tudor will on the history of England from 1528-1603 has long been recognized by historians as a most potent factor in the many changes that were effected in England during this period. The writer is not aware of any work devoted exclusively to the problem of how

the Tudor will dominated the religion of England, but recognizes the many authors mentioned in the bibliography at the end of this paper as furnishing background and material for the solution of the problem.

CHAPTER II

HENRY VIII AND THE SCHISM

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CHURCH BEFORE THE SCHISM

The early years of Henry's reign, when he was still a youth, directed and guided by the advice of the statesmen of his court, do not notably foreshadow the disastrous effect of his powerful Tudor will. In the first years of his reign Henry VIII lived a happy life with Katharine, his wife, and also in perfect harmony with the Church. However, he wanted a male heir as his successor and all but one of his six children--she a frail girl--died in infancy. This was a great disappointment to the King. At his court was Anne Boleyn, young, healthy, attractive. She could bear him an heir, but not unless Katharine were out of the way. Here was an occasion which roused the power of Henry's Tudor will. It soon became evident that there was nothing he would not stake to obtain his object. The result of his policy was a complete break with the Church which as a young man he had loved and defended. The story of Henry's divorce deserves first place as a typical example of Tudor dominance as it influenced religion, because before this event there was nothing in the condition of the Church of England that in any way suggested a break from Rome. Rightly Hilaire Belloc in his book How the Reformation Happened calls Henry's schism the "English Accident".

Let us take a glance at England in her relation to the Church at the opening of the Protestant Revolt in 1517. Although Europe was being torn from the unity of Christendom by the teachings of Luther and Calvin, the influence of their

teaching in England was not alarming. Henry VIII at the time Luther published his ninety-five theses had no intention whatever of breaking with the Church. He had been a loyal and devout adherent of the doctrines and of the authority of the Church of Rome. England was geographically separated from the rest of Europe and the influence of false doctrines was not generally felt. The attitude of Henry toward the Church was indeed more favorable than that of the majority of rulers of his day. Henry was a firm believer in the doctrines of the Church,--"he scented the new Lutheran heresy and sought speedily to exterminate it".[1]

---

1 Hayes, Carlton J. H. A Political and Social History of Modern Europe. Vol. I, p. 151.

As Protestantism began on the continent, he was engaged in the writing of a book which he called The Defense of the Seven Sacraments, and which he dedicated to the Pope. Pope Leo X, in turn, gave him the title Fidei Defensor, or Defender of the Faith, which title Henry cherished for the rest of his life. There had been growing in Europe the general opinion among the rulers and their subjects that the Pope of Rome exercised too much political power. But Henry in this book did not question the political claims of the Pope. In fact, with the advice and connivance of his chief adviser, Cardinal Wolsey, Henry on several occasions allied himself with Pope Leo X in the game of European politics. So far there was no serious interference with Henry's plans and ambitions. His will had not been crossed. Really, the Pope

had catered to him in granting him the title of "The Defender of the Faith".

Even at this early period of his reign, 1517, however, he showed a tendency toward political superiority in his relations with the Pope--a foreshadowing of his complete break with the Church at a later date. On the occasion of a visit of the Papal delegate, Cardinal Campeggio, asking for help in a crusade against the Turks, there was little respect shown to the Apostolic See. The Papal Legate was placed in an inferior position in comparison with Wolsey, the English Cardinal. Another instance of Henry's attitude regarding the Pope concerns an agreement made between himself and Francis of France during the Pope's captivity in the Castle of San Angelo.

> "By this treaty Henry and Francis bound themselves to reject any bull signed by the Pope during his captivity, and they agreed that whatever the bishops of either country, assembled by the authority of their respective sovereign's consent, should be decreed and considered as binding, as if it had been done by the Pope. Thus was Henry taught his lesson as future Supreme Head of the Church of England."[2]

---

2 Hope, Mrs. The First Divorce of Henry VIII, p. 54.

Incidents of this type reveal the character of Henry which was such as to brook little or no opposition.

COMING OF ANNE BOLEYN

As Henry advanced to middle age, his disappointment at not having a male heir began to loom large in his life and

simultaneously Anne Boleyn, captivated his sensual appetite. Then in quick succession one idea after another presented itself to his imagination. His Tudor pride said there must be a legitimate male heir. Katharine, his wife, five years his senior, had outgrown her attractiveness as well as her usefulness. What should he do? There was a possibility. A marriage to a brother's widow was contrary to the laws of the Church; and, although there had been a dispensation at the time of his marriage, was that dispensation lawful?[3]

---

[3] "Most contemporary writers, whether Catholic or Protestant, agree that it was Wolsey who first put it into his head." Hope, Mrs. The First Divorce of Henry VIII, p. 43. This has been disproved by later research. Cf. Gairdner, James, "New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII", English Historical Review, XI, (1896) p. 672.

The King must find a possible way out of the difficulty. His passion for Anne Boleyn grew upon him and to keep her as his mistress would not bring him a legitimate male heir.

It is true that Anne Boleyn was an evil genius for the King of England; still it was the decision of Henry VIII himself that finally and permanently brought about the disruption of the unity of Christendom.[4] In the year 1522 Anne

---

[4] Belloc, Hilaire. How the Reformation Happened, p. 90.

Boleyn had made her appearance in court and Henry's passion for her was aroused. The court of England had been rather subdued under the direction of the good Queen Katharine. With the coming of Anne Boleyn, who had spent some time in the French court, some of the French finesse was introduced,

and the morals of the court of England declined. Henry had a strong passion for lust and his followers dared not oppose him.

It was in the year 1522 that Henry first expressed his pretended scruples concerning the validity of his marriage with Katharine. As time went on they grew upon him and took definite shape. What Henry wanted was not a "divorce" which would be a dissolving of an existing contract, but an "annulment", the declaration from ecclesiastical authorities that the first marriage with Katharine of Aragon was from the start invalid. The progress of the case was slow. In 1522 we find Henry expressing his scruples; in April, 1525, there is the earliest notice of the "divorce" "in a letter from Archbishop Warham to Wolsey....., in which reference is made to 'this great matter of the King's grace'," [5] and on the

---

5 Hope, Mrs. op. cit., p. 43.

---

seventeenth of May the formal proceedings toward getting a "divorce" were instituted.

DISPENSATION BULL OF POPE JULIUS II

Let us consider the negotiations of Henry VIII with the Church concerning his divorce as briefly as possible from its inception to the final decision given by Rome, and let us also trace the effect of his dominating will power on the progress of the case. In 1501 Katharine of Aragon had been married to Arthur, Henry VIII's older brother. After five months Arthur died. Two years later a contract was made be-

tween Henry VIII and the King of Spain for a marriage of Katharine with Arthur's brother, provided the Pope would grant a dispensation. Julius II granted the dispensation in wide terms including the conditions of whether the marriage had been consummated or not. A careful examination of the bull and the terms in which it was couched, revealed a flaw in its content that did not escape the keen eye of Wolsey when this brief of dispensation was later presented for examination. Herbert Thurston, S. J. explains the flaw in the bull of dispensation issued by Pope Julius II at the request of the King of Spain. The Spaniards wanted to be certain that there was no impediment existing, whether the marriage had been consummated or not. However, the bull was issued to remove the impediment of affinity. But as it had been proved that the marriage had not been consummated, the impediment of affinity did not exist. There was another impediment known as publicae honestatis justicia that did exist because of the marriage ceremony. This impediment was not mentioned in the bull. Besides the word forsan appeared in the bull, implying an uncertain condition regarding the impediment, and therefore being in that point inconsistent. Even with these inconsistencies, however, the Pope had included in this brief to Ferdinand and Isabella a very clear and decided statement authorizing the marriage of Henry and Katharine.

When Henry expressed his scruples concerning the validity of his marriage, there were only two courses open to him.

> "Either he could plead that Julius had acted ultra vires, that marriage with a deceased brother's wife was forbidden by divine law and could therefore not be validated even by the Pope, or he could acknowledge this power to be adequate, but allege legal defects in the bull of dispensation which would render that instrument itself invalid."[6]

---

6 Smith, Richard Lawrence. John Fisher and Thomas More: Two English Saints, p. 150.

For a long time Henry wavered between the two courses, but finally he leaned to the latter course of alleging legal defects in the bull of dispensation. He really could not consistently adhere to the first course, as he was trying to enter a contract with Anne Boleyn with whom the impediment of affinity existed through his relation with Mary Boleyn, her sister. And it was the impediment of affinity that was dispensed with in the bull which enabled him to marry Katharine. Therefore, if he wanted to contract a marriage with Anne Boleyn, he would have to recognize the dispensing power of the Pope on the question of affinity. In making his decision Henry exercised his power of will. He was determined to marry Anne Boleyn; therefore he chose to recognize the dispensing power of the Pope. This course would enable him through another Papal dispensation to remove the impediment that existed between himself and Anne Boleyn. This was the only method for him to follow in order to get his way. If he won in the divorce case, he would be free to ask for another dispensation because of the impediment of affinity with Anne Boleyn.

EMBASSIES TO THE POPE

Henry wished to be certain that the decision would prove favorable to him. Therefore he tried to persuade Pope Clement VII to permit Cardinal Wolsey and himself to decide the case in England without further appeal. Pope Clement was patient and tractable, and felt bound to Henry by ties of gratitude. Yet, there was another political consideration. The Pope was in the power of Charles V, the Emperor, and the nephew of Katharine. If he acceded to Henry's request, Charles V would deeply resent it. Embassy after embassy was sent to Rome with documents for the Pope's signature and even from the beginning, the reports left little hope in Wolsey's mind that the Pope would decide favorably for Henry.

In one of these embassies

> "The envoys presented to him for signature two instruments, by the first of which he would empower Wolsey (in case of objection to Wolsey they were permitted to substitute Staphilaeo) to hear and decide the cause of the divorce; by the second he would grant to Henry a dispensation to marry, in the place of Catherine, any other woman whomsoever, even if she were already promised to another, or related to himself within the first degree of affinity."[7]

---

[7] Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England. Vol. IV, p. 498.

He signed the latter without alteration. The other was to be composed in a new style by the Cardinal Santi Quatri. James Gairdner says of this bull that Knight obtained a

> "conditional dispensation for the new marriage in the case the existing one with Katherine were declared invalid; and certainly it is not a little remarkable that such a document should have been actually issued by the papal chancery. Strange that the papal chancery did not insist that the sentence of nullity should be obtained in the first instance before any such document was conceded."[8]

---

8 Gairdner, James. "New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII". English Historical Review, XI, (1896), p. 695.

But Knight had scarcely left Orvieto when a request came from England for a papal legate. The result was the establishment of the Legatine Court under the authority of Campeggio, the Papal Legate, and of Wolsey. It was Campeggio who brought to England the

> "bull which automatically annulled the marriage of Henry and Katherine provided Wolsey and Campeggio in the legatine court should decide that the former marriage between Arthur and Katherine had been consummated. But the bull was strangely given: it was not to be shown or entrusted to anybody. And Cardinal Campeggio should carry it very slowly, and he should try when he got to England to temporize, to allay the King's passion, to let the affair blow over, so that the bull should never have to be used."[9]

---

9 Sargent, Daniel. Thomas More, p. 195.

There is evidently a disagreement in the opinion as to what this brief "which automatically annulled the marriage" under the above conditions implied. Sargent does not state that a new commission was required from Rome before judgment was passed. Guggenberger says that the papal brief simply

"empowered Campeggio and Wolsey to hear the cause at issue between Henry and Catherine, but not to pass judgment without a new commission; Campeggio, in that case, had to refer the matter back to Rome. An appeal to the Pope was always open to the Queen. Not for a moment through all the weary negotiations of six years did Clement give the final decision out of his own hand. The secret decretal commission which intrusted to the exclusive keeping of Campeggio, and in which he defined the law in the event of the facts being ascertained, is no exception to this rule. Pope and Cardinals were alike determined 'never to make a concession which would enable an injustice to be done with the sanction of the Holy See'. It was not until he had spent some weeks in England, that Cardinal Campeggio fully understood how hopeless the reconciliation of Henry and Catherine was made by the stubbornness of the king."[10]

---

10 Guggenberger, A. A General History of the Christian Era. Vol. II, p. 190-191.

LEGATINE COURT

Here we see how determined Henry was to have the Legate's Court of Inquiry summoned quickly. Campeggio, however, had been instructed not to act too quickly; besides he had been suffering physical ills and was unable to begin at once. But Henry was determined, for he knew of the possibility of the Pope's calling the case to his own tribunal and of the privilege that the queen always had of appealing to Rome. The trial was held in the Blackfriars' Palace in London on June 21, 1529. Queen Katharine was called into the court,--she whose cause was clear as crystal before the whole world, whose cause was the cause of the people of England; she who was as frank as her opponents were secret. She came before

the court and addressed them calmly:

> "My Lords Legate, in this land you are prejudiced and incompetent judges, both holding as you do benefices from the King. I do not recognize you. I appeal my case to the Holy Father and the Court of Rome."[11]

---

[11] Barrington, E. Anne Boleyn, p. 225.

She then left the court, but was again summoned, and she reiterated her previous decision. Here the cardinals denied her the right of appeal to Rome. Henry's dominance made them afraid to grant what popes had promised. Again she was summoned and this time on her knees before the assembly she made her heart-piercing appeal to Henry, asserted her rights, implored his justice, and then solemnly appealed to Rome. There she would give her answer.

> "Even if she could consent to leave the throne she could not, if she retained any sense of womanly dignity, acknowledge that she had never been a wife to Henry, or suffer her daughter to be branded with illegitimacy."[12]

---

[12] Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. A Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to 1885. Vol. II, p. 382.

Katharine was quite sure of her ground. In December, 1528 the Emperor Charles V had produced a breve of Julius II containing a confirmation of the dispensation. Then in June, 1529, when the court was in session, Katharine at once entered two protests. The first was against the competence of the court which consisted of Henry's bishops; and the second was that her marriage with Arthur had not been consummated.

Henry did not contradict her in this. She soon left the court and would not appear again in person or by her attorney. She was therefore pronounced contumacious in consequence of her departure after appearing in Court. Henry made use of this opportunity to urge on the case still more persistently in his favor. After her departure the proceedings continued, but the arguments were all on the King's side. He saw in her disappearance a better chance for the success of his cause. The King's counsel endeavored to prove three things:

> "1. That the marriage between Arthur and Catherine had been consummated; whence they inferred that her subsequent marriage with Henry was contrary to the divine law: 2. that supposing the case admitted of dispensation, yet the bull of Julius II. had been obtained under false pretences; and 3. that the breve of dispensation, produced by the queen, which remedied the defects of the bull, was an evident forgery."[13]

---

13 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. IV, p. 525.

The first two of these points the court failed to prove, and the third was far from being proved though appearances were in favor of it.

During one of the first sessions of the court Bishop Fisher openly espoused the cause of Katharine. He appeared before the court stating that he had come to demonstrate with sufficient reasons that the marriage of the king and the queen could not be dissolved by divine or human power. For this opinion he was ready to lay down his life. He also declared in court that his signature had been forged

on the license for inquiry. This caused confusion in the court; and Henry, chagrined at the exposure of the fraud, dissolved the court. After this Fisher was a marked man. On the twenty-fifth of June the court met again but Katharine refused to answer the summons.

Negotiations continued in the Legatine Court interrupted by repeated adjournments, while Campeggio kept putting off any decisions until the whole proceedings should be placed before the pontiff. On the twenty-third of July they held the last session and Campeggio announced that he was determined to consult the Apostolic See, and adjourned the court until October. Within two weeks it was learned that the commission had been revoked by Pope Clement VII and the case was called to Rome.

THE FALL OF WOLSEY

This bad outcome had no effect on Henry except to strengthen his purpose to get what he wanted. One of Henry's most ardent supporters was Cardinal Wolsey. As Chancellor Henry had showered him with benefices and honors. Wolsey had taken the affair of the annulment into his own hands and had pledged himself to succeed. Yet he saw as time went on that all his efforts were futile. At first the esteem in which Henry held him was not greatly diminished; yet, he knew that the Boleyn's were his enemies and either way, whether he was successful or not in this great affair of Henry VIII, he was bound to lose his influence. If he succeeded in obtaining the annulment, Anne, as queen, would use

her influence against him and try to diminish his power and get her own favorites in control. If he did not succeed in the annulment, he would place an obstacle in the way of Henry's will and naturally lose the King's favor. Accordingly, his fall was certain.

On October 9, 1529, the day after the departure of Campeggio, Henry had a bill of indictment of Praemunire filed against Wolsey. Henry's friendship was turned into hate because the Chancellor had failed to carry out the will of the king. The Cardinal was brought before a lay court, from which he was really exempt. Wolsey submitted to its decisions; and, hoping to regain favor, signed a confession of his wrong doing and submitted his property to the King. This the King gladly took and consigned Wolsey to his See of York. To his credit it may be said that Wolsey saw in this last year of his life the futility of servile adherence to an earthly monarch and gave testimony of sincere conversion by many acts of humility and charity. On November 4, 1530, at the instigation of Anne Boleyn he was summoned to London on a charge of high treason. His health did not permit him to travel immediately, and when he did set out it was only to take refuge at the Abbey of Leicester to die.

Chapuys, the ambassador of the Emperor to England, gives some enlightening details in his letters to the Emperor:

> "On November 27, Chapuys announces his arrest, and adds, what is important, that his physician had been arrested also, and was entertained like a prince by the Duke of Norfolk.....It can scarcely be doubted that the physician

had turned against Wolsey, and had given the information which would have led to worse consequences if he had not anticipated the machinations of his enemies by dying on the eve of St. Andrew's Day."[14]

---

14 Gayangos, Pascual de. "The Divorce of Katherine of Aragon". Art X, Edinburgh Review, clii (1880), p. 140.

The Cardinal's death far from checking Henry's stubborn pursuit of purpose was only one of the catastrophies which were to illustrate the stubbornness of this Tudor Monarch once he had made up his mind that he wanted something. Come what might, he must have it.[15]

---

15 The following quotation from Shakespeare's Henry VIII gives a favorable estimate of the Cardinal. A comment on it follows.

Griffeth. "This cardinal,
Though from an humble stock, undoubtedly
Was fashion'd to much honour from his cradle.
He was a scholar, and a ripe and good one;
Exceeding wise, fair-spoken and persuading:
Lofty and sour to them that loved him not,
But to those men that sought him, sweet as summer.
And though he were unsatisfied in getting,
Which was a sin, yet in bestowing, madam,
He was most princely: ever witness for him
Those twins of learning that he raised in you,
Ipswich and Oxford! one of which fell with him
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it;
The other, though unfinish'd, yet so famous,
So excellent in art and still so rising,
That Christendom shall ever speak his virtue.
His overthrow heap'd happiness upon him;
For then, and not till then, he felt himself,
And found the blessedness of being little:
And, to add greater honours to his age
Than man could give him, he died fearing God."
Shakespeare, William. The Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII, Act IV, Sc. ii., p. 113-114.

The greatest of dramatists lifted the veil for a moment; and, notwithstanding his intense respect for the general judgment of mankind, and the universal impression of his own days, saw that there was a better and a brighter side, which even

> the unanimous and uncritical prejudices of history and tradition could not wholly obscure. To men whose knowledge and estimation of such events were exclusively derived from the pages of Foxe and Hall, this defence of the Cardinal, beautiful yet slight and insufficient as it was, put in the mouth of Katherine's receiver, must have appeared no less remarkable for its boldness than for its innovation on long established prejudices. Protestant and even Catholic historians had shut every avenue to clearer and more faithful intelligence....Yet in spite of all these heavy imputations on his memory, in spite of all this load of obloquy, obscuring our view of the man, and distorting his lineaments, the Cardinal still remains, and will ever remain, as the one prominent figure of this period."

Brewer, J. S. The Reign of Henry VIII from his accession to the death of Wolsey, Vol. 2, p. 457.

PERSISTENT EFFORTS OF HENRY

Now that Henry had disposed of Wolsey it was necessary that there be another Chancellor. Thomas More was finally chosen to fill the place as he was considered the best fitted for the position.

Henry saw that he was meeting reverses. The Legatine Court had failed and now Wolsey's efforts had proved futile in every negotiation with Rome. But Henry would not stop. He was untiring in his efforts to get what he wanted, and therefore in order to strengthen the cause of the divorce Henry consulted the Universities of Europe and England in February, 1530, asking whether a marriage with a brother's widow would be contrary to divine and natural law. The whole inquiry was a farce. Gardiner and Fox were the chief advocates of the King. In order to get a decision favorable to the King it was necessary to use bribes or threats or packed committees, and even then as at Oxford, where the

opposition was stronger than at Cambridge, the decision was not to be registered with seal as it had not been passed by Convocation. On the continent where the Emperor was able to bribe or bully the university men, the decision was against Henry.

On the twelfth of June, 1530, there was a petition drawn up to the Pope in insolent terms requesting him to declare Henry's marriage invalid. It was signed July 13, 1530 by comparatively few of the high officials--two archbishops and forty-two nobles, four bishops, a small number of abbots and commoners. The names of the most distinguished men of England, as More and Fisher, and the majority of bishops, clergy, and gentry were missing. This petition drawn up practically under compulsion was to represent the sentiment of the nation concerning the cause of Henry. Henry's efforts here to secure his point were brought almost to the breaking point. He uses this subterfuge to influence the Pope to give a decision in his favor. He continued to make preposterous demands upon the Pope, and the Pope continued to delay decision. Pope and cardinals agreed to delay for fear that in giving the decision there might be an injustice done with the sanction of the Holy See. This they could not permit. The Pope, too, hoped that in time Henry would relent, or that perhaps God would intervene through the death of Katharine, which event would automatically stop further difficulties. Then, too, he was still between the "anvil and the hammer"--if he decided favorably for Henry, the Emperor would be his enemy; if

against Henry, England would show her ill will.

Toward the end of this year the ambassador, Chapuys, gives some interesting information about "a meeting held on Sunday the 19th (Dec. 1530) at Lambeth by Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, at which Stokesby, Lee, and Foxe were present."[16]

---

16 Gayangos, Pascual de. op. cit., p. 141-142

They tried to induce Fisher to come over to the King's side. He remained firm as ever and declared that the Pope was the only person who could speak authoritatively on the marriage case. Further on Chapuys expressed regret that the Archbishop had been won over to the cause of the King.

The Pope knew that he would soon have to give a decision forbidding Anne Boleyn and Henry to live together. Henry had his arguments to excuse his actions. The Universities of England and some learned men of his kingdom had favored the annulment. If the Pope would not decide in his favor, could he not, as the German princes had done, break away from this authority and set up an obedience of his own? His attitude had changed. So far there was no thought of a complete break with the Church; but now if he could not have his way through the ordinary process of Church legislation, he was determined to use other means. "The die was cast", and the close of the year 1530 practically ended an era of English liberties under the guidance of the Church.

SUBMISSION OF THE CLERGY

The beginning of the year 1531 was a critical period in the development of the case. Since the death of Wolsey, the trend of events was largely in the hands of Thomas Cromwell, the new minister. Cromwell would stop at nothing when it came to carrying out the will of Henry. He would not hesitate at the overthrow of the Papacy.

During the delay of the divorce proceedings Henry, with the strong support of Cromwell, had been campaigning against the Church of Rome. He was led on by passion and resentment, and he became more and more tyrannical toward the clergy. General directions to support the divorce were sent to the clergy. If one upheld the truth, that is the Papacy, he was hailed before the court. The clergy, in general, but especially those who were most loyal to the Pope, felt the effect of the King's wrath. In 1531 he required and obtained the submission of the clergy through Convocation. After a struggle the bishops submitted to his demands of not enacting or executing laws without his consent. Henry also demanded that his subjects should not swear fealty to the Pope; in fact, to no one but to himself. After much bickering Convocation finally gave in to the demands of the King "as far as the Law of Christ permits". It was on this very day, February 11, 1531, that Thomas More resigned his chancellorship. He foresaw what was bound to come.

Henry kept himself secure by acting through the consent of both houses of Parliament and Convocation. But the ex-

ample just given of dominating the latter is typical of his highhanded dealing with the former.

RELATIONS WITH ROME

The Act of Annates was passed by Parliament in 1532. This act forbade the English clergy to send the Pope the first fruits of a new benefice. The main purpose of Henry in urging this act was not so much to get money--for he would have spent much more to succeed in the divorce case--but to influence the Pope by consideration of interest, and thereby obtain a satisfactory decision by Rome

In the meantime the case in Rome was being further delayed. Briefs were sent to Henry at the beginning of 1530, 1531, and 1532. The first two were much alike in content, forbidding Henry to marry before the publication of his sentence and enjoining him to treat Catherine as his lawful wife. The third bore a definite order to dismiss Anne Boleyn until final sentence were passed by the Court of Rome.

> "This Brief was dated at Rome on November the 15th, 1532, but after the Pope had met the Emperor at Bologna, a second date, December the 23rd, was affixed to it. Even then it was not to be made public till the nuncio had informed Henry. This the nuncio did about the middle of January 1533, after which it was published at Dunkirk on the 1st, and at Bruges on the 23rd."[17]

---

17 Hope, Mrs. op. cit., p. 293.

It contained the injunction that if he did not dismiss Anne Boleyn within a month after the reception of the brief he would be excommunicated.[18]

18 Gairdner, James. "The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon". Edinburgh Review, clx (1884), p. 89-117.

THE "DIVORCE"

Archbishop Warham of Canterbury had died in 1532, and Dr. Cranmer was appointed as his successor. He was a man in sympathy with the reformation on the continent. This appointment gave a prospect for a decision of the divorce case in England. A court for the divorce was soon held near Ampthill near the Queen's residence. The Queen also was called to the court, but she ignored the call. She was declared contumacious, and the court decided that the marriage of Katharine and Henry had been null and void from the beginning.

In anticipation of this decision Henry had secretly married Anne Boleyn in January, 1533. As early as March, 1533, it had been well known that Henry and Anne had been married. This fact was disclosed through the instructions that Henry had given his ambassador to the Emperor. He urged the Emperor to intercede for him at Rome so that the Pope would sanction what had been done in England.

At any rate, in order that the expected heir to the throne would be legitimate they could no longer keep the marriage secret. Therefore, on April 12, 1533 the marriage was solemnized. On May 23, Cranmer publicly declared the marriage of Henry and Katharine null and void from the beginning, and the marriage with Anne Boleyn valid and legal. On June 1, Anne was crowned queen by Cranmer in Westminster Abbey.[19]

19

Lingard gives the following note concerning the irregularity of this marriage: "I conceive that, immediately after judgment pronounced by Cranmer, Henry and Anne were married again. Otherwise, Lee, archbishop of York, and Tunstall, bishop of Durham, must have asserted a falsehood, when they told Catherine, that after his highness was discharged of the marriage made with her, he contracted new marriage with his dearest wife, Queen Anne. --Stat. Pap. i, 419." Vol. V, Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire, History of England, p. 12.

But all of these events did not settle matters. Henry still wanted the assent of the Pope to his marriage. He knew that the fight was not over. On June 29 he appealed in the presence of the Archbishop of York and other witnesses against the possible excommunication which the Pope would give. On July 11 Pope Clement VII issued the bull of excommunication and the declaration of nullity of the marriage with Anne Boleyn, but suspended its operation until the end of September, 1533.

KATHARINE'S SYMPATHIZERS

In the meantime Henry issued an important proclamation which forbade all persons to say or do anything prejudicial to the marriage and forced them to call Katharine by no other title than princess dowager. During the course of the proceedings the popular feeling was greatly in favor of Katharine. Many had to suffer because of their conviction of the justice of her cause. Many of the principal peers and their wives favored her cause. The Duke and Duchess of Norfolk, and the Marquis of Dorset were banished from court. The Earl of Shrewsbury, Sir Thomas More, and Sir Henry Guildford were

openly in favor of the Queen. Gardiner, a former ambassador for Henry's cause, had changed his mind about the question. Bishops Fisher and Tunstall were openly opposed to the King's cause; and, what was hardest for the King to bear, Reginald Pole, his cousin, would not support him. Pole went to the continent to avoid complications and later was created a cardinal of the Church.

The common people, too, favored Katharine. They gave none of the ordinary public demonstrations for Anne Boleyn as they had been accustomed to give for Katharine. In fact, when Anne was on a trip of any kind they would rather cry, "Nan Bullen--we will have none of her." Some of the popular feeling was fostered by traveling friars who went about administering the sacraments and preaching, and who in their discourses would uphold the cause of Katharine. Friar Peto, the provincial of the Observants, was especially zealous in upholding the cause of the Queen, and did not hesitate to denounce Henry and Anne from the pulpit in their very presence.[20]

---

20 Constant, G. The Reformation in England, p. 132 note.

HENRY'S ROYAL SUPREMACY

From these facts we can see very clearly that Henry's will was the criterion of all action. He was virtually an absolute monarch although he called in Parliament and Convocation to sanction his acts. His Parliament was subservient though many individual members did not agree with his prin-

ciples. Those who had the courage along with their convictions were indeed few. It was Henry's dominant will power that brought matters so far that he and the entire nation were carried into schism because of his passion for Anne Boleyn. But the people would have to be convinced. If they were to recognize Anne Boleyn as his lawful wife, it was necessary that he be recognized as supreme in both spiritual and temporal matters; for had he not defied the Papal authority in taking Anne Boleyn as his wife contrary to the laws of the Church and without the consent of her Supreme Head?

The means he used to secure his supremacy were deceitful. In urging supremacy he tried to keep the spiritual side in the background. The people had always unquestionably held the belief in the Pope's spiritual supremacy, even though there were disagreements between Rome and England in temporal matters. Now, when the time came for England to throw off the yoke of Rome, it was necessary to justify this action. The writings of this time reveal that this justification was made in the minds of the people by turning their thoughts to the temporal aspect of the Papacy, whereas the religious aspect was relegated to a secondary position. Gasquet says:

> "Even the actual meaning attached to the formal acknowledgment of the king's Headship by the clergy was sufficiently ambiguous to be understood, by some at least, as aimed merely at the temporal jurisdiction of the Roman curia. It is true it is usually understood that Convocation, by its act acknowledging Henry as sole supreme Head of the Church of England, gave him absolute spiritual jurisdiction. Whatever may have been the intention of the king in requiring

> the acknowledgment from the clergy, it seems absolutely certain that the ruling powers in the Church considered that by their grant there was no derogation of the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction."[21]

---

21 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Eve of the Reformation, p. 99.

Convocation always carefully guarded against any admission that the king had spiritual jurisdiction. While Henry and Cromwell desired the Supremum Caput clause to cover the spiritual jurisdiction, Archbishop Warham and the other bishops intended the clause to apply only to temporal matters formerly taken care of by the Pope. The general idea of the clergy was that the king should be supreme head in so far that the people should be protected from heresy and their temporalities should be maintained. When convocation was to admit Henry as supreme head, Archbishop Warham

> "first protested that the admission was not to be twisted 'in derogation of the Roman Pontiff or the Apostolic See,' and the very last act of his life was the drafting of an elaborate exposition, to be delivered in the House of Lords, of the impossibility of the king's having spiritual jurisdiction, from the very nature of the constitution of the Christian Church. Such jurisdiction, he claimed, belonged of right to the Roman See."[22]

---

22 Ibid., p. 100.

THE SCHISM COMPLETED

The Long Parliament of the Reformation which began November, 1529 and was not dissolved until April, 1536, was

subservient and under the direction of Cromwell. In the autumn of 1533 there were a number of vacancies in Parliament and the seats were filled at "the king's pleasure". This interference of the Crown in elections continued. Certain abbots were forced to resign and the vacancies were filled by royal commissioners. At the opening of Parliament, January 15, 1534, measures were discussed immediately to complete the Schism.

> "In the spring of 1534, this Parliament transferred the powers of the Pope to the sovereign. Payments which had been hitherto made to the Pope, were now to go to the king's treasury. Appeals formerly lodged in Rome were now carried to the royal courts. The bishops were henceforth appointed by the king, to him they took their oath of fealty, from him they received both the spiritualities and temporalities of their sees."[23]

---

23 Guggenberger, A. A General History of the Christian Era, Vol. II, p. 194-195.

This latter act was called the statute for the Restraint of Appeals and the last sentence quoted above contains the fundamental principle of the Reformation in England under Henry VIII.

During the fifth session, 1534, Parliament passed four important acts:

1. The 'Act for the Submission of the Clergy' ratifying the three articles contained in the submission made in 1532 by Convocation.

2. The 'Second Annates Act', confirming the Annates Act

of 1532 and adding a clause for the election of bishops by the Cathedral Chapter.

3. The Third act was that forbidding papal dispensations and the payment of money in the form of pensions, Peter's pence, etc., to the Pope.

4. The first of the succession acts was passed acknowledging the marriage of Anne Boleyn with Henry and entailing the crown on her children. It was misprision of treason to refuse to take an oath to observe this act.

Lingard sums up the acts passed in the Parliament in November, 1534:

> "1. The Act of Supremacy declared that the King is, and ought to be, Supreme Head of the Church of England "with full power to visit, reform, and correct all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities."
>
> "2. To remedy the defect in the late act of succession, it was declared that the oath administered at the conclusion of the session was the very oath intended by the legislature, and that every subject was bound to take it under the penalties of the same act."
>
> 3. The Third Annates act provided that all first fruits and tenths, benefices, spiritual dignities, offices be annexed to the crown. Thus bishops became exclusively royal nominees, and no longer joint nominees of the Pope and King.
>
> 4. By the Treasons Act it was made high treason not to admit the royal supremacy--"to wish or will maliciously, by word or writing, or to attempt by craft, any bodily harm to the king or queen, or their heirs, or to deprive any of them of the dignity, style, and name of their royal estates, or slanderously and maliciously to publish or

> pronounce by words or writing that the king is a heretic, schismatic, tyrant, or infidel."
>
> "5. As an additional security a new oath was tendered to the bishops, by which they not only adjured the supremacy of the pope, and acknowledged that of the king, but also swore never to consent that the bishop of Rome should have any authority within the realm; never to appeal, nor to suffer any other to appeal to him, never to write or send to him without the royal permission; and never to receive any message from him without communicating it immediately to the king."[24]

---

[24] Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 34-35.

But all this legislation was not sufficient to convince the people. The idea of a lay prince as spiritual head was repugnant to them. Henry, however, used psychological methods to overcome their prejudices and forced them to submit their will to his. To keep the idea of Pope away from the minds of the people, he ordered even the word "pope" to be taken from all books used for public worship. The teachers in the schools were to inculcate this doctrine of the King's supremacy in the minds of the children; the clergymen had to preach that the pope's former authority had been usurped and that now the King was the true head of the Church; and the sheriffs in the counties had to report any neglect on the part of the preachers. The most learned and loyal prelates were also required to decry the authority of the Pope and, at the same time, to support the new dignity that the king had assumed. Some of these, notably Tunstall and Gardiner,

complied with the demands rather from fear of the royal displeasure than from real adherence to the cause. We see by these details how Henry considered nothing insignificant when there was an advantage to be gained for himself. He certainly went out of his way to attend to comparatively minor points in the hope of receiving more loyal adherence to his cause.

