

1960

## The English Reformation

Donald Edwin Lakey  
*University of Rhode Island*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Terms of Use

All rights reserved under copyright.

---

### Recommended Citation

Lakey, Donald Edwin, "The English Reformation" (1960). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1778.  
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1778>

This Thesis is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons-group@uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons-group@uri.edu). For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

DA315  
L3

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

BY

DONALD EDWIN LAKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS  
IN  
HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1960

## ABSTRACT

The Roman Catholic Church, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was an international organization that was suffering from the problems of abuses and formalism. Some of the most prominent abuses that existed within the Church were the evils of simony, pluralism, indulgences, dispensations, the immorality of the clergy, and the worshipping of relics and images. Also, a conflict had developed between the temporal and spiritual authorities over matters of jurisdiction, especially as concerned benefit of clergy. However, the most serious fault that existed within the Church was, perhaps, the formalism of ritual that had developed. Forms and pageantry had oftentimes replaced worship and belief. The common people came to believe more in the forms of worship than in the principles of religion upon which they were based. Within this framework of religion, the English Reformation took place.

Henry VIII assumed the practices of the Church of Rome and defended them against the innovations of Martin Luther in his book, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, which earned the king the title of Defender of the Faith. Nevertheless, Henry's desire to secure a divorce from Catherine of Aragon (because of the need for a male heir to the throne and the king's wishes to possess Anne Boleyn) resulted in the

break between England and the Church of Rome, for the Pope, Clement VII, refused to grant Henry the necessary divorce. In 1533, Thomas Cranmer, the archbishop of Canterbury, separated Henry from Catherine. The king developed the principle of the royal supremacy, and, through this doctrine, he subordinated the ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the civil authority. The religious houses in England were dissolved, to quell possible opposition and to insure the loyalty of the new ruling class to the crown through their possession of Church lands. However, during the reign of Henry VIII, the Church of England maintained national Catholicism, the major difference being that the royal authority replaced that of the Pope. Through the Ten Articles and the Six Articles, the major points of Catholic dogma were retained in the English Church.

During the brief reign of Edward VI, the Church of England embraced Protestantism, following the lead of the continental reformers. Although the first Book of Common Prayer of 1549 was reconcilable with Catholicism, the second Edwardine prayer book of 1552 and the Forty-two Articles of Religion of 1553 rejected the old traditions, especially the medieval doctrine of transubstantiation. However, there was not enough time in Edward's reign to make these Protestant innovations of lasting effect.

The reign of Queen Mary witnessed the restoration of Roman Catholicism, through the two Marian acts of repeal and the absolution from schism granted by the papal legate,

Cardinal Pole. With the revival of the former heresy acts used against the Lollards, Mary set out to enforce the restored religion upon the realm. The deaths of some 300 martyrs attested to the queen's steadfast purpose, but the people were more appalled than convinced, and the persecutions proved to be advantageous to the Protestant cause.

In 1559, Elizabeth I ascended the throne of England, and, during her reign, the Elizabethan settlement ended the religious controversy that had plagued England since the reign of Henry VIII. Both the Marian restoration and the national Catholicism of Henry were rejected, as the Church of England modified the innovations of the reign of Edward VI. The royal supremacy was restored over the spiritual jurisdiction by the Act of Supremacy of 1559. The Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles established a middle way for the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England. Thus, the Elizabethan settlement climaxed the English Reformation and opened the way for the greater glories of the British Empire.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
<b>Chapter</b>	
I. THE CHURCH AND THE CONFLICT. . . . .	10
II. HENRY VIII . . . . .	40
III. EDWARD VI . . . . .	122
IV. MARY . . . . .	161
V. ELIZABETH I . . . . .	187
VI. CONCLUSION . . . . .	218
APPENDIX A . . . . .	225
APPENDIX B . . . . .	230
APPENDIX C . . . . .	242
APPENDIX D . . . . .	245
APPENDIX E . . . . .	255
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	267

## INTRODUCTION

With the dawning of the sixteenth century, Europe arose from the Middle Ages to a new luster of such brilliance that the fine achievements of the preceding era must be judged as dark or drab by comparison. Europe was faced with a challenge, the challenge of opportunity, which called for an expansion of thought to grasp the scope of its significance. Whereas before man had been contained in the narrow confines of feudal civilization, the sixteenth century welcomed a greater possibility for achievement. The contraction of the world was released and humanity sought new areas of fulfillment. The New World presented a challenge of discovery and exploitation, and it offered riches that could change all previous concepts of splendor. With this expansion overseas, the sixteenth century also brought an increased growth to commerce, industry, and agriculture. The concept of the territorial state, the national monarchy, and nationalism grew with the times, and the spread of learning brought accepted religious tenets under the scrutiny of thought and discussion. Thus, the sixteenth century resembled the flowering of the bud--the bursting forth of radiance and light.