By the legislation of 1534 Henry had attained his main object--his marriage with Anne Boleyn, but at the sacrifice of separation from Rome. He was by no means an adherent of any of the doctrines of Luther or Calvin, but remained orthodox in the point of dogmatic theology which did not concern the submission to the discipline of the Church of Rome. His Religion was a schism. Within the next five years, by 1539, he had organized his church and made its chief tenets a part of parliamentary legislation as well as acceptance by Convocation.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

In 1536 Henry with the aid of theologians compiled his book of 'Articles' that was presented to Convocation.

> "It may be divided into three parts. The first declares that the belief of the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed, is necessary for salvation; the second explains the three great sacraments of baptism, penance, and the altar, and pronounces them the ordinary means of justification; the third teaches that, though the use of images, the honouring of the saints, the soliciting of their intercession, and the usual ceremonies in the service, have not in themselves the power to remit sin, or justify the soul, yet they are highly profitable, and ought to be retained."[25]

25 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 105.

Henry worked earnestly at the establishment of his Church. In this he was deeply attached to the ancient faith and deplored any departure from the tenets of the old religion, except where his own authority was concerned. The men of the new learning were given no concessions except where the removal of abuses was concerned. Convocation was assigned the task of compiling a clear explanation of the doctrine as set forth in the 'Articles'. These are generally known as the 'Ten Articles' of 1536. Convocation compiled a book entitled: "The godly and pious Institution of 'a Christian Man'".

> "It explains in succession the creed, the seven sacraments which it divides into three of a higher, and four of a lower order, the ten commandments, the Pater noster and Ave Maria, justification, and purgatory. It is chiefly remarkable for the earnestness with which it refuses salvation to all persons out of the pale of the Catholic church, denies the supremacy of the pontiff, and inculcates passive obedience to the king."[26]

26 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V., p. 105-106.

Yet with all the care concerning the articles of doctrine, innovations were bound to creep in. Henry had promised the removal of abuses, and he made an attempt at keeping this promise by abolishing certain holidays that he considered superfluous, and he told the clergy they could use images only as a means of instruction. Images and shrines as an aid

for prayer were to be considered as sources of idolatry. For that reason, it was claimed, Henry would remove any source of abuse by demolishing shrines, burning genuine or superstitious relics, and breaking or burning even the most celebrated crucifixes and images.

In 1539 there was another reorganization of the doctrines. This time they adopted the Six Articles and included the penalties for non-acceptance. Henry met with strong opposition in this instance from Cranmer who proclaimed both in Parliament and in Convocation that the passing of the Six Articles betokened a Catholic reaction. Yet the Six Articles were passed in spite of these protests. These articles were:

(1) Transubstantiation

(2) Communion under one species

(3) Masses for the dead

(4) Confession

(5) Vows

(6) Celibacy.

The penalties for the violation of these articles is summarized by Lingard:

> "1. If any person write, preach, or dispute against the first article, he shall not be allowed to abjure, but shall suffer death as a heretic, and forfeit his goods and chattels to the king; 2. If he preach in any sermon or collation, or speak openly before the judges against any one of the other five, he shall incur the usual penalties of felony; but if he only hold contrary opinions, and publish them, he shall for the first offence be imprisoned at the king's pleasure, and shall forfeit his lands during life, and his goods forever; for the second he shall

> suffer death; 3. The act pronounces the marriages of priests or nuns of no effect, orders such persons so married to be separated; and makes it felony if they cohabit afterwards; 4. It subjects priests, living carnally with women, or nuns with men, to imprisonment and forfeiture on the first conviction, and to death on the second; and lastly, it enacts that persons contemptuously refusing to confess at the usual times, or to receive the sacrament, shall for the first offence be fined and imprisoned, and for the second be adjudged felons, and suffer the punishment of felony."[27]

---

27 Ibid., p. 130.

PARTIES IN THE SCHISM

The law of the Six Articles marked the zenith in the struggle between the followers of Henry and the followers of Cranmer. Discussions were held on both sides by the leaders of the two groups. Some of the leading bishops among the adherents of Henry were: Lee, Gardiner, Tunstall, Stokesley, Sampson, Rugg, and Aldrich. The bishops with Lutheran tendencies were: Cranmer, Latimer, Barlow, Goodrich, Hilsey, and Shaxton. The "whip with the six strings" was hard on the reformers, for the denying of any of the articles meant severe punishment. The law was enforced immediately and within a fortnight there were 500 arrests in London alone. The authorities, however, did not deem it advisable to have mass execution; and, therefore, they set the prisoners at liberty.

In 1540 a committee had been appointed to compose a new code of doctrine and ceremonies. After three years of work on the subject the symposium was laid before the king and finally published under the title 'A necessary Doctrine and

Erudition for any Christened Man'. It was commonly known as the King's book. For the rest of Henry's reign the book was the authorized standard of English orthodoxy.

There were other agents at work at the same time. Cranmer was an important authority on Lutheran views, and he attempted at various times to influence Henry to abolish old customs and ceremonies in their worship. Cranmer did not succeed in doing this during Henry's reign, but he did prepare a Book of Homilies, which was the first Book of Common Prayer, and also a revision of the canonical laws. These were published in Edward VI's reign and brought the real spirit of the reformation into England.

Thus was the schismatic church of Henry VIII as he conceived it, organized in order to be able to carry out his own designs. Those infected with Lutheranism, notably Cranmer and his group, had their plans for controlling affairs later on, but they made little progress toward that end during Henry's life time. The resistance Henry encountered from those loyal to the Apostolic See was soon to be met. In the next chapter we shall trace more in detail how the supremacy was resisted in various parts of England, and how Henry resorted to persecution of some who consistently adhered to the supremacy of the Pope and thereby resisted the royal will.

CHAPTER III

RESISTANCE TO HENRY'S POLICY: HIS PERSECUTIONS

THOMAS CROMWELL, HENRY'S VICEGERENT

In all the decisions of Henry and his Parliament there could hardly be universal acquiescence. Resistance was bound to come from various quarters, but that would not deter Henry from establishing himself firmly in his new position as head of the Church of England as legally determined by the Act of Supremacy, passed in November, 1534.

He had established his position through a willing Parliament. No member of his Parliament ever thought of acting contrary to his wishes.

> "If the King wished to burn heretics, they were willing he should burn them. If he wished to threaten the Pope by abolishing annates and firstfruits, they offered no objection. Parliament did not pay them. With them it would have been equally orthodox and scriptural to pass an Act at one time for asserting the King's supremacy, and at another the Six Articles denouncing the Creed of Protestantism. In the reign of Henry VIII. the Reformation is the work of the King, in all respects, as far as it went, and of his minister Cromwell."[1]

---

1 Brewer, J. S. The Reign of Henry VIII from His Accession to the Death of Wolsey. Vol. II, p. 468.

Thomas Cromwell was indeed the strong advocate of Henry's cause, the instrument through which the reign of terror following the Schism was inaugurated. Cromwell was Henry's able minister who besides carrying out the wishes of the King, had designs for himself and his own aggrandizement. Cromwell's rise to power is the more remarkable because he had been Wolsey's secretary. It matters not what he did to gain the favor and esteem of Henry; but that

he gained it by strategem is most certain. It is thought that he procured, and that unjustly, one of Wolsey's documents which gave Wolsey Henry's permission for the legatine powers. After the disappearance of the document Wolsey could no longer prove that he held these powers from the king, and thereby had to be at the mercy of the king in his indictment for Praemunire. It is most likely that after this favor toward the king, but traitorous act against his master, Cromwell rose rapidly in power in the state, and maintained that power as long as he satisfied the king and his interests. Gasquet has this to say about him:

> "The position occupied by Thomas Cromwell during the years of his power is unique in English history. As vicegerent and vicar general he was placed above the archbishops and bishops, even in convocation and other strictly ecclesiastical assemblies. Hardly was the venerable Fisher executed, than he was elected his successor as chancellor of the University of Cambridge. Though a layman, he did not scruple to hold the deanery of Wells and other ecclesiastical benefices. In parliament, he took precedence of the nobility of every rank by virtue of his ecclesiastical title of king's vicar general."[2]

---

[2] Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 141-142.

> "Cromwell fully understood, before entering on his new service, what its conditions were, and neither will nor ability was lacking to their fulfilment. Under his management, at once skilful and unscrupulous, Henry mastered the Parliament and paralysed the action of Convocation, moulding them according to his royal will and pleasure."[3]

3 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Last Abbot of Glastonbury, p. 27.

Cromwell's influence in carrying out the will of the King cannot be overestimated. That influence follows all the important developments in England up to his fall in 1540. He is the agent through whom Henry overcame all obstacles in carrying out his program. Henry's will was expressed in the acts of Cromwell, especially in carrying on the internal development of the realm. Cromwell's power was so great and his knowledge of state affairs so complete that he could have few intimates. He was friendly with few people, and when the occasion presented itself to Henry and where he knew Cromwell had made a political blunder, he soon got rid of him as he had Wolsey in 1529. Cromwell was unpopular, and Henry wanted to remain in the good graces of the people. Therefore, when Cromwell no longer served his purposes, he had him attainted.

Our chief purpose in this chapter is to show how the schism was received in England, and how Henry imposed upon his subjects their allegiance to him as supreme head of the Church in England, and finally how he overcame the resistance by persecuting individuals whose conscience would not permit them to acknowledge his headship.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATHS OF SUCCESSION AND SUPREMACY

Through the act of Supremacy Parliament had declared the king "supreme head of the Church of England", according

to the dictates of Henry. After a short and ineffectual resistance Convocation also acquiesced. Henry had now to obtain universal recognition of his title of Supreme Head and to do away with any traces of adherence to the Papacy.

> "With his hands upon their throats Henry demanded what, in the quarrel with Rome, was, at the time, a retaliation upon the pope for his refusal to accede to the royal wishes, the acknowledgment of the king as supreme head of the Church of England. Few among English churchmen were found bold enough to resist this direct demand, or who even, perhaps, recognized how they were rejecting papal supremacy in matters spiritual. As a rule, the required oath of royal supremacy was apparently taken wherever it was tendered, and the abbots and monks of Colchester, of Glastonbury, and probably also of Reading, were no exception, and on September 19th, 1534, Abbot Whiting and his community, fifty-one in number, attached their names to the required declaration."[4]

---

4 Ibid., p. 27-28.

It took the greater part of the years 1534 and 1535 to administer the oaths of Succession and Supremacy. Consequently, in the summer of 1534 the officials under the immediate direction of Cromwell were busy administering the Oath of Succession to various abbots or heads of religious houses. This was the summer before the Act of Supremacy had been passed, but the Act of Succession, nevertheless, contained in substance a recognition of Henry's supremacy. This act also contained the qualifying clause 'as far as the law of Christ permits', and therefore, most churchmen did not consider it against their conscience to submit to the oath.

> "All subjects, of either sex, who had 'arrived at full age' were required to swear to the Act of Succession.... This act implied a denial of papal authority, since it recognized the validity of the marriage between Henry and Anne Boleyn. The wording of the oath showed that it was a blow aimed at the Pope, for the people swore faith, fidelity and obedience only to the king's majesty, and not to any foreign authority. Since the Treason Act of November, 1534, it was a crime of high treason to call the king schismatic."[5]

---

[5] Constant, G. The Reformation in England. I., p. 129.

This Act of Succession, strange to say, had not been prescribed by statute. Consequently as the occasion demanded Henry could adjust any points he pleased. He required the clergy to declare in addition to the regular act that the Bishop of Rome had no more authority in England than any other foreign ruler. He also omitted the qualifying clause 'as far as the law of Christ permits' in the recognition of the king as supreme head of the Church of England.

In the course of administering the oath there was generally not much difficulty in obtaining the submission. Convocation itself set the example of conformity.

> "On March 31st the southern Convocation declared, by thirty-four votes to four (and one doubtful vote)--and the northern Convocation followed its lead with a unanimous declaration on May 5th--that, according to the Scriptures, the Bishop of Rome had no more power in England than any other foreign prince, and no more jurisdiction than any other foreign bishop."[6]

---

[6] Ibid., p. 130

Gasquet called the admission that the Pope had no power in England the "thin end of the wedge which finally severed the English Church from the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See."[7]

---

7 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Eve of the Reformation, p. 100.

SUBMISSION OF THE MAJORITY

It is remarkable that so many of the staunchest bishops of the realm as Gardiner, Tunstall, Bonner, and Thirlby should give their submission--they who had been strong adherents of the cause of the Church. It is true these bishops did not succumb to the doctrines of Luther or Calvin; yet their example of time-serving was an incentive to many an intimidated soul whose conscience most likely protested. Prominent men of the age were themselves surprised at the great number who conformed.

> "'I am ashamed to say,' wrote Harpsfield, 'how easily people consented to take the oath, despite the protests of their conscience.'"[8]

---

8 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 131.

> "I never was more deceived,' wrote Pole to Contarini, 'for I always thought Tunstall was full of zeal for the religion. Whereas he contests my belief or rather the Church's belief in the Pope's authority, which he desires to see wholly destroyed.' Thus Tunstall, like the rest of the Henricians, accepted the theory of and practised passive obedience to the civil powers."[9]

9 Ibid., p. 363.

In the following paragraph Gasquet furnishes us with an explanation of why so few offered resistance to the headship of Henry and why they could even in good faith and with a clear conscience take the oath.

> "The idea of headship was not absolutely new: it had in a measure been conceded some years before, without, so far as appears, exciting remonstrance from Rome. Beyond this to many, the oath of royal supremacy over the Church of England was never understood as derogatory to the See of Rome. While even those who had taken this oath were in many instances surprised that it should be construed into any such hostility." 10

10 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Last Abbot of Glastonbury, p. 28-29.

Henry's work was rendered easier through the almost universal conformity. He realized that it was possible to take care of the small minority and to deal with them as he pleased. This, we shall see, he did through imprisonments, executions, and deprivation of property. Among the noted heads of monasteries who "generally" conformed were Robert Holgate, head of the Gilbertine Order. He became chaplain to Henry VIII and later bishop of Llandoff. Through surrendering twenty-four houses of his order to the State he hastened the suppression of the order. He gave up his faith later, but was reconciled to the Church before his death.

John Bird, a Carmelite friar, also supported the divorce and upheld the supremacy of Henry. He was later made bishop

of Chester and also married. William Barlow, an Augustinian Canon, was a favorite of Anne Boleyn and believed with Cranmer that a priest would simply have to receive an appointment as bishop; consecration would not be necessary. Then there was Paul Bush, provincial of the Augustinians; other ex-Augustinians, as Robert Barnes, who was later burned by the king for heresy; Miles Coverdale, later known for his translation of the Bible; George Browne, who it is thought officiated at the marriage of Henry and Anne Boleyn. Three prominent Dominicans, John Hilsey, John Scory, and John Hodgkin later helped in the suppression of monasteries. There was, indeed, an array of prominent men and women who espoused the cause of Henry. Had he not had practically universal support, he could not have so completely and thoroughly broken with the authority of Rome.

RESISTANCE OF THREE RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Three religious orders offered a splendid resistance to the taking of the oath. These were the Franciscan Observants, the Brigittines, and the Carthusians. We have already noted how some of the Franciscan Friars, especially Father Peto, had espoused the cause of Katharine. Peto, Elstow, and Forest were among the most noted preachers of that time. When Bedyll and Roland Lee came to administer the oath, the Friars all refused to take the oath. The whole order was attainted and the seven houses in England were closed and given to the Augustinians. Of the two hundred monks, the most obstinate were sent to the Tower, fifty to the unre-

formed Franciscans where they were put in chains and later died in large numbers, and others went to France or Scotland. These were the first of the religious to be driven out by order of Henry VIII, and they were also the first to return under Mary.

The most notable resistance was offered by the London Charterhouse. In 1534 they took the oath with the clause "as far as the law of Christ permits"; but when in 1535 the qualifying clause was omitted, three prominent leaders, John Houghton, prior of the London house, Robert Lawrence of Beauvale, and Augustine Webster of Axholme denied in Cromwell's presence the right of Henry, a mere layman, to be head of the Church. As a matter of course they were imprisoned, but they continued to reject the royal supremacy. John Haile of Isleworth was treated in the same manner. These confessors of the faith suffered death on May 4, 1535--all enduring the tortures reserved for those guilty of high treason.

> "Tied to hurdles, they were dragged to the gibbet at Tyburn. There they watched with admirable courage while their brethren were tortured one after the other, and without any change in their features or the tone of their voices they exhorted the people to obey the king in all that was not contrary to the honour of God or of the Church. In a half-strangled state they were placed on the block by the executioner, who proceeded to tear out their heart and bowels. Their bodies were then dismembered, and their head and limbs thrown into a cauldron of boiling tar prior to being exposed on London Bridge and at the gates of the city."[11]

11 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 131-132.

Many of the lords and courtiers assisted at this spectacle just for pastime. Three weeks later three other London Carthusians were condemned and put to death (June 19, 1535). Gasquet says that fifty of the Observants died from the hardships of their prison life. 12

12 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 57.

We note here especially how Henry was determined to dispose of any group that might prove disastrous to his position as supreme head of the Church, and how he did not hesitate to use arbitrary power to accomplish his purpose. His plans were made, he would not be foiled in his designs, and therefore he acted promptly and effectually. That these Friars and Carthusians really died for their faith with the glory of martyrdom is very generally accepted. The following quotation is representative of the general opinion.

> "'I profess,' said the Prior Houghton, 'that it is not out of obstinate malice or a mind of rebellion that I do disobey the king, but only for the fear of God, that I offend not the Supreme Majesty; because our Holy Mother the Church hath decreed and appointed otherwise than the king and Parliament hath ordained.' Houghton and his fellows were as truly martyrs as Frith had been. They at least had sown no seeds of rebellion, and they died because a tyrannical king insisted on ruling over consciences as well as over bodily acts." 13

13 Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. A Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to 1885. Vol. II. A. D. 1509-1689, p. 394.

The gist of the whole matter is that Henry had set his mind on becoming Pope in England and as such, he was determined to be recognized by all of his subjects. In order to be certain that the administration of the oaths would be carried out thoroughly, Henry, together with his vicar-general Cromwell, planned the visits of the officials carefully. John Hilsey, a Dominican Friar, who had accepted Henry's supremacy and Dr. George Browne, a prior of the Augustinian hermits, were appointed as "grand visitors". They were to examine the religious houses carefully, to discover their feelings concerning Henry, to speak to the assembled chapter, and to interview each friar individually. Their instructions were detailed and precise.

> "The oath of allegiance to Anne Boleyn was to be administered to them, and they were to be bound to swear solemnly that they would preach and persuade the people, to accept the royal supremacy, to confess that the bishop of Rome had no more power than any other bishop and to call him Pope no longer. Further, the sermons of each preacher were to be carefully examined, and if not orthodox they were to be burned. Every friar was to be strictly enjoined to commend the king as head of the Church, the queen, the archbishop of Canterbury and the clergy to the prayers of the faithful. Lastly, each house was 'to be obliged to show its gold, silver, and other moveable goods, and deliver an inventory of them,' and to take a common oath, sealed with the convent seal, to observe the above orders."[14]

14 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 51-52.

RESULTS OF ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS

The results of the administering of the oaths were drastic. There were many defections among the Friars, many a monastery was demoralized, discipline was relaxed, and the life of prayer was abandoned. Those who took the oath served in turn as spies of Cromwell and reported secretly to Cromwell any act of their brethren that indicated adherence to the Pope of Rome. Members of the same house grew suspicious of each other and the life of charity and study was a thing of the past. The agents of Cromwell could not be persuaded by the abbots and priors, abbesses and prioresses, to be bought off with any kind of remuneration. Even where the oaths of obedience were taken to the "new pope" these visitors did not rest satisfied. As we shall see later, they did not rest until lands and treasures of monks and of nuns were given to the king, and the members of the houses were dispersed. 15

15 Clayton, Joseph. The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 66.

These methods were pursued through the years 1534 and 1535. By the end of 1535 royal supremacy was recognized by the great majority. The defection was complete and absolute. A whole nation had become schismatic, practically through the will of one man. Still there were numerous agents at work, both on the side of Rome and that of England that were responsible at least in part for the complete schism that

resulted. Joseph Clayton gives a partial explanation in the following lines:

> "To many a noble--and the nobility were mostly new men who had come to the front under Henry VII, the wars of the Roses having uprooted the older baronage--Cardinal Wolsey, papal legate and Lord Chancellor, had been so obviously head of the Church and State that it was not particularly startling to be told that now and henceforth the king was head....
>
> "The heads of religion included men already disaffected from the old religion and willing to follow where Cranmer and Latimer led. Many a simple prior confessed, and the letters remain, that hitherto he had always believed the pope to be the supreme head of the Church, but, as he understood it, this belief was only a human opinion and not of divine revelation.....
>
> ".....Ignorance of the doctrine of the Church, perplexity of mind, timidity that shrank from bodily torment, love grown cold, all these qualities are displayed by the prelates who made submission to the royal will at the summons of Thomas Cromwell."[16]

---

16 Clayton, Joseph. op. cit., p. 67-68.

DOMINANCE OF HENRY'S WILL

It must not be understood, however, that we consider the clergy as free agents in all this legislation against the Church of Rome. Gilbert Child, the historian, says:

> "The whole history of the years in question, as it is read in the State papers and drawn out in Appendix IV to the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, shows plainly that the great changes brought about in the position of the English Church were entirely the work of Henry and of Cromwell, with the willing cooperation of Par-

liament, but that the clergy were helpless tools in their hands throughout--they either were not consulted or else dragooned."

"By the help of his Parliament he (Henry) coerced the clergy into joining him in repudiating the annulling his authority but by depriving him of his revenue to his own person, while all the time he maintained the Church in appearance very much as it was before, and made it, in fact, far more subservient to himself than it ever had been to the Pope."[17]

---

17 Child, Gilbert. Church and State under the Tudors, p. 99 and 101-102. Quoted from Rope, H. E. G., Beginnings of the Anglican Church, p. 8.

Thus Henry forced his will upon the nation. Those who rejected it were disposed of by the ordinary process of law, which interpreted in the light of modern research, was really persecution because of religious convictions. The next step in the development of our topic is the discussion of a few of the various types of persons put to death under Henry VIII, for the sake of religion and especially for adherence to the Papacy. These were mainly persons who were averse to Henry, and whose influence, if allowed to carry on and live, might frustrate his plans. They are Elizabeth Barton, "The Holy Maid of Kent", who had become rather popular with a special group of the common people; St. Thomas More, the ex-chancellor, who represented the better class of Catholic laymen and whose ability was universally recognized; St. John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester, who set the example for Churchmen; Friar John Forest, who had all along been an adherent of the cause of Queen Katharine; and finally Blessed Margaret Pole,

the Countess of Salisbury and relative of Henry, who was the first person to be attainted under the new law. The events relative to the execution of these persons are separated in time by a period of seven years, 1534-1541.

THE HOLY MAID OF KENT

The first of this group is Elizabeth Barton. She lived in Aldington, Kent, as a serving maid. In 1525, after a serious illness, she claimed she had had visions and told "wondrously things done in other places whilst she was neither herself present nor yet heard to report thereof."[18] She was

---

18 Hollis, Christopher. Thomas More, p. 190.

---

advised to enter a convent. This she did and after that her visions increased. When the Archbishop of Canterbury was informed of her visions and prophecies, he appointed Dr. Bocking as her confessor. Many of the faithful believed in her, and even Thomas More and Bishop Fisher had had some intercourse with her. However, her visions bore no political aspect until they made allusion to Henry's divorce. She expressed herself freely against the marriage and even foretold that Henry would lose his kingdom in seven months if he married Anne Boleyn.

An important point of controversy is that Elizabeth Barton herself admitted that she was an imposter. A confession to that effect was extorted from her in November, 1533, shortly after the public penance of herself and that of her abettors,--Edward Bocking, John Dering, Hugh Rich, Richard

Risby, Richard Masters, and Henry Gold. This confession, however, proves little. In fact, any confessions of this kind meant very little under circumstances where at times a faint glimmer of hope might lead one to confess even against one's will. Such a confession was always a prepared document that the accused person was asked to sign. In this case it was written by those in whose power she had been in the past four months--from November to April, the time of her death. It was a matter of vital importance for the officials at this time to have an acknowledgment from Elizabeth Barton that she was for a long time an imposter.

> ".....And with Cromwell to manage the affair, that confession would not be difficult to procure. In fact, the draft of a letter exists, with corrections in Cromwell's own hand, by which the Marchioness of Exeter is made to ask pardon of Henry VIII, for putting such belief 'in the most unworthy and deceivable woman called the holy maid of Kent.' (Calendar, vi. No. 1464.) What he did in this case he may, with better reason have used every effort to do in regard to the nun herself. According to the act of attainder, indeed, the poor woman is said to have confessed her duplicity and falsehood before 'divers of the king's counsel.'" 19

---

19 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 41.

After the public penance Henry VIII and Cromwell had tried to secure sufficient evidence to convict her of high treason. The trial was closed without a sentence. But it was more convenient and more secure to resort to a bill of attainder by parliament for high treason. Under this law of attainder no trial was allowed. The person was simply

attainted, brought to the Tower, and executed in due course. It soon became generally known that the bill of attainder had been issued, but the names of the abettors were kept concealed. The effect of this arrangement was to put every one who had had any intercourse with the Maid in great fear of being condemned to death.

In this case, through ordinary process of law, Henry was determined to put a stop to anything that would interfere with the universal acceptance of himself as head of the Church. Elizabeth Barton was not noticed as long as she did not speak of the divorce. But when she fearlessly declared her adherence to the Holy See and openly expressed her rebukes to the king, her life was no longer safe. Her abettors were offered their freedom, some of them twice, if they would acknowledge Henry as head of the Church in England. They all refused the offer, and consequently suffered death with Elizabeth Barton on April 20, 1534.

> "It is almost impossible not to feel on the side of this Maid of Kent, not because anybody knows enough to be sure that her revelations were genuine, but simply because she was the one person in England except for England's John the Baptist, Bishop Fisher, who had the courage to say what so many felt."[20]

---

20 Sargent, Daniel. Thomas More, p. 233.

FISHER AND MORE INVOLVED

St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More's names "were included in the bill of attainder which was to put the nun to

death, as if she and as if they had been interested in politics, fomenting rebellion."[21] At one of the sessions of the

---

[21] Ibid., p. 234-235.

Legatine Court we saw how Fisher had stood firmly against the rest of the English clergy in upholding the validity of the first marriage. Since then he was a marked man. He and Thomas More were both charged with misprision of treason because of their having had in the past some slight intercourse with Elizabeth Barton. This bill of attainder against Elizabeth Barton was read before Parliament, March 6, 1534.

At this time Fisher was unable to be present on account of illness, but he expressed his opinion through a letter to the House of Lords. He spoke favorably of Elizabeth Barton and her confessor, Dr. Bocking.

> "'I sought not for this woman's coming unto me,' he told them, 'nor thought in her manner of deceit.....And as I will answer before the throne of Christ, I knew not of any malice or evil that was intended by her, or by any other earthly creature unto the king's highness.' Why repeat to the king what she declared she had already told him? He pointed out that laws or interpretations of laws which infringed upon the constitutional freedom were as dangerous for themselves--Cromwell was one day to experience this--as for him. 'And therefore eftsoons I beseech all your benign charities to tender this my most humble suit as you would be tendered if you were in the same danger yourselves.' Tried in his absence, he was condemned to be imprisoned and to have all his property confiscated. The king, however, commuted the penalty into a fine of £300."[22]

22 Constant, G. op. cit. I, p. 213.

OATH ADMINISTERED TO MORE AND FISHER

The Oath of Succession was administered to the bishops and all important laymen early in 1534, especially where there might be a question as to loyalty to the king. More and Fisher, of course, were included. Both accepted the succession as it stood. It made no difference to them who should rule in temporal matters. But both rejected that part of the oath which, if accepted, would be a denial of the supremacy of the Pope. These two great men, saints of God, declared their loyalty to the Church of Rome and maintained their loyalty to the king in temporal matters. Both had come to the same conclusion without first having consulted each other on the subject, but by having for long years deliberated on the matter in their own souls. Conscience was their guide, backed up by the supreme authority of the Church of God. Upon the refusal of this oath both were cast into prison for misprision of treason, and all their property was confiscated.

IMPRISONMENT AND TRIAL OF FISHER

Bishop Fisher was not spared the ordinary rigorous treatment given to political offenders, in spite of the fact that his health was very poor. Visitors often tried to dissuade him from his course and to take the oath in its entirety, or to catch him unawares in his speech. He was kept in prison for about a year before his execution, enduring

all the hardships in his body, and not less in his soul because of the deprivation of all spiritual comfort.

In November, 1534, the case against Fisher took a new turn when the Act of Supremacy was passed. This very Parliament had condemned both More and Fisher to perpetual imprisonment because they had not accepted the Act of Succession in its entirety. After the first of February, 1535, it was made high treason

> "'maliciously to wish, will or desire by words or writing...to deprive them (the king, the queen, or their heirs apparent) or any of them of their dignity, title, or name of their royal estate'--a futile precaution indeed, for in the tyrannical hands of Henry VIII the weapon was not less deadly."[23]

---

23 Ibid., p. 216.

It was a great problem for the authorities to secure sufficient testimony for a trial against Fisher. They were obliged to secure a verbal refusal of the Act of Supremacy as a reason for condemning Fisher for high treason. On May 7, 1535 Cromwell and a number of the Privy Council put Fisher under a severe cross-examination in order to extract from him sufficient matter for the now non-existent indictment against him. There is a question whether it was on this occasion or whether it was before the single, biased witness, Rich, that Fisher stated that the king was not supreme head of the Church of England.

"These interviews could not be avowed openly, nor could they prove Fisher's guilt.....Lord Macaulay calls the

State trials of those days 'murder preceded by mummery'."[24]

---

24 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 217-218.

No matter what view we accept, we know that the king was bent upon having Fisher condemned for high treason.

> "He was charged before a common jury with having falsely, maliciously, and traiterously said that the King is not the Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England! He maintained that he had not made the statement maliciously and was therefore not guilty under the statute. Nevertheless he was condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, but at the last minute the King had an overwhelming fit of mercy and ordered the saint's head to be struck off with an axe."[25]

---

25 Heseltine, G. C. "Blessed John Fisher". The Sign, May, 1935, p. 590.

FISHER CREATED A CARDINAL: HIS EXECUTION

A month before this trial Pope Paul III in Consistory had created Bishop John Fisher a cardinal. When the king heard of this, he became extremely angry and, then and there, determined that there would be no head for the Cardinal's hat to rest upon. Pope Paul III later admitted that he did not realize the extreme tension then existing between the king and Bishop Fisher, and that he meant no offense whatever by the act. The king was more determined after this to conclude the action against both Fisher and More. Either they would yield or they would suffer death. And they suffered death in spite of the plea of not guilty and of the brave and straightforward answer which evoked the sympathy of many

of the court. The twelve men of the court knew that it was a foregone conclusion that they would have to pronounce the prisoner guilty. And this they did. Henry could permit no opposition of any kind. He was determined to submit to no one. Personal aggrandizement, desire for power, greed, deep-seated passion, fear of loss of influence and desire for supremacy, both in spiritual and temporal matters--all of these motives reflect the King's dominant will through his own high-handed acts, those of his Parliament, and of his Council. Consequently, Cardinal John Fisher, whose sentence had been commuted to beheading, was executed June 22, 1535.

IMPRISONMENT OF THOMAS MORE

Thomas More had been imprisoned because he had not taken the Oath of Succession in its entirety. It may be noted that the form of the oath for which both More and Fisher were imprisoned was not passed by the legislature until November, 1534, and the statute under which they were condemned was not passed until February, 1535. This brought in the phrase "maliciously to wish, will or desire by words or writing to deprive them (the king, the queen, or their heirs apparent) or any of them of their dignity, title, or name of their royal estate."[26]

---

[26] Constant, G. op. cit., p. 216.

After fifteen months of imprisonment, Thomas More was finally brought to trial on the first of July, 1535 to the Court of the King's Bench in Westminster Hall. Fifteen

justices and twelve jurymen awaited Thomas More. They held the indictment that More was guilty of treason. These fifteen justices were commissioned to do the will of the King. No treason trial was expected to render any decision except that of guilty. "The King wished to discredit More in the eyes of England. More wished in his defense to unmask the King."[27]

---

27 Sargent, Daniel. "The Trial of Sir Thomas More". Catholic Historical Review. Vol. 22, April, 1936, p. 1.

Henry VIII had been assuming a disguise for a long time on the question of his marriage. More had to be executed so that Henry might "save his face".

> "The situation which caused the battle is well known. The king in order to change wives had taken a series of steps which finally led him to account himself as a kind of local 'Pope' of the Church of England. To save his pride in such a disguise, and to preserve the great blessing to him and to England of a united country, he had to have his disguise accepted by his subjects. Sir Thomas More, his own ex-Chancellor, and perhaps the most popular of all his subjects, had made it evident that he saw through the disguise, and considered the wearing of it but a means of making right a wrong divorce. Therefore, Thomas More had either to be made to acknowledge himself wrong, or to be made to appear wrong by being executed as a proven traitor."[28]

---

28 Ibid., p. 2.

TRIAL AND EXECUTION OF THOMAS MORE

The point that More made in the trial was to prove that the statute on which his indictment was based was illegal. He declared that the Act of Supremacy was illegal for three

reasons. His own words follow.

> "'This indictment is grounded upon an Act of Parliament, directly oppugnaunt to the lawes of God and his holye Church, the supreame government of which, or of any part thereof, maye no temporall Prince presume by any lawe to take uponn him as rightfully belonginge to the See of Rome...; it is contrary to Magna Charta, and contrary to that sacred oath which the King's Heighness himselfe, and every other Christian Prince allwayes at their Coronations receaved; noe more might this Realme of England refuse obedience to the See of Rome, than might the Childe refuse obedience to his naturall father. This Realme, beinge but one member and small parte of the Church might not make a particular lawe dischargable with the generall lawe of Christ's holye Catholique Church, no more then the Cittie of London, being but one poore member in respect of the whole Realme might make a lawe against an Act of Parliament....And therefore am I not bound, my Lords, to conforme my conscience to the Councell of one realme against the generall councell of Christendoome.'"[29]

---

29 Constant, G. The Reformation in England. I, p. 248-249.

No matter what proofs were brought forth, the court was helpless. It was to pass judgment on the act as it stood. Judgment was passed and Thomas More was to be hanged, drawn, and quartered for high treason. His sentence was later commuted to beheading.

> "When he was told that the king, as a special favour, had commuted his punishment to decapitation, 'God', he replied, 'preserve all my friends from such favours.'"[30]

---

30 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hiliare. The History of England. Vol. V., p. 45.

An outstanding characteristic of Thomas More was his "right merry spirit". The chronicler of Henry VIII, Edward Hall gives an estimate of this spirit.

> "I cannot tell whether I shoulde calle him for a foolishe wyseman or a wise foolishman, for undoubtedly he beside his learnyng had a great witte, but it was so myngled with tauntyng and mockyng, that it seemed to them that best knew him, that he thought nothing to be wel spoken except he had ministred some mocke in the communicacion."[31]

---

31 Hall, Edward. Henry VIII, p. 265.

In this way he went to his execution on July 6, 1535 with a truly joyful heart.

> "'I call you to witness, brothers,' he cried from the scaffold, 'that I die the faithful servant of God and the King, and suffer death in and for the faith of the Holy Catholic Church.'
>
> "He embraced the executioner, bound his own eyes, and calmly prostrated himself.
>
> "'Stay', he murmured with his last breath, moving his beard aside, 'Pity that should be cut which hath committed no treason.'
>
> "So he entered into the merry eternity he had long craved."[32]

---

32 Wilby, Noel McDonald. "St. Thomas More". The Sign. Vol. 14, No. 11, p. 681.

These two saints, St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More, raised to the dignity of the altar in our own day, stand out in bold relief as true victims of the distorted idea of one

man who must have his will dominate even over the consciences of individuals.

BLESSED JOHN FOREST

Blessed John Forest is the last in this group, that we are considering, who were executed under Henry VIII because of the connection with Queen Katharine. He had been friend, adviser, and confessor to Queen Katharine. He was one of the most prominent of the Friars Observants and belongs to those who were suppressed in 1535. John Forest was imprisoned as early as 1534, but he was not executed until May, 1538. It is likely that he took the oath later with the mental reservation that so many had done in those days. But whether or not he really gave in to a temptation at the time, or whether he was ignorant of its complete import, we are unable to judge. But at the time that he was again taken prisoner, there is no question but that he was most loyal to the Papal authority for which belief he finally gave up his life. It is said that Forest expressed in confession on being asked concerning the King's supremacy, his adherence to the papal primacy. This was soon noised abroad and was used in the indictment against him so that in the end he was put to death not only for treason but also for heresy. As in the case of More and Fisher it could easily be figured out how he was accused of treason, but how they could declare him guilty of heresy is difficult to discover, for the only thing that he was tried for for heresy was that he had dissuaded his penitents in confession from admitting the King's supremacy.

A contemporary of Queen Elizabeth and a strong adherent of the Crown--John Foxe--mentions him in his Acts and Monuments. He says:

> "Forasmuch as the number of years doth lead us thereunto, we will somewhat touch and speak of friar Forrest; although he be unworthy of a place, and not to be numbered in this catalogue.
>
> "This Forrest was an observant friar, and had secretly, in confessions, declared to many of the king's subjects, that the king was not supreme head; and being thereof accused and apprehended, he was examined how he could say that the king was not supreme head of the church, when he himself had sworn to the contrary? He answered, 'that he took his outward man, but his inward man never consented thereunto.' And being further accused of divers damnable articles, and thereupon convicted, he gladly submitted himself to abide the punishment of the church."[33]

---

33 Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. Vol. V., p. 179-180.

Gasquet says that

> "The depositions against Forest are clear and decisive of his real sentiments as to the matters at issue between the king and Rome, and it may be taken as certain that he died for his belief in the necessity of the Papal supremacy, and that even in the agony of his fearful death he remained constant and true to this his faith."[34]

---

34 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Op. cit., p. 57.

A meeting with Cromwell and Latimer was held and the result was that John Forest was condemned to be burned in Smithfield on the 22nd of May, 1538. Bishop Latimer in the

and tried to make Forest recant, but to no avail. The Friar declared that

> "if an angel should come down from Heaven and teach him any other doctrine than he had received from his youth, he would not now believe him. And that if his body should be cut joint after joint, or member after member burnt, hanged or what pain soever might be done to his body, he would never turn from his old profession."[35]

---

35 Ibid., p. 59.

BLESSED MARGARET POLE

Blessed Margaret Pole is another prominent example of persecution. Henry was determined to get revenge on the family of the Poles, his own relatives. Reginald Pole, who had been a special favorite of the king in his earlier days, could not in conscience approve of the divorce. Pole fled to Rome, worked for the cause of the unity of the Church, and openly attacked the king in his book De Unitate Ecclesiae. His attack was made, however, only upon the insistent demand of Henry himself--a demand that he give his complete and precise opinion without mental reservations or dissimulations of any kind concerning the divorce question.

> "The gist of the book as a whole may perhaps be best expressed in Pole's forcible phrase that Henry's Headship of the Church is a ridiculous claim since it leads to the conclusion that Nero was the spiritual superior of St. Paul."[36]

---

36 Walsh, Gerald Groveland. "Cardinal Pole and the Problem of Christian Unity". Catholic Historical Review, Jan. 1930, Vol. XV.

Pole's representation of the conditions in England had hastened the excommunication pronounced upon Henry by the Pope, and Henry decided upon cowardly revenge taken upon the family of Pole.

> "'They shall feel what it is to have a traitor for their kinsman', cried he, and forthwith Lord Montague, Pole's elder brother, was executed, together with the Marquis of Exeter, on Tower Hill. Sir Geoffrey Pole, a younger brother, who had been prevailed upon to bear witness against them, was pardoned, and passed the rest of his life in miserable regret for his Judaslike act."[37]

---

[37] Wilmot-Buxton, E. M. A Book of English Martyrs, p. 54.

His aged mother was questioned, her house was searched, and her neighbors and tenants were closely scrutinized. They found a few undated papal bulls and a white silk tunic which had embroidered in it together with the arms of England the badge of the Pilgrimage of Grace. A few months after the search she was sent to the Tower where she remained for two years until her death. On May 10, 1539 Cromwell presented to parliament a bill of attainder against the countess and her family--the latter of whom had already been executed. Two days later Cromwell showed the white tunic to Parliament. This was sufficient, and Parliament passed the bill of attainder in June. Only after almost two years of imprisonment was the countess beheaded, May 28, 1541. She protested her innocence, but gladly suffered for the faith. The imperial ambassador relates that an inexperienced executioner hacked her head and shoulders before her head finally fell.

> "'I was with Cardinal Pole,' wrote Becadilli, 'when he heard of his mother's death. To me he said: 'Hitherto I thought God had given me the grace to be the son of one of the best and most honourable ladies in England, and I gloried in that fact and thanked God for it. Now, however, He has honoured me still more and increased my debt of gratitude to Him, for He has made me the son of a martyr. For her constancy in the Catholic faith the King has caused her to be publicly beheaded, in spite of her seventy years. Blessed and thanked be God for ever!"[38]

---

38 Constant, G. op. cit., I, p. 272.

She is now venerated in the Church under the title "Blessed Margaret Pole". Pastor sums up the case thus:

> "Without a single witness being called she was executed in the Tower, on 27th May, 1541, for the sole reason that she was a faithful Catholic and the Cardinal's mother."[39]

---

39 Lord Bishop of Clifton. "Popular Resistance to the New Religion". In Camm, Bede. The English Martyrs, p. 134.

The death of the Countess proclaimed to the world that the heart of Henry was steeled against any feeling of affection and that there was nothing but absolute obedience that could ever shield any one from his vengeance.[40]

---

40 In the case of Blessed Margaret Pole a precedent was established by having the person attainted without a trial. This was Cromwell's suggestion to the judges. Strange to say, the means that Cromwell used to maintain himself in power led to his own downfall. The attainder was used against him in 1540.

PENALTIES FOR HERESY

The Catholics denying the royal supremacy were not the only ones who resisted the will of Henry on religious matters and who were put to death for religious opinions. The Lutherans and Zwinglians were punished for heresy. The penalty inflicted on those who denied the first of the Six Articles, Transubstantiation, was burning at the stake. The fires of Smithfield were so abhorred that the very term "Smithfield" at times almost became an obsession. Those who spoke against the other five of the Six Articles were imprisoned for the first offence and hanged for the second. The result was that at times heretics and Catholics were drawn on the same hurdles to Tyburn.

TREASONS

The examples that we have cited under resistance to Henry's will--his persecutions--do not by far include all the cases of persecution. There is, of course, the legal side to consider. So many acts and words, even thoughts, of people were made the subject of treason under the law. Lingard sums up in the following paragraph some of the treasonable acts proclaimed during Henry's reign. Although these treasons do not directly refer to the religious question, they are an index of the arbitrary means used by the King to secure his will.

> "Treasons were multiplied by the most vexatious, and often, if ridicule could attach to so grave a matter, by the most ridiculous laws. It was once treason to dispute, it was afterwards treason to maintain, the validity to

> the marriage with Anne Boleyn, or the legitimacy of her daughter. It became treason to marry, without license, any of the king's children, whether legitimate or natural, or his paternal brothers or sisters, or their issue; or for any woman to marry the king himself, unless she were a maid, or had previously revealed to him her former incontinence. It was made treason to call the king a heretic or schismatic, openly to wish him harm, or to slander him, his wife, or his issue. This, the most heinous of crimes in the eye of the law, was extended from deeds and assertions to the very thoughts of men. Its guilt was incurred by any person who should, by words, writing, imprinting, or any other exterior act, directly or indirectly accept or take, judge, or believe, that either of the royal marriages, that with Catherine, or that with Anne Boleyn, was valid, or who should protest that he was not bound to declare his opinion, or should refuse to swear that he would answer truly such questions as should be asked him on those dangerous subjects."[41]

---

41 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V., p. 225-226.

ARBITRARY METHODS IN THE PERSECUTIONS

The manner in which the persecutions were conducted are no less arbitrary. There was no chance of failure to convict, if such was the royal pleasure. The prisoners were interrogated in their cell, urged to make a confession with the hope of pardon, ensnared into admissions dangerous to them. From this the prosecution was prepared, placed before the grand inquest, and the decision made. The jury was to decide which of the two deserved more credit--the prisoner maintaining his innocence or the 'grand inquest' pronouncing

his guilt. The indictment containing a summary of the proofs against the accused was read, and the prisoner perhaps for the first time found out the charges against him. Only after this, was he allowed to speak in his own defense without, however, being allowed to call for his accusers or claim any aid of counsel. Every chance was in favor of the prosecution.

Yet this was not certain enough for the authorities. Cromwell, as we have seen, found a more certain method--a bill of attainder--that was brought up by Parliament through which the accused found himself condemned to death without any opportunity whatever to vindicate himself.

In the next chapter we shall see how, as a result of the dissolution of the monasteries, many more were executed for treason because of their part in the Pilgrimage of Grace. This uprising was in reality a reaction in the north of England to the dissolution of the monasteries, and for that reason this resistance to the Royal Supremacy will be treated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

HENRY'S WILL EXPRESSED IN THE DISSOLUTION OF MONASTERIES

DISSOLUTION AND VISITATION BEFORE THE SCHISM

The practice of dissolving monasteries was not new in England. The authorities frequently found excuses for suppressing small houses which they thought no longer fulfilled the purpose for which they were destined and it was decided that small houses encumbered with debt or badly administered were no longer useful. Could any one object to their dissolution? That was what Wolsey thought when he suppressed forty monasteries to build his two colleges, Oxford and Ipswich.

> "But even those who, like More and Erasmus, laughed at monks and religious men, were not prepared for the suppression of monasticism. Partly from the dislike of change, partly from unwillingness that the revenues of these houses should be diverted from the neighbourhood in which they were sent to the support of distant colleges, Wolsey's conversion of them into educational endowments was regarded generally with disfavour. The monks might not be very strict ascetics, but they were pleasant neighbours and easy landlords. It was their interest to keep on good terms with those around them; to avoid litigation; to offer shelter and hospitality, not only to the poor, but to the traveller, in seasons and places where no other shelter could be had."[1]

---

1 Brewer, J. S. The Reign of Henry VIII from His Accession to the Death of Wolsey. Vol. II, p. 269.

There were always some who were opposed to the suppression of monasteries which was followed by the secularizing of monastery lands. This is reflected strongly in the Pilgrimage of Grace following the dissolution of the lesser monasteries. There were people who looked upon these centers

as monuments of the past where faith and religion were at their best. They objected to this deprivation of solidly religious influence which they received through intercourse with the monks and nuns.

In the time of Henry VIII the right of visitation of monasteries by church or secular officials under the authority of the government was recognized, and this right was carried out in some instances under Archbishop Warham. The reports concerning the depravity of the religious in the monasteries of this time were often grossly exaggerated. Comparatively recent research shows this quite conclusively. Mary Bateson sums up the results of such a visitation in the following paragraph.

> "Here the visitation ended. Its list of complaints contains many that are ludicrously human--many that might come from anybody of persons enjoying a state charity at the present day. They lend no support to the theory that inmates of religious houses were steeped in inhuman wickedness. On the other hand the decay of the monastic spirit is obvious throughout."[2]

---

[2] Bateson, Mary. "Archbishop Warham's Visitation of Monasteries, 1511." English Historical Review. VI, p. 35.

HENRY'S DETERMINATION TO DISSOLVE MONASTERIES

Henry VIII as Supreme Head of the Church of England could claim every right over the monasteries. He knew that here above all there would be the greatest loyalty to the Church of Rome even though the monks had taken the Oath of Supremacy--in fact, he considered the monasteries as

strongholds of the Papacy. He was determined by all means to rid himself of any danger of influence from Rome now that he had consummated the Schism, and therefore pressed upon Parliament to pass the act for the dissolution of the smaller monasteries. He thereby accomplished a twofold purpose, namely breaking down any danger against acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Pope in England, and also acquiring for the Crown the needed revenues to carry on the government and to overcome his adversaries.

GENERAL VISITATION OF MONASTERIES, 1534-1536

The way for the dissolution was prepared by the general visitation of the monasteries in the summer of 1534 and of 1535. In the preceding chapter (p. 52) we considered some of the conditions accompanying these visitations, which at the same time were made the occasion of administering the Oaths of Succession and of Supremacy. In every case Cromwell "undertook to throw the mask of religious zeal over the injustice of the proceedings."3

---

3 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England. Vol. V., p. 53.

> "The instructions which they received breathed a spirit of piety and reformation, and were formed on the model of those formerly used in episcopal and legatine visitations; so that to men not intrusted with the secret, the object of Henry appeared, not the abolition, but the support and improvement of the monastic institute."4

---

4 Ibid., p. 54.

The inquiries made at these visitations--eighty-six in number--were drawn up by Dr. Layton. Besides that there were added injunctions in twenty-six articles relative to papal power, supremacy, succession to the crown, internal discipline, revenues, and giving of alms. The regulations and inquiries were searching, exacting, minute, irritating--with the privilege of adding more at the discretion of the commissioners. A few examples of the regulations may be given:

> "All religious under twenty-four years of age, or who had been professed under twenty, were to be dismissed from the religious life. Those who were left became practically prisoners in their monasteries. No one was allowed to leave the precincts (which, even in the larger monasteries, were very confined as to limit) or to visit there. In many instances porters, who were in reality gaolers, were appointed to see that this impossible regulation was kept. What was simply destructive of all discipline and order in the monasteries was an injunction that every religious who wished to complain of anything done by his superior or any of his brethren was to have a right at any time to appeal to Cromwell. To facilitate this, the superior was ordered to find any subject the money and means for prosecuting such an appeal in person, if he so desired."5

---

5 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 80.

The commissioners--the chief of whom were Leigh, Layton, Ap-Rice, Dr. London, and Bedyll--proceeded to the lesser houses first. There they endeavored by intimidation to force the inmates to surrender their property to the king.

Where this failed, they exaggerated the reports so greatly that the subsequent closing of the houses would seem justified. But during the winter of 1535-1536 the agents could receive the surrender of only seven houses.

REPORTS OF COMMISSIONERS

The commissioners brought back with them after the visitation of 1535-1536 highly exaggerated accounts of the uselessness, immorality, and lack of religious spirit in order that there would be a pretense for closing the monasteries. Yet with all the exaggeration we find the following summary which does not at all reflect unfavorably on the monasteries in general:

> "Against thirty of the monasteries nothing could be found except their revenues. Of the one hundred and fifty-five monasteries given in the Compendium Compertorum forty-three were simply accused of possessing relics. In certain houses the religious life was so much above suspicion and so edifying that the very inquisitors, though little addicted to scruples or sentiment, could not help imploring Cromwell's pity for them."6

---

6 Constant, G. The Reformation in England. I, p. 162.

The reports showed irregularities in both the larger and the smaller monasteries; yet at the time Henry had no intention of closing the larger houses, and consequently construed the reports to suit his whims. The smaller monasteries were advertised as dens of vice and the larger as havens of virtue.

> "To some men it appeared contrary to experience that virtue should flourish

> most where the temptations to vice were more numerous, and the means of indulgence more plentiful; but they should have recollected that the abbots and priors of the more wealthy houses were lords of parliament, and there present to justify themselves and their communities; the superiors of the others were at a distance, unacquainted with the charges brought against them, and of course unable to clear their own characters, or to expose the arts of their accusers."7

---

7 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 55.

The reports of the commissioners gave the excuse for the introduction of the bill into Parliament in the spring of 1536 for the dissolution of the smaller houses. Then, too, as had been done in Wolsey's time, Henry could offer the excuse that more good could be done by dissolving the monasteries and in their stead, erecting new bishopries. And Henry really did establish six episcopal sees, although he had planned eighteen, after the dissolution of the larger monasteries in 1540. This was perhaps to lull his own conscience, but most likely to silence the murmurs of his subjects.

Some immediate effects of the visitations were reducing of the number of religious, impoverishing of the religious houses by the taking of their valuables to London, depriving them of their right to sell or lease property, exhausting their resources through extortion by the agents, and disorganizing religious life.8

---

8 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 159.

SUPPRESSION OF SMALLER MONASTERIES

Conditions had developed regarding the smaller monasteries where all that was necessary to carry out the dissolution was its authorization by an act of Parliament. Therefore, when the Parliament met in February, 1536, the King asked for a bill for the dissolution of the monasteries whose revenues did not exceed £200 per annum. The reports of the visitors were so greatly exaggerated that Parliament recognized that condition and it was forced to accept Henry's statement that the houses were dens of vice.

Such garbled reports would naturally have their evil results, and perhaps the most important result of this act was that it robbed the monasteries of their good name and for centuries after, the stigma of evil repute remained with them. Historians ever since have related the evil conditions of the lives of monks and nuns--never questioning the veracity of the officials who originated the stories. Even a prominent writer like Green in his History of the English People has accepted the stories as generally true in details though recognizing the fact that they were exaggerated. He writes:

> "Two royal commissioners were dispatched on a general visitation of the religious houses, and their reports formed a 'black book', which was laid before Parliament in 1536. It was acknowledged that about a third of the houses, including the bulk of the larger abbeys, were fairly and decently conducted. The rest were charged with drunkenness, with simony, and with the foulest and most revolting crimes. The character of the visitors, the sweeping nature of their report, and the long debate that followed on its reception,

leaves little doubt that these charges were grossly exaggerated."9

---

9 Quoted from Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 97-98.

This is a sample of the moderate version of the reasons for the confiscation of the property of the monasteries. Yet there is no evidence of the existence of a 'black book'. The records make it at least improbable that such records existed. The 'black book' which probably never existed and the Comperta, reports of inquisitors, were both full of intentional exaggerations. It is only in recent times that the true conditions are being disclosed.

As the bill for the dissolution of the smaller houses came to be passed in Parliament, it was considered for a long time in the lower house. It is likely that the king came in person to Parliament.

> "'I hear,' he said, 'that my bill will not pass, but I will have it pass, or will have some of your heads.' This settled the fate of the smaller monasteries."10

---

10 Guggenberger, A. A General History of the Christian Era. Vol. II, p. 197.

Thus Parliament decided

> "that the property of these religious 'should be converted to better uses, and the unthrifty persons so spending the same be compelled to reform their lives.' And therefore they prayed the king to take all the property of monasteries having an income under £200 a year."11

11 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. op. cit., p. 101.

The preamble to the act for the dissolution of the lesser monasteries commences with the statement that sin and abominable living exist in houses of less than twelve in number; evidently presuming that all those houses with more than twelve would have much better discipline and morals. Besides the preamble tries to cover up the fact that so much property of value had been appropriated by the commissioners and by the king. Henry said he would send the inmates of the smaller houses to larger ones where they could live better lives, but that was done for comparatively few. Many dispensations for the sacred promises made at taking vows in religion were granted, and the monk or nun was given either a priest's or a layman's gown and forty shillings and asked to shift for himself as best he might.

It cannot be denied that in some way or other there were defections in the monasteries. In such a large number what else could be expected? In some cases they had really lost their first fervor. But to take such excuses as defection and loss of fervor as reasons for dissolving the monasteries is not to be conceded. These motives should have been a reason for reforming the monasteries, not for dissolving them.

EFFECTS OF THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SMALLER HOUSES

Henry knew what he wanted and under the pretext of looking for the spiritual welfare of the inmates, he broke

down every vestige of opposition to his Royal Supremacy, in putting an end to these "strongholds of the Papacy". No one can maintain that the dissolution of monasteries resulted in the reformation of the lives of these monks, but most people will admit that the breaking up of so many centers of religion weakened the moral status of the country and helped to prepare the way for the new doctrines of Luther and Calvin.

We must recognize, of course, that the wealth of the monasteries served as a serious temptation to Henry and his minister, Cromwell. Constant says that "They were not scandalized by their lives until they were tempted by their wealth". 12

---

12 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 155.

Although our main purpose is to show the influence of the Tudor will on the religion of England, it is practically impossible to separate the influence on religion from the secular effect of the acquisition of enormous wealth by the Crown through the delivery of the property of the monasteries to the royal treasury.

The work of dissolution made rapid strides. Three hundred and twenty-seven religious houses--two hundred twenty-four of men and one hundred three of women--having a revenue of less than £200 came under the law. All but fifty-two were dissolved, but these had to pay an annual sum to the Crown. Two houses dissolved in 1536 were reorganized in 1537. The monasteries that were allowed to stand were drained of their

resources by continually greater demands.

The act for the dissolution of the smaller monasteries had attached to it the privilege that Henry and Cromwell could use the income at their own discretion. By this act the property of the monasteries, the donations by the poor, the wealth of the churches, and the shrines--all within the period of four years passed into the hands of Henry and Cromwell to be used as they saw fit.

NORTHERN INSURRECTIONS

All of this spoliation and high-handed robbery was not carried on without protest. There were insurrections in the North, notably in Lincolnshire and in Yorkshire. Certain counties were especially affected by the recent innovations--by the looting of the monasteries and their dissolution, by the reorganizing of parishes by merging two or three into one, and by the passing of the late "Statute of Uses" which demanded that the property be transferred by will--thus assuring the king of his feudal dues. The people were consequently brought to a high tension concerning both spiritual and temporal innovations. Very many houses of religion had been suppressed in Lincolnshire and there were reports that more dissolutions were to take place. Besides that there were churches and chantries desecrated and destroyed. So on Michaelmas, 1536, the insurrection began at Louth. On October 3 the country round Horncastle rose with great unanimity. The insurrection was poorly organized and accompanied by considerable damage. At Lincoln itself there

was a rising of the people. A number of the important abbots of the larger monasteries supported the king in this insurrection--some of whom were executed for treason three years later. At Hornastle a number of grievances were drawn up and submitted by a messenger to the king. They were the following:

> "They complained (1) of the dissolution of the religious houses and of the consequent destitution of 'the poorealty of the realm;' (2) of the restraints imposed on the distribution of property by 'the statute of uses;' (3) of the grant to the king of the tenths and first-fruits of spiritual benefices; (4) of the payment of the subsidy demanded of them; (5) of the introduction into the king's council of Cromwell, Rich, and other 'such personages as be of low birth and small reputation;' and (6) of the promotion of the archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, and the bishops of Rochester, St. David's, and others, who, in their opinion, had clearly 'subverted the faith of Christ;' these articles were dispatched at once to the king at Windsor, and Heneage, the royal commissioner, was allowed to accompany the messenger."13

---

13 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, p. 210-211.

By October 11 the king's herald came with the royal answer to the articles. It was given in angry and vigorous language with a strong refutation of each point. The king, of course, realized that his position abroad would be prejudiced by such an expression of dissatisfaction on the part of the people. He wanted to clear up any 'false' reports about his looting of churches and monasteries in the minds

of the powers abroad and sent his ambassadors a message explaining his position and the treason of the men in Lincolnshire. He also explained that the leaders were already taken care of by the law. Suffolk, his agent, obtained the submission of the men of Lincolnshire, and Henry then issued a proclamation for their pardon.

Historians have distorted facts concerning this rising. They have made the abbots, especially Barlings and Mackeral, the head of the rising. The abbots, however, declared that they were forced by the leaders of the rising to give help and food to the rebels. A number of these monks who aided the insurgents were deposed and received terrible punishment. Although the pardon had been granted, about one hundred of the insurgents were taken to the Tower of London and tried the next spring. They were condemned although the jury was in their favor. Sixty-three were respited, and early in March thirty-three were executed for treason.

> "Towards the end of March the abbot of Barlings, William Moreland, monk of Louth-park, Thomas Kendal, vicar of Louth, with two other priests and twelve laymen, were tried in London before Chancellor Audeley, found guilty, and condemned to death." 14

---

14 Ibid., p. 219.

THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE

Shortly after the uprising in Lincolnshire was quelled others began in Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland. These risings were known as the Pilgrimage of Grace. They

stood for the old order in religion and their members wore the badge of the wounds of Christ.

> "Breaking up the religious orders, destroying monasteries, making the king head of the Church, and holding the pope of no account, were the bitter complaints of the pilgrims of grace, and for the redress of these things they were banded together in revolt."15

15 Clayton, Joseph. The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 80.

The king promised redress and pardon, and the Duke of Norfolk was to accept the rebel terms: (1) to hold a Parliament at York; (2) to restore the monks; (3) to grant a general pardon. This solemn promise was given in December; but after the king had time to recover his forces his agent, the Duke of Norfolk, with his troops were sent to slaughter far and wide. The important leaders, Aske, Lord Darcy, and Sir Robert Constable were executed as traitors.

> "Darcy was beheaded in the Tower of London. Constable was hanged at Hull, and Aske at York, after being drawn through the streets on hurdles. In the month of February, the king checked a final attempt to revolt, in Cumberland and Westmoreland, by striking terror into their hearts: seventy-four insurgents were hanged at Carlisle, and a good many others at Durham and York. It was then the middle of winter wrote Harpsfield, and yet one might have believed it was autumn, the trees were so laden with these strange fruits which, hanging high up in the branches, threatened to fall upon the heads of those who passed by."16

16 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 180-181.

The abbots and monks were not spared in this rising. They were accused of connections in the risings that they had never had. It was the king's will that they be tried, and it was understood that they be convicted. These abbots and monks, without doubt, fell victims to Henry's vengeance. He was determined that no resistance against his supremacy should succeed. It is true they were put to death for treason, but it was the royal will that decided their fate.

> "The fate of those who had withstood the royal will and appealed even to arms to save the ancient abbeys of England from spoliation and to protest against the changes in religious faith and practice imposed upon an unwilling nation, struck terror into the hearts of the English people. The collapse of the rising removed every restraint upon the autocratic power of the crown and opened the way for further seizures of monastic and church property."17

---

17 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. op. cit., p. 263-264.

DISSOLUTION OF THE LARGER MONASTERIES

The Pilgrimage of Grace proved a failure for the insurgents. This was a good excuse for Henry to finish up the business of dissolution. As we have seen, a number of the abbots and priors who had taken part in the risings were executed, and their monasteries were confiscated. Where nothing remarkable could be proved against the larger monasteries, for by act of Parliament they had been declared free from vice, their abbots were terrified into voluntary submission. Spies were everythere. Henry and Cromwell now

acted on a new precedent--that of attainder of the abbots of monasteries followed and accompanied by the dissolution of the monastery.

> "Hitherto the attainder of a bishop or abbot would not affect the property of the diocese or abbey over which the attainted superior ruled. It was left to Henry to include the forfeiture of possessions of a corporation in the punishment awarded to its head for supposed or real treasonable practices. Even Burnet argues that such a proceeding was unjustifiable. 'How justly soever these abbots were attainted,' he writes, 'the seizing of their abbey lands, pursuant to those attainders, was thought a great stretch of law, since the offence of an ecclesiastical incumbent is a personal thing, and cannot prejudice the church; no more than a secular man, being in office, does by being attainted bring any diminution of the rights of the office on his successors.'"[18]

---

18 Ibid., p. 269-270.

Henry, through his agents, took vengeance on the larger monasteries of the North after the insurrections. The actual dissolution by attainder was carried on without legal force; however, surrender was the more general method of dissolution of the larger monasteries. Pressure was placed on the abbots and priors, and a good pension of say £40 a year was offered them. If persuasion failed, severity and intimidation followed.

> "1. The superior and his monks, the tenants, servants, and neighbours, were subjected to a minute and rigorous examination; each was exhorted, was commanded, to accuse the other and every groundless tale, every malicious insinuation, was carefully collected and recorded. 2. The commissioners called for the accounts of the house, compared the expenditure with

> the receipts, scrutinized every article with an eye of suspicion and hostility, and required the production of all the moneys, plate, and jewels. 3. They proceeded to search the library and the private rooms for papers and books; and the discovery of any opinion or treatise in favour of the papal supremacy, or of the validity of Henry's first marriage, was taken as a sufficient proof of adhesion to the king's enemies, and of disobedience to the statutes of the realm. The general result was a real or fictitious charge of immorality, or peculation, or high treason. But many superiors.....obeyed the royal pleasure."19

---

19 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 94-95.

Surrender was really the only method that Henry could now use safely. Parliament had granted by law that monasteries of less than £200 a year could be suppressed. The larger houses did not come under this law, and therefore, the suppression of the houses without surrender, but by attainder because of the 'treason' of the abbots, was a stretching of the law. It was simply an expression of Henry's dominant will to maintain his Supremacy. It was not until April, 1539 that Parliament legalized the suppression of the larger houses after most of the houses had already come into the king's hands. The first act for the dissolution of the monasteries would not help the king against any recalcitrant superior of a house. Provision was made indirectly for such a case in April, 1539.

> "This Act, which included a retrospective clause covering the illegal suppression of the greater monasteries

> which had already passed into the king's hands, granted to Henry all monasteries, etc., which shall hereafter happen to be dissolved, suppressed, renounced, relinquished, forfeited, given up or come unto the king's highness. These terms seem wide enough, but there is also an ominous parenthesis referring to such other religious houses as 'shall happen to come to the king's highness by attainder or attainders of treason. The clause did not find its way into the Act unawares. It will be seen that it was Cromwell's care how and in whose case the clause should become operative. And with just so much of countenance as is thus given him by the Act, with the king to back him, the monasteries of Glastonbury, Reading, Colchester, from which no surrender could be obtained, 'were, against every principle of received law, held to fall by the attainder of their abbots for high treason.' 20

---

20 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Last Abbot of Glastonbury, p. 46.

The "surrenders" were made mainly in 1538 and 1539. About one hundred fifty monasteries were signed over to the king in this manner and any opposition to the royal will would probably mean death. The surrenders are to be deplored; yet, who could expect a great number to resist heroically? The monasteries were attacked singly and they fell singly. Concerning Richard Whiting of Glastonbury we find the following:

> "For an abbot to hand back and demur, and worse still, to secrete such plate money as he could for his community and himself, in the hope of better days coming, and so baffle the royal marauder, as one would now trick a common burglar, was to resist the supremacy, and ask for a bill of attainder. The bill came and Blessed Richard was done to death 'in odium fidei', a verdict which,

> as Benedict XIV lays down, it is for the Church's tribunals to pronounce, whatever the motive or pretext alleged by the oppressor may have been. The 'treasons' committed by him were set forth in a Book of depositions sent up to London from Wells by the King's visitors."22

---

22 Lord Bishop of Clifton. "Popular Resistance to the New Religion", in Camm, Bede. The English Martyrs, p. 133.

In this way throughout the north of England the commissioners under Sussex labored to take control of the monasteries. They sold all articles having a price, and left the walls as a quarry for the people of the neighborhood. Sometimes the abbots who had confessed themselves great sinners, by signing ready-made formulae for confessions, were rewarded with some ecclesiastical benefice.

Not alone in the North but also in the South were these drastic methods carried. In fact, the success of the suppression in the North gave a new impetus to the commissioners in the South. For four years these commissioners went from house to house urging and even compelling the inmates of the monastery to submit to the royal pleasure. By these means every monastery had submitted and every vestige of papal power in England was destroyed.

> "On March 23rd, 1540 the one remaining abbey in the country--that of Waltham in Essex--was surrendered to the king. Between the years 1537 and 1540 one hundred and fifty-eight large monasteries for men, not counting their cells or the religious houses in the towns, had been dissolved, and thirty nunneries; twelve had been dissolved by attainder. In 1540 forty-three commanderies, belonging to the Knights of Malta, were confiscated.

> The French ambassador had predicted that not a single abbey would be left standing; in April, 1540, he was able to write to Francis I that in the whole of England there was not a single monk who had not exchanged his habit for the dress of a secular priest."23

23 Constant, G. Op. cit., p. 185-186.

DESTRUCTION OF SHRINES

Another phase of Henry's actual vandalism was that of the destruction of the shrines. In 1538 Henry ordered the commissioners to seize the shrines of saints in all the churches of England and to carry all relics, gold, silver, and jewels to the Tower.

> "From 1538 onwards the crusade against relics and images went hand in hand with the dissolution of the monasteries. Certain false relics and superstitious devotions were the pretext for an almost universal destruction.
>
> "From devotions that were superstitious they passed to others that were not. Certain celebrated sanctuaries, such as Our Lady's at Ipswich, St. Anne's at Buxton, and Our Lady of Walsingham were all desecrated. The reliquaries of St. Richard at Chichester, St. Swithun at Winchester, and St. Cuthbert at Durham were emptied of their relics and sent to the Tower of London. (1538) St. Thomas a Becket's shrine at Canterbury was the richest and the most famous of all..... The shrine was smashed to pieces, and the gold and precious stones sent to the Treasury." 24

24 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 303-304.

St. Thomas of Canterbury was especially dishonored by being declared guilty of treason. Henry's own greed for the

wealth of the shrine was thus covered over by a most singular and absurd proceeding. St. Thomas was to be struck off the list of saints. Lingard tells the story most interestingly.