To gather the significance of this world in flux, it is necessary to note briefly the importance of the several areas of expansion. Overseas discovery and exploration were powerful forces behind the achievements of this time, for the extension of the horizon provides a natural impetus for man to broaden the scope of life. Little Portugal was the first nation to reap success through the seas from the efforts of such men as Diaz, da Gama, and Cabral. Yet, it was an Italian named Christopher Columbus, sailing in the service of Spain, who brought forth the brilliance of the New World in 1492. His four voyages, which took him to most of the West Indies, along the coasts of Honduras and Panama, and to Trinidad, gave Spain a claim to a large portion of this new area. From England, John Cabot, under the commission of Henry VII, established an English claim on the eastern shores of North America. Along with the English, the French also joined in the hopeful pursuit of a "northwest passage." Through the actions of these men, the world became more than the European community, and the overseas activity helped to quicken the pulse of commerce, industry, and agriculture. Thus, one opportunity opened the door to several others.

The achievements in commerce, industry, and agriculture--encompassing a majority of the economy--were of natural importance to the advancement of the sixteenth century. "Under the impact of an increasing demand for

goods, the merchants improved not only methods of transportation and communication, but also the organization of commerce and finance."<sup>1</sup> Increased activity could be noted in the building of roads, bridges, and ships; also the use of collective messenger services helped to increase the flow of communication. Business organization progressed rapidly with the sixteenth century, until it had passed from partnerships to regulated and joint-stock companies. With the establishment of permanent markets, such as those at Bruges and Amsterdam, the advance of business was rapid. Luca Pacioli's 1494 treatise on double-entry bookkeeping reflected the insistence on efficiency in business that came with the growth of commerce.

Industry and agriculture, though they did not achieve the growth of commerce, underwent fundamental changes at this time. In spite of the restrictive nature of the craft guilds, industrial production increased, as journeymen attempted to organize guilds of their own. However, in those industries which produced goods for a growing market, the guilds were able to exercise little or no supervision, restriction, or suppression. Also, the demands of growing markets brought about the introduction of home industry or the putting-out system (in rural areas beyond the jurisdiction of the guilds) and the rising importance of the entrepreneur. Capital investments

---

<sup>1</sup>Harold J. Grimm, The Reformation Era: 1500-1650, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954), p. 8.

increased, especially in industries such as mining with the development of artillery for the incessant wars. Agriculture also benefited from the expansion of commerce and industry and the subsequent growth of cities, for these factors presented a demand for increased agricultural production that had to be met. Many wealthy townsmen invested in tenant farming or share farming, as increased profits allowed them to expand in this direction. Often agricultural changes were made because of industrial needs, such as the enclosure movement to provide wool for textiles. Thus, commerce, industry, and agriculture were all important components of the changing world of the sixteenth century.

The combination of overseas expansion and increased economic development helped to shape one of the most important changes of the time--the rise of the national monarchy. The growth of wealth, power, and possessions brought national interests into a clearer perspective, and fostered nationalism. The central point of this emerging nationalism was the king or ruler. "It was the aim of the territorial ruler to gain the allegiance of his people with respect to every aspect of their lives, economic, social, political, cultural, and religious."<sup>2</sup> Because the aims of the ruler coincided with the desires of the people, a type of unified, single-ruler nationalism

---

<sup>2</sup>Grimm, The Reformation Era, p. 20.

began to grow with the sixteenth century, for the people were willing to accept greater governmental control for the advance of their material interests. The territorial ruler centralized the state about the royal person and replaced the feudal levies with mercenary armies. The ruler was faced with increasing costs from a growing administrative personnel and the support of a large mercenary army, but the townsmen, with their growing wealth, were willing to back the ruler with financial support in return for protection of their economic prosperity. The territorial rulers, in view of their rising position, patronized literary men and artists with the objective of giving the people the identification of a national culture. This also inspired the support and establishment of universities and turned the rulers' attention towards religion as an area in which an appurtenance with the state could be created for the people. Thus, the gains from overseas expansion and the growth of commerce, industry, and agriculture were used by the rulers to foster nationalism and the concept of the territorial state.

The interest of the territorial rulers in learning and the universities helped to inspire the advancement of new thought in the sixteenth century. This movement in new directions of thought and learning became known as humanism. In Italy, humanism was a rediscovery and new emphasis of the dignity of man and the basic goodness and power of man and nature; it was worldly instead of other-worldly centered. However, in northern and western Europe,

humanism laid more emphasis upon Christian than classical sources, and these humanists believed that the new learning could successfully lead to true piety and religious reform. The accepted leader of this type of humanism was Erasmus.

In the true spirit of Humanism, Erasmus desired to free man in his moral nature by way of a philological rationalism with the help of the antique-pagan and Christian cultural heritage. Erasmus, the philologist, text critic and editor, hoped to substitute freedom of thought, an anti-dogmatic, Platonic, Stoical-Christian outlook for a Scholasticism enshrouded in darkness. Trained to obey reason, inspired by Christian love for all men, and guided by wisdom, man will act justly, love mercy, and be morally good. Let men learn to know God aright, to love Him, imitate Him, be like Him, let them assimilate the teaching of Christ and supplement it with the rational wisdom of the ancients, and they shall be truly virtuous. And virtue and faith together establish perfection.<sup>3</sup>