> "The king's attorney was therefore instructed to exhibit an information against him; and 'Thomas Becket, some time archbishop of Canterbury,' was formally cited to appear in court and answer to the charge. The interval of thirty days, allowed by the canon law, was suffered to elapse; still the saint neglected to quit the tomb in which he had reposed for two centuries and a half; and judgment would have been given against him for default, had not the king, of his special grace, assigned him a counsel. The court sat at Westminster; the Attorney-general and the advocate of the accused were heard; and sentence was finally pronounced, that Thomas, some time archbishop of Canterbury, had been guilty of rebellion, contumacy, and treason; that his bones should be publicly burnt, to admonish the living of their duty by the punishment of the dead; and that the offerings which had been made at his shrine, the personal property of the reputed saint, should be forfeited to the Crown." 25

---

25 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 109.

FINAL RESULTS OF THE DISSOLUTION

During these five years, 1535-1540, Henry had accomplished what he set out to do. His agents on the whole had been loyal in carrying out his wishes. At the beginning of these five years Henry was determined to have universal recognition of his supremacy in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. This was now accomplished, for since the monasteries were dissolved there would be no danger of the

"reserve force of the Papacy" to rise and demand loyalty to the Holy See, as some feared the inmates of monasteries would do. By the dissolution Henry also had satisfied his spirit of greed in assuming for use according to his own caprice, the wealth of the hundreds of monasteries, chantries, and shrines. There is no other conclusion to be drawn from all these events but that this Tudor monarch was a "ruthless tyrant" whose obstinacy of will was reflected in practically every phase in his reign.

Guggenberger gives an estimate of some of the results of the dissolutions in the following paragraph:

> "About 8,000 religious persons of both sexes and 80,000 persons dependent upon them were expelled in this 'suppression by attainder.' The fall of the monasteries transferred a yearly income of more than two million pounds sterling of the present money from the Church and the poor to the purses of the king and his accomplices."[26]

---

26 Guggenberger, A. op. cit., Vol. II, p. 199.

But what were the effects on religion of this suppression of monasteries and destruction of Shrines? Numerous centers of worship and of religious life and loyalty to God and Holy Church were thus destroyed. The individuals who were disbanded suffered in their spiritual development. Charity, almsgiving, self-sacrifice, in fact, all neighborly virtues declined, and the influence of the religious strongholds was no longer felt in England. The monasteries often supported students for the universities and since their dissolution

universities declined and, consequently, there was less dissemination of religious knowledge. Another important result was that England was deprived of an important source of its ideals, namely, the monastic life. The English are a practical race, and up to this day they feel the want of these ideals. This is manifest from the fact that during the last three quarters of a century they have been trying to fill this void--in fact, since 1847 scores of monastic and conventual establishments have been erected.

I. Blunt, a Protestant historian, summarizes the drastic effects of the suppression.

> "On the whole question it may be said that we must ever look back with shame on that dissolution, as on a series of transactions in which the sorrow, the waste, the impiety that were wrought, were enough to make angels weep....A blot and a scandal were indelibly impressed upon our history; and every bare site, every ruined gable, is still a witness to what was nothing less than a great national tragedy." 27

---

27 Constant, G. op. cit., p. 198-199.

ABSOLUTE POWER OF HENRY VIII

We may wonder how it was possible for Henry to maintain his strength of influence through all those years. When he ascended the throne, there was a certain amount of freedom in court circles. This freedom gradually disappeared and before the death of Henry VIII, England's king had become a despot and the people practically a nation of slaves. Lingard ascribes this condition to three causes, namely--the subserviency of Parliament, the ecclesiastical supremacy assumed

by Henry, and the servility of the two hostile groups of religious bodies--those adhering to the old doctrine and those wishing to adopt the new. 28

---

28 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 219.

We have seen the effects of the subserviency of Parliament and of the ecclesiastical supremacy. We may close this chapter with an estimate of the influence that these two parties had upon keeping Henry's will ever in the foreground. These groups were so jealous of each other that they could not watch nor resist the encroachments of the Crown. Each group wanted to win the favor of the king in order to crush the other's power. To obtain this they flattered him, submitted to his caprices, and became his slaves. But Henry played them off against each other by sometimes pretending to adhere to the new doctrine and at other times showing favoritism to the old. Thus their hopes were alternately raised or depressed, but neither side ever gained complete power. In this way Henry could have his will in every measure that passion or caprice would suggest, whether or not it was in accordance with prudence, justice, reason, or the fundamental laws of England.

CHAPTER V

MARY TUDOR'S DOMINANT WILL: HER RESTORATION OF CATHOLICISM

EDWARD VI: RELIGIOUS CHANGES

Before considering Mary Tudor's influence on religion during the brief period of her reign, it will be necessary to give a brief resume of the religious changes during the reign of Edward VI. It is not within the scope of this paper to develop these changes at any great length because Edward VI did not manifest any influence on the development of religion during his reign. He was a boy of nine when he ascended the throne in 1547, and six years later he died.

The Earl of Hertford, Edward Seymour, who later became the Duke of Somerset was really the "power behind the throne", with the virtual authority of the Crown during the first years of Edward's minority. These years, 1547-1553, were years of great changes both in political and in religious matters. Somerset and his group were strong adherents of the new doctrine, and the young king was accordingly trained along these principles.

One of the first changes on the question of religion mitigated the severity of the Treasons Act and the Act of the Six Articles which had been passed in the reign of Henry VIII. Legislation against heresy followed and protestant principles gradually took the place of the orthodox doctrines. In 1549 the first Act of Uniformity was passed. It included the use of a common prayer book composed largely by Cranmer and modeled on the old ceremonial of Henry VIII. Cranmer was so much influenced by the reformers on the continent that in places his book of common prayer leaned

decidedly toward Protestantism. The language of the book was so obscure that sometimes one did not know which opinion to hold. In one place transubstantiation was practically denied, and communion considered as a memorial. Under Somerset there were no laws of recusancy as later under Northumberland, but the clergymen who refused the new prayer-book incurred heavy penalties.

In 1545 under Henry VIII the law for the dissolution of chantries and other religious endowments had been passed by Parliament. A chantry was a religious endowment given to a priest to say Masses for a departed soul. This law was hardly under way when Henry died and the act lapsed. It was renewed, however, under Edward, and most of the chantries were abolished. If these were allowed to remain, they would retain the prayers for the dead and at the same time a tendency for promoting "superstition", as the advocates of the new doctrine claimed. Relics, shrines, statues, and pictures were destroyed at the same time as the dissolution of chantries. This vandalism shocked the religious sensibilities of a large number of people who adhered to the old doctrine and practices. Under Henry VIII there was a distinction made between those that they thought were superstitious and those that were not. During this reign there was no longer a distinction made. All the images and relics were confiscated or destroyed, even at times without legal process or authority.

Camden sums up the religious changes in the following

paragraph:

> "This pernicious Law of Six Articles and others which had been established by King Henry the Eighth, against the Protestants, are suppressed, and those which tended to the abolishing of the Popes authoritie confirmed; the Masse abrogated; the Images taken out of the Temples; the Bookes of the Old and New Testament imprinted; the Service celebrated in the vulgar Tongue; the Eucharist distributed under both kindes: But nevertheless the avaritious sacriledge fell ravenously upon pillaging the goods of the Church, Colledges, Quiers, Hospitals, as things judged to bee for superstitious vses: ambition and envy among the great ones, and audacite and disobedience among the Commons, so insolently exulted that England seemed to be raging madde with rebellious tumults, taking sides, depravation of money, and withall, the evils that are accustomed to be during the minority of a King."1

---

1 Camden, William. Annales, p. *3

REVOLTS IN THE NORTH AND SOUTH

In 1549 as a result of these changes in religion, there were numerous uprisings in the North and the South of England. Somerset had been in Scotland working for a union with that country and when he returned he found the country in a blaze. The people of Devon and Cornwall demanded:

> "'We will have the holy decrees of our forefathers observed, kept, and performed, and the Sacraments restored to its ancient honor.' They demanded to have the Mass in Latin, the Sacrament worshiped as of old, communion under one species and public prayers and Masses for the souls in Purgatory."2

---

2 Guggenberger, A. A General History of the Christian Era. Vol. II, p. 206.

In fact the grievances were general. The wants of the poor had been neglected, and now above all there were innovations in the form of their religion which they felt they could not tolerate.

> "They complained of that system which had diminished their resources, and now compelled them to practice a worship foreign from their habits and feelings. The day approached when the use of the old liturgy was to cease, and that of the new to begin, instead of the high mass, its music and its ceremonies, with which they had been familiarized from their infancy, they were to hear what they deemed an inanimate service, a 'mere Christmas play'."3

---

3 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England. Vol. V., p. 285.

The risings were suppressed, but they led to Somerset's fall. The same year Warwick, Duke of Northumberland, had gained the ascendency. Somerset was executed for treason only in 1552.

EDWARDINE ORDINAL

After Warwick's ascendency, in 1550, the new ordinal was adopted according to which ministers should be ordained. It was drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, modeled on Bucer's ordinal at Strassburg. They emphasized the fact that the new ordinal was not to provide for the ordination of priests according to the Catholic ceremonial. The ceremony of the presentation of the chalice and paten was omitted, thus emphasizing the fact that no Mass was to be celebrated. The ministers were "to administer the doctrine and sacraments

and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church and realm hath received the same."4

4 Clayton, Joseph. The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 98.

The Bishops who were most averse to the new form were gradually deprived and advocates of the new doctrine were installed. The Protestant group favoring further innovations was growing stronger up to the execution of Somerset in 1552. After this, every opposition was quickly met by Warwick. Consequently in 1552 a new Act of Uniformity was passed and a second book of common prayer prescribed which was more protestant in tone than the first. In the next year the council drew up forty-two articles of doctrine distinctly protestant.

> "They asserted the typical Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, denied transubstantiation and abandoned five of the seven medieval sacraments, though they were otherwise moderate towards Rome."5

5 Lunt, W. E. History of England, p. 360.

The first really Protestant Church in England was thus formed with a comparatively small percentage of people willing to adhere to its tenets and with the majority still attached to the priesthood, the episcopacy, and above all to the Mass. Under these conditions it is not surprising that a large number of people welcomed a return to the Church of Rome in the reign of Mary.

A short time before the death of Edward VI in 1553, Northumberland and the Council drew up a new form of succession which Edward was prevailed upon to sign. This document provided for the succession of the crown upon Lady Jane Grey who had married Northumberland's son. Those who advocated this succession claimed the illegitimacy of both Mary and Elizabeth, and under that pretext, broke their sworn promise of carrying out the will of Henry VIII.

ACCESSION OF MARY TUDOR

The news of the death of Edward VI was not allowed to be spread until Lady Jane Grey had been proclaimed the new sovereign. They told Mary Tudor that Edward wanted to see her and she prepared to go to him, but Throckmorton secretly informed her of her brother's death and of a conspiracy to take her into custody and to deprive her of her right of succession to the Throne. She acted upon this information with characteristic precision and dispatch. Her heritage of Tudor obstinacy manifested itself on this occasion to great advantage. In a few days she had a willing army at her command, and with the whole hearted support of the people of London brought about a revolution. Even Northumberland turned to her and offered his allegiance when he saw there was no other alternative. His own forces that were sent against her did not follow his orders, but espoused the cause of Mary. Having been an unwilling queen in the Tower of London for nine days, Lady Jane Grey now became an unwilling prisoner in the same tower.

Mary had succeeded in dominating over her adversaries, and the people were willing to acknowledge her as their queen. She had been despised and abused, but she had held her own against all attacks on her fidelity to the old religion. Large numbers of Englishmen, though they deplored the fires of Smithfield,[6] felt unmixed relief at the return

---

6 Smithfield was notorious because it was the place of execution where heretics, in the days of Henry VIII, were burned at the stake.

---

of Mary, for it meant a return to Catholicism. All that had been dear to them had been taken away during the last reigns --the priests, the chantries, the images of Christ and of the saints, even in many instances their very means of support. It was especially the landed gentry who welcomed the change.

> "They had not wavered in their faith, but all that had been to them of aid and consolation in their often lonely lives had been swept away. In place of the genial parish priest they found some 'under groom' or unlearned curate, jeered at by the country lads as 'lack-Latins who slubbered up their services,' or worse still, read a service that sounded strange and irreverent to ears attuned to the fine cadences of the Roman Missal.
>
> "No longer could they send their boys and girls to the neighbouring abbey school or convent, for the beautiful old cloisters, where the children had stood to sing their 'pricksong', now stood roofless and desolate." 7

---

7 Wilmot-Buxton, E. M. Book of English Martyrs, p. 70.

The people welcomed Mary, for they knew little of Lady Jane Grey and much of Northumberland's ambition. Mary gathered forces of over thirty thousand men--all volunteers, and triumphantly entered London. The leaders of the opposition were soon imprisoned, but of the twenty-seven imprisoned only three were executed. This leniency, however, secured for Mary greater assurance of holding her power. That Mary was well received by many of her subjects, we deduce from some of the writings of the time. Little has been written about the Marian period or how well Mary was liked. The following quotation shows the attitude of some of her people towards her.

> "Let us all praie God bothe more and lesse
> that hath sent us a quene, our thralles to relesse
> Where w^t we were captyve both in soule and body
> We may be right glad, ye god hath now changed
> A lambe for wolves, ye unsatiably devoured
> The realme and the comons without pitie or mercye.
> God save and preserve our noble Quene Mari
> Over us longe to reygne, let us al pray hartlie
> God save the Quene." 8

---

8 Marshall, Gorgias. Fugitive Poetical Tracts. 1st ser.

CHARACTER OF THE QUEEN

Mary's outlook on life had been warped on account of the sad days of her youth. She had been deprived of the presence and help of her mother and her friends, and subjected to numerous abuses because of the hostility of Anne Boleyn. During the period of Northumberland's power she was continually persecuted because of her adherence to the Catholic religion. All of these reverses, however, did not break her spirit.

She had a heritage of strength of will from both her father and her mother--from her father egotism and imperiousness; from her mother, determined obstinacy. Her experiences were bound to leave upon her a mark of bitterness and even harshness. In her early years she received her sole consolation from her adherence to the practices of her religion and she was convinced that all the evils in England were a punishment from God for the separation of England from the Church of Rome. It was her firm conviction that her mission as Queen of England was to restore the ancient form of worship and to bring England back into the fold of the Church under the supremacy of the Pope at Rome.

MARY'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS CATHOLICISM

At the very beginning Mary announced that her intention was to restore the old religion. Bishop Gardiner, together with other bishops imprisoned during Edward's reign, was recalled and made her chief adviser. Mary had also acquainted the Spanish Emperor Charles V of her design to reestablish the Catholic religion in the country, but he advised her to proceed quietly and cautiously and to keep from public innovations until she obtained the consent of Parliament. She acted upon this advice and issued no order for the restoration of the old religion.

Her mind, however, was bent upon the restoration of the Catholic religion, and she herself set the example of attending Catholic worship. Others who were attached to the old worship were emboldened by her attitude and celebrated Mass

or attended at the celebration, contrary to existing laws. Difficulties were bound to arise. On one occasion a riot resulted from an unauthorized celebration of Mass. Bourne, a royal chaplain, complained in his sermon of the innovations of the late reign and of the deprivation of the Catholic clergy. "Pull him down" was heard from the crowd, and Bourne had to flee at the risk of his life. 9

---

9 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 398.

PROCLAMATION OF AUGUST 28, 1553

This incident led the Queen to issue an order forbidding preaching without license. Soon after, she issued a proclamation to the effect that she could not conceal her religion, but that she had no intention of forcing anyone to embrace it until matters could be ratified by common consent--a hint that she might do it later. This procedure was a little imprudent but typical of Tudor willfulness. She also bade the people to refrain from any opprobrious language by calling each other heretic or papist. This proclamation--the main points of which follow--was given August 28, 1553.

> "The Queen's Highness, well-remembering what great inconveniences and dangers have grown...through diversity of opinions.... hath thought good," being now well "settled in her just possession of the Imperial Crown of this Realm, and other dominions thereunto belonging," to require the restoration of the Religion "which God and the world knoweth she hath ever professed from her infance..." Urgently desiring her subjects to "embrace the same," she preferred their willing conversion: and so "she does signify unto all...

> that of her most gracious disposition and clemency" she "mindeth not to compel any of her said subjects thereto, unto such time as farther order by common assent may be taken."
>
> "Meanwhile she bade her 'good loving subjects to live together in quiet sort and Christian charity' not using against each other the "new found devilish term of Papist and Heretic!" but avoiding "rash talk" and contentious words, and uniting in loyalty and devotion. "And her Highness...chargeth and commandeth" that none of her subjects presume on their own authority to punish or rise against any person guilty of printing forbidden matter;" or against "any other offender in words or deeds in the late rebellion....by the Duke of Northumberland."...
>
> "Though she would be sorry to have to put the laws severely into execution "she utterly determines not to permit such unlawful and rebellious doings of her subjects to remain unpunished." 10

---

10 Tenison, E. M. Elizabethan England. Vol. I, p. 77.

ACTIVITIES OF THE REFORMERS

After this proclamation the reformers placed their hopes in Elizabeth as a possible rival to Mary. But within the next month Elizabeth was instructed in the Catholic religion, gave up the practice of the reformed religion, and practiced the Catholic. The Protestant cause did not fear this action greatly, for Mary had really been lenient with them. Even Cranmer, who had granted the divorce dishonoring her mother and who had been one of the last to uphold the lost cause of Northumberland, had felt the effects of her leniency and had not been sent to the Tower. Now, however, while in his retirement at Lambeth, he heard that Mass had been said at

his Cathedral at Canterbury and that at his orders. It was also reported that he had said Mass before the Queen. These reports incensed him greatly and he prepared a refutation of the charges by a public denial, through the circulation of pamphlets giving his views. The paper betrayed his bitter feelings even if it did honor to his courage. In it he declared that the Mass was invented by the father of lies, that the Mass had been restored at Canterbury by a deceitful monk, that he had not offered to say Mass before the Queen, but that he was ready to prove with the help of Peter Martyr that the Mass contained many blasphemies, and that the doctrine taught during Edward VI's reign was that used in the early days of the Christian era. Some of the copies were publicly read in the streets.

> "The council sent for the archbishop, and 'after a long and serious debate committed him to the Tower, as well for the treason committed by him against the queen's highness, as for the aggravating the same his offence by spreading abroad seditious bills, and moving tumults to the disquietness of the present state.' A few days afterwards, Latimer, who probably had imitated the conduct of the metropolitan, was also sent to the same prison for 'his seditious demeanour.'" 11

---

11 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V, p. 401.

This was in September, 1553. Here began his agony of imprisonments, his disputations, his recantations, his degradations, and final scene at St. Mary's. He petitioned for life, but Mary was determined. He had ruined all his chances by the tract he had written against the Mass shortly after

Edward's death. He was transferred to Oxford in 1554, for the Queen was determined that he should die. Therefore, with Latimer and Ridley, he was sent to Boccardo prison, in April, 1554. He was being kept until the country was reconciled to the Papacy and the anti-Papal legislation was repealed.

MARY'S LENIENCY

But this came after the first eighteen months of Mary's reign. In the first period the queen showed rather exceptional leniency under provoking conditions.

> "Her leniency in the case of Northumberland accomplices had been almost unparalleled. A second rebellion when she had been barely six months on the throne was treated with no more than ordinary severity, though a very few of those implicated with Northumberland, who would otherwise have been spared, were executed in consequence. The advocates of the old religion had come into power, but their power had certainly not been used more oppressively than that of the opposition party under Warwick or even under Somerset: and there was more excuse for the treatment of Cranmer and Ridley at least than there had been for that of Gardiner and Bonner. If Latimer and Hooper, Ferrar and Coverdale, were imprisoned, it was no more than Heath and Day and Tunstall had suffered. The deprivation of the married clergy was certainly a harsh measure, since the marriages had been made under the aegis of the law; but that appears to be the one measure which had hitherto savored of bigotry--at least, which had gone beyond the bounds of even-handed retaliation."12

---

12 Innes, Arthur D. England under the Tudors, p. 229.

In regard to this last point we can easily see how Mary felt in conscience bound to have the parished served by the

unmarried clergy. This was both the rule according to Henry VIII and also according to the Church of Rome. That it does seem harsh, is likely true to those who do not understand the Catholic point of view. In this she was manifesting her natural Tudor obstinacy and determination of carrying out her will.

RESTORATION OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION

In Rome Mary's accession was looked upon as a triumph for Catholicism. There was hardly a question as to what Mary would do, and plans were made accordingly. The Pope of Rome, Julius III, foreseeing what was to come, appointed Cardinal Pole as his legate to England. Pole desiring to obtain more satisfactory information, secured the help of the legate, Dandino, at Brussels. The latter dispatched Commendone to England to get as much information as he could concerning the conditions in England. He remained in London for some time in disguise and procured several audiences with the Queen. He brought the following message from the Queen to the Pope and to Cardinal Pole:

> "That it was her most anxious wish to see her kingdom reconciled with the Holy See; that for this purpose she meant to procure the repeal of all laws trenching on the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic church; that on the other hand she hoped to experience no obstacle on the part of the pontiff, or of her kinsman the papal representative; and that for the success of the undertaking it would be necessary to act with temper and prudence; to respect the prejudices of her subjects; and most carefully to conceal the least trace of any correspondence between her and the court of Rome." 13

13 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V., p. 402.

However determined Mary was to restore the religion, she did well in not acting independently. She waited for the meeting of her first parliament in October, 1533. According to an ancient custom the members first attended a Mass in honor of the Holy Ghost. Here Mary received many expressions of loyalty and attachment. At this parliament Mary hoped to accomplish two things: she wanted to remove any stain of illegitimacy from herself and to establish the ancient religion. With the first she had no difficulty. In fact, the bill received unanimous consent. But with the second, as she anticipated, there was some trouble. Most of the peers were willing to accede to her wishes, but there was considerable discussion among the Commons. They preferred to retain the Royal Supremacy. The idea of placing the church under the authority of Rome was repugnant to them. They preferred to restore the religion as it was at the death of Henry.

An important consideration in the restoration to the church under the authority of the Pope was the restoring of the ecclesiastical property. This had been distributed very widely by this time, and it was practically impossible to restore all the property to the Church which had been in its possession before the dissolution of the monasteries. The difficulty, however, was later removed when the Pope freed persons in possession of church lands from the

obligation of returning them if they became Catholics, while those remaining Protestants, of course, were not bothered. Camden gives a brief estimate of this situation in the following paragraph:

> "But the states of the Kingdome (and Mary bethought her selfe of it) feared to receive and acknowledge the Popes authority which they had already shaken off, neither could they suffer that the Queene should quit the Title of Soueraigne head of the Church of England, to which the most part of them, Prelates, Peeres, and Common-people, had sworne to Henry the Eighth, his heires and successors and there were many of them that had got their riches from those of the Church. But tooke it greatlie to heart to forsake him, perswading herselfe that all the right that she had to the Kingdome of England, was upholden by no other means, then by the power of the Pope, who gave sentence of her side, after her father had declared her illegitimate." 14.

---

14 Camden, William. Annales, p. A2-A3.

Mary herself as we see was convinced that she should not retain the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England, but in this case she gave in to the judgment of Parliament, and that body passed the bill without division.

> "By it was at once razed to the ground that fabric which the ingenuity and perseverance of Archbishop Cranmer had erected in the last reign; the reformed liturgy, which Edward's parliament had attributed to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and now pronounced 'a new thing, imagined and devised by a few of singular opinions;' the acts establishing the first and second books of common prayer, the new ordinal, and the administration of the sacrament in both kinds, that authorizing the marriages

> of priests, and legitimating their children, and those abolishing certain festivals and fasts, vesting in the king the appointment of bishops by letters patent, and regulating the exercise of the episcopal jurisdiction, were repealed; and, in lieu thereof, it was enjoined that from the twentieth day of the next month should be revived and practised such forms of divine worship and administration of sacraments, as had been most commonly used in England in the last year of Henry VIII." 15

15 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V., p. 406.

Other bills were passed by this parliament. Treasons created since the twenty-fifth of Edward III, felonies and cases of praemunire since the first of Henry VIII were abolished. But the statute under Edward VI concerning riotous assemblies was partly revived, extending to meetings whose object was to change by force existing laws regarding religion.

MARRIAGE NEGOTIATIONS

Early in 1554 Mary made known to parliament her projected marriage with Philip II of Spain. In the eyes of hostile Englishmen,

> "The marriage promised to throw England into the arms of Spain and place the resources of the kingdom at the command of the Emperor's son." 16

16 Encyclopaedia, Britannica. Vol. XV., p. 600.

Mary's subjects widely opposed the marriage. Gardiner advised against it, and some thought that even Pole was not

in favor of it. But Mary was a Tudor and her obstinacy and determination helped her to carry this through to the dissatisfaction of all these groups. So many people wanted an Englishman as king that a conspiracy was formed with the help of the French ambassador. The members of the conspiracy planned to have Courtenay propose to Mary after Arundel and Paget, the strongest adherents of the Spanish marriage, were murdered. If Mary should refuse to accept, Courtenay should marry Elizabeth and gather an army from Devonshire and Cornwall to support Elizabeth as queen. But Courtenay was timid and cautious, and he had not the courage to carry out the plans.

About the same time, Mary addressed herself to the Commons expressing her right to choose for herself regarding her marriage and promising that it would be for the happiness of the people. Gardiner in the early part of 1554 saw that it was fruitless to oppose further, consented to negotiate a treaty respecting the marriage. In this treaty Gardiner deserves the credit of guarding the liberties of the English against any possible attempts of a foreign prince to the throne of England.

Mary hardly realized how critical a thing it was for her to form such an alliance.

> "How was Mary to understand her subjects' hatred, or to realise that even if Philip's credentials had included a passport for the kingdom of heaven they would have been utterly useless without an English birth-certificate? Insular feeling, jealousy of Spain's trading monopoly in the New World, and the belief

> that Spain beyond all other European countries was identified with the Papacy, rendered whatever he did suspect. It made no difference that during part of the reign Philip was at war with the Pope. The anti-Spanish feeling that, within a week of the signing of the marriage treaty, had declared itself in Wyatt's rebellion grew steadily in intensity. And as Mary's devotion to Philip and his interests became more and more apparent, so her own unpopularity came almost to equal his." 17

---

17 Byrne, M. St. Clare. "Mary I". The Great Tudors by Garvin, Katharine, p. 195-196.

Although the marriage with Philip of Spain is not directly a religious issue, yet the people saw in it a greater possibility of reunion with Rome under the control of the Papacy. But Mary would not see the point. Her Tudor obstinacy and Spanish inflexibility were not assets to her for the difficult period of transition in which she lived. Her mind was too rigid and direct to cope successfully with the changes.

WYATT'S REBELLION

Agitated by the proposed Spanish marriage the Protestants in Kent and in the Midlands planned to overthrow Mary and place Elizabeth on the throne. Insurrections broke out and it is thought that even Elizabeth was not inactive in the cause of the rebels. Guggenberger also recognizes her connection with the rebellion when he says:

> "Elizabeth and Courtenay, the real culprits, who wanted to deprive Mary of her crown and life, escaped, owing to the Lord Chancellor's partiality for Courtenay, with a light punishment." 18

18 Guggenberger, A. op. cit. Vol. II., p. 210.

The most famous rebellion was that of Wyatt in Kent. The insurgents had considerable success, but they were probably deceived in their hope of success from the late revolution--as Lady Jane had been supplanted by Mary; Mary in turn, could be supplanted by Elizabeth. But Mary again acted quickly and the officials did all in their power to put down the rebellion. Bridges were torn down and the important places of London were fortified. Wyatt and a large following managed to repair a bridge sufficiently to cross over and boldly entered the city.

> "His men, however, were for the most part cut off in an engagement near Hyde Park corner, and it was with only three hundred followers that he reached Ludgate --to find the gate closed against him. 'I have kept touch' he said, and suffered himself to be led away a prisoner." 19

19 Gardiner, Samuel Rawson: A Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to 1885, p. 423.

Sir Maurice Berkeley it was who carried Wyatt before the court and finally to the Tower. Within a few hours the remaining conspirators were also captured.

From the Tudor Tracts we find that religion was really the cause of the insurrection, while the occasion was the Spanish marriage.

> "And considering with himself that to make the pretence of his Rebellion to be the restoring or continuance of the new and newly-forged Religion was

> neither agreeable to the nature of Heresy (which always defendeth itself by the name and countenance of other matter more plausible); neither so apt to further his wicked purpose, being not a case so general to alure all sorts to take part with him: he determined to speak no word of Religion, but to make the only clour (pretence) of his commotion, only to withstand Strangers (i. e. the Spaniards), and to advance Liberty."
> N. B. The cause why Wyatt made not Religion the outward pretence of his Rebellion. 20

---

20 Pollard, A. F. Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588. p. 209

The issue in these rebellions was mainly political and therefore must be passed by quickly.

PARDONS AND EXECUTIONS

But Mary's will was manifest here also. She was determined even before the end of the insurrection, that justice must be done, especially to Winchester and Wyatt, the leaders of the insurrection.

> "Her Majesty indicates the course she intends the law to take: 'Mercy to mean offenders we'll extend; Not unto such that dares usurp Our Crown.' But actually there is nothing to prove that she thus early made up her mind they should not live." 21

---

21 Tenison, E. M. op. cit. Vol. I., p. 29.

The Dudleys, including Lady Jane Grey, who had been in the Tower since her accession, were beheaded within the Tower on February 8, 1554. Among the insurgents the greater number was pardoned, about fifty deserters were hanged, and in Kent only six suffered. There were six who were brought to the

bar and four--the Duke of Suffolk, Sir Thomas Wyatt, Thomas Grey, and William Thomas--were executed. The Spanish ambassador, Renaud, agitated for the death of Elizabeth, but no one could convince Mary that Elizabeth should be put to death. The executions after this rebellion have been the cause of charging Mary with unnecessary cruelty; but they reveal a motive of political justice. An orderly government could not tolerate such risings.

THE MARRIAGE OF THE QUEEN

Now that Mary had successfully quelled the rebellion of Wyatt, and that with the support of her Council, there was little difficulty for her in concluding the Spanish marriage. The new parliament approved the marriage which took place, July 25, 1554.

The articles of marriage had been drawn up by Gardiner. The traditions of England were therein provided for.

> "The administration of the kingdom was to be wholly in the queen, no foreigner should hold any office in the realm, and no change should be made in the English laws, customs, and privileges." 22

---

22 Guggenberger, A. op. cit. Vol. II., p. 210.

REUNION WITH ROME

The next important accomplishment of the Queen was the reunion with Rome. There were a number of steps in this process. Mary had now determined to lose no time in restoring the religion in England to that condition it had at the time of her birth. Her first parliament had offered no

resistance to the restoration of the old form of religion; the second had approved her marriage, but when asked to renew the statutes against heresy and the Six Articles, it failed to pass the legislation; the third parliament was destined to bring England back to union with Rome. But before the third parliament was summoned, Mary instructed "the returning officers to admonish the electors of the Catholic sort. The warning apparently had effect, for this parliament proved more amenable." 23

---

23 Lunt, W. E. op. cit., p. 364.

In the third parliament there were two groups of men who would present serious difficulties--those who were opposed to the Roman Pontiff and those who objected because of personal interest. From the first there was not much to fear as they were an apostate group, not great in number nor deep in conviction, but ready to accept almost any form that suited their convenience. The second group comprised a larger number--in fact, almost all the wealthy class who had profited so greatly by the confiscation of church property in the preceding reigns. Gardiner foresaw the trouble and procured from the Pope a promise that on the return of England to the Church of Rome, the old property of the monasteries, chantries, shrines, and churches would be left in the hands of the present possessors. An official bill was drawn up to that effect

> "empowering the legate to give, alienate, and transfer to the persent possessors all property, moveable or immoveable, which had been torn from the church during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI."24

---

24 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V., p. 449-450.

In the meantime Cardinal Pole returned to England as Papal Legate. The parliament shortly before had passed a bill repealing the attainder against Pole. When he met parliament he urged that body to uphold all measures that would repeal the separation from Rome and he assured them that he would hasten the union of the Church of England with the Church of Rome. The next morning the two houses deliberated and passed the Act of Union, November 29, 1554.

> "The motion for the reunion was carried almost by acclamation. In the Lords every voice was raised in its favour; in the Commons, out of three hundred members, two only demurred, and these desisted from their opposition the next day. It was determined to present a petition in the name of both houses to the king and queen, stating that they look back with sorrow and regret on the defection of the realm from the communion of the Apostolic See: that they were ready to repeal, as far as in them lay, every statute which had either caused or supported that defection; and that they hoped, through the mediation of their majesties, to be absolved from all ecclesiastical censures, and to be received into the bosom of the universal church." 25

---

25 Ibid., p. 452.

The following day Cardinal Pole absolved the nation from all heresy, schism, and from censures, judgments, and

penalties incurred. From the fact that parliament received this absolution on its knees, it is frequently spoken of as the "Kneeling Parliament".

On the whole the people welcomed the return of England to the Church. They acclaimed this by demonstrations of rejoicing. Cardinal Pole favorably guided the Catholic life in England. He urged the clergy not to persecute the Protestants, but be renewed in their own spirits. The convocation of 1555 enacted decrees similar to those of the Council of Trent.

Mary's great purpose in life had been accomplished. Her Tudor will would not let her rest secure until she had submitted to the Church of Rome. Like her father, she had an obstinate determination to get her end, which spurred her on; but unlike him, she consulted her council or advisors, acquired the necessary information, and acted more on the principle of right than of expediency. She was convinced that her principles were correct and that it was her duty to see them carried out.

ATTITUDE TOWARD HERESY

The next step in Mary's program, which she considered her conscientious duty in spite of every protest to the contrary, was to root out heresy from the country, and to bring back the old laws against heresy--not only as they were at the time of the death of her father, but also as they were at the time of the Lollards in the fifteenth century. There was really nothing new about all this

procedure, nor about the penalties. It was simply a reversion to the days when there was a definite line drawn between heresy and orthodoxy. But conditions had in the meantime changed considerably. Heresy had been the state religion for six years, the Church of England had been independent of the Pope for thirty years, and now Mary was to resort to forceful means to cause a return to the conditions before Henry's schism. Mary had always been a devout Catholic and perhaps did not realize the immense change that had taken place in the minds of the people. Her leniency in the beginning of her reign brought her wide support, but now she was determined to stamp out heresy according to the severer methods of medieval ages. That she was wise in her methods is questionable. It is certain that she did not succeed in stamping out heresy by these methods, nor did she bring upon herself a great amount of happiness.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PERSECUTION

Where does the responsibility of this persecution for heresy lie? It is hardly possible that the Spaniards incited persecution. They knew that to incite the persecution would by no means pacify the people of the country. And they were bent on pacification. The lay nobility surely did not urge the suppression of heresy, as generally they were ready to accept whatever form of religion was used in the country. No political motive for this persecution can be discovered. There was no one section of the country that desired the burnings of heretics. Most certainly the outstanding reason

that makes these burnings intelligible is the Queen herself who felt a moral duty to stamp out heresy. Her conscience urged her to act.

The method applied in stamping out heresy by burning was not new. It had been used in both of the preceding reigns. There can hardly be any doubt but that Mary and her advisers were the chief instigators in adopting this form of punishment. Innes thinks that Pole, whose personal influence over Mary was very great from the time that he came to England, must share more than Gardiner with Mary in the ultimate responsibility. 26

---

26 Innes, Arthur D. op. cit., p. 230.

We cannot neglect the fact that Mary's parliament shares some of the responsibility. But what was the character of Mary's parliament? The members of that body did not, according to our modern view of representation, really represent the nation. Many of them were chosen by undue pressure under the direction of Mary's agents, who were instructed to fill the House with men who were of the same opinions as the Queen. As a result, the parliament was pliable and naturally willing to endorse the desires of the sovereign and the men in power. The members hardly foresaw the extent to which this legislation would be carried, nor realized completely the gravity of its application.

RESISTANCE TO THE LAWS AGAINST HERESY

As soon as the laws against heresy were revived, the reformed preachers naturally were alarmed. They organized their confession of faith and presented a petition to the king and queen, and to the Lords and Commons of Parliament. One of the preachers, Ross, was very zealous in the cause of Protestantism. He collected a congregation at which he administered communion and prayed that God would convert the queen or call her out of the world. This was reported, Ross and his followers were imprisoned, and it was made a treason to pray for, or to have prayed for the death of the queen since the opening of the session of parliament. It was, however, provided that those who would acknowledge their sorrow for having prayed for the death of the queen and would promise amendment, would be set at liberty.

EXECUTIONS FOR HERESY

With the beginning of the year 1555 the persecution began in earnest. Gardiner presided at the hearings. Six prisoners were brought before him. One pretended to recant and another asked for time. The other four, Hooper, Rogers, Saunders, and Taylor said that they could not in conscience conform. They were given twenty-four hours more to consider and then upon refusal they were excommunicated. Rogers was the first victim--he who in the previous reign had pleaded for the burning of Jean Bocher. He was burned at Smithfield; Saunders was burned at the stake at Coventry. John Foxe lauds his constancy and compares him to St. Laurence.

> "And thus have ye the full history of Laurence Saunders, whom I may well compare to St. Lawrence, or any other of the old martyrs of Christ's church; both for the fervent zeal of the truth and gospel of Christ, and the most for the cruel torments that he, in his patient body, did sustain in the flame of fire. For so cruel his enemies handled him, that they burned him with green wood, and the smothering, rather than burning fuel, which put him too much pain, but the grace and most plentiful consolation of Christ, who never forsaketh his servants, and gave strength to St. Lawrence, gave also patience to this Laurence, above all that his torments could work against, which well appeared by his quiet standing, and sweet sleeping in the fire, as above declared." 27

---

27 Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. Vol. VI., p. 628.

Bishop Hooper was carried to Gloucester--one of his two Sees that he had stripped of wealth in order to enrich the Crown. Taylor was burned at Hadley. All displayed an equal constancy. They scorned to purchase life by feigning to ascribe to doctrines in which they did not believe. They were the proto-martyrs of the reformed church.

Latimer and Ridley, two of the leaders in the insurrection of Wyatt, were priests. They had been ordered to confer on controverted topics, refused to renounce their opinions, were degraded from the priesthood, and handed over to the secular power. They were condemned to be burned and suffered with great constancy.

Cranmer would naturally have accompanied Latimer and Ridley to the stake, but as he had been consecrated a bishop

it was thought proper to get the permission from the Pope to perform the act. This authorization came in 1556 and Cranmer was accordingly burned at the stake. He had recanted six times in the hope of being pardoned and not from conviction. When he saw that his recanting would not help him, he recanted his recantation. He placed his right hand in the flames and held it there steadily saying that as it had offended it should be the first to be burnt.

PROCEDURE IN PUNISHING FOR HERESY

In the treatment of these heretics and as well as those who followed them we find that the method was first to reform them by admonishing them, then, if obstinate to send them to the ordinary to instruct them and give them the right doctrines, and only then to proceed according to the law. There was some difficulty with the prelates, especially Bonner, in carrying out these instructions. They were averse to following such orders and at times refused to receive such prisoners that were sent to them.

> "This reluctance of the prelates was remarked by the lord treasurer, the marquess of Winchester, who complained to the council, and procured a reprimand to be sent to Bonner, stating that the king and queen marvelled at his want of zeal and diligence, and requiring him to proceed according to law, for the advancement of God's glory, and the better preservation of the peace of the realm. The prelates no longer hesitated; and of the prisoners sent before them by the magistrates, many recanted, but many also refused to listen to their exhortations, and defied their authority. Conviction followed conviction; and the fate of one victim served only to encourage others to imitate his constancy. To describe

> the sufferings of each individual would fatigue the patience, and torture the feelings of the reader." 28

---

28 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. V., p. 470-471.

We must note too that in these executions there were very few of the higher class of people and many from the lower group. The authorities had hoped that by subjecting a few to the flames, there would be many who would be converted to the true Church and recant their errors. The persecution, however, had the opposite effect. Those who suffered so bravely gave new courage to their fellows and many more were willing to die.

Shortly after Cranmer's death Pole became archbishop of Canterbury. Under him the persecution continued. In all it lasted four years and in that time there were 277 put to death for heresy. Most of these were from the eastern and southeastern parts of England where Protestantism was most widely spread. The number of victims in these parts also had the effect of increasing the numbers of protestants rather than of diminishing them. Sex nor age had any influence on the judges, but we find that as a whole the laymen of station most generally conformed. It was found too that there could be more fear instilled by putting to death larger numbers at one time.

The persecution continued up to the death of Mary, but always with the consent of the council. Sometimes milder councils prevailed and all the prisoners were discharged on

taking an oath to be true to God and to the Queen. Generally, however, intolerance held sway.

As regards the method of execution, we find that the reformed writers stress the fact of "burnings" as if that were so very much more terrible than hanging, followed by cutting the rope while the victim was conscious, opening the body, and drawing out the heart and entrails while the victim was still conscious. In the burnings many efforts were made to hasten the death. Very frequently the flames were started, and gunpowder was exploded in order to lessen the sufferings by hastening the death.

MOTIVES OF MARY

Through it all we find that Mary was determined and earnest, always intent on following the dictates of her conscience. She must have realized that she was winning unpopularity, but still she persisted in her policy, which was no longer sanctioned by popular opinion. True, Cranmer and Ridley had acted in a similar manner and had instilled similar principles in the mind of the young King Edward, when they were making England Protestant. Lingard quotes their advice to Edward:

> "That, as Moses ordered blasphemers to be put to death, so it was the duty of a Christian prince, and more so of one who bore the title of Defender of the Faith, to eradicate the cockle from the field of God's church, to cut out the gangrene that it might not spread to the sounder parts." 29

---

29 Ibid., p. 487.

The motive given was different. Under Edward it was treason to the Supreme Head of the English Church. Under Mary her methods were criticised as stopping freedom of conscience. This is a subterfuge, but it added to Mary's growing opposition. All in all, we can see that Mary's aim --and for her it was a conscientious duty--was to strengthen the Catholic cause by punishing for heresy and that in an age when the medieval spirit was departing and when it would have been wiser to use the means less intolerant. But for Mary we see that her intense conviction was that she could not be too severe in inflicting the punishment so that souls might be saved.

UNPOPULARITY OF HER METHODS

Her methods could not reach the tens of thousands who had already imbibed the doctrines of the reformed religion. A few hundred victims were merely a handful, and produced the effect of bringing more to the heretical doctrines. Had Mary made treason the issue rather than heresy she would perhaps not have been so reviled. Persecution for religious opinions hereafter would have to be a political issue rather than a religious one. Arthur D. Innes gives a rather unbiased opinion of the situation which made Mary's persecution unpopular in the following quotation.

> "Religious opinions as such might be penalized by fines, imprisonment, the boot or the thumbscrew, the imposition of disabilities; still the ultimate penalty had to be associated at least with the idea of treason. In Mary's time, heresy as such was the plain issue. The status of all but some half dozen of the early

> clerical victims precludes any other view; and the first movement against the heretics in January 1555 was contemporaneous with an amnesty for the surviving prisoners of the Wyatt rebellion. The immediate practical effect was that every martyrdom brought fresh adherents to protestantism, and intensified protestant sentiment while extending the conviction that persecution was part and parcel of the Roman creed. That any of those responsible, from Mary down, took an unholy joy in the sufferings of the victims, appears to be a libel wholly without foundation; for the most part they honestly believed themselves to be applying the only remedy left for the removal of a mortal disease from the body politic; Bonner, perhaps the best abused of the whole group, constantly went out of his way to give the accused opportunities of recanting and receiving pardon. The fundamental fact which must not be forgotten in judging the authors of the persecution is, that the general horror of death as the penalty for a false opinion was not antecedent to but consequent upon it. What they did was on an unprecedented scale in England because heresy existed on an unprecedented scale; and the result was that the general conscience was awakened to the falseness of the principle." 30

---

30 Innes, Arthur D. op. cit., p. 231-232.

MARY'S CONSTRUCTIVE ACTIVITY

With all the efforts to uproot heresy, Mary did not neglect constructive work during her short reign. She brought back into England the true Catholic life, for which many of the older people had longed since the days of Henry VIII. It is true, the younger generation did not know much of the active Catholic spirit of the early days of Henry VIII; yet there was a large percentage who still clung to the

ancient doctrine and practice. This was their rightful heritage. Mary's will dominated in bringing back much that had been lost, and had she lived twenty years longer there is no question but that Catholicism would have triumphed. Mary did not understand her people and their national feelings. She reverted to the past in her methods. She was medieval while the world had passed into the modern era. But we know that Mary was sincere in what she did.

> "For Mary did what she could to build up again the religious life in England, not only by inviting the return of monks, friars, and nuns, but also by re-endowing the restored communities with crown lands, annexed from the Church. The example did not commend itself to landlords not always in possession of a good title to their property. The new landlords were willing enough for the most part to support the old religion, since the queen, her council, and parliament so ordered it; they had no objection to monasteries, priories, and convents--provided present owners were not to be disturbed. But there was always danger of such disturbance when a Catholic sovereign desired ecclesiastical property to be restored to the Church.
>
> "Mary Tudor did what she could to bring back religion to England; it was the purpose that ruled her life. The abbey at Westminster once more had its Benedictine monks; at the old priory of St. Bartholomew, in Smithfield, the Dominican friars were granted a temporary home. Bridgittine nuns returned to their former convent at Syon House, Isleworth; Carthusian monks to their charterhouse at Richmond--the house of Jesus of Bethlehem at Sheen." 31

---

31 Clayton, Joseph. The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 125.

From this enumeration we see the power behind her dominant will. We often fail to appreciate the fact that Mary in the short period of five years accomplished as much as she did with all the opposition that she encountered. It was the will of Mary persistently spreading the fear of penalty that kept many a one from lapsing into Protestantism. A Spanish State Paper, dated November 21, 1558, London, points to this in referring to Mary's death:

> The Count De Feria to King Philip: "Indeed the nation soon sees what a good Christian she was, for since it was known that she was dying they have begun to treat the images and religious persons disrespectfully." 32

---

32 Mumby, Frank A. Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth, p. 248.

HER FAILURES

After a reign of five years Mary died, November 14, 1558 bearing with her the odium of the Spanish marriage which saddened her because of the absence and neglect of Philip. Moreover she was broken by the political reverses in her relations with France which caused the loss of Calais; grieved at Pope Paul's withdrawal of the legatine powers for Cardinal Pole; and unstrung by the failure of the religious persecution. Her convictions were strong, her methods terrible; but her life had been saddened from her very early years, and pity is evoked for her even by such a highly prejudiced author as Guizot. Speaking of Mary and of Cardinal Pole who died within a few days of the Queen, Guizot says:

"The two pillars of the Catholic Church in England fell at the same time. Pole had hoped to insure triumph of his cause by gentleness and justice; Mary had supported it by steel and fire. Both were equally sincere and conscientious. Mary was of a religious mind, her character, naturally stern and determined, had been embittered by injustice and suffering; but she was upright and honest, avoiding the subterfuges and deceits which Queen Elizabeth too often practiced.....

"The memory of these good qualities and misfortunes placed in the presence of a supreme fault: a terrible stain remains imprinted upon the brow of the unfortunate queen by her fanaticism and her conscientious cruelty. She persecuted piously; she burnt sincerely; her acts, more than her character, merit the odious name which history has given her. On examining her life closely, one is tempted to pity 'Bloody Mary'." 33

---

33 Craig, Asa H. Christian Persecutions, p. 279.

STRENGTH OF HER CONVICTIONS

Holinshed in his Chronicles sees in all the reverses of Mary's reign a manifestation of God's wrath. Recent research has generally placed a more correct and at the same time a more charitable interpretation on the events of her reign. She was thoroughly convinced on the question of her religion. She was honestly sincere in its practice and it was her determination to have every person in her kingdom practice that religion. Her will dominated her acts, but it was a will guided by right and conscience as she saw it. There was not the duplicity that we find in Elizabeth's character. But the times were out of joint. She reverted to medieval methods of stamping out heresy. These methods were taken amiss by her

subjects, and ever since they have been marked with the odium of cruelty. However, we do find people who appreciated her sincerity and her attachment to her faith, although they were not in sympathy with that faith. The following quotation illustrates this point.

> "'If we count her Religion a deformity,' wrote the Protestant Sir Richard Baker looking back from the next century, 'yet her constancy and devotion in it we must needs count a beauty.'" 34

---

34 Tenison, E. M. op. cit. Vol. I., p. 128.

CHAPTER VI

ELIZABETH'S SETTLEMENT OF RELIGION

HER PRECARIOUS POSITION

Queen Mary had hardly expired and Elizabeth was proclaimed her successor. Elizabeth's position, however, was precarious at the time. Her advisers and council claimed there was no question about the legality of the situation. By the statute of the 35 Henry VIII, c 1.

> "Parliament had granted the disposal of the Crown to the King, who in pursuance of this Act arranged for the succession of Mary and Elizabeth to the throne, failing lawful heirs either to himself or his son Edward." 1

---

1 Birt, Henry Norbert. The Elizabethan Religious Settlement, p. 2.

There was an earlier statute (28 Henry VIII) that had not been repealed.

> "Technically Elizabeth's position was somewhat dubious. By the succession statute (35 Henry VIII) she was the lawful inheritor of the crown after Mary; but an earlier statute (28 Henry VIII) had declared her 'preclosed, excluded, and barred to the claim', and this statute was still unrepealed." 2

---

2 Black, J. B. The Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1603, p. 15.

Lingard says that

> "Though the statute of Henry VIII, by which Elizabeth had been pronounced illegitimate was still in force, she was made in her proclamation to the people to style herself 'the only right heyre in bludde,' and in her letters to foreign princes to attribute her succession to her right of inheritance, and the consent of the nation." 3

3 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England. Vol. VI, p. 4.

It had been a medieval principle that no illegitimate person should occupy a throne. Mary Tudor had met this difficulty by having parliament pass an act declaring herself legitimate. With Elizabeth it remained a moot question, but it was decided to waive the earlier statute (28 Henry VIII) and act according to the later one (35 Henry VIII). Her will to rule England was evident from the start. In writing to Philip II, her brother-in-law from Hatfield she informed him that

> "'by the singular mercy of God, and by the consent and approval of all ranks, and to the entire joy of her subjects, that the kingdom and dominion of England had devolved on her, as being the undoubted and most legitimate sole heiress by highest right of her most dear father of happy memory, Henry VIII.' Moreover, writing to the English Commissioners treating with the French for peace at Cateau Cambresis, to announce her accession and to renew their powers, Elizabeth used the expression: 'whereby, as thereof ye be not ignorant, the Crown of this Realm is by natural blood and lawful succession descended unto us as to the only right heir thereof.'" 4

4 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 3.

The question of legitimacy was ignored in the political settlement; still it continued to trouble Elizabeth from other sources for a long time. It was this point that really seems to have settled Elizabeth in her decision regarding the change

in her religion. She wanted to be queen, she was determined to hold her throne, but it would be hard for her to keep her throne and remain a Catholic. If she retained the authority of Rome over the Church of England, she would have to acknowledge the decision of the Pope regarding the marriage of her mother, Anne Boleyn, with her father, Henry VIII, and she would ever have to bear the sting of illegitimacy. This she could not do as she had her mind set on ruling England, and Catholic tradition barred from the throne any child born to a king out of lawful wedlock. To Elizabeth, then, her religious changes meant much more than freedom from submission to the Pope of Rome.

However, this sort of reasoning could not stand the light of public opinion. The new Queen had practiced Catholicism during the reign of Mary without a murmur. If now she assigned a reason for her new trend in religion based upon grounds other than those of conscience, it would make her attitude appear hypocritical. Hence, as is evinced from contemporaneous writing, she chose to find a religious motive for the change.

> "At these happy beginnings, her first and chiefest care was re-establish the Protestant Religion: the which as much by the instruction and knowledge that shee had received thereof from her infancy, as also by her own particular judgement, she firmly held and maintained to be very true, and most conformable to the holy Scripture, and to the sincerity of the primitive church, and so effectually resolving in her heart to settle and re-establish the same, that she imployed to that purpose some of her Councellors, being the most intimate." 5

5 Camden, William. Annales, p. 4.

HER ADVISERS

Elizabeth was very discriminating in chosing her advisers. Her choice was from the most experienced statesmen in the realm, with emphasis on those who had opposed Catholicity. William Cecil, who had been secretary to Edward VI, was chosen the chief adviser. Elizabeth chose for her council some of the most distinguished of Mary's advisers and eight others who had especially helped her and who were indebted to her secretary, William Cecil. The council, therefore, was greatly divided in opinion. The old members adhered to the old religion, and the new members were all Protestants. Naturally there would be difficulties, but there was an inner circle dominated by William Cecil that would direct all affairs, political and religious.

ELIZABETH'S LACK OF RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS

Elizabeth's position in regard to establishing a definite form of religion was insecure.

> "Her dislike for Catholicism may have been due to the circumstances of her birth, which the Church could never regard as legitimate, although the injurious effects of the stigma could have been canonically removed in order to secure her succession to the throne. It is certainly arguable that she was actuated by the Tudor political theory which rejected all idea of an independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the absolutist and omnipotent State. A not improbable motive was the deplorable financial condition of the kingdom." 6

6 Rogers, J. F. "The Elizabethan 'Device for the Alteration of Religion'". Camm, Bede. The English Martyrs, p. 157.

As regards Elizabeth's actual religious convictions she might have remained a Catholic as well as becoming a Protestant. She really did not favor Calvinism. The fact that she made no formal announcement of her accession to the Pope of Rome shows that she intended to break with the Church. She preferred to ignore the Pope by not informing him of her accession. In her dubious position she wanted to be independent of any authority. She feared that if she submitted to Pope Paul IV she would have been in greater danger of losing her throne because of the very character of the Pope,[7] and also of the machinations of the French representatives at Rome who would favor Mary Stuart's accession to the throne of England.

7 "Fully conscious of his own dignity, he regarded princes not as his sons but as his subjects...He told the ambassadors that the place of kings was at the feet of the pope, from whom they should receive their laws as his pupils.... The utterances of his volcanic nature were as sudden as the eruptions of Vesuvius." Pastor, L. History of the Popes, vol. xiv, ch. iii, p. 69-70.

FORMAL ANNOUNCEMENT WITHHELD FROM THE POPE

Historians, among them Lingard and Canon Tierney, editor of Dodd's History, have placed the blame upon Pope Paul IV for not recognizing the accession of the queen. They

> "state that Carne was ordered to notify the Pontiff of Elizabeth's accession, but that Paul IV, persuaded by the statements of the French ambassador, had replied 'that he was unable to comprehend the hereditary right

> of one who was not born in lawful wedlock; that the Queen of Scots claimed the Crown as the nearest legitimate descendant of Henry VII; but that if Elizabeth were willing to submit the controversy to his arbitration, she should receive from him every indulgence which justice could allow' (Hist. of Eng., vi., p. 347). It appears that later, both Lingard and Tierney acknowledged that they had been misled. (Cf. Rambler, Nov., 1861, pp. 124-9.) 8

8 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 10-11.

Later research has changed this opinion. Sir Carne, the ambassador to Rome, writes to the Queen:

> "....that the French here can obtain nothing at his Holiness' hands against your Majesty; and that his Holiness hath such respect to your Majesty and to your realms, that he will attempt nothing against your realms, unless the occasion be given first thence, as I am credibly informed. One of the Cardinals that is greatest with his Holiness showed me that he and others, that be chief with His Holiness, do mind to move his Holiness to send his Nuncio to your Majesty thither, but that they stay till your Majesty do send hither first to his Holiness; whereof I thought good to advertise your Majesty....." 9

9 Ibid., p. 9.

The Pope showed that it was his intention to acknowledge Elizabeth in due course after having been officially informed of her accession.

> "The Pope showed that he was anxious to smooth over difficulties of a temporal nature, such as the alienation of ecclesiastical property; and, in a document drawn up to embody and attest his

> assurances, expressed himself thus: 'If ever the most serene Queen shall be willing to return to union with the Church and the Obedience of this See, his Holiness promises that he will receive her with fatherly affection and with all the love that she can desire. And as for the above-mentioned difficulties, he will apply to them such remedies as the Queen's Majesty and Parliament and the united will of the entire realm shall judge most fit for the stability of the throne and assurance of peace and quiet of the whole people; and that in every particular he will confirm whatever shall be judged just and pious' (Cath. Record Soc.; Miscellanea, ii, pp. 5-6)." [10]

---

[10] Ibid., p. 11, note.

Elizabeth had discourteously withheld the formal announcement of her coronation from the Pope when on November 18, 1558 she struck the Pope's name from the list of those who were to be officially informed. The withholding of this formality showed the Pope for the first time that she intended to break with the Church.

ELIZABETH'S CAUTION

But it was necessary that the Queen act cautiously. At the time of her accession when the country was financially weak and without an adequate army, it was not advisable to foster a complete break with the Papacy. As Henry VIII, toward the end of his reign, had supported the new doctrine at one time and the old at another in order that neither group should dominate; so Elizabeth at the beginning of her reign tried to secure the support of all religious bodies by being rather lenient to all groups that the Catholic group would

not realize fully the contemplated break with Rome. She needed the allegiance of as many of her subjects as possible before she could be secure in making the change. That she disliked Catholicism is very evident by a number of incidents, and the causes are varied.

Elizabeth's trend away from the Catholic Church in religious matters was soon discerned, but she was clever in not making her attitude appear too strongly anti-Roman. Her attitude toward the Pope and her favoritism to the Protestants were not reassuring to the Catholics, but they were sufficiently moderate not to cause resentment. Elizabeth's first public appearance became the occasion of an anti-Catholic demonstration. The heretical group among the people soon learned that they were welcome in the court circles. The first Sunday of her reign was marked by a sermon at St. Paul's Cross given by William Bill who had been deprived under Queen Mary. The following Sunday Christopherson, Bishop of Chichester, replied to this sermon in a spiritual way and was sent to the Tower because of his zeal.

HER ATTITUDE TOWARD CATHOLIC PRACTICES

At Christmas, 1558, Elizabeth showed her attitude toward the Catholic practices by issuing an order to Bishop Oglethorpe not to elevate the Host at Mass. Oglethorpe was not her obedient servant and replied boldly:

> "That whether he should say Mass at that altar or not was as the Queen pleased, but with the rite and with what ceremonies it should be said, he being a Bishop knew quite well, nor would he make any change." 11

11 Rogers, J. F. op. cit., p. 165-166.

Elizabeth consequently left the chapel after the gospel. On the occasion of her coronation she issued the same order to Oglethorpe, but he again refused; but her obedient court chaplain carried out her wishes.

Thus from the very beginning of her reign we are aware of her attitude and of her intention to bring the Church of England into a schism as it was during the last years of Henry VIII. Her course was mapped out for her from the very start by Cecil. He knew her leanings and her condition, and was bent on carrying out her wishes. Moreover,

> "The intention to effect some alteration, here sounded with no uncertain note, also showed that preparations were in progress to bring proposals before the coming Parliament, summoned for 23rd January, a few days after the ceremony of the Coronation. What the nature of those proposals was transpires from an important document preserved among the Cotton MSS. This is 'A copy of the device for alteration of religion at the 1st year of Queen Elizabeth.' It is significant that the suggestions therein contained practically found their fulfillment in one shape or another before many months had elapsed." 12

12 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 16.

Belloc sums up the chief points of this 'Device' in the following quotation.

> "The three points it contained were (1) the stopping of all preaching except by official order; (2) the turning out from the magistracy of those who

> sympathized with the old religion, especially the senior magistrates, and the putting in their place of younger men picked for Protestant sympathies; and (3) the setting up of a committee which would be kept very secret and which should prepare a new Liturgy for England to take the place of the Mass."13

13 Belloc, Hilaire. A Shorter History of England, p. 306.

HER FIRST PARLIAMENT

Early in the year 1559 the first Parliament was summoned. Just how far it was packed historians are not able to judge. But it is evident that there was discrimination in the selection of members. Investigation has proved that the Protestant vote outnumbered that of the Catholic. This conclusion is arrived at long after the events. At the time of the events it was quite difficult to determine just what was the sentiment of each individual peer. 14

14 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 49 and 52.

One of the first things the Parliament of 1558 did was to

> "undo the work of Mary, to repeal the Statutes of Heresy, to dissolve the refounded monasteries, and to restore the Royal Supremacy.....Further she had no personal wish to go. A third of the Council and two-thirds of the people were as opposed to any radical changes in religion as the Queen." 15

15 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. "Hampshire Recusants" in Old English Bible, p. 327.

These religious innovations were made binding on all her subjects by acts of Parliament. The churchmen from the beginning

to the end opposed the innovations. The peers had a very large number whose sympathies were definitely Catholic, but Elizabeth had a subservient Lower House and with this support the ministers got to work. There were three bills which were introduced and passed by Parliament (1559).

> "The first, the Bill for the Restoration of Tenths and First Fruits (1 Eliz. c. 4), seized the papal revenues derivable from this country by ancient and long-standing custom, which, though recently abrogated by Henry, had been still more recently restored by Mary. These were finally annexed to the Crown of England. The Bill for the Supremacy wholly abolished the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See in this country, and restored to the Crown that ecclesiastical jurisdiction assumed by Henry VIII and Edward VI, but relinquished by Mary. The Bill of Uniformity authorized the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (i. e., that of 1552) with a few slight alterations, enjoining its exclusive use in the administration of the Sacraments, and in the Ordering of Bishops and Ministers, instead of forms found in the ancient Liturgy of the Catholic Church." 16

---

16 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 56.

The shaping of the new religion was almost entirely done by laymen.

> "The only organized body capable of expressing a considered opinion on the religious policy of the government was the clergy; but their co-operation was not invited, and they were given no opportunity of influencing the course of events except.....through parliamentary channels. Convocation, the official organ of the church, was deliberately ignored." 17

---

17 Black, J. B. op. cit., p. 12.

ACTS OF SUPREMACY AND UNIFORMITY

Two very important innovations were the passage of the Acts of Supremacy and of Uniformity. Parliament had means to pass both acts at the same time, but because of the objection to the Act of Uniformity the latter was shelved for two months.

> "The Act of Supremacy repealed 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8., which had revived papal jurisdiction, and the statutes concerning heresy made in that reign. Ten statutes of Henry VIII and one of Edward were revived. It dropped the title 'Supreme Head of the Church,' although it retained the substance and provided for the exercise of a supreme royal authority by means of ecclesiastical commissions practically unlimited by law as to composition, number and duration. The old jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts was, however, retained. The Act of Uniformity imposed an ambiguous Prayer Book, designed to permit men of all faiths to take part in the services. Of laymen no declaration of faith was demanded; outward conformity, signified by attendance upon the service, was all that was asked; and a fine of twelve pence imposed for absence from the new services was intended to secure attendance. Office-holders, both lay and clerical, were required to take an oath acknowledging the Queen's supremacy and renouncing all allegiance and obedience to any foreign power, upon pain of loss of, and disqualification for office. Clerics who took the oath, but refused to use the service and comply with the terms of the act, were subject to increasing penalties culminating in deposition and life imprisonment." 18

---

18 Klein, Arthur Jay. Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth Queen of England, p. 21-22.

From various writers we deduce that there was a considerable wrangle concerning the act of Uniformity. The Marian bishops and clerics were not to submit without a struggle.

The act of Uniformity, however, was eventually passed (April 29, 1559) by force, though without much violence. Two Bishops were imprisoned in the Tower, three others were severely fined and harassed by daily threats of further extremities. These measures sufficed.

> "The Catholic majority was turned (in a thin house) into a minority of three, and the Bill of Protestantizing the country became law in spite of the protests of Convocation and of both the Universities and of the opposition of the majority in the kingdom. With the sessions of Parliament all the activity of the Bishops ceased, and they were all in confinement before the end of the year." 19

---

19 Pollen, J. H. "The Politics of the English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth." The Month, xcix (1902), p. 46.

OBJECTIONS TO THE BILL OF UNIFORMITY

The Bishops had greatly objected to the Bill of Uniformity for they were not consulted on this point--a question of ecclesiastical polity. The bill became a law without a single episcopal vote in its favor. This fact has brought up the opinion that the bill itself is illegal and invalid and consequently making all legislation based upon it as illegal. In a subsequent paper drawn up during James I or Charles I's reign it is said:

> "The aforesaid Act of Eliz. seemeth not of force, having been enacted without any consent of the Lords Spiritual, as appeareth in the context, but only of the Lords Temporal and Commons; and by necessary consequence, all penal laws made with reference to this seem also ipso jure, not to have force of parliamentary laws, supposing that the presence of the Lords Spiritual

be necessarily required to a Parliament, as the lawyers seem to judge."

(Note) State Papers, collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon, pp. 91-92. A recent Writer admits that this aspect must be taken into account. Referring to the deprivation of the bishops in 1559, he says the lawyers questioned the legality of the proceedings against them 'on ground that they were made the victims of laws which concerned the ecclesiastical polity, but which they, the ecclesiastical authorities, just never accepted on behalf of the Church. The lawyers' scruple was perfectly justified--the proceedings were irregular,' he admits, 'the ecclesiastical changes of both the Supremacy Act and the Uniformity Act ought, properly speaking to have received that 'assent of the clergy in their Convocation' which the Supremacy Act itself recognised to be the proper authorisation, reinforced, if need be, by a ratification of Parliament, in questions of ecclesiastical legislation." (Frere, A Hist. of the Engl. Church in the reigns of Eliz. and Js. I, p. 39.) 20

---

20 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 91.

In the house of Commons there were scarcely any laymen who made objection to the laws of Uniformity and Supremacy. Dr. John Storey, late Chancellor to the Bishop of London, in fact, was the only one who objected strongly to the changes to be brought about by the Act of Uniformity which imposed a penalty on those who refused to attend reformed services. For this stand he

"was summoned before the Council, when he defied his accusers to prove that he had said anything at which offence could reasonably be taken, adding, 'Should her Majesty will otherwise, I do not refuse to die for the Church.' The words were prophetic of his end." 21

---

21 Wilmot-Buxton, E. M. A Book of English Martyrs, p. 73.

ELIZABETH'S ARBITRARY METHODS

Elizabeth had throughout all this legislation used these dubious means to attain her end. She had Parliament pass the laws it is true; but how could she reconcile herself with the means she used except that she wanted to maintain her doubtful authority as ruler of the nation. To bring about the religious changes she resorted to such means as a packed parliament and a withholding of any influence by Convocation, the body of churchmen, who by their profession should be the best judges in matters of religion.

Although Parliament was free to act according to its own decisions, the will of Elizabeth was carried out on principle. The members of the lower house were her obedient servants. They adhered to the principles that they knew Cecil and his group advocated. There could be no other outcome, if we consider the fact that the votes of the Peers and Ecclesiastics were practically nil in the passing of this legislation.

INJUNCTIONS AND PROCLAMATIONS

Again we follow her Tudor will in the suppression of much Catholic activity. We see this through the series of Injunctions given by her Majesty in the first year of her reign. They were distinctly repressive against Catholics.

> "They enjoined on all ecclesiastical persons to accept the royal Supremacy and to preach against all usurped and foreign power, also against images, relics, miracles and such like suprestitions; upholders of papal Supremacy were to be denounced; regulations were laid down about Bible reading, proper licensing of preachers, keeping of registers, support of the poor, and of students at the Universities, the upkeep of

> chancels and clergy-houses, the payment of tithes, the parochial duties of incumbents, the substitution of Litanies for processions (except for 'beating the bounds'); the treatment of notorious sinners; the removal of shrines and suchlike 'monuments of feigned miracles, idolatry, and superstition'; the imposition of humiliating rules to be observed by clergy proposing to marry; methods of teaching and catechising, and so forth."22

---

22 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 142.

In this series of Injunctions given by her Majesty the printing of books was strictly forbidden unless they were licensed by Her Majesty or by the Privy Council, or by two officials named by the Council.

> "This was followed by a series of royal proclamation reiterating still more sternly the same prohibition in various forms, and on various occasions, and practically reducing all books of Catholic controversy to the status of traiterous and seditious libels." 23

---

23 Thurston, Herbert. "Catholic Writers and Elizabethan Readers". Father Parson's "Christian Directory," The Month, 82, p. 458.

VISITATION OF THE DIOCESES

During the summer months of 1559 following the passing of the acts of supremacy and uniformity there was a visitation of the clergy carried out. England was divided into six circuits. Commissioners, mostly laymen, were to administer the oaths and to inquire into certain articles especially those concerning the late persecutions. The set of royal injunctions was also brought with them for the guidance of the Church. It has been a very general opinion that these visitors met with little or

no opposition on the part of the clergy in their acceptance of the oaths of Supremacy and Uniformity.

> "This idea is based upon an entire misconception of the facts. Mr. R. Simpson (Life of Edmund Campion, p. 196-7, new ed.) has put these most clearly. Before the end of 1559 all the Bishops had been deprived of their Sees. On May 23, 1559, a royal commission, partly lay, partly clerical, was appointed to tender the oath to the clergy generally. They were directed to proceed with caution, but in October it was found that they had been too zealous, and several laymen were appointed to supercede the clerical members. But even then the inquisition had such serious effects, that in December the Queen had to write to the commissioners to suspend their proceedings. The general result of the proceedings was, that of the multitude of clergymen who refused to subscribe only a few were at once deprived, some had three years given for consideration, and others seem to have been connived at. The province of York was visited in August and September, 1559, with the following result: out of 90 clergymen summoned, 21 came and took the required oath, 36 came and refused to swear, 17 were absent without proctors, 16 were absent with proctors. In the province of Canterbury, the dean and canons of Winchester Cathedral, the warden and fellows of the College, and the master of St. Cross, all refused the oath. The visitors for the whole province returned 49 recusants and 786 conformists, significantly omitting the absentees. Out of 8,911 parishes and 9,400 beneficed clergymen, only 806 took the oath, whilst all the bishops and 85 others expressly refused to subscribe, and the rest absented themselves. The assertion of Camden that only 189 clergymen were deprived in this visitation proves nothing, even if it were true. At the end of State Papers, Domestic Elizabeth vol. x., is an abstract of the number of rectors, vicars and curates who refused to attend when summoned in the four dioceses of York, Chester, Durham, and Carlisle. The total is 314. There is no abstract of the number who attended but refused to take the oath, but the book proves that in this

province 370 clergymen refused to swear, or would have refused had they been pressed. Probably the real number, had we the means of knowing, would be found to be double that figure." 24

---

24 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. "Hampshire Recusants in the time of Elizabeth". In the Old English Bible, p. 327-328.