Erasmus believed in the compatibility of the Greco-Roman tradition and the Christian spirit to lead to the development of the rational faith that is the basis of humanistic theology. As a religious philosopher, he found religious truth in the great intellectual creations of all peoples and all times, and he thought that the essential import of Christianity was to be found in its ethical content and the interpreting of it within the spirit of antiquity. Humanism was a product of the flux of the times, in that men began to go beyond the conventional wisdom and search for new answers in the traditions of the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ida Walz Blayney, The Age of Luther: The Spirit of Renaissance-Humanism and the Reformation, (New York: Vantage Press, 1957), p. 64.

past. It was a return to ancient concepts of truth, ethics, reason, and man--as an individual. As a movement of learning devoted to applying the wisdom of tradition to the advancement of the concepts of the present, humanism was reflected in the intellectual light of the Reformation. In fact, there appeared to be three separate areas of contribution of humanism to the Reformation.<sup>4</sup> First, humanism brought forth a knowledge of primitive Christianity that could be contrasted to the church at that time. Second, the humanistic movement promoted criticism of the immorality of the clergy. Third, humanism replaced emphasis on the inwardness of religion and minimized outward show, as exemplified by images, festivals, and the like. The Reformation was to progress in the sixteenth century from an intellectual foundation built by the leaders of the humanistic movement. This was a period of great change--of flux--in established institutions, and the men of the sixteenth century must be noted for their constant striving to advance and learn with their changing times.

Bearing in mind the factors of change that were inherent with the beginning of the sixteenth century, it is essential now to turn to the situation in England, especially as regards the church. Our concern is with the English Reformation and the social, political, and economic

---

<sup>4</sup>See Grimm, The Reformation Era, pp. 85-87, for greater detail on the contributions of humanism to the Reformation.

factors that influenced it, with the object being to show that the reformation of the Church of England occurred during the reign of Elizabeth I, rather than during the reign of Henry VIII. A movement of such diverse factors as the English Reformation requires an understanding of the position of the Roman Catholic Church in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century and an exploration of available information concerning the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth I, reflecting the status and position of the Church of England and the advancement of the reformation during these times.

There had been movements for church reform in England before the sixteenth century (a notable one was the Lollards under Wycliffe), but the Roman Catholic Church had maintained a firm hold on its position. However, conditions in the church were in many ways ready for reform.

The spiritual aspect of religion had been largely obscured, and medieval Christianity had tended to become almost exclusively sacerdotal, sacramental, and spectacular. The clergy had virtually ceased to exercise a true "ministry" and acted instead as mediatorial agents between the people and God. Salvation had come to be dependent on the gift of the Church, and normally all grace and pardon came through the sacrifice of the mass or the sacrament of penance, both of which were dispensed exclusively by the priest.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, conditions existed within the church that called for reform and waited for the spark. Yet, the sixteenth century

---

<sup>5</sup>C. Sydney Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912), p. 4.

was a century of change, and the English Reformation was to pass through many fluctuations before an established form was reached through the Elizabethan Settlement. Therefore, it is requisite that the course of the reformation be charted from its stormy beginnings under Henry VIII to the calmer days of the reign of the "Virgin Queen".

CHAPTER I  
THE CHURCH AND THE CONFLICT

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Catholic Church was a universal organization of the Christian world. As such, it was charged with the saving of men's souls--with opening the "gateway to heaven". The handling of this ultimate religious obligation was entrusted to the systematized hierarchy of the Catholic Church. The Pope, vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter, was the supreme authority of this vast international machinery. Subject to the Pope, there were two branches of the clergy:--the secular and the regular. The secular clergy were so called because they labored in the world with the religious problems and salvation of the people. The cardinals were at the head of the secular organization and served in the consistory or papal court, along with handling various aspects of papal government.

The members of the secular clergy that dealt more directly with the people were the archbishops, bishops, and priests. An archbishop controlled a province, in which he exercised a certain influence over the bishops within his jurisdiction. One of his prerogatives was the right to summon the bishops of the province to meet in provincial

council. The bishop was the head of a diocese and was generally regarded as a successor of the apostles. The duties of a bishop were, in most cases, divided between the diocese church and church court, the governmental tasks assigned by the king, and his obligations as a feudal lord. The parish was the subdivision of the diocese, headed by a parish priest. The priest dealt directly with the people in conducting the services of his parish church.

The regular clergy had, normally, taken vows of poverty, obedience, and chastity and were organized into monasteries under abbots and priors, which were grouped in provinces under provincials or generals. Their service to the church was rendered through charitable, educational, and missionary work. Some of the outstanding orders of the regular clergy were the Benedictines, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Augustinians.

The religious requirement of the salvation of souls led the Catholic Church to develop an efficient doctrine for the requisite effect. The position of the Church was that a man's soul after death goes permanently to heaven or hell or temporarily to purgatory--till prepared for heaven. Only the ministrations of the Church could provide mankind salvation from eternal damnation. Catholic doctrine formalized the saving of souls through the seven sacraments, listed as follows:

Baptism. Every infant must be baptized, usually eight days after birth. The ceremony ritualistically represents the washing away of original sin.

Penance. This rite removes from the soul sins committed after baptism. It is composed of three elements--contrition, oral confession, and absolution.