The religious changes were not universally spread to all parts of England. Many of the priests in obscure parishes and many more of the parishioners did not know what was going on. They were not well versed with every phase of the controversy and consequently could not judge on the spur of the moment what to do concerning the oath of Uniformity. Some did not have an adequate perception of the matter simply by having it presented to them by the visitors, and consequently conformed at least outwardly, and quietly hoped for a return to Catholicism in the near future. We do not see how they could reconcile their conscience to this act, nor is it for us to judge in this case.

ATTITUDE OF CATHOLICS TOWARD THE INNOVATIONS

The Act of Uniformity was to go into effect June 24, 1559, but some three or four months later we find that a number of churches still did not have the books for the English form of worship. In some places where the curate was willing to conform, the people despised the new service and even disturbed the priest during the service. In other places the curates were remiss in introducing the Common Service by not interpolating the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments in English into the Latin Mass. In other places they were

averse to giving up the shrines and images. Individual laymen would at times carry to their homes or elsewhere for safe-keeping the statues of our Lady or of the saints. In other cases the images remained in the vestry without being destroyed, and still in others the crucifixes were retained.

John Strype gives some interesting details of the visitation of the dioceses, and also how the religious innovations resulting from the act of Uniformity, especially concerning the book of Common Prayer and the new ceremonies for the administration of the sacraments, were received by the Catholics.

> "Aug. 13, Skory, new bishop of Hereford, preached at St. Paul's while the visitation of that church was in hand. Two days after, the rood there, with the altar, was pulled down."
>
> "But the papists priests, that is, the majority of them, utterly refused. Whose peevish obstinacy, he writes, was patiently suffered seven months, in conferences and open disputations." 25

---

25 Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation. Vol. I, Part I, p. 199 and 201.

> "(The Papists regret the Common Prayer.) Yet it passed not without some struggling and opposition made against it by the old Papalins. How illy they digested it may be seen by this passage: while in the days of Queen Mary, George Marsh of the north (afterwards martyred for the Gospel) was in examination before the earl of Darby and divers others, and having said, that, as he had ministered under King Edward, so, if the laws would have suffered him to minister after that sort. (that is, by the Book of Common Prayer,) he would minister again; presently one who was the Parson of Grampnal in Lancashire threw in this word; 'This last Communion was the most devilish thing that ever was devised.'

"To the establishment of this book but four Lords protested.....

"This act, being the greatest stroke struck against Popery, and for throwing out the mass, may deserve some particular observation. It was called, An Act for the Uniformity of service and administration of the sacraments throughout the realm."

"But the Papists were very angry to see their old superstitious ceremonies thus laid aside; and those that came after laboured all they could to asperse and enervate it, by calling the religion a parliamentary religion, (so Dr. Hill), and the Church of England, thus reformed, a Parliament Church, (so Dr. Boistom.)"26

---

26 Strype, John. Ecclesiastical Memorials. Vol. II, Part I, p. 132, 133, 136.

The general impression in regard to the clergy is that of dissatisfaction with the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. If they did conform, it does not imply that they did so with conviction. It seems to us, however, as time serving; yet on the whole it was but a natural consequence of the "constant kaleidoscopic changes through which the clergy had been passing for the last quarter of a century." 27 We can make no other de-

---

27 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 167.

---

duction but that the Elizabethan clergy acquiesced not from conviction but from fear of molestation on their person, their property, their wealth.

THE OLD BISHOPS AND THE NEW

In the latter part of 1559 the question of consecrating of new bishops arose. Practically all the Marian bishops had

been deprived of their Sees because "they refused to have anything to do with the supremacy oath or the book of Common Prayer."[28] These bishops were to be replaced by those of the

[28] Black, J. B. op. cit., p. 16

Queen's own choice. The deprived bishops were disposed of in various ways. Although it was illegal to confine to prison for the refusal of the oath of supremacy, some of the Bishops were imprisoned; three escaped to the continent; a number died within a short time; and the rest were quartered on some of Elizabeth's new bishops, deprived for the rest of their lives of the consolations of religion, at the same time witnessing the transformation of their own churches into centers of heretical worship.

Elizabeth's new bishops had to pronounce the oath of allegiance and homage to the Queen because it was her wish.

> "'God hath made me overruler of the Church,' Elizabeth told her Parliament on one occasion; 'If you, my lords of the clergy, do not amend certain faults and negligences, I mean to depose you.'" [29]

[29] Allies, Mary H. The Church in England, p. 165. Quoted from Prothero, Statutes and Constitutional Documents, p. 221.

The "lords of the clergy" humbly submitted to the oath of allegiance. It ran:

> "I acknowledge and confess to have and to hold the said bishopric and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only of your majesty and crown royal of this your realm." [30]

[30] Ibid.

The new bishops formed a striking contrast to the deprived Catholic hierarchy. Their rights were all transferred to the Queen, resting on uncertain Erastianism; whereas the rights of the old bishops rested securely on the authority of the Pope of Rome.

CLAIM OF CONTINUITY

It was the claim of the English people that their faith rested on Scripture. They went to the first centuries of Christianity for their source of ritual and claimed the principle of continuity through to their time. To them the Catholic church was a branch lopped off from the trunk, the Anglican church. We, however, know that just the reverse is true. England is a limb of the body of Christendom, and cutting her off from this body will cut her off from her past. Even Froude, not friendly to Catholicism, recognizes the instability of the Elizabethan hierarchy in contrast with the soundness of the Catholic system.

> "'A Catholic bishop holds his office by a tenure untouched by the accidents of time. Dynasties may change--nations may lose their liberties--the firm fabric of society may be swept away in the torrent of revolution--the Catholic prelate remains at his post; when he dies, another takes his place; and when the waters sink again into their beds, the quiet figure is seen standing where it stood before--the person perhaps changed, the thing itself rooted like a rock on the adamantine basements of the world. The Anglican hierarchy, far unlike its rival, was a child of convulsion and compromise: it drew its life from Elizabeth's throne and, had Elizabeth fallen, it would have crumbled into sand. The Church of England was as a limb lopped off from the Catholic trunk; it was cut away from the stream by which its vascular

> system had been fed; and the life of it, as an independent and corporate existence, was gone forever. But it had been taken up and grafted upon the State. If not what it had been, it could retain the form of what it had been--the form which made it dangerous. The image in its outward aspect could be made to correspond with the parent tree.'" 31

---

31 Hollis, Christopher. The Monstrous Regiment, p. 117-118.

The point here is that Elizabeth wanted the support of all her people, and it would be impossible to separate them from the past so abruptly. She kept the external form in much of the service and sternly insisted that episcopacy be retained in England. There was a real struggle under Elizabeth, not however with the Catholics on this score, but mainly with the Puritans.[32] Elizabeth's personal will was decidedly felt in

---

32 This phase of the struggle with the Puritans will be discussed more at length in Chapter VII.

---

the decisions concerning the hierarchy.

RETURN OF EXILED BISHOPS

Immediately upon Elizabeth's accession the Protestant bishops who had gone into exile at the beginning of Mary's reign, returned. They had imbibed much of the spirit and doctrine of the Protestant Reformation on the continent. The returned exiles hoped for preferences in clerical appointments, and they were disappointed when they did not receive them immediately. But Elizabeth knew that while the bishoprics were vacant, the revenues would go to the Crown. Gradually, however, the places were mapped out for the new bishops.

Much of this information concerning the bishops comes from the letters of Jewel to Peter Martyr on the Continent, in 1559.

> "'Some of our friends are marked out for bishops; Parker for Canterbury; Cox for Norwich; Barlow for Chichester; Scory for Hereford; and Grindal for London; for Bonner is ordered to vacate his See.' Writing later, on 1st August, Jewel told Martyr that 'some of us are appointed to bishoprics: Cox to Ely; Scory to Hereford; Allen to Rochester; Grindal to London; Barlow to Chichester; and I, the least of the apostles, to Salisbury.' This letter is a curious comment on the source of jurisdiction. At the date of writing, Jewel was not yet elected, the conge d'elire being issued only on 27th July; yet, on the strength of that instrument, he spoke of himself, correctly, as already appointed." 33

---

33 Birt, Henry Norbert. op. cit., p. 231.

MATTHEW PARKER

Elizabeth was careful about the choice of her bishops, but more especially about the choice of the primate of the See of Canterbury. She knew that

> "On him would fall the duty and responsibility of shaping the destinies of the new settlement of religion, so that on the one hand anything distinctively Roman should be avoided and abolished, while the aim was to secure as wide a comprehensiveness as possible, avoiding, as far as might be, so violent a break with the past as wholly to alienate the sympathy and adhesion of that section of the nation which seemed disposed to hold fast to the Pope at all costs. A man was wanted who should be at the same time revolutionary and conciliatory; learned, and yet not a schoolman; one to whom all could look as a man above reproach." 34

---

34 Ibid., p. 231-232.

The choice fell on Matthew Parker as the best suited for the position. Elizabeth would have Parker as primate although he himself protested, as we see from the following quotation.

> "Elizabeth and Cecil had long marked out Parker for the onerous and responsible task of piloting the half-manned ship into port, but it was with considerable reluctance that he would consent to undertake the office. He was over fifty years old, he said; he suffered periodically from the quartan ague; his voice was somewhat decayed; he was lame of a fall from horseback. Above all, being a man of backward and retiring disposition, he pleaded that he could never hope to influence the world by his personality, though he might hope to do so by his pen. He therefore asked to be allowed to remain in obscurity. But Elizabeth and Cecil were imperative, and Parker, betraying all the shrinking diffidence of the scholar, was dragged into the theatre of public life. Perhaps the government knew their man better than he knew himself; the archbishop was indeed a remarkable man." 35

---

35 Black, J. B. op. cit., p. 25.

He was pliable, however, and best able to do the will of Elizabeth. In one point, however, Parker did not agree with Elizabeth and that was the question of celibacy. Parker took to himself a wife, and Elizabeth never favored a married clergy.

CONSECRATION OF THE ARCHBISHOP

The question came up as to how Parker should be consecrated. Both the Catholic ordinal and the Edwardine ordinal had been abolished by different parliaments. It was finally decided by six theologians and canonists that the queen in the plenitude of her power possessed the right, as the head of the Church, to decide what form of ceremonies should be used for the

consecration. This decision is given in the following quotation.

> "By Act 25 of Henry VIII. four bishops were required for his consecration. This condition did not in the least imply that four consecrated. One consecrates, nor can his deficiencies be supplied by any of the assisting prelates, supposing that they are duly qualified.....With the single exception of Kitchin of Llandaff the Catholic hierarchy was suspended, nor would even Kitchin have consented to consecrate Parker. Besides the lack of consecrator, there was no Ordinal. That of Edward VI. had been abolished by Mary's Parliament, and the Catholic Ordinal by Elizabeth's. The case was solved by six theologians and canonists, who declared that the Queen 'through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority' could supply every defect." 36

---

36 Allies, Mary H. History of the Church in England, p. 143-144.

Several deprived bishops were asked to perform the ceremony of consecration according to the ordinal used at the close of Edward VI's reign, and at last one was found who did what Elizabeth demanded. This one was Bishop Barlow of Bath and Wells. The form, according to the Ordinal of Edward VI, was not adopted by parliamentary legislation until 8 Elizabeth, 1, III.

> "'...that such order and form for the consecrating of archbishops and bishops, and for the making of priests, deacons and ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward the Sixth, and added to the said book of common prayer, and authorized by parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand and be used and observed in all places within this realm, and other the Queen's majesty's dominions and countries:'" 37

37 Child, Gilbert W. Church and State under the Tudors. Appendix, p. 399.

QUESTION OF VALIDITY OF ANGLICAN ORDERS

The difficulties concerning the consecration of the bishops were insurmountable according to Catholic teaching, and up to 1896 the question of validity of Anglican Orders, and therefore the Apostolic Succession, was still questioned --not however, supposing that popes had not declared definitely concerning the invalidity of the Anglican Orders before this time. The question, "Was Barlow a Bishop?" evoked considerable controversy. There is no longer any doubt, for Pope Leo XIII has placed the final verdict of the Holy See in his Bull Apostolicae Curae.

> "Parker, on whose Orders those of all Anglican bishops depend, was shown to have never been validly consecrated and, therefore, could neither make Bishops or priests for the Elizabethan Church." 38

38 Letter Apostolic of His Holiness Leo XIII concerning the Anglican Orders. Introduction by Joseph Keating, p. 5.

This is infallible for it expresses a dogma concerning the entire Catholic world. Joseph Keating, S. J. explains how the decisions in this Bull are infallible.

> "The Pope assures Cardinal Richard that his intention was to issue on the question of Anglican ordinations 'a final judgement and complete solution' ('causam....absolute judicare et penitus dirimere') wherefore all Catholics must accept his decree with entire submission 'as one forever determined, fixed and irrevocable' ('tamquam

perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem'). Thus the decision in the Bull is a pronouncement on a 'dogmatic fact,' and, as the Jansenistic controversy proved, the Holy See claims the right to decide infallibly on dogmatic facts, as well as on the dogmas with which they are essentially connected." 39

---

39 Ibid., p. 7.

The following is a quotation from the Bull itself leading to the final statement of invalidity of Anglican Orders.

"Nevertheless We deemed it well to postpone a decision in order to afford time, both to consider whether it would be fitting or expedient that We should make a fresh authoritative declaration upon the matter, and to humbly pray for a fuller measure of Divine guidance. Then, considering that this matter of practice, although already decided, had been by certain persons, for whatever reason, recalled into discussion, and that thence it might follow that a pernicious error would be fostered in the minds of many who might suppose that they possessed the Sacrament and effects of Orders, where these are nowise to be found, it has seemed good to Us in the Lord to pronounce Our judgment.

"Wherefore, strictly adhering in this matter to the decrees of the Pontiffs, Our predecessors, and confirming them most fully, and, as it were, renewing them by Our authority, of our own motion and certain knowledge We pronounce and declare that Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void." 40

---

40 Ibid., Test, p. 23-24.

It is not our main purpose to enter into any controversial matter concerning the validity or invalidity of Anglican Orders, which is no longer open to dispute for Catholics, but to illus-

trate the influence Elizabeth exerted on the Anglican religion. The progress of the religious change was quite rapid after the new bishops were consecrated. As we have seen, many of the clergy conformed. The country was soon purged of the non-juring priests. Some were deprived for refusal to take the oath of Supremacy, others resigned on conscientious scruples, and some went to the continent. After a short time there was a great lack of the clergy, and the places had to be filled by some means or other. To tide over the period while these ministers could be prepared, laymen became instructors and read the services for the congregation.

PARKER'S "ADVERTISEMENTS"

One of the first things that Matthew Parker accomplished was the drawing up of a set of injunctions in accordance with Elizabeth's theories. This was done in 1564 in relation with the controversy concerning vestments. Later in 1566 they were known as The Advertisements. They were sent to the Queen for her signature in 1565 and again in 1566. She refused to sign them, and Parker then issued them without royal authority. But why did Elizabeth refuse to sign the Advertisements? Frere says:

> "When they were presented to the queen she approved and amended them, but she refused to them the royal assent which was necessary to give them statutory force; they were, however, acted upon in church government by right of their ecclesiastical authorization, and became an effective part of the ecclesiastical system independently of the civil sanction. This was probably the result which the queen intended, for she was continually urging the bishops to stand upon their own legs, when they were timidly inclined to lean

> upon the support either of parliament or of the Crown.....The recovery of episcopal authority from the laxity and corruption into which it had lapsed in the days when bishoprics were the reward of successful diplomacy or skilful statesmanship was not to be accomplished with ease, especially in the face of a growing presbyterian opposition." 41

---

41 Frere, W. H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., p. 166.

The "Advertisements" provided for an episcopacy which Elizabeth wished to preserve. This was most important in the face of the growing menace of Puritanism.

SUMMARY OF FIRST REPRESSIVE MEASURES

By the year 1563 Elizabeth had carried her point in having the legislation passed for the re-establishment of the Church through the acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. With the direction of Cecil her will was law. She was now vested with both temporal and spiritual authority, and if she decided that Parliament should pass laws in spiritual matters without the consent of Convocation or the spiritual Peers, the legislation would be effective. At least during the first ten years Elizabeth's position was uncertain because of the Catholic majority. Further legislation against Catholics caused Elizabeth to fear. She had several groups to satisfy,--her own group, the Catholics, and the Puritans. What there was of repression in these first years was generally included in the observance of the acts of Supremacy and of Uniformity. Yet despite danger and because Elizabeth wished to secure her

throne the following measures had been passed: no heir to the throne, no person receiving preferment in the Church, no officer under the Crown, no member of either university could maintain their positions without having taken the oath of supremacy and thereby renouncing the Catholic faith. The first Parliament had abolished the Mass, and substituted the revised Prayer Book, had decreed uniformity in prayer and the sacraments, and had placed grievous penalties on the non-observance of those acts.

THE CATHOLIC MINORITY

It is rather surprising that within these few years there could have been so much progress in the new religion. But we realize that the Catholic majority had in the meantime been changed to a Catholic minority. The bishops and outstanding clerics had been deprived, and the Catholics found themselves without prominent leaders. The Protestant contagion from London and the vicinity soon spread to the south, the west, and the north, and almost everywhere there was at least the outward resemblance of conformity to the Established Church. With rather weak leaders among the Catholics we find that the Catholics were no menace at all to the government, and from the beginning were incapable of defending themselves against the wiles of William Cecil and his crew. The bishops on the other hand offered no organized plans for resistance to the Established Church.

> "There were no flashes of political genius, no displays of foresight, of power of organization, of the art of exciting popular sympathy. This means that there

> was not only no serious resistance to Elizabeth, but that there was practically no political force opposed to her at all. The persecuting measures passed by her first Parliament were in no sense inevitable retaliations or necessary precautions to ensure liberty of conscience to Protestants." 42

---

42 Pollen, J. H. "The Politics of the English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth". The Month, xvix (1902), p. 47.

The Spanish ambassador at the time declared that if the Catholics had not been of so small account politically, "things would have turned out differently." 43 The ambassa-

---

43 Ibid., p. 47.

---

dor's notes, however, abound in references to Catholics imprisoned, of bishops and magistrates deposed, of persecuting measures passed and of the exile of both priests and laymen to escape further evils. Yet on the whole evidence is strong in upholding the position that the Catholics of the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign were "uniformly, almost monotonously patient, law-abiding and inoffensive." 44

---

44 Ibid., p. 60.

SECOND PARLIAMENT, 1563

In March, 1563, at the second session of Parliament it was proposed and carried to extend the obligation of taking the oath of Supremacy to others besides those mentioned above, and to make the first refusal subject to a praemunire, and the second punishable by death, as in cases of treason.

After a long struggle this bill was carried with several provisions. The temporal peers were exempted from its operation and the heirs of the attainted were also protected from forfeiture.

> "Still it extended the obligation of taking the oath to two classes of men not contemplated in the original act; 1. To the members of the house of Commons, to schoolmasters, private tutors, and attorneys; and 2. To all persons who had ever held office in the church, or in any ecclesiastical court, during the present, or the last three reigns; or who should openly disapprove of the established worship, or should celebrate, or hear others celebrate, any private mass; that is, in one word, to the whole Catholic population of the realm. As to the first class, it was enacted in their favour, that the oath could be tendered to them but once, and of course they were liable only to the lesser penalty of forfeiture and perpetual imprisonment; but to those of the second class, it was to be tendered twice; and for the second refusal the offender was subjected to the punishment of death, as in cases of high treason." 45

---

45 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England. Vol. VI, p. 83.

The queen herself was appalled at the prospect of the consequences of carrying out this law to the letter and gave orders that the bishops should proceed with leniency and caution. Therefore we see that the government was rather lenient in enforcing measures against the recusants--that is, those who refused to attend the reformed service in England. On the whole, there were not so many of these, for a large percentage of the people had not understood to the fullest extent the import of the change.

> "A great majority both of clergy and laity yielded to the times; and of these temporising conformists it cannot be doubted that many lost by degrees all thought of returning to the ancient fold. But others, while they complied with exterior ceremonies, retained in their private devotions their accustomed mode of worship. It is an admitted fact that the Catholics generally attended the Church, till it came to be reckoned a distinctive sign of their having renounced their own religion. They persuaded themselves (and the English priest, uninstructed and accustomed to a temporising conduct, did not discourage the notion) that the private observance of their own rites would excuse a formal obedience to the civil power" (p. 120). "There is nothing.....which serves to countenance the very unfair misrepresentations lately (i. e., 1845) given, as if the Roman Catholics generally had acquiesced in the Anglican worship, believing it to be substantially the same as their own. They frequented our churches, because the law compelled them by penalties so to do, not out of a notion that very little change had been made by the Reformation." 46

---

46 Gasquet, Francis Aidan. "Hampshire Recusants" in Old English Bible, p. 336-337. Quoting Hallam's Constitutional History of England.

TEMPORIZING CATHOLICS

In the beginning of the change in religion in Elizabeth's reign no official declaration had been given by Rome concerning the attendance of the faithful at the public service. The people thought it was not wrong to attend these services if they also in secret attended Holy Mass either before or after. This accounts in part for the small percentage of recusants in the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign.

The laws passed by the Parliament of 1563 were the source of considerable dissembling on the part of the clergy

and laity alike. Priests who could not in conscience conform whole heartedly would perform the ceremonies of the new religion and later say Mass in a neighboring house. Some performed the Lord's supper according to the English rite and said Mass elsewhere. But this group was the minority.

When a definite statement came from Rome concerning the double dealing, in regard to attendance at services, saying that it was not allowed to attend the Established Service, many still did so just to prevent ruin and material misfortune from falling upon them.

On the whole the Catholic party was rather weak and vacillating during these first ten years of Elizabeth's reign. They lacked the initiative and support of a clergy powerful enough to support them in the government and to spur them on to uphold their rights. Most of the Marian bishops and many of the priests, as we have seen, had been deprived; others had left the country or resigned; some had died; and a large number had conformed. Therefore, it was a great problem for those who were staunch to the old faith to hold to their convictions. They needed a native clergy, and the Established Church would not supply the deficiency for the Catholics. The curates of the Established Church could not say Mass and to the ardent Catholics it was the Mass that mattered most.

William Allen, a famous Oxford professor and a most devout Catholic, saw the need. Through his efforts much

was accomplished that was to bear fruit in later years. He had been trained in the staunch Catholic spirit and even while still a layman could not understand how so many of the Catholics could reconcile their consciences with their attendance at the new service. He never could dissemble in any way himself, and he made it his chief work to discourage any temporizing with the English Church and to stiffen the Catholic resistance. As we shall see in the next chapter, William Allen, through the founding of a seminary for English students for the priesthood, was largely responsible for the Catholic revival in England during the seventies and eighties.

PERSECUTION OF CATHOLICS

There were commissioners sent out to the heads of the universities and to the local magistrates demanding submission to the Parliamentary laws. They either had to conform, resign, or be fined or imprisoned. There were no bloody persecutions for the Catholics at this time if they attended the parish church--that is, the reformed church on Sunday. There was no objection either if the Catholics preferred to leave the country. The monasteries and convents that would not give up the Mass were dissolved, their members disbanded, and their property taken by the State. Of course, we say there was no bloody persecution, but if Catholics would not attend the service they had to pay fines and more fines, and at times were even impoverished and their lands and buildings taken over by the tax collector. It was not bloody, but it was a method of starving the people into submission.

CONVOCATION OF 1563

About the same time that Parliament was in session, 1563, Convocation also met. The matters submitted for its deliberations were

> "an adequate provision for the lower order of the clergy, a new code of ecclesiastical discipline, and the promulgation of a national creed, the future standard of English orthodoxy. The two first were opposed and prevented by the avarice and prejudices of the courtiers, who sought rather to lessen than increase the wealth and authority of the churchmen; to the third, as it interfered neither with their interests nor their pleasures, they offered no objection." 47

---

47 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. op. cit. Vol. VI, p. 84.

The Forty-two Articles of Edward VI were revised into the Thirty-nine Articles as they now exist in the Church of England. They were accepted by both houses of Convocation, and an effort was made to force them on the consciences of the people. The Council objected to this measure as it already had a means of bringing all Catholics to the scaffold under the Act of Supremacy, and they wanted to deal more gently with dissenters because the queen sought to win them rather by indulgence than by severity.

Within the first decade of her reign, Elizabeth found her will carried out according to her direction. Parliament had established the church on a legal footing, Convocation had sanctioned it, and Matthew Parker had been made primate of the Church and, therefore, in a position where he could go ahead

on his own responsibility. What remains for us to consider is the resistance offered from various sources to Elizabeth and to the church that she established, and to show how she by her dominant will met these difficulties.

CHAPTER VII

RESISTANCE TO ELIZABETH'S WILL

WILLIAM ALLEN'S SEMINARY

The Church of England made considerable progress in the first years of Elizabeth's reign, as we saw in the previous chapter. Her will, as expressed through the work of Cecil and the Parliament, had carried through so far. Nevertheless she was considerably more lenient to the Catholics in these first ten years than we shall find her in the next few decades. Her position as queen was still precarious and was to remain so for several years more. But after the Pope, in 1570, issued the Bull of Excommunication, her attitude became defiant even though it was to act through the ministrations of Cecil.

Elizabeth and Cecil had hoped that before long the Catholic element in England would be of little account. The aim of Cecil was to decatholicize England. But William Allen had sufficient foresight to avert that calamity. Here we meet the first serious setback to the Established Church.

Allen had been a student at Oxford, but in 1561 when the persecution warmed up he could not remain, for he would yield nothing in his religion. He was still a layman. He went to Louvain for a year and returned to England as a lay apostle endeavoring to preserve the faith of Englishmen against attacks made upon it. After three years he found that if he wished to continue his work he would be obliged to leave the country. He was soon ordained, became a professor of theology, and planned a Catholic university for English students abroad.

A few years later, in 1568, with the authority of Pope

Paul IV, he and six companions founded the seminary for missionary priests at Douai. Within five years this seminary sent nearly one hundred priests to England, many of whom were martyred. [1] The students of this university were

---

1 Heseltine, G. C. "William Cardinal Allen". The Sign. Vol. 12, No. 3, p. 155-156.

---

animated with a zeal for their religion, for which they had left their native country. Their object was to study theology, to receive orders, and to return to England, thus maintaining a constant succession of a native Catholic clergy.

There were large numbers of students who flocked to the seminary--so large that the English government took steps to stop the flow of these young men to the continent, for they feared a political reaction. But this did not help the government. The movement grew apace, so that in time there were other centers for these missionary priests established, as Rome (1579), Valladolid (1589), Seville (1592).

> "There is no reason to suppose--indeed the evidence is conclusively against such a supposition--that political aims entered into Allen's scheme, or that the priests who enlisted under his banner were other than they professed to be, crusaders for the Catholic faith. The via dolorosa that led from Douai to Tyburn could not have been trod by men who were not profoundly imbued with the spiritual character of their work. But the fact that the Pope and the Spanish king were the chief patrons of the colleges afforded a strong presumption against the alleged innocence of the missionaries. It was difficult to disconnect the seminary movement from the avowed policy of Pius V, or to avoid the conclusion that under the guise of saving souls the priests were really acting as executors of the bull. Moreover, even if the mission

> was devoted to exclusively religious ends, the law, as we have seen, made it treason to reconcile the queen's subjects to Rome. Consequently, when they began operations in England, in 1574, the unfortunate priests walked straight into the trap which circumstances had prepared for them. The very word 'seminarist' came to mean in common parlance 'conspirator'." 2

---

2 Black, J. B. The Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1603, p. 140.

OPPOSITION TO ELIZABETH' WILL

The will of Elizabeth was meeting considerable opposition through the growth of this missionary spirit, and she was bent on opposing this Catholic activity. Since Rome had declared definitely on the position of the Catholics and their obligation concerning the established service, there was found to be more opposition. The number of recusants increased, and the priests from Allen's seminary were arousing the Catholics to heroic resistance. Along with that there were plots developed that made Elizabeth's position on the throne more dangerous. Mary Stuart in the meantime had been in captivity in England, and her sympathizers many of whom were Catholics plotted to place Mary Stuart on the throne and if necessary to kill Elizabeth. Thus, for many years was Elizabeth threatened by various groups, but her determination, with the help of Cecil, did she meet and overcome her adversaries. Besides there was a very strong influence at work against the Established Church, namely--the development of Puritanism. We shall also see how her strong will was really responsible for the preservation of Anglican ideals in her Church.

We shall first consider the episode of Mary Stuart clearly conflicting with the will of Elizabeth to maintain her influence and her power in England, and shall summarize briefly the history of Mary Stuart and her connection with Elizabeth.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

Mary Stuart was the granddaughter of Margaret, the elder sister of Henry VIII; and according to Catholic principles, she had greater right to the throne of England than did Elizabeth, whom all Catholics regarded as illegitimate. Mary Stuart was also Queen of Scotland, for Margaret, her grandmother, had married James IV of Scotland. She had been brought up in the French court, for her mother was Mary of Guise. When Mary Stuart was seventeen years old, she married Francis II of France who died the following year, 1561. In the capacity of Queen-dowager of France, Mary returned to Scotland. When she set foot in Scotland, her troubles began.

This period of residence in Scotland was marked by insurrections among the nobility. She married Darnley, her Catholic cousin in 1565. He proved a weak profligate husband and an inefficient ruler. Rizzio, the queen's foreign secretary, was murdered. The conspirators tried to imprison Mary, but she escaped with the help of her husband. In 1567 her husband, Darnley, was murdered, it is thought at the instigation of Bothwell, who very soon apparently forced Mary into a marriage with him and that with a Protestant rite, May 15, 1567.

> "No sooner had Bothwell accomplished his crime, than the scene changed as if by magic. The plotters who had signed the

> Craigmillar and Ainslie bonds and urged the queen to marry Bothwell, now turned against him, and charged him with the murder of Darnley and the treasonable seizure and marriage of the queen, signed bonds at Stirling, and armed. The opposing forces met at Carberry Hill. Here Mary surrendered to the lords upon their assurance that they would acknowledge her as their sovereign. But whilst Bothwell was allowed to depart unharmed, Mary Stuart was at once treated as a captive, loaded with brutal indignities, and imprisoned in the fortress of Lochleven."3

---

3 Guggenberger, A. A General History of the Christian Era. Vol. II, p. 286.

The rebel lords forced her to surrender her crown to her infant son. In May, 1568, Mary escaped from Loch Leven prison and fled to England with the Lords Herries and Fleming. On May 15 she wrote to Queen Elizabeth, giving her an account of the rebellion of her subjects and imploring her help.

> "'I am now forced out of my kingdom and driven to such straits that next to God I have no hope but in your goodness.' On May 16 she crossed the border, and May 19 the first orders of Elisabeth arrived in Cumberland which made Mary Queen of Scots, the prisoner of the English queen for nineteen years." 4

---

4 Ibid., p. 286-287.

MARY STUART IN ENGLAND

Mary had begged to be brought into the Queen's presence, but Queen Elizabeth refused this request. Hereupon, Mary wrote again, sending the letter to Lord Herries, begging either that she might see the Queen, or be sent back to Scotland. The Queen replies:

"Greenwich, June 30, 1568.

"Madam, I am greatly astonished that you press me so for Lord Fleming's going to France, and will not take my answer by Lord Herries at his first coming..... I love no dissimulation in another, nor do I practice it myself; that made me give the same reason to the King my good brother's ambassador.....After reading your letters, Herries came to tell me two things I thought very strange: one, that you would not answer but before myself; the other, that without force you would not stir from your present abode unless licensed to see me....I assure you I will do nothing to hurt you, but rather to honour and aid you....." 5

---

5 Harrison, G. B. The Letters of Queen Elizabeth. No. XVIII, p. 53.

Hereafter Mary was at the mercy of the English Queen and Elizabeth would have her way. Elizabeth had supported the rebels of Scotland for the past ten years, for she was aware of movements in Scotland that tended to place Mary Stuart on the throne of England. Mary had also allied herself with the Pope who had promised her financial aid and also with Philip of Spain who should supply her military aid. Mary being a Catholic, expected that the Catholics of England and of Scotland would come to her aid, but without help from the continent she could not succeed. The promised help did not come, and the revolutionary party in Scotland secretly aided by Elizabeth overthrew the government and Mary had to flee to England.

In the first years of her reign Elizabeth had hoped to maintain loyal support of all of her subjects, but with the claims of a Catholic queen, Mary Queen of Scots, this support

was endangered. Religion became an important issue in the controversy. The Catholics really had frowned on Mary's actions in Scotland, but now that Mary was a prisoner in England and they themselves were being oppressed, they united forces with her against a common enemy. Mary Stuart now asked that her position in Scotland be restored to her, or that she be given a free passage to France, or be permitted to have a personal interview with Elizabeth, as we saw above. Elizabeth denied all requests until every suspicion concerning Darnley's death should be removed from Mary.

INTRIGUES AGAINST THE QUEEN OF SCOTS

A conference was held first at York and later at Westminster between commissioners appointed by Queen Elizabeth, by Mary Stuart, and by Murray, regent of Scotland and half-brother to Mary--one of the chief instigators in the plots in Scotland. Murray was also in close communication with Elizabeth. The conferences were a farce, for Mary Stuart was not even given an opportunity of being confronted with the proofs of her supposed guilt. Decisions were delayed and Murray was afraid of being discovered in his intrigues.

> "The Scots were divided into two parties, called the king's lords, and the queen's lords, at the head of which were the earl of Murray on one side, and the duke of Chastelherault, lately returned from France, on the other. Both of these earnestly desired a compromise. Murray knew that his charge against Mary would be met with a similar charge against his associates, and that her proofs were better able to bear investigation than his. Should he fail, he would be left without resource to the vengeance of his sovereign; should he succeed, the sickly state of the infant king

> made it probable that, in a short time, his mortal enemy, the duke, would come to the throne. Hence he was willing to give up his proofs against Mary, to pronounce her innocent by act of parliament, and to allow her a considerable revenue from Scotland, provided she would either confirm her resignation of the crown, or, retaining the name of queen, consent to reside in England, and leave to him the title and the authority of regent. The duke, the next heir after the infant James, feared, on the contrary, the intrigues of Murray, and the hostile pretensions of the house of Lennox. He demanded that the queen should be restored to the crown; but was willing that the prince should be educated under the care of Elizabeth, and that the government should be conducted by a council of noblemen, in which every man should have that place which became his rank." 6

---

6 Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England. Vol. VI, p. 182-183.