The Holy Eucharist. This sacrament embodies transubstantiation or the miracle of the bread and wine becoming the body and blood of Christ. As John O'Brien commented:

The Holy Eucharist is called the "mystery of faith" from the fact that its real greatness is hidden from the senses, and nothing is left to enable us to form a judgement of the extraordinary change which has been wrought any more than if no such change had ever taken place. All is left to pure faith; and, therefore, well may it be called a mystery.<sup>1</sup>

This miracle of mystery helps the recipient to resist the temptations of sin and lead a fuller spiritual life.

Confirmation. This ceremony occurs when a boy or girl has reached the age of six and can distinguish between right and wrong; after learning the catechism, the child is anointed on the forehead with heavy oil and balsam (signifying the fragrance of righteousness) by the bishop and becomes a full-fledged member of the Catholic Church. By this sacrament the receiver is strengthened by the Holy Spirit and goes forth as a strong and perfect Christian and soldier of Christ.

Matrimony. The Catholic Church declares that when properly performed by a priest the marriage bond is indissoluble.

---

<sup>1</sup>John O'Brien, A History of the Mass; and its ceremonies in the Eastern and Western Church (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1879), p. 330.

Ordination or Holy Orders. This sacrament is administered to men entering the priesthood, granting them the power to forgive sins and perform the miracle of transubstantiation.

Extreme Unction. This rite consists of the anointing by a priest of a dying person with oil in the Lord's name to speed the departing soul towards heaven.

At the expense of some traditional religious values, the Catholic Church became a puissant organization. "For the Hebrew--Christian religion, a hope, a conviction, an ecstasy, had through the Middle Ages become an all-powerful and authoritative institution called 'the Church'."<sup>2</sup> The Church permeated the lives of the people; it succored the needy, educated the ignorant, and brought hope through the faith of religion. Men were awed by the mystery of the ceremonies, the majesty of the pageantry, the magnificence of the cathedrals. "The Church had acquired so complete a control over the souls of men, its venerable antiquity and its majestic organization so filled the imagination, the services it had rendered seemed to call for such reverential gratitude, and its acknowledged claim to interpret the will of God to man rendered obedience so plain a duty, that the continuance of its power appeared to be an unchanging law of the universe, destined to operate throughout the limitless future."<sup>3</sup> The very scope of the Catholic Church

---

<sup>2</sup>Blayney, The Age of Luther, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Charles Lea, "The Eve of the Reformation," The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. 1 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1902), p. 653.

marked it as an institution of the highest importance. Perhaps never in the history of man had a single organization amassed so much power to benefit humanity. Yet, as any large body will, the Catholic Church became formalized in the precepts of its dogma, for tradition led the way to static rather than dynamic activity. With an established position to maintain, Catholicism had little energy for spiritual advancement.

But though the Roman Church in the course of its history afforded the world moments of high spiritual vision, though it made use of the world's goods to attract and quicken the human spirit, though art and architecture vied with each other in an attempt to sanctify worldly treasures to the exaltation of men's souls, by the sixteenth century there was felt to be, nonetheless, a lack, an unfulfilled ideal. For the splendor and force of the medieval Church had now deteriorated to mean in general that something be done rather than thought or felt or believed.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, despite the preeminence of its position, the Catholic Church had fallen prey to power, and worldly influence predominated over the spiritual values of religion. Piety gave way to profit, faith to forms.

The question of abuses by the hierarchy of the Roman Church became increasingly important to the people, as they saw religion subordinated to the faults of worldly interest. Pious benefactors bequeathed vast wealth upon the Catholic Church and clergy. This addition of wealth led the Church towards corruption and demoralization. The material world was expensive, and the clergy sought further

---

<sup>4</sup>Blayney, The Age of Luther, p. 4.

opulence. It was the people who paid; yet, they received in return little spiritual aid and leadership. Wealth, worldliness, and immorality among the men of God did not inspire reverence in the common people. Thus, the position of religion in society was seriously affected by the abuses of the hierarchy in the Church, for, as the clergy led, the people must either follow or reject the traditions of the past.

One of the abuses of the Catholic Church was the use of superstition as a component part of religion. Rites, relics, images, and pilgrimages were all a part of the "magic" offered to the people. Religion lost meaning and assumed form.

Pious devotion and spiritual worship had been displaced by blatant formalism. True repentance for sinful deeds, contrition of heart, prayer to God for forgiveness, and a godly life counted for less in the eyes of the Church than fastings, the mumbling of formal prayers, pilgrimages, observance of the rites of the Church, and the payment of money. In consequence religion and morality were divorced. Dogmas were ardently debated by those of the foulest life.<sup>5</sup>

When men learned mere forms from the altar, the progress of religion was halted. People made up for their lack of religious leadership by fostering beliefs in symbols and superstitions. "The reverence for relics, the adoration of images, the enjoyment of gorgeous processions, and pilgrimages had replaced the ethical values of Christianity."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Alexander Clarence Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1930), p. 473.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 474.

The inner spiritual meaning of piety and devotion had been replaced in Catholicism by reverence for rite and ritual. The error of the Roman hierarchy was their revision of the belief of primitive Christianity into representative symbols. Thus, the people came to believe more in the forms than the idea.