Murray employed Maitland to suggest to Mary a marriage with the Duke of Norfolk and promised in the event of its accomplishment, that Elizabeth would restore her on the throne of Scotland. But Cecil decided upon a new expedient.

> "Now that he was fully acquainted with the state of the conferences at York, the reluctance of the regent to bring forward the charge, the presumed insufficiency of his proofs, the project of marriage between Norfolk and Mary, and the multiplied intrigues of Maitland, he induced the council, instead of returning a direct answer, to reply that the questions of Murray contained several points which could not be elucidated by letter, and to require that two commissioners from each party, with Sir Ralph Sadler, should hasten to the court, to give to the queen the necessary information. Mary, though she felt surprise at this unexpected demand, expressed her satisfaction that the cognizance of her cause would at length come before Elizabeth herself. Murray, who was in the

> secret, signified his acquiescence, and at the same time solicited permission to attend the commissioners in person." 7

---

7 Ibid., p. 184.

The secret mentioned in the above quotation was the plot formed by Murray with the help of Cecil. There was a council held at Hampton Court where it was determined

> "1. That, to take from Mary's commissioners all pretext of evading the defence of their mistress, the queen should previously, if it were possible, draw from them in conversation an avowal of the full extent of their powers. 2. That Murray's commissioners, as an inducement, should receive an assurance of impunity, if they could prove, to the satisfaction of the queen and her council, that Mary had been guilty of the murder of her husband. 3. That, to prevent the escape of the Scottish queen to the borders, she should be removed from Bolton to Tutbury; and lastly, that, on account of the importance of the investigation, the attendance of all the privy councillors should be required, and in addition, of the earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Sussex, and Huntingdon, so that the first estate of the English nobility might be consulted." 8

---

8 Ibid., p. 184-185.

Mary discovered the scheme which was devised for her ruin and prevented the working out of the scheme by making her demands. When she received the news that she would be refused to be admitted to the presence of Queen Elizabeth she

> "ordered her commissioners to declare to the queen and council that, 'where Murray and his accomplices had said that she knew, counselled, or commanded the murder of her husband, they had falsely, traitorously, and wickedly lied, imputing unto her the crime of which they themselves were the authors, inventors, doers, and

> some of them the very executioners;' that, where they alleged that she had intended to make her son follow his father, 'the natural love which a mother bears to her only bairn' was sufficient to prove their falsehood, their attempt to have slain him in the womb sufficient to show their hypocrisy; that she could not allow charges so calumnious to pass over in silence, but demanded that copies of the papers should be given to her commissioners, and the originals submitted to her own inspection; and pledged her word to name certain individuals among her accusers, and to convict them of the murder, provided she might have access to the presence of the queen, and a reasonable time to collect her witnesses and proofs." 9

---

9 Ibid., p. 190.

This turn of events was unexpected by the Queen, and the conference was broken off. The unexpected triumphant tone of Mary alarmed her adversaries. But in the meantime Murray had brought forth the Casket Letters to the English commissioners who had made copies of them and carried their verdict to London. These letters are usually attributed to Mary and provide the main proof of her complicity in the murder of Darnley. Students of research have not definitely settled on the matter whether these letters are authentic or whether they were forged or partly forged. The mystery concerning Mary's guilt hinges on these letters and even to-day there is no certainty about it at all. Elizabeth adjourned the conference to Westminster where she could investigate matters more closely.

> "Under the influence of threats, cajolery, and promises that he would not suffer by taking the bold course, Murray tabled his evidence against Mary in detail; and after a minute examination lasting for days,

> followed by a survey of the case by the privy council, the conclusion was arrived at that 'in view of these vehement allegations and presumptions', Elizabeth could not 'without manifest blemish of her own honour....agree to have the same queen come into her presence, until the said horrible crimes may be, by some just and reasonable answer avoided and removed from her.' Since Mary could not be induced to take up the refutation seriously--her representatives had been withdrawn from the conference--a presumption was created that she had no valid defence to offer. On 10 January (1568) Elizabeth summed up the situation by declaring that nothing had been brought forward to impair the honour and allegiance of Murray and his supporters, and that nothing had been 'sufficiently proven' against Mary. Not proven! It was a prudent resolution for the English queen, because it left the door open for future negotiation; but it was a damning one for the queen of Scots, whose character was now hopelessly smirched." 10

10

Black, J. B. op. cit., p. 85
N. B. In the above quotation there is an error in the date. The year was 1569.

These vehement 'allegations and presumptions' mentioned in the above quotation were the suspicion placed upon Mary for the murder of Darnley.

MARY STUART'S IMPRISONMENT: ITS EFFECTS

Soon after Mary was imprisoned in Tutbury, and Murray returned to Scotland to try to destroy the Marian party. Elizabeth had her way again, but was it to her advantage?

> "By imprisoning Mary in England she all unwittingly lost her own freedom, and for the next nineteen years lived in ceaseless anxiety lest her prisoner might escape. While the two queens lived, there could be no quiet in the realm. Far better would it have been--such is the irony of history--had Elizabeth allowed her defeated and discredited enemy to go whither she pleased.

> The catholic world, scandalized by her recent behaviour, would have treated her with cold contempt; she would have sunk into comparative insignificance, suffered, it may be, complete political eclipse; and her name would have left no mark on history."11

---

11 Ibid., p. 85-86.

Mary's presence in England remained a constant danger to Elizabeth. Catholic France and Spain had sympathized with Mary Stuart and now that she was imprisoned, there was danger that the Catholics of England would plot to unite forces in Europe against England and place Mary Stuart on the throne of England because of the illegitimacy of Elizabeth. Besides the English people had not lost their sense of justice and veneration for an anointed and crowned queen. This imprisonment of Mary Stuart irritated many noblemen and aroused in them a chivalrous feeling strong enough to make them risk their lives in the defense of this Queen. More of her adherents were to found in the northern part of England where the Catholic faith had been staunchest and less infected with the new religion. At the same time the penal laws were being enforced more stringently in England, and the Catholics looked to Mary Stuart as the best possible hope for freedom to practice their religion. The Catholics were practically bound to recognize Mary Stuart's claim to the throne of England over that of Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, on her part, felt that she could not act differently either toward Mary Stuart or toward the Catholics. She was determined to keep her throne and with the help of the

wily Cecil she kept it to the end. For almost twenty years she was surrounded by plots against her life--plots when closely studied were on the surface formed by her enemies, but in reality instigated by her own ministers, always discovered--by design, of course--in the nick of time and resulting in executions of her enemies, the Catholics, under the law of treason. The ministers allowed the plots to develop entirely so that they would be certain of all the intricacies of the plots and of all the persons involved, and make their conviction for treason appear just before the world.

ATTITUDE OF CATHOLICS TOWARD PENAL LAWS

It will be necessary at this point to revert our discussion to the beginning of 1566 in order to trace the reaction of the Catholics to the penal laws of the parliaments of 1559 and of 1563, especially in the northern part of England. There was, in fact, little observance of these laws in certain dioceses.

> "In North Wales the Bishop of Bangor, at the end of 1567, found 'images and altars standing undefaced in the churches, lewd and undecent watches and vigils observed, much pilgrimage-going, many candles set up to the honour of saints, some relics yet carried about, and all the country full of beads and knots.' Eastward in Yorkshire things were no better: the Latin mass was being said daily, in spite of the Council of the North and its president the archbishop; and northwards again, in the diocese of Durham, there was at least 'backwardness in religion.'
>
> "Bishop Downman of Chester had been carrying on a slack resistance to the Recusants ever since his first entry into

> the diocese. In 1562 he had been granted a special ecclesiastical commission for his diocese; but two years later his brother of Durham, visiting in his native Lancashire, complained greatly to Parker of the laxity of the bishop's government. The ferment was going on unchecked, but also unobtrusively. The work which Allen had left was carried on by others, who were also successful in convincing many of the claims of the Roman see, of the truth of its doctrine, and of the unlawfulness of attendance at their parish churches." 12

---

12 Frere, W. H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., p. 139-140.

As we have seen, the attitude of Rome in regard to the religious innovations had been more or less a laissez faire attitude. Pope Pius IV had hoped to convert Elizabeth and thereby restore the Catholic worship. His successor, Pius V, was more aggressive.

> "Pius, in full consistory, granted authority to Sanders and Harding to reconcile those who had conformed, from the schism in which, as it was now declared, their conformity had landed them. This declaration was enforced by strong language against 'the schismatical service or damnable communion now used,' which the pope's agent employed as a gloss upon the official decision." 13

---

13 Ibid., p. 140.

This project did not accomplish much among the Catholics. They wanted a more formal definite authorization of reconcilement from the Pope. This was obtained August 14, 1567, "to which there was added a solemn form of absolution from all irregularity and excommunication." [14] The result was that the

14 Ibid.

people of Lancashire bound themselves not to attend the communion service of the new religion.

The government took action against this movement in the North.

> "In January 1568 a series of letters to the ecclesiastical commissioners of the diocese was drafted, calling attention to these attempts to 'withdraw men away from allegiance and conformity.' A month later orders were sent for the apprehension of some deprived ministers who have been secretly maintained in private places,' endorsed with a list of six names, amongst which were those of Vaux and Allen. At the same time a severe rebuke went to the bishop for his slackness." 15

15 Ibid., p. 141.

THE NORTHERN RISINGS

We see that the way was prepared for an organized resistance to Elizabeth and her newly established church. By the beginning of 1569 conditions were favorable for a rising, for Elizabeth was at odds with Philip II of Spain on account of the policy of raiding Spanish vessels. The Spanish ambassador thought

> "Elizabeth could be driven from her throne by making use of the adherents of Mary Stuart, and the favourable moment had come for restoring the Catholic religion in England, and thus bringing about peace in Flanders. Many anonymous letters expressed the conviction that as soon as the standard of Spain was raised all the Catholics would rise in rebellion.

> "Mary Stuart herself at the end of 1568 thought she could safely say that if Philip II. would lend his aid, she could at the end of three months be Queen of England." 16

16 Pastor, Ludwig Von. The History of the Popes. Vol. XVIII., p. 204-205.

The rising was soon organized in the North. The Duke of Norfolk was the first to take the lead, but he soon wavered, then fell, and was finally taken to the Tower, October 8, 1569. We find an interesting episode concerning Norfolk's call to London by the Queen. In this letter Elizabeth's dominating will is manifest. The Queen wrote:

"Sept. 25, 1569

> "We have received your letters by delivery of the same to us by our Council, finding by the same that upon pretense of a fear without cause you are gone to Keninghall, contrary to our expectation, which was that as you wrote to certain of our Council from London not past four days. But now we will that as you intend to show yourself a faithful subject, as you write you are, you forthwith without any delay upon the sight of these our letters, and without any manner of excuse whatsoever it be, do speedily repair to us here at our Castle of Windson, or wheresoever we shall be: And this we command you to do upon your allegiance, and as you mean to have any favour showed you by us, who never intended in thought to minister anything to you but as you should in truth deserve." 17

17 Harrison, G. B. op. cit. No. XXI, p. 56-57.

Two days later she insisted that he come in a litter if need be. Norfolk had claimed illness as an excuse for not coming. He was sent to the Tower, October 8, 1569, and later released, but put

under surveillance.

The Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland were the next to rise in the cause of Mary Stuart. They promised the Spanish ambassador to help release Mary and unite with Spain. But the government under Cecil was watchful and had a sort of secret service working throughout the summer. By the middle of November the rebellion took shape.

> "....the news spread fast that the Latin mass was set up again at Durham: it reached the sheriffs and justices of Notts just as they were met to put their signature to a declaration of conformity to the church services, which the Council had recently demanded as part of a scheme for laying recusancy bare. From them and from more official sources the news came to the government, and soon it was known everywhere. It was the first open act of the earls and their confederates, and there followed the issue by them of a proclamation, announcing as their purpose the restoring of 'the true and catholic religion,' and the ridding of the realm from the Queen's disordered and ill-disposed counsellors." 18

---

18 Frere, W. H. op. cit., p. 144.

REVERSES OF THE INSURGENTS: VENGEANCE OF THE QUEEN

The insurgents went from place to place restoring the ancient worship throughout the North amid the rejoicing of the people. However, when they got farther south the support was not so whole hearted. Besides, the promised reenforcements from the Duke of Alva did not arrive. The supplies of the insurgents gradually gave out, and an army of Puritans, organized in the South under the Earl of Sussex, put down the rising. Martial law was declared in the principal districts

and the vengeance of the Queen was terrible. Some nine hundred of the poorer class of people were put to death in summary fashion. The Earl of Sussex complained that he had nothing to do in the North "but to direct hanging matter." 19

---

19 Guggenberger, A. op. cit., p. 288.

The number of Elizabeth's executions, nine hundred and these without trial--far exceed that of Mary's condemnations for heresy. She put 277 to death for heresy. Did Elizabeth have more right to hang these 900 insurgents because they were Catholics rather than because they had taken part in the insurrections, than Mary had to burn the heretics because she felt it was her conscientious duty? The higher classes among the rebels were tried for treason. The Earl of Westmoreland escaped to Flanders. The Duke of Norfolk, as we have seen, was sent to the Tower. Thomas Percy, the Duke of Northumberland, was first imprisoned and subsequently in 1572, was martyred for the faith. Thus practically all the Catholics and the northern earls were either exiled, put to death, or reduced to utter powerlessness.

EXECUTIONS FOR RELIGION

Some of the insurgents put to death were true martyrs, for they were offered their freedom if they would renounce their faith. Two especially deserve mention--Thomas Plumtree, a priest, and Thomas Percy, the Earl of Northumberland. Concerning Thomas Plumtree we find the following:

> "On the fourth of January, 1570, he was taken from Durham castle to the market place where, 'on his arriving at the place of execution his life was offered to him if he would but renounce the Catholic faith and embrace the heresy; to which he made answer that he had no desire to do so, to continue living in the world, as meantime to die to God.' Wherefore having fearlessly confessed his faith, by God's grace he suffered death in this world, that he might merit to receive from Christ eternal life." 20

---

20 Wilmot-Buxton, E. M. A Book of English Martyrs, p. 92.

In the meantime Thomas Percy had been taken prisoner in Scotland and thus he was kept for two and a half years. Repeatedly during his imprisonment he was urged to give up his faith on the condition of release. His wife and friends at one time had procured enough money for his ransom, but Elizabeth having been informed by spies outbid them and procured the possession of his person. He was conducted to York for execution. Here again he was offered his liberty if he would give up his faith, but he most firmly refused the offer. He died beautifully declaring his firm adherence to the Catholic Church and calling upon God to receive his soul. The time of his death was at three o'clock Friday, August 22, 1572.

These facts prove without a doubt that Elizabeth was putting these people to death because of their faith, not because of the political revolt. The fact that she offered freedom to some of these prisoners if they would renounce the faith, shows that she really was more concerned that the Catholic religion be stamped out in England than she was that rebels be put to death.

ELIZABETH'S DOMINANT WILL IN THE FACE OF OPPOSITION

Elizabeth knew how to get her will. She was determined with the help of Parliament and the Council, to put down every opposition to her power, and that naturally meant putting down every vestige of the Catholic religion. If the French government formally complained about the condition of Mary Stuart as a prisoner, Elizabeth knew how to defend herself. She writes to Sir Henry Norris, Ambassador in France. The French king by his ambassador had complained that Queen Elizabeth was helping the French rebels; he had also charged her with ill-treating Mary Queen of Scots. The queen writes a very long, detailed letter, justifying her actions. It is typical of Elizabeth on the defensive; she makes out an excellent case, which is set forth very plausibly and well seasoned with irony. Elizabeth's will dominates in her insistence on the impression that she leave on others that Mary Queen of Scots is treated well in England. She says: "she escaped an evident danger of her life." She is "attended upon with persons of nobility", etc. She has it better in England than in Scotland in regard to service. She explains how Mary through her own mistakes puts herself in this predicament. 21

---

21 Harrison, G. B. op. cit. No. XXVI, p. 68-82.

THE BULL OF EXCOMMUNICATION

About the time of the beginning of the risings in the North the college of Cardinals in Rome were considering the preparation of a bull of excommunication against Queen

Elizabeth--and including the freeing of all Catholics from allegiance to her. From the point of view of the relations of nations with the Catholic Church in our own day we consider such a step out of the field of jurisdiction of the Church. In those days, however, the separation of Church and State was comparatively a new idea. Yet the effect of this action by the Cardinals produced upon the sovereigns of Europe at that time was not at all what Rome expected. The very fact that the Christian rulers of Europe did not unite to bring the excommunicated sovereigns to terms shows how far the effect of the Protestant Reformation had gone--it shows that the world had passed from the medieval to the modern era.

The Bull of Excommunication was prepared in the Papal Court under the Pontiff, Pius V. He

> "grounded his excommunication on two points: (1) Elizabeth, illegitimate by birth, had no true title; and (2) she was a heretic and a persecutor of the Catholic religion. The Pope stated the case in the following words of his bull, Regnans in excelsis:--
>
> "'She (Elizabeth), the pretended Queen of England, has forbidden by the strong hand of power the observance of the true religion, overturned by the apostate Henry VIII., and by the help of the Holy See restored by Mary the lawful queen of illustrious memory. She has followed after and accepted the errors of heretics. She has driven the English nobles out of the Royal Council, and filled their places with obscure heretics. She has been the ruin of those who profess the Catholic faith, and has brought back again the wicked preachers and ministers of impieties. She has done away with the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Divine Office, fasting, the distinction of meats, celibacy, and the Catholic rites. She has ordered the use of books, containing manifest heresy, throughout the realm, and the observance by her subjects of impious

> mysteries and ordinances, according to the rule of Calvin, accepted and practised by herself. She has dared to take away their churches and benefices from the bishops, the parish priests, and other Catholic ecclesiastics, and has given them with other ecclesiastical goods to heretics. She has made herself a judge in ecclesiastical causes. She has forbidden the prelates, clergy, and people to acknowledge the Church of Rome, or to obey its mandates and the Catholic constitutions. She has compelled many to take an oath to observe her wicked laws, to renounce the authority of the Roman Pontiff, to refuse to obey him, and to accept her as the sole ruler in temporal and spiritual matters. She has decreed pains and penalties against those who do not submit to her, and has inflicted them upon those who continue in the unity of the faith and obedience.
>
> "She has thrown Catholic prelates and parish priests into prison, where many, worn out by sorrows and their protracted sufferings, have ended their days in misery."22

---

22 Allies, Mary H. History of the Church in England, A. D. 1509-1603, p. 189-190. Quoted from Lee, The Church under Elizabeth, i., 192.

Copies of the Bull of Excommunication were sent to the Duke of Alva to communicate the news to the Netherlands. One copy was also sent to the Spanish ambassador in England. On the 15th of May a copy was seen affixed to the gates of the bishop's residence in London. John Felton was the man who confessed to have posted the bull. He was taken prisoner, cruelly racked three times even after his admission of "guilt" but refused to disclose the name of any of his abettors. Felton soon suffered the death of a traitor.

REACTION OF ELIZABETH TO THE BULL

Elizabeth, however, endeavored under a threat of personal revenge to have the bull of excommunication recalled. She asked Maximilian, the Emperor, to intercede in her cause. The Pope, however, was firm. He asked the prince whether Elizabeth considered the sentence valid or invalid. If valid, why would she care for a reconciliation? The Pope had done his duty and was ready to shed his blood in the cause. But was the action on the part of the Pope wise for the time in which the bull of excommunication was issued? Pollen remarks very frankly that his (Pope Pius V's) action in regard to Elizabeth--though it led indirectly to certain beneficial results--was an obvious and very unfortunate failure, in regard to the main object which it was intended to accomplish.

> "But this country had become, if I may say so, prematurely adult with the Reformation. Medieval remedies, such as the deposition of the Sovereign by the Pope, were now no longer acceptable to the people. Paternal correction is an excellent thing, indispensable to the education of the young, but it may do unspeakable harm if exercised on adults, and even on youth who, as sometimes happens, acquire precociously, by contact with sin, some of the aspirations and independence of men. This then is the reason which strikes one as most fundamental to Pius V's error in excommunicating Elizabeth in the way which he selected." 23

---

23 Pollen, J. H. "The Politics of English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth." The Month. No. II, p. 139.

The bull of excommunication was the signal for further and more stringent penal laws. It certainly was not the signal for

bringing Elizabeth to terms. Her reaction is reflected in the laws of parliament, passed in April, 1571. Parliament enacted that

> "'if any person, after the first day of July next coming, shall use or put in use in any place within the realm any bull, writing or instrument obtained or gotten....from the Bishop of Rome....he shall suffer pains of death, and also lose and forfeit all his lands, tenements and hereditaments, goods and chattels.' Next, 'if any person after the same 1st July shall take upon him to absolve or reconcile any person...or if any shall willingly receive and take any such absolution or reconciliation he should be subject to the same penalties. Furthermore, any person bringing into the realm any tokens, crosses, pictures, beads, from the Bishop or See of Rome, and delivering the same to any subject, should incur the penalties of Praemunire.' Both bringer and receiver fell under the Statute." 24

---

24 Allies, Mary H. op. cit., p. 191-192. Quoted from Prothero, Statutes and Constitutional Documents, Third Parliament, p. 57.

The priesthood thus became a crime, and Thomas Woodhouse, a Marian priest, was put to death just because he was a priest. Many others followed in his steps to execution.

In the early part of her reign Elizabeth had shown considerable leniency toward the Catholics because she needed their support to keep her throne. Now for a similar reason she turned from that early leniency to severe measures. Since the Bull of Excommunication the Catholics were assured that they were freed from allegiance to the Queen, and now Elizabeth to keep her throne would have to be much more vigilant.

CATHOLIC REACTION: PLOTS

The Catholic reaction to the Bull of Excommunication was rather desperate. Since the bull absolved Catholics from allegiance to Elizabeth, Catholics became more urgent in plotting against the Queen. The English feeling toward the Catholics also became more bitter, as we have seen in the penal enactments. The same year, 1571, the Ridolfi Plot was formed. Ridolfi, an Italian banker, was a secret agent of the Pope. Norfolk, who had been released from the Tower, was to marry Mary, and they were to become King and Queen of England with the help of foreign powers. Burghley with his spy system unraveled the scheme. Norfolk was again captured, tortured, and questioned. The entire affair was disclosed, and then Cecil struck. Norfolk was again imprisoned, the Spanish ambassador was dismissed, and the Queen of Scots' chances for life were lessened.

In the execution of the sentences given by Parliament after this plot Elizabeth showed her dominant will. Parliament condemned Norfolk and wanted to draw up a bill of attainder against Mary. The power of Elizabeth's will in this instance is shown in the following quotation.

> "The two Houses conferred and negotiated; and when the queen still opposed the passing of a bill of attainder against Mary, even the gentle Parker wrote in excited protest to Burghley, and the bishops as a body presented a document to the queen to urge her assent to the execution of justice upon her rival. Elizabeth was a woman after all, and a woman with a strange mixture both of caprice and of tenderness in her hard character. She had reached a point where no minister or parliament could force her hand: she refused to countenance extreme

> measures against her cousin, and, indeed, it was only with great difficulty that her consent was finally secured to the execution of the sentence against the Duke of Norfolk on June 2, 1572. " 25

25 Frere, W. H. op. cit., p. 177.

Despite these feelings toward Mary Stuart, however, Elizabeth's will to keep her throne would ultimately make her consent to the execution of Mary, as we shall see later.

THE SEMINARY PRIESTS

In 1574 Allen's seminary priests helped to bring about a real revival in Catholic life and spirit and, consequently, increased the number of recusants. These priests too were hunted by the spies of the government, but they carried on their missionary work in spite of government, council, and queen.

> "The effect on England was most striking. One of those sent over writes to Dr. Allen after a year's work, 'The number of Catholics increases so abundantly on all sides that he who almost alone holds the rudder of the State has privately admitted to one of his friends that for one staunch Catholic at the beginning of the reign there were now, for he knew for certain, ten.
>
> "Later on it was reported that 'one of the younger priests lately sent on the mission had reconciled no fewer than eighty persons in one day.
>
> "Such a revival was certain not to escape the vigilant eye of Cecil, and in 1577 the first of the long line of seminary priests whose names are written as martyrs in the Book of Life was called upon to die for the Faith." 26

26 Wilmot-Buxton, E. M. op. cit., p. 105.

The priest referred to above was Cuthbert Mayne. Elizabeth's will through all this priest hunting was carried out through the spy system which was superadded to the regular penal laws that reached a climax in 1585. In that year it was enacted

> "(1) 'that all Jesuits, seminary priests and other priests whatsoever, made or ordained.....by any authority....derived ....from the See of Rome since 24th June, 1559, should within forty days depart out of this realm.'
>
> "(2) Any Jesuit, seminary priest or other, so remaining after the same forty days should incur the offence of high treason and suffer its penalty. Any person aiding or receiving 'such Jesuit or other' should be adjudged a felon, without benefit of clergy, and suffer death and forfeit as in case of felony.
>
> "(3) All English subjects at foreign Seminaries should return home within six months and take the oath of supremacy, or else be adjudged traitors and suffer as in case of high treason.
>
> "(4) After the same forty days no one should sent their child or dependent 'into the parts beyond the seas,' except by special licence of her Majesty or four of her Privy Council, upon pain to forfeit £100 for each offence.
>
> "(5) Any person after the same forty days concealing the knowledge of a Jesuit's or other priest's presence to be fined and imprisoned at the Queen's pleasure."27

---

27 Allies, Mary H. op. cit., p. 212-213. Gleaned from Prothero, Statutes and Constitutional Documents, 1559-1625, p. 27. Elizabeth, cap. ii., p. 83.

These enactments certainly outlawed the Catholic religion and showed how Elizabeth was going further and further. At

first in 1558 she demanded the recognition of her supremacy and the uniformity in services, and in that she was lenient. In 1563 laws became more stringent against recusants, but she still urged leniency in their enforcement. After the bull of excommunication and the Northern Rising in 1570, the Parliament passed stricter laws against recusants making it treason to reconcile or to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, and it made such subject to praemunire who would distribute any articles of devotion blessed by the Pope. The climax of persecution was reached in the legislation of 1585 quoted above to retaliate against the work done in England by the seminary priests.

BABINGTON PLOT

During the next year, 1585, the Babington conspiracy was formed. As things appeared, it was a conspiracy against the life of Elizabeth, but one wonders whether further research will not prove that it was a conspiracy against the life of Mary Stuart. At any rate, Walsingham knew about the plot as soon as it was conceived, but he did nothing to counteract it until he had full proof of the guilt of the conspirators. He had "evidence" that Philip II had approved the plan, and that Mary Stuart was one of the plotters. This was announced in 1586.

> "There was certainly an inner ring of conspirators, to which Babington belonged, who were determined to carry out the full programme. As certainly the conspiracy had wider ramifications, and the greater number of the conspirators were only aware of the purpose of freeing Mary and knew nothing of the plan for assassination of Elizabeth.

> "The English have, it seems, an especial talent for espionage. The English government's secret service has, from the time of Elizabeth to our own day, always been greatly superior to that of any other power. So now the conspirators were as children in Walsingham's hands. Their plans were known to him from the first. They were given sufficient rope to hang themselves--and, what was more important to hang Mary--and were then seized, and, of course, executed. Elizabeth specially requested that the death of the conspirators should be 'protracted to the extremity of pain' and with the first victims this was done, but the horror of the crowd at the barbarity of the execution compelled the executioners to dispatch the remainder more quickly."28

---

28 Hollis, Christopher. The Monstrous Regiment, p. 142-143.

EXECUTION OF MARY STUART

It was decided that Elizabeth would not be safe as long as Mary Stuart lived. Parliament accordingly requested the death warrant. It was granted, but Elizabeth hesitated for some time to sign the warrant, but finally put her signature to the deed in 1587. The exact time of the execution was unknown to her and she with characteristic meanness blamed her secretary Walsingham for the execution. He was then dismissed.[29] She decided on this desperate line of action to save

---

29 Lunt, W. E. op. cit., p. 379

---

her Crown. The countries friendly to Mary Stuart were incensed at the execution. If Elizabeth could shift the blame on some one else it would not be so dangerous to her Crown.

The action, however, was a signal for Spanish

aggressiveness which resulted in the affair of the Spanish Armada the next year. That Elizabeth actually wanted Mary Stuart executed is evident from her own letters. She writes to James, Mary's son, about 1 February, 1586-7. She offers various arguments for the necessity of putting her to death. The Scottish commissioners wanted to put Mary in a neutral country and there be allowed no interference in England. Elizabeth ridicules the proposal and vindicates her intention to sacrifice the life of her prisoner, upon the plea of necessity.

> "Be not carried away, my deare brother, with the lewd perswations of suche, as instead of infourming you of my to nideful and helpeless cause of defending the brethe that God hath given me, to be better spent than spilt by the bloudy invention of traitors handz, may perhaps make you belive, that ether the offense was not so great, or if that cannot serue them, for the overmanifest triall wiche in publik and by the greatest and most in this land hathe bine manifestly proved, yet the wyl make that her life may be saved and myne safe, wiche wold God wer true, for whan you make vewe of my long danger indured thes fowne--wel ny five--moneths time to make a tast of the greatest witz among my owne, and than of French, and last of you, wyl graunt with me, that if nide were not more than my malice she shuld not have her merite." 30

---

30 Bruce, John, ed. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland. No. XXVI, p. 43-44.

That Elizabeth's will was ever uppermost in the minds of her favorites we also find sufficient evidence regarding the case of Mary Stuart.

> "Her ill-starred appeal to Queen Elizabeth we shall see working out slowly to results culminating on a scaffold inside Fotheringhay castle;....These English statesmen (Dudley, Burghley, Walsingham, Hatton), according to their code and creed, laboured devotedly in the service of their monarch; and had no enemies except her enemies, no friends except her friends." 31

---

31 Tenison, E. M. op. cit. Vol. I, p. 329.

We cannot lose sight of the fact of what Tenison says is often obscured in regard to Mary Stuart. "The point sometimes obscured is that she suffered more for her religion than any other Catholic potentate of her day." 32.

---

32 Ibid., p. 330.

THE PURITAN MOVEMENT

Another phase in the resistance to Elizabeth's established Church is the Puritan movement. The influence of the Protestant Reformation on the continent had become stronger after the accession of Elizabeth because the exiled bishops had returned and had imbibed Puritan ideas. Their influence became an important factor in shaping developments in England and most certainly in bringing about the religious struggle of the next few decades.

> "The same contentious spirit which had characterised them at Frankfort was transferred to England, there to show itself only in increased bitterness. It is of importance to realize this, as it is the key to much of the religious trouble of Elizabeth's reign. It is fruitless to speculate on what might have been the course of the Elizabethan settlement of religion if these turbulent spirits had remained abroad; certainly a

> workable and working compromise of toleration for Papists and Reformers alike might have been effected; or, at least, such a solution is thinkable. But the arrogant intolerance exhibited against one another by both sections of the Frankfort dispute, while still continuing unabated after the return of the exiles to England, was combined into a semblance of peace and unanimity against the common enemy--those who adhered to the Pope and to the Mass." 33

---

33 Birt, Henry Norbert. The Elizabethan Religious Settlement, p. 226.

These zealots showed themselves averse to anything Catholic and in their zeal destroyed images and altars unauthorized by the government. This zeal elicited a proclamation, 27 December, 1558, forbidding all manner of preaching. These extremists also began to oppose the liturgy as prescribed by law, because for them such articles as surplices, copes, crucifixes, and candles, savored too much of popery.

We have seen in the preceding chapter how Archbishop Parker issued injunctions to the members of the church, which were known as the "Advertisements". A number of articles in the "Advertisements" were concerned with preaching and doctrine, some with the administration of the sacraments and of prayer, others for certain orders in ecclesiastical policy, and still others for outward apparel for ecclesiastics. Many of these points were contrary to the Puritan principles because they savored of popery. These "Advertisements" were being observed in Parker's diocese and served later on as a basis to stem the tide of growing Puritanism in other dioceses.

RESISTANCE TO PARKER'S "ADVERTISEMENTS"

The "Advertisements" were staunchly resisted by leading Puritans whose aversion to "Romish" practices and habits was becoming stronger. Some of the leaders in the Puritan reaction were deprived of their livings and even imprisoned. The climax came when, in 1566, Parker and the Bishop of London called a meeting of the clergy of London to present themselves before them.

> "About a hundred and ten presented themselves, and were confronted with a minister properly attired in the prescribed vestments. The Chancellor of the diocese then spoke: 'My masters and ministers of London, the Council's pleasure is that ye strictly keep the unity of apparel like to this man as ye see him: that is a square cap, a scholar's gown priest-like, or tippet, and in the Church a linen surplice; and inviolably observe the Book of Common Prayer, and the Queen's Majesty's injunctions and the Book of Convocation. Ye that will presently subscribe write volo. Those that will not subscribe write nolo. Be brief, make no words.' When the names were called, thirty-seven refused to conform, 'of which number were the best and some preachers,' says Parker. But their good qualities did not save them for they were summarily suspended. They suffered with a clear conscience, and a full recognition of the consequences. Some of them left the ministry for various scholastic pursuits, some became chaplains in the families of Puritan gentry, some joined the Presbyterians in Scotland, and some emigrated. Five persisted in preaching, and were committed by the Queen's Council as prisoners in the private custody of various bishops."34

---

34 Selbie, W. B. English Sects, p. 32-33.

A number of the Church dignitaries were infected with the principles of Puritanism; yet there were bishops who would submit their judgment to the will of the Queen. Jewel was

likely one of the best of Elizabethan divines and he expresses his sentiments in the following terms:

> "'The contest, about which I doubt not you have heard either from our friends Abel or Parkhurst, respecting the linen surplice, is not yet at rest. The matter still somewhat disturbs weak minds; and I wish that all, even the slightest, vestiges of Popery might be removed from our churches, and above all from our minds. But the Queen, at this time, is unable to endure the least alteration in matters of religion.'" 35

---

35 Child, Gilbert. Church and State under the Tudors, p. 209.

The Established Church was firm in its principles of adhering to the Act of Uniformity. And Parker, too, was firm in his insistence of the authority of the bishop and in maintaining the traditions of the English Church. In order to keep to these traditions it was necessary to have well trained priests. Where there were not sufficient numbers of priests ready, lay readers supplied the deficiency temporarily. Parker believed that pastors must be men fit to guide and guard their flock against ignorance and loss of faith. He built up her traditions, worked against concessions to Puritans, and directed the policy of the English Church through attacks by both Catholics and Puritans. We have already considered the resistance that the Catholic group offered to Elizabeth in the work of Allen, the seminary priests, and in the Northern Risings. Now our main interest is in the struggle with the Puritan groups.