Ofttimes, the making of pilgrimages was looked upon as an excellent chance for selling relics to the pilgrims. A spell of mysticism hung over these relics, which led to further superstition among the laity. It was a great deviation from the purposes of true religion when these objects were offered to a believing population. Yet, such was the case.

The popular practice of making pilgrimages to famous shrines also fostered the grossest credulity and superstition. A most profitable trade in relics was carried on at these sacred places, where numbers of the most ignorant were imposed on by the sham miracles which the priests performed, while costly gifts were offered to the various images in expectation of bodily healing. The shrines of Our Lady of Walsingham and St. Thomas of Canterbury were veritable treasuries of wealth. The "true blood of Our Lord" was exposed at Hailes Abbey, while the famous "Road of Grace" at Boxley was an image which "miraculously" moved its features at the bidding of the priest.<sup>7</sup>

Teaching the ignorant that images and relics were items worthy of devotion, was the grossest sort of inner corruption by the religious hierarchy of the Roman Church. Of course, as a source of material plenty, the sale of relics and the worshipping of images was undeniably valuable. The misdirection of the religious intents of the people, however,

---

<sup>7</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, pp. 5-6.

was a serious abuse. "Great reliance was placed in the efficacy of relics and images as means of salvation."<sup>8</sup>

Albeit the people did possess a natural veneration for things of the past, this was in no way a justification for the exploitation of the ignorant by selling sham memorials and fake curios. Also, only a weakened or internally corrupt Church would have allowed the pagan practice of image-worship to turn the laity from the central religious tradition of Christianity.

Another facet of the abuse of superstition placed upon the people by the Catholic Church was the adoration and invocation of saints. The great number of images of saints found in the churches made them familiar to the laymen, who believed that the saints--from their favored positions--could intercede with God in behalf of common people. Nonetheless, there was a danger to religion from this superstitious worship of saints.

Again, the invocation of saints, no less an evil than pilgrimages, had developed into a homage which virtually amounted to a form of polytheism. Each saint, as Erasmus declared, was regarded as a deity possessing special powers. "In fact, as many things as there are that we either fear or wish for, so many Gods have we made for them."<sup>9</sup>

If the worship of saints indicated a tendency towards polytheism, it was certainly not within the interests of

---

<sup>8</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, pp. 453-54

<sup>9</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 6

Christianity, especially when it became a miracle popularity contest. "The cult of a saint began at his tomb, and it was the report of the miracles wrought there that determined his popularity."<sup>10</sup> Thus, saints were worshipped because of a popular, though superstitious, belief that they could effect miracles, cause bodily healing, and the like. The laity's beliefs in the powers of and their reverence for saints, images, relics, rites, and pilgrimages were maintained by the Catholic Church more for possible profit than for religious significance.

Another of the evils effected by the Roman leadership was the practice of simony or the sale of Church offices. Often, a not too spiritually minded candidate would offer bribes or gratuities to those who bestowed the appointments, until the buying and selling of benefices came to be regarded as common practice.

The worth of candidates for offices was not considered, but they went to the highest bidders as a regular "business". Consequently, many minors and ignoramuses were given places and the result was the survival of the unfit in the service of the Church.<sup>11</sup>

The fitness of the candidate for an ecclesiastical office usually was not even considered; it became a question of how much would he pay. Naturally, the morals and ethics of

---

<sup>10</sup>H. Maynard Smith, Pre-reformation England (London: Macmillan and Co., 1938), p. 168

<sup>11</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II p. 435

the Church were lowered by the influx of men whose main interest lay in getting a return on their investment. In this way, the basic organization of the Church became a profitable business. As Flick continued:

Consecration was also sold for money. In fact one could not obtain a priestly honour, or holy consecration, or an ecclesiastical degree, of any sort without money. This simoniacal traffic was developed into a fixed rule of definite taxes for all church offices. All conscience was lost, and simony was almost viewed as a legal right.<sup>12</sup>

Simony was, perhaps, a natural outgrowth of the benefice system, in that appointive positions which represented revenues from land and endowments would be considered desirable objects by unscrupulous persons. Possibly the benefice system was the best way to apportion Church positions, but the fact remained that this arrangement was wide open to corruption. Therefore, the evil effects of simony--unfit clergy, immorality, poor religious instruction for the people--far outweighed any organizational benefits derived from the continuance of the benefice system, and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church was definitely in error in allowing this abuse to continue.

The immorality of the clergy was one of the worst abuses of the Roman Church. The people, told to practice the right life, watched the clergy violate their own words. Worldliness amongst the ecclesiastics was a serious problem, for it bred neglect of the spiritual welfare of the people

---

<sup>12</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, p. 435

and lowered the laity's opinion of the clergy.

By reducing many of its services to what amounted to money payments, the church became increasingly wealthy. As administrators of this wealth, many of the clergy, particularly the great prelates, gave a disproportionately large share of their attention to secular matters. It is no wonder that many townsmen looked upon the clergy as hoarders of wealth who drained their cities and lands of gold and silver. The poorer classes also often resented this wealth, as well as the tremendous power which the clergy exercised over them "from the cradle to the grave".<sup>13</sup>

The inflow of wealth to the clergy provided the ages--old temptations of the worldly life, and spiritual ideals were inadequate to meet the attractions of ungodliness. As the ecclesiastics strayed from the basic philosophical premise of the Church life, their flocks suffered the pangs of misdirection and lack of guidance. "The immorality and corruption of the clergy, which centered in Rome and spread the infection throughout Christendom, was the most potent factor in arousing popular hatred against the ecclesiastical leaders high and low."<sup>14</sup> Albeit the moral standards of the sixteenth century were not extremely high, the laity adopted the attitude that the clergy should adhere to a higher plane of virtuous conduct, befitting their spiritual position. It was true that oftentimes the morals of the clergy left something to be desired. "The practice of compulsory celibacy had developed into a system of recognized concubinage amongst the clergy, which was either

---

<sup>13</sup>Grimm, The Reformation Era, p. 18.

<sup>14</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, p. 472.

connived at or condoned by the payment of a fine to the bishop".<sup>15</sup> The evil effects of immorality spread in two ways: The clergy engaged in ungodly pursuits such as concubinage, and higher officials of the Church accepted fines (bribes) to allow the practices to continue. Thus, the moral fiber of the Roman Church was internally weakened by this negligence of righteous behavior.

This abuse of immorality was, perhaps, a natural result of the ignorance of the clergy, which was reflected in their worldliness. "The average spiritual level of the bishops was very low."<sup>16</sup> This low spiritual level among the bishops did not provide dynamic leadership for the lower ecclesiastics. Therefore, it was not surprising that the clergy, in general, was ignorant, immoral, and worldly. As Carter commented:

Even many of the clergy were terribly illiterate. The friars, whose earnest preaching had produced such a marvellous but transitory revival in the thirteenth century, were now conspicuous for their love of sloth and avarice rather than for their zeal for souls; while the monastic system was being brought into general contempt by the worldliness, idleness, and ignorance of so many of the monks.<sup>17</sup>

Enjoyment of worldly pleasures, no matter how far it was rationalized, would not be considered a just conduct for

---

<sup>15</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 7.

<sup>16</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, p. 433.

<sup>17</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 7.

the members of the clergy. The error of the Catholic hierarchy was in allowing immorality to exist (for a small fine) and in letting unlettered men represent the spiritual life to the people. Certainly, such a system could be justifiably criticized.

A concurrent problem of the Church was the abuse of pluralism. The holding of more than one benefice by an official of the Church made for inefficient administration of the spiritual needs of the people, for it was clearly impossible to be responsible for the religious problems of more than one area, especially when the areas were quite often far removed from each other. A man who held several benefices could not adequately fulfill the duties of them all--even if he so desired. The abuse of pluralism was advanced by the unlimited appointment power of the Holy See.

Through the exercise of the right of appointment the evil of pluralism assumed alarming proportions. Bishoprics and other benefices were showered on the Cardinals and Papal favorites--the money went to Rome to the impoverishment of localities--and the necessary religious services were sadly neglected.<sup>18</sup>

As the pluralist gained more benefices, he followed the natural concomitant of pluralism--absenteeism. The result was a general neglect of religion; the interests of the purse were stronger than those of the spirit. Multiple benefices were loaded upon Papal favorites and, oddly enough, on scholars, as rewards for their contributions to knowledge and learning. "A still worse scandal was the way

---

<sup>18</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, p. 471.

in which benefices were heaped upon favored minors".<sup>19</sup> It was one thing to give a benefice to a man, who could have managed it, but it was quite another thing to intrust more than one benefice to a mere youth, who could not possibly carry out the necessary functions. The scope of this evil was enormous, growing as it did from an unlimited appointment power. As Carter related:

We can form some idea of the extent of this evil when we remember that the Pope claimed by a divine right to present to all the livings and bishoprics in Christendom, and as these preferments were openly bought and sold, this claim, while it became a source of enormous profit to the Papal treasury, was most ruinous and demoralising to the Church at large.... It also directly fostered the twin abuses of pluralism and non-residence, as by virtue of a Papal bull foreigners or even mere boys could often enjoy the profits of a number of cures, the duties of which they either disgracefully neglected or were utterly incapable of fulfilling. Thus at the beginning of the sixteenth century a boy of sixteen actually enjoyed, besides the deanery of Lincoln, three canonries, one prebend, one college mastership, and one rectory.<sup>20</sup>

Pluralism must be accounted as an excellent source of revenue to the Catholic Church or, more specifically, the Pope, but the damaging effects of this policy far outweighed its use as a source of monetary gain. Absenteeism deprived the people of spiritual guidance; foreigners overlooked their duty in another country or didn't reside there, and youths were placed in positions that they could neither comprehend or carry out. Thus, pluralism was one more way in which true religion was withheld from the populace.

---

<sup>19</sup>Smith, Pre-reformation England, p. 35.

<sup>20</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 21.