TWO GROUPS OF PURITANS

In the early development of Puritanism we find two groups--those who wanted to purify the Established Church from Roman practices, and those who wanted to form an entirely separate organization outside of the Established Church without the Book of Common Prayer and Uniformity. They became the group of non-conformists or separatists who had to be invited by the government to leave the country if they wanted to keep to their separate church organization. In that sense they were treated as the Catholics.

There was a group under the leadership of Thomas Cartwright who opposed the episcopal organization because it was too much like the Catholic Church. He advocated the adoption of the presbyterian system for the Established Church. This group became a great menace to the organization of the Established Church for it tended to manage the State. Elizabeth met these difficulties by issuing a proclamation (1573) against conventicles. Cartwright met a strong opponent in John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, and later second successor of Parker. Whitgift himself was not without Puritan principles, but he recognized revolutionary principles in Cartwright's theories.

ELIZABETH'S CONTROL OF RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENTS

Through this struggle against the Puritans Elizabeth kept the upper hand. When in 1572 a pamphlet appeared entitled "An Admonition to Parliament" by Field and Wilcox, expressing itself against the bishops, the book of common

prayer, and abuses in the Church, Elizabeth expressed herself to the Commons forbidding them to pass bills relating to religion without the consent of herself and the clergy.

> "In the matter of church difficulties she was as unyielding as ever: the reforming section in the Commons might meet expectantly and proceed valiantly with a Bill for Rites and Ceremonies to supercede the prayer-book, and the House might agree to accept some modification of it, securing a general uniformity without tying ministers to a prescript form; but again the guillotine descended on it. On May 22 the Speaker brought the unwelcome order from the queen that henceforward no bills concerning religion were to be received into the Commons, unless they had first been considered and liked by the clergy. At her request the two recent bills were sent to her, and they were accompanied by an apologetic assurance from the House. The treasurer returned answer on the next day that the queen utterly misliked one of the bills, and was determined not to allow the molestation of the clergy which it purported; but she would herself, as Defender of the Faith, discourage all papists and maintain all good protestants." 36

---

36 Frere, W. H. op. cit., p. 178-179.

Again in 1576 when the Commons wanted to legislate in ecclesiastical affairs and with the connivance of Convocation she interfered.

> "A petition to the Crown for the reformation of discipline was drawn up and entrusted to the privy council. It had even reached in March 1576 the point of developing into a bill, when again the queen stopped proceedings, saying that she had been conferring already with the bishops on the matter, and would see that there was redress of the grievances through their agency. The next session, however, found things no better: the Commons made a formal appeal to the Crown to remedy abuses, alleging especially four things--the incapacity of the clergy and the abuse of discipline by wrongful

> excommunication, commutation of penance, and excessive dispensations. The clamour for reform was shared by the Lower House of convocation, which, to remedy these abuses, drew up articles of its own, calling on the bishops for reform.
>
> "The queen sent for Archbishop Sandys, and he with five other bishops, met the deputation from the Commons, and agreed upon a programme of reform, which must have been considerable, since the archbishop judged that it would necessitate a new act of parliament. But the queen would have none of it; and, when pressed by the archbishop for a reply, she only said that she would not tolerate the interference of parliament in the matter." 37

---

37 Ibid., p. 198-199.

When Grindal, the successor of Parker, upheld Puritan principles and refused to suppress the "prophysings" or conventicles on Elizabeth's request, Elizabeth suspended him from his episcopal office for six months, and sent orders directly to his suffragans to suppress the meetings. Elizabeth ever claimed herself as head of the church and 'Defender of the Faith'. Elizabeth would have deprived him entirely, but that was difficult. Grindal remained in disgrace and practically suspended for the rest of his life.

> "For the most part the government behaved with extraordinary leniency and consideration towards the Puritans. Some of the preachers were, it is true, deprived when they had made themselves too noticeable, and here and there one or two were sent to prison, but harsh treatment was only meted out to the extreme left of the party, the adherents of Robert Browne, who had formerly separated himself from the national church in order to form a community composed solely of the 'more worthy', and denied not only the validity of the

> Anglican consecration, but also the spiritual supremacy of the queen. In spite of this, Browne, who was a relative of Burghley, was for a long time treated with great consideration, until in 1581 he thought it wise to fly to Middelburg in Holland with his friends. This sect gave the Puritans their first two martyrs; two of Browne's disciples, who obstinately denied the spiritual supremacy of Elizabeth had, in 1583, to expiate their unpardonable crime on the scaffold." 38

---

38 Pastor, Ludwig Von. The History of the Popes. Vol. XIX, p. 475.

In 1583 Whitgift succeeded Grindal as Archbishop of Canterbury. In the meantime non-conformity had been rendered almost as penal as popery. The Puritans had always posed as friends of the Queen, but they claimed to be at odds with the bishops. This condition could not exist satisfactorily, for the bishops were but the tools of the State. Elizabeth really controlled matters. She had a great distasts for modifications in ceremonies and vestments. The bishops, as Jewel, Grindal, and others sympathized with the Puritans, and if they had had the power many more changes would have been made. Again it was the dominant Tudor will that controlled matters.

FIRM STAND CONCERNING ORDERS

In the latter half of Elizabeth's reign there was considerable strengthening of the position of the Church of England. There were two cases either of proposed deprivation or actual deprivation on account of the question of Orders. Elizabeth and the church authorities insisted on orders being conferred according to the established formula. One was

Mr. Whittingham who the Archbishop said

> "'hath not proved that he was orderly made minister at Geneva, and as far as appears that he did not allege that he had received any imposition of hands.' The Chancellor also further quotes the words of the first certificate which Whittingham displayed to the Commission, saying that 'he was made a minister by lot and election of the whole English congregation at Geneva.' This certificate he afterwards attempted to amend, but to very little purpose." 39

---

39 Child, Gilbert W. op. cit., p. 229.

Mr. Whittingham was not actually deprived before his death which occurred soon after this controversy.

The other case was that of Mr. Travers, a relative of Burghley and a professed Puritan. Archbishop objected to his becoming Master of the Temple, which office was vacant in 1584. Whitgift wrote to Lord Burghley

> "'unless he (Travers) would testify his conformity by subscription as all others did which now entered into ecclesiastical livings, and would also make proof unto him that he is a minister, ordered according to the laws of this Church of England (as he verily believed he was not, because he forsook his place in the college upon that occasion), he could by no means yield to consent to the placing him there, or elsewhere in any function of this Church.'" 40

---

40 Ibid., p. 231.

Travers refused to undergo reordination and therefore did not receive the appointment. The appointment was given to Richard Hooker, but Travers was allowed to preach. He contradicted the sermons of Hooker, and Whitgift forbade him to

preach. These cases show that Elizabeth was determined not to allow Puritanism a place in her religious organization. Anglicanism was becoming stronger through this stand against the Puritans and it showed that it was taking a stand of exclusiveness towards Protestant churches. At the same time it maintained the uncompromising attitude toward Rome.

FINAL DECISION CONCERNING THE PURITANS

The activities of the Puritans would not cease because of repressive measures on the part of the government, but led gradually to a complete separation from the Church of England. Neither would the Established Church succumb on account of these developments.

> "The longer Elizabeth lived the more insistent became her claims to absolute authority in things ecclesiastical; and, in urging these claims, she found in Whitgift a fit tool for her purpose. So far as outward appearance went, she won the fight against the Puritans all along the line. Their leaders were deprived of their livings, and great multitudes of them were imprisoned. They had to carry on their propaganda in secret; their books were confiscated; and many of them went in peril of their lives." 41

41 Selbie, W. B. op. cit., p. 40-41.

> "Soon the conviction forced itself on Elizabeth that there was a stubbornness about Puritanism which was powerless to subdue. The numbers of the nonconformists were few. Now that public opinion was moving away from them they were dangerous only when they were martyrs. It was better to cut off the rotten limb altogether than maintain a festering sore. Accordingly, in 1593, she appealed to Parliament, and an act was pssed providing that those who

refused to attend church, or who attended unauthorised religious meetings of their own, should be banished from the country. The result was completely successful." 42

---

43 Wakeman, Henry Offley. An Introduction to the History of the Church of England, p. 341.

GENERAL RESULTS OF THE DOMINANT WILL OF ELIZABETH

There are repeated instances that show the individual will of Elizabeth in her relations with the Church. It may be well here to summarize the main points by another quotation from Child.

> "....the supremacy really meant not any idea of State power in the abstract, but simply the concrete will--too, often, indeed, the mere caprice--of the individual sovereign for the time being.
>
> "In this instance, again, we find theory and practice, in these early days of the Reformed Church, very much at one. The Elizabethan Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. c, 1) provides for the government of the Church by the sovereign herself, by the machinery of Commissions under the Great seal; and Elizabeth accordingly, and her next two successors after her, looked upon the government of the Church as their own individual prerogative, and invariably resented any attempt on the part of Parliament to interfere with it.... In the beginning of the reign we find Jewel stating that it is to the Queen's own determined dislike of change that the maintenance of the vestments and ceremonies objected to by the Puritans, and disliked only a little less by the bishops themselves, is due. Later on we have seen her personal objection to the 'prophesyings' leading to their prohibition by the bishops, and to the suspension of the archbishop himself, because he declined to acquiesce; and towards the end we have seen her rebuking Archbishop Whitgift for permitting the predestinarian controversy to emerge..... and throughout the reign we find any attempt on the part of Parliament to deal with

> ecclesiastical matters of any kind checked and rebuked in no measured terms, even in cases in which the Queen took the same view as the Commons themselves." 44

---

44 Child, Gilbert W. op. cit., p. 249-250.

It is evident that Elizabeth in spite of every conflict and in every power of resistance to her will, held her own and did it not so much by her direct personal acts, as by her agents who always knew how to have her will dominate.

> "Few monarchs have been better served than Elizabeth Regina, and the 'causes why' her absolute power was deliberately built up by her Councillors, afford an education in the art of government." 45

---

45 Tenison, E. M. Elizabethan England. Vol. I, p. 331.

This episode with regard to the dissenters would lead us to believe that Elizabeth had become sincere in maintaining the state religion according to her established ideals. Her state religion which was a sort of Via Media, a middle course that kept from extreme changes in doctrine and did away with certain ceremonies that savored too much of "Popery", had served her well and she would not let it be threatened. It would seem that the will to rule had brought Anglicanism into existence, but the result was a Protestant State Church in England with the sovereign of the Kingdom as supreme head of the established church.

SUMMARY

The conclusions drawn from the study of the influence of the dominant will of the Tudors on the religious trends of the sixteenth century may be summed up briefly. Henry VIII in his will to possess a male heir to the throne, sacrificed his loyalty to the Church of Rome by defying the Pope, divorcing his wife without Papal sanction, marrying Anne Boleyn, declaring himself head of the church of England, and bringing the entire nation into a schism. To overcome any opposition to his will he required his subjects to take the oaths of Succession and Supremacy and had many executed who refused to acknowledge him as head of the Church. In order to do away with any vestige of loyalty to the Papacy he dissolved the monasteries and shrines and used the wealth of these religious institutions for his own benefit. Through his dominant Tudor will Henry acquired and maintained until his death absolute control over the Church as well as over the State.

The personal will of the Tudors was not expressed during Edward VI's reign, but the powers were assumed by a group of Protestant statesmen who organized the first real Protestant Church in England.

With the accession of Mary the Tudor will was again active. Mary through parliamentary legislation swept away the Protestant organization and re-introduced the authority of the Pope and Catholic life and activity into England. Through her personal will the medieval method of persecuting for heresy by burning at the stake was used with rigor, and

through the centuries the odium of cruelty has clung to her, although Henry VIII and Elizabeth both persecuted as strenuously, but under a cloak of executing for treason.

Elizabeth in her precarious position at the time of her accession was determined at all costs to rule. If she remained a Catholic, she would be recognized as illegitimate because of the marriage of Henry VIII with Anne Boleyn, her mother. By parliamentary laws the Royal Supremacy was restored. She demanded the oaths of Supremacy and of Uniformity to be taken. However, in order to maintain support she was lenient towards Catholics and Puritans in the first years of her reign. Resistance to her religion was offered by William Allen in the establishing of the seminary for priests, by the Catholics in the North who wanted to place Mary Stuart on the throne, by the Papal Bull of Excommunication, by plots against the life of the Queen, and by the development of various groups of Puritans. Her will was expressed through more severe penal enactments against Catholics and Puritans after the first years of her reign, by her insistence of retaining the episcopacy in the organization of the church, and by making of it an establishment which has continued to our own day.

Our final conclusion is that it was the personal, concrete will of the Tudor monarchs that brought about the changes in religion making the Church of England a creature of the State with the claim of continuity of order and organization traced back from the early days of Christianity, and, at the same time, in complete independence of the Papacy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND BOOKS OF REFERENCE

Read, Conyers. Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period, 1485-1603. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933. 467 p.

A complete historical bibliography of the Tudor period. It contains over 4000 titles and is invaluable for any subject of research relating to this period of history.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, an International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church. Edited by Herbermann, Charles J.; Pace, Edward A.; Pallen, Conde B.; Shahan, Thomas J.; Wynne, John J.; assisted by numerous collaborators. In fifteen volumes. Volume XI. New York, Robert Appleton Company, 1911.

Gillow, Joseph. A Literary and Biographical History, or Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics from the Breach with Rome in 1534 to the Present Time. New York, Burns & Oates, Catholic Publication Society, 9 Barclay St. Nineteenth century.

Good for quick reference on individual characters.

Low, Sidney J. M. and Pulling, Frederick S. Ed. Dictionary of English History. 1884. Enlarged and revised. London and New York, 1928.

Bibliographies. Extremely convenient dictionary of brief articles on individuals, battles, treaties, institutions, and various other topics.

Stephen, Leslie and Lee, Sir Sidney. Ed. Dictionary of National Biography. 63 vol. London, 1885-1900.

Valuable bibliographies. Invaluable work of highest scholarship. No person living at the time of the publication of the work has a place in the work. Includes many biographies or sketches of Americans before the revolt of the thirteen colonies.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Allen, William. A True, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholics That Suffer for Their Faith both at Home and Abroad, against a False, Seditious and Slanderous Libel, Entitled: 'The Execution of Justice in England.' 2 vol. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder, 1914.

"Wherein is declared how unjustly the Protestants do charge Catholics with treason; how untruly they deny their persecution for Religion; and how deceitfully they seek to abuse strangers about the cause, greatness, and manner of their sufferings, with divers other matters pertaining to this purpose."

Bruce, John. Ed. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland. Some of them printed from originals in the possession of the Rev. Edward Ryder and others from a ms. which formerly belonged to Sir Peter Thompson. Camden Society, 1849.

The official correspondence between Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland is especially interesting in revealing the intimate relations of the two rulers.

Camden, William. Annales: The True and Royall History of the famous Empresse Elizabeth, Queen of England, France, and Ireland, etc. True faith's defendresse of Divine renoune and happy memory. Wherein all such memorable things as happened during her blessed raigne, with such acts and treaties as past betwixt hir Ma.tie and Scotland, France, Spaine, Italy, Germany, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Russia, and all Netherlands are exactly described. London, 1625.

This rare copy of Camden's Annales is very interesting. The work contains a very fine but brief summary of Henry's, Edward's, and Mary's reigns. This introductory part proved more helpful than the rest, which is the history of Elizabeth.

Cheyney, Edward P. Readings in English History drawn from the Original Sources. Chicago, Ginn & Co., 1908.

This is one of the best collections of source material for ordinary high school and college classes.

Dearmer, Percy. Religious Pamphlets. Selected and arranged with an introduction and notes. New York, Henry Holt & Co. London, Kegan, Paul, Trench Truebner & Co., 1898. 380 p.

It contains pamphlets by Cartwright, Knox, Parsons, selections from the Marprelate Tracts--all material valuable for the Tudor period.

Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. A new and complete edition with a preliminary dissertation by the Rev. George Townsend. Edited by the Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley. Vols. V and VI. London, R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1838. 8 vols.

World history written in the time of Elizabeth. Extremely biased in favor of the Crown.

Gee, Henry and Hardy, William John. Documents Illustrative of English Church History. Compiled from original sources. London and New York, MacMillan and Co., 1896. 670 p.

This volume contains the most important documents through the history of the English Church to the present time. It contains a particularly large number of documents belonging to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They are reprints in most cases from originals or nearly contemporary copies.

Hall, Edward. Henry VIII. Vol. II. London, T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1904.

A panegyric of the house of Tudor, especially of Henry VIII, to whose reign the bulk of the work is devoted. The best contemporary history of Henry VIII. It is greatly biased in favor of Henry.

Harrison, G. B. The Letters of Queen Elizabeth. London, Cassell & Company Ltd., 1935.

This work contains selections of official correspondence between the Queen and her minister, Cecil, to Mary Queen of Scots, to the Deprived Bishops, to Ambassadors, and other officials.

Marshall, Gorgias. Fugitive Poetical Tracts. First Series. Written in verse. The condition of Religious and Political Feeling in England and of the State of Society there during Two Centuries. A Compendious Treatise in metre. 1554.

Two copies of the Compendious Treatise in metre are preserved--one in possession of Mr. Huth and the other in Lambeth Palace. It is valuable for reflecting the trend of thought and sentiment by various groups with highly varied convictions. There are a number of poems of the Tudor period.

Mumby, Frank A. The Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth. A narrative in contemporary letters with an introduction by R. S. Rait. London, Constable & Co., Ltd., 1909. 354 p.

An interesting narrative in itself but not very helpful on the topic of religion.

Palaeophilus, Anglicanus. The Conduct of Queen Elizabeth towards the Neighbouring Nations, and particularly Spain, compared with that of James I. In view of the late and present Behaviour of Great Britain. London: Printed for J. Robinson near Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, 1729.

Not so pertinent to the religious question, but more valuable for the political viewpoint.

Pollard, A. F. Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588. An English Garner Series. London, Archibald Constable and Co.

There are a number of tracts that pertain to the subject of religious persecution.

Roper, William. Life of More in Utopia, by Sir Thomas More. New York, A. L. Burt. p. 45-127.

This is written by More's son-in-law. It is, therefore, the original source of all information as to Thomas More's personal history.

Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and other various occurrences in the Church of England, during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: together with an appendix of original papers of state, records, and letters. Oxford, Clarendon press, 1824.

Contains most valuable documentary material, sometimes inaccurately or carelessly given.

Strype, John. Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion and the reformation of it and the emergencies of the Church of England under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary I, with large appendixes, containing original papers, records, etc. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1824.

Valuable for the three reigns as source material.

Tudor Proclamations. Facsimiles of Proclamations of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Philip and Mary. Oxford, 1897.

This is an especially fine collection of facsimile documents.

Warrender, Margaret, Ed. Illustrations of Scottish History. 16th century Letters and Documents of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, James VI, Bothwell, etc. From the originals in the possession of Sir George Warrender, Bart., of Lochend. Edinburgh; James Stillie, 1889.

This is especially valuable for political correspondence where Scottish history touches the English.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Allies, Mary H. History of the Church in England. From the accession of Henry VIII to the death of Queen Elizabeth. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 1895. 255 p.

A scholarly treatment of the religious question of the period. Viewpoint is Catholic throughout.

Barrington, E. (L. Adams Beck). Anne Boleyn. Garden City, New York, Doubleday Doran & Co., Inc., 1934.

An interesting biography in popular and sensational style. Not very scholarly.

Belloc, Hilaire. How the Reformation Happened. New York, Robert M. Mc Bride & Company, 1928.

This is a general history of the Reformation with special sections devoted to the English Reformation. The point of view is rather unique in treatment. It is an interesting general account.

Belloc, Hilaire. A Shorter History of England. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1934. 438 p.

The chapters on the Tudor period are interesting. Belloc in this book rather forgets personalities and considers large movements. It is interesting for the general reader, but hardly adequate for the college student. Though Belloc is considered an authority, he neglects to give references and bibliographies.

Benger, Miss: Memoirs of the Life of Mary Queen of Scots. With anecdotes of the court of Henry II during her residence in France. From the second London edition. In two volumes. Vol. II. Philadelphia, John E. Potter and Company, 617 Sansom Street. No date, but printed in the 19th century.

This is a specially sympathetic treatment of the Queen of Scots. It is a Catholic viewpoint.

Birt, Henry Norbert. The Elizabethan Religious Settlement. A study of contemporary documents. London, George Bell and Sons, 1907. 4 595p.

Roman Catholic viewpoint. Critical of Gee. Very valuable for pertinent quotations from state papers.

Black, J. B. The Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1603. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936. 448 p.

This book is one of the new series of volumes put out by the Oxford University. It is very scholarly. This work considers all aspects of the reign of Elizabeth with special emphasis on the cultural and social. It is especially good on the question of puritanism and the settlement of religion.

Brewer, J. S. The Reign of Henry VIII from his Accession to the Death of Wolsey. Reviewed and illustrated from original documents. Edited by Gairdner, James. London, John Murray, 1884. 2 vol. Vol. II.

A scholarly account by a distinguished archivist. This is useful mainly in the latter half of Vol. II in relation to the divorce of Henry VIII.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by Lord Acton. Vol. 2, "The Reformation". New York, Macmillan, 1904.

A standard general account of the Reformation. Most scholarly. Excellent bibliography.

Camm, Bede Dom. The English Martyrs. St. Louis, B. Herder, 1929.

A collection of papers from the summer school of Catholic studies held at Cambridge, July 28--August 6, 1928. It proved useful for the resistance to the Anglican settlement.

Cheney, Edward P. A Short History of England. New edition. Chicago, Ginn & Co., 1932. 790 p.

Good for a general and simple account of English history. The Tudor period is fairly treated.

Child, Gilbert W. Church and State under the Tudors. London, Longmans, Green Co., 1890. 429 p.

Appendix of documents is very valuable for the period. The text bears upon the relation of the Tudors to the State and the Church. It emphasizes the strong influence these rulers exerted on religious changes. It is especially useful for the period and draws very freely from original documents.

Clayton, Joseph. The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain. Milwaukee, Bruce Pub. Co., 1934. 252 p.

An unbiased, truthful presentation of the subject. The author says: "In all my history work I do what I can just to set out the truth, with understanding, and therefore with some sympathy towards the persons concerned--above all my aim is to set out what really happened, and why and how." (Preface, vi.)

Constant, G. The Reformation in England. I, The English Schism Henry VIII (1509-1547). Tr. by the Rev. R. E. Scantlebury with a preface by Hilaire Belloc. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1934. 531 p.

Scholarly and impartial. It gives a very clear presentation of the schism and its accompanying circumstances.

Craig, Asa H. Christian Persecutions, being a historical exposition of the principal Catholic events from the Christian era to the present time. Second ed. Burlington, Wis., The Burlington Pub. Co., 1899.

This is written from an unprejudiced standpoint. It is good for generalizations. The author is neither Catholic nor Protestant, but the viewpoint is especially in favor of the Catholic side.

Einstein, Lewis. Tudor Ideals. New York, Harcourt, Brace & co., 1921.

It is somewhat prejudiced. Various phases of the Tudor period are treated.

Frere, W. H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625). London, Macmillan Co., 1904. 413 p.

An authoritative work on the period based on the study of original sources and built up from much of the new source material lately placed at the disposal of the student. Many other authors draw from this source.

Froude, James Anthony. History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. 12 vols. New York, Scribner, 1865.

This is a brilliant work by a learned but biased writer, who misuses his sources in his anxiety to defend Henry VIII.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. A Student's History of England from the earliest times to 1885. Vol. II. 1509-1689. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1891.

The complete work is in three volumes. For many years the most substantial textbook for colleges. Multiplicity of detail. Gardiner remains one of the greatest masters of history.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Eve of the Reformation. Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, & Co., Ltd.--London, 1900.

Studies in the religious life and thought of the English people in the period preceding the rejection of the Roman jurisdiction by Henry VIII. Scholarly presentation of the Roman Catholic viewpoint.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries. Vol. I and II. John Hodges, London, 1893.

An attempt to illustrate the history of their suppression. Roman Catholic viewpoint. An authentic source on the subject. It was especially valuable for the divorce case and for the monasteries.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Last Abbot of Glastonbury and Other Essays. London, George Bell & Sons, 1908.

A number of the essays in this volume are very useful for the Tudor period.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan. "Hampshire Recusants in the time of Elizabeth". In the Old English Bible and Other Essays. London, John C. Nimmo, 1897. 399 p.

Roman Catholic viewpoint. Many documents.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan and Bishop, Edmund. Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer. An examination into its origin and early history with an appendix of unpublished documents. London, John Hodges, 1891.

Valuable for the reign of Edward VI.

Green, John Richard. England New York, Cooperative Publication Society. World's Best History Series.

Brilliant essay of England. A mass of materials of very various value.

Green, J. R. A Short History of the English People. Vol. VI. Everyman's Library, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co.

Passes over lightly and briefly the details of foreign wars and diplomacies, and dwells at length on the incident of that constitutional, intellectual, and social advance which tells the history of the nation.

Guggenberger, A. A General History of the Christian Era. In 3 vols. Vol. II, The Protestant Reformation. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder, 1916. Vol. II, 472 p.

A detailed and careful study of the Christian era with a decidedly Catholic viewpoint. Useful for general reference.

Hayes, Carlton J. H. A Political and Social History of Modern Europe. Vol. 2. New York, Macmillan Co., 1931.

An authoritative general account of modern history for college students.

Headley, P. C. The Life of Mary Queen of Scots. New York, W. H. Appleton, 92 and 94 Grand Street, 1865.

A biography of Mary Stuart told rather uninterestingly; yet containing many letters written by the unfortunate queen.

Hollis, Christopher. The Monstrous Regiment. New York, Minton, Balch & co., 1930. 250 p.

A study of the religion of the reign of Elizabeth with a Catholic viewpoint. It emphasizes the question of the apostacy of England from the Church of Rome at the time of Elizabeth.

Hollis, Christopher. Thomas More. Milwaukee, Wis., Bruce Pub. Co., 1934.

A very interesting account of More by a scholarly and a literary artist.

Hope, Mrs. The First Divorce of Henry VIII as told in the state papers. Edited, with notes and introduction by Gasquet, F. A. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner, & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, 1894.

James Gairdner says in 'New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII' E. H. R., xi, (1896), p. 672: Mrs. Hope's posthumous work does not apply the thorough investigation that is wanted though it may pass muster as a popular account of the matter.

There are many details in the book that would ordinarily be treated in a more general work.

Innes, Arthur D. England under the Tudors. New York, Putnam Sons, 1905.

Vol. IV of A History of England in 6 vols. Of little independent value. The views in some instances are biased in favor of Protestantism. Persecution under Mary is treated in a fair and reasonable way.

Klein, Arthur Jay. Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth, Queen of England. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1917.

Lacks penetration. The title is misleading. "The bibliography is not critical, and evidences the author's anti-Catholic prejudice. He warns his readers against accepting the statements of Catholic writers, but says nothing against unfair books like Bury's 'A history of freedom of thought.' Cath. World 105:546. Jl '17 670w. The book reflects the anti-Catholic prejudice of the author.

Lingard, John and Belloc, Hilaire. The History of England from the first invasion by the Romans to the accession of King George the Fifth. With an introduction by His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons. In eleven volumes. Vol. IV, V, and VI. New York, The Catholic Publication Society of America, 1912. 596. 546, 719 p.

Lingard presents the moderate Roman Catholic attitude towards the religious controversies of the sixteenth century, though even from this point of view he needs to be checked by the later researches of Roman Catholic scholars, particularly those of Gasquet for Henry VIII and of Pollen for Elizabeth.

Lunt, W. E. History of England. New York, Harper Brothers, 1928. 900 p.

An especially scholarly text for college students. The bibliographies are of exceptional value.

Moyes, Mgr. Aspects of Anglicanism, or Some Comments on Certain Events in the 'Nineties. London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909. 499 p.

Valuable for attitude about fifty years ago concerning Anglicanism, the validity of Orders, and the question of continuity.

Pastor, Freiherr Von Ludwig. The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. Drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources. Tr. and ed. by Kerr, R. F. Vol. XVIII and XIX. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder, 1930. 486, 645 p.

Good for the Catholic viewpoint in the chapters dealing with the Tudors. For Elizabeth drawn copiously from Frere.

Pollard, A. F. Henry VIII. New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913.

A good biography by a very careful writer.

Pollard, A. F. The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603). New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910.

This is Vol. VI of the Political History of England by Hunt, William and Poole, R. L. It is the best general account of the period considered. Contains useful bibliography.

Sargent, Daniel. Thomas More. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1933.

The last chapters of this book are valuable for reflecting the persecution of Henry VIII.

Scott, Maxwell (Mrs.). The Tragedy of Fotheringay. Founded on the journal of D. Bourgoing, physician to Mary Queen of Scots, and on unpublished MS. documents. Edinburgh, Sands & Co., 1905.

Interesting and scholarly.

Selbie, W. B. English Sects: A History of Nonconformity. New York, Henry Holt & Co. London, William and Norgate. n. d. 256 p.

This book is more or less for the general reader. It gives a clear exposition of the question of nonconformity in English history.

Shakespeare, William. Henry VIII. Philadelphia, Pa., John D. Morris & Co., 1901. With introduction, notes, glossary, critical comments, and methods of study.

One of Shakespeare's historical dramas. It is valuable in giving a favorable character sketch of Wolsey.

Smith, Richard Lawrence. John Fisher and Thomas More: Two English Saints. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1935.

Not particularly valuable as history, but a study of the characters of the two saints and their relation to one another.

Strickland, Agnes. Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest. Abridged by the author. Revised and edited by Parker, Caroline G. Chicago, American Book Co. n. d. 681 p.

Useful but uncritical and antiquated.

Tenison, E. M. Elizabethan England: being the History of this country in relation to all Foreign Princes, from original manuscripts, many hitherto unpublished, co-ordinated with XVIth Century Printed Matter Ranging from Royal Proclamations to Broadside Ballads. In X volumes quarto with many hundred portraits and other illustrations in collotype, also title pages and portraits in line, and with Portfolio of unique Maps, Charts, Documents, etcetera, relevant to the text, and now first published. Issued for the author to Subscribers only at the Sign of the Dove with the Griffin, Royal Leamington Spa, in the County of Warwick, 1933.

A very interesting, scholarly set of books, highly illustrated and beautifully bound. Exceptionally informative, but rare and therefore, difficult to use.

Wakeman, Henry Offley. An Introduction to the History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. Revised with an additional chapter by S. L. Ollard. London, Rivingtons, 34 King Street, Covent Garden, 1923. 519 p.

A scholarly work, but antiquated. New source materials were available since the book was written. Therefore, it may contain some statements disapproved since the death of the author, 1899.

Waugh, Evelyn. Edmund Campion. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1932.

A very interesting life. Much historical background. Scholarly.

Wilmot-Buxton, E. M. A Book of English Martyrs. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder, 17 South Broadway, 1915.

An interesting, yet simple, general account of the martyrs during the Tudor reigns. The details of the narrative remain true to facts though references are not always given. Written for the general reader.

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS

Bateson, Mary. "Archbishop Warham's Visitation of Monasteries", English Historical Review, vi., (1891), p. 18-55.

Chapman, John H. "The Persecution under Elizabeth", Royal Historical Society's Transactions, 9, (1881). First Series, p. 21-43.

Gairdner, James. "Letters and Papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII, preserved in the P. R. O., the British Museum, and elsewhere in England. Arranged and catalogued by James Gairdner, assistant keeper of the Public Records under the direction of the master of the Rolls, and with the sanction of Her Majesty's secretary of State." Art. IV. Vol. VI and VII. London, 1882-83. Edinburgh Review, clx (1884), p. 89-117.

Gairdner, James. "New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII", English Historical Review, xi (1896), p.672-702; xii (1897), p. 1-16.

Gayangos, Pascual de. Ed. "The Divorce of Katharine of Aragon", Art. X--Calendar of letters, dispatches, and state papers, relating to the negotiation between England and Spain, preserved in the archives of Semancas and elsewhere. Vol. IV, Part I. Henry VIII, 1529-1530. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, London, 1879. Edinburgh Review, ciii (1880), p. 132-144.

Gerard, John. "Father Garnet and His Accusers", The Month, 92, 1898, p. 144-152.

Gerson, Armond J. "The English Recusents and the Spanish Armada". American Historical Review, 22, 1917, p. 589-594.

Heseltine, G. C. "Blessed John Fisher". The Sign. Vol. 14, No. 10. May, 1935, p. 588-590.

Hutton, W. H. "The Religious Writings of Sir Thomas More". English Historical Review, iv. (1889), p. 667-683.

Kennedy, W. P. M. "Bishop Wakeman's Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Gloucester, 1548". MSS. of the Dean and Chapter of Gloucester. English Historical Review, 39, (1924), p. 253-256.

Law, T. G. "Cuthbert Mayne and the Bull of Pius V." English Historical Review, 1 (1886), p. 141-144.

Leo XIII, Pope. "Letter Apostolic of His Holiness Leo XIII, concerning Anglican Orders (Apostolicae Curae)". London, Catholic Truth Society, 34/48 Eccleston Square, S. W. 1.

Maitland, F. W. "Elizabethan Gleanings". III, Pius IV and the English church service, English Historical Review, 15 (1900), p. 530-532.

Maitland, F. W. "Elizabethan Gleanings" IV, Thomas Sackville's Message from Rome, English Historical Review, 15 (1900), p. 575-580.

Merriman, Roger Bigelow. "Some Notes on the Treatment of the English Catholics in the Reign of Elizabeth". American Historical Review, 13 (1908), p. 480-500.

Petriburg, M. "The Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth". English Historical Review, 7 (1892), p. 81-88.

Pollen, J. H. "The Politics of English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth". The Month, xcix (1902), p. 43-60, 131-148, 290-305, 394-411, 600-618; c (1902), p. 71-87, 176-188.

Pollen, J. H. "Religious Terrorism under Queen Elizabeth". The Month, 105, (1905), p. 271-289.

Rope, H. E. G. "Beginnings of the Anglican Church". Catholic Truth Society.

Sargent, Daniel. "The Trial of Sir Thomas More". The Catholic Historical Review. Vol. xxii., No. 1, p. 1-11.

Thurston, Herbert. "Catholic Writers and Elizabethan Readers, I--Father Parsons' Christian Directory". The Month, 82, p. 457-476.

Walsh, Gerald Groveland. "Cardinal Pole and the Problem of Christian Unity". The Catholic Historical Review, Vol. XV, January 1930, p. 389-407.

Wilby, Noel Macdonald. "Saint Thomas More". The Sign, Vol. 14, No. 11, June, 1935, p. 679-681.