The sale of indulgences and dispensations was another serious abuse of the Catholic Church. The indulgence was the sale of surplus or superabundant merit laid aside in heaven from Christ's sacrifice on the cross. The Pope, as vicar of Christ, had the keys to this treasure-house of merit and could dispense it at his discretion. Church theory held that an indulgence was only valid for a penitent who had received absolution and that it only remitted the ecclesiastical penance which was due. However, it was found in practice that more indulgences could be sold if the theory was forgotten. The Church had commercialized sin for a profit. "Practical men bought indulgences to escape from an unpleasant penance; superstitious people bought them as some sort of insurance against the flames of purgatory; and casual people bought them because they were cheap."<sup>21</sup> Indulgences appealed to all classes of people, as an easy way to rid oneself of sin. Quite often, the ignorant would buy indulgences under the false belief that they were buying admission to heaven, and it was good business for the Roman hierarchy to let them continue to think this way. The Catholic Church's doctrine of penance helped to lead to the sale of indulgences, for people turned to buying their way (they thought) out of a condition of sin by indulgences rather than by doing penance.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Smith, Pre-reformation England, p. 21.

The penitential system, originally most beneficial as a disciplinary measure in the early Church, had been grossly corrupted, until by the scholastic theory of Indulgences the punishment due even to the worst offences could be commuted by an elaborately calculated system of money payments or by some specially meritorious act.... Although it was always officially declared that Indulgences could only release the sinner from the temporal penalty due to his offense, and that only absolution, which must be preceded by contrition, or at least sorrow for the personal consequences of sin (attrition) could release from the eternal guilt of sin, yet the popular conception was that an Indulgence practically did away with the necessity of Confession and Absolution.<sup>22</sup>

The clergy did little to dissuade the people from their false impressions concerning the power of indulgences, and, concurrent with the sale of indulgences, the granting of dispensations represented a similar abuse. "Even more demoralizing were the revenues derived from the sale of countless dispensations for marriage within the prohibited degrees, for the holding of pluralities, for the numerous kinds of 'irregularities' and other breaches of the cannon law; so that its prescriptions might almost seem to have been framed for the purpose of enabling the Holy See to profit by their violation."<sup>23</sup> The purpose of a moral code to supplement religion was subverted by indulgences and dispensations. The very thought of "buying" one's salvation was repugnant to Christianity. Yet, the Church followed these practices out of greed, selling grace and commercializing sin, mainly for the purpose of making a profit. These abuses show that there existed a strong need

---

<sup>22</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 5.

<sup>23</sup>Lea, "The Eve of the Reformation," p. 668.

for reform within the Catholic Church and its hierarchy, if the reform was not internal then, as surely as the people were dissatisfied, it would come from without.

Considering these abuses existing within the Catholic Church, the question of what religious conditions were in England was of paramount importance. The whys and wherefores of the people's view of religion were important at the beginning of a century that would see reform and reformation, for the people were (and are) the ultimate judges of the "rightness" of all change. Certainly there was some degree of dissatisfaction concerning religion at the time. As Balleine reflected:

It is enough to state that there is ample evidence that early in the sixteenth century there was a bold and vigorous movement in many parts of England, not merely attacking questionable customs, like pilgrimage and relic-worship, but vehemently assailing the central doctrines of the medieval church, transubstantiation, priestly absolution, purgatory, and invocation of saints.<sup>24</sup>

Despite Balleine's ample evidence, he was probably overstating the case. There was concern over abuses and Papal claims of secular power, but, excepting the earlier Lollard movement, there did not appear to have been much disagreement over the central Catholic doctrines. Although persecutions of heretics were fairly heavy at the time, this activity could, perhaps, be laid more to misdirected religious zeal than to serious dissatisfaction. However,

---

<sup>24</sup>G. R. Balleine, The Layman's History of The Church of England (second ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914) p. 93.

there were some who were strongly opposed to Catholic teachings. "It is, indeed, not improbable that up and down the country there were, at this period, some dissatisfied spirits; some who would eagerly seize any opportunity to free themselves from the restraints which no longer appealed to their consciences, and from teachings they had come to consider as mere ecclesiastical formalism."<sup>25</sup> In the sixteenth century, as in almost any time, there were some "rebels", who were extremely disaffected towards institutions as they found them. Yet, it appeared that most of the condemnation of the Roman Church was directed against that organization's wealth and power.

The barons, townsmen, and sheep-raising landlords all resented the great wealth of the church and the secularization of its clergy. About one-fifth of the national wealth was in the hands of the church. The masses of the people, adversely affected by the enclosure of lands, replacement of craft guilds by the domestic system, and the rise in prices, were also greatly dissatisfied with conditions in general. Their antipathies might readily be aroused against any institution which they might consider responsible for their adverse circumstances.<sup>26</sup>

The people, then, were concerned not so much with what might be errors in doctrine as they were with the abuses

---

<sup>25</sup> Francis Aidan Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation: Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the Period Preceding the Rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900), p. 209

<sup>26</sup> Grimm, The Reformation Era, pp. 289-90.

of the Church. The wealth and worldliness of the clergy were reflected against the poorer economic condition of the people. The fact that the people still retained an interest in religion was reflected in the church art and architecture of the period. "There never was a period in which such life and energy was displayed in the building and adornment of churches of all kinds as on the very eve of the Reformation."<sup>27</sup> This adornment of houses of worship reflected a serious interest in religion on the part of the populace; it was active expression of the idea and the ideal. The people were not ready to stage a mass exodus from the bonds of Catholicism, but they were critical of what they saw and felt was wrong with the Church. Thus, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the English people were not, as a whole, dissatisfied with the Roman Church to the point where they would attempt to introduce doctrinal changes; however, they were disenchanted by the abuses of the Church and afraid of its power. It might be said that the Church was being watched with a careful, critical eye.

Another important consideration of religion in England was the religious instruction of the people. In order to be effective, religious instruction had to reach the people and be understandable to them. The Catholic Church did bring religion to the people in the vulgar tongue, although the Mass was in Latin.

---

<sup>27</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, pp. 9-10.

From the time of the constitution of Archbishop Peckham at the Synod of Oxford in 1281, to the time of the religious changes, there is every reason to suppose that the ordinance contained in the following words was observed in every parish church in the country: "We order," says the Constitution, "that every priest having the charge of a flock do, four times in each year (that is, once each quarter) on one or more solemn feast days, either himself or by some one else, instruct the people in the vulgar language simply and without any fantastical admixture of subtle distinctions, in the articles of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Evangelical Precepts, the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins with their offshoots, the seven principal virtues, and the seven Sacraments."<sup>28</sup>

If Archbishop Peckham's Constitution was in constant effect from 1281 to the Reformation, the people were getting religious instruction in English. Yet, it was possible that the abuses of the Church, especially absenteeism, affected the quality and frequency of this instruction. Also, the fact remained that the people knew very little about the Bible.

Probably the chief cause of such gross superstition was due to the fact that the common people were almost entirely ignorant of the Bible. There was no authorized version, except in Latin, while Wycliffe's translation had been condemned as heretical.<sup>29</sup>

The lack of the Bible in the vulgar tongue placed the whole burden of religious instruction on the clergy, for the people, denied access to the Scriptures by a language barrier, had to depend on the ecclesiastics for their knowledge of religion. Considered from this light, the reading of religious lessons in English four times a year

---

<sup>28</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, p. 280.

<sup>29</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 6.

was certainly not excessive instruction. Furthermore, the people often received just the Mass from the clergy, with no sermon. Albeit the Mass was fundamental religious doctrine, the people could have gained a firmer knowledge of religion--ideas and ideals--from a sermon. Consider the opinion of a fifteenth century religious pamphlet on this question:

Nothing could possible be more definite or explicit upon the necessity of popular instructions and upon the duty incumbent upon the clergy of giving proper vernacular teaching to their flocks than the author [anonymous] of Dives et Pauper, the most popular of the fifteenth-century books of religious instruction.... This is what the author of Dives et Pauper says about preaching: "Since God's word is life and salvation of man's soul, all those who hinder them that have authority of God, and by Orders taken, to preach and teach, from preaching and teaching God's word and God's law, are manslaughterers ghostly. They are guilty of as many souls that perish by the hindering of God's word, and namely those proud, covetous priests and curates who can neither teach, nor will teach, nor suffer others that both can and will and have authority to teach and preach of God and of the bishop who gave them Orders, but prevent them for fear lest they should get less from their subjects, or else the less be thought of, or else that their sins should be known by the preaching of God's word. Therefore, they prefer to leave their own sins openly reprov'd generally, among other men's sins. As St. Anselm saith, God's word ought to be worshipped as much as Christ's body, and he sins as much who hindereth God's word and despiseth God's word, or taketh it recklessly as he that despiseth God's body, or through his negligence letteth it fall to the ground. On this place the gloss showeth that it is more profitable to hear God's word in preaching than to hear a Mass, and that a man should rather forbear his Mass than his sermon. For, by preaching, folks are stirred to contrition, and to love God and goodness, and (by it) they be illumined to know their God, and virtue from vice, truth from falsehood, and to foresake errors and heresies. By the Mass they are not so, but if they come to Mass in sin they go away in sin, and shrews they come and shrews they wend away.... Nevertheless, the Mass profiteth them that are in grace to get grace and forgiveness of sin....

Both are good, but the preaching of God's word ought to be more discharged and more desired than the hearing of Mass."<sup>30</sup>

As this pamphleteer stressed, the people needed a sermon to bring out the moral values of religion and a greater feeling of reverence to God. Although the author had a basically Catholic frame of reference, he was aroused by the lack of instruction by the worldly members of the clergy. Thus, though the Catholic Church did make an attempt to give the English people some religious instruction, the people required further teaching in the vernacular, especially in the Bible. In fact, the lack of an English Bible was one of the serious faults of the time.

The area of greatest dispute between the Catholic Church and England was over the division of lay and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The rising spirit of nationalism advanced temporal jurisdiction and brought new doubts concerning papal pretensions to power. The idea of national monarchy would not admit to sharing power with the Holy See. "That the Catholicity of the Church, the unity of Christian people over all the earth in one Lord, one faith, one baptism, depended on one common chief pastor; that without papal supremacy there was neither the one fold nor the one shepherd, was ignored or forgotten by princes bent on power."<sup>31</sup> The temporal rulers were willing to concede the

---

<sup>30</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, pp. 283-85.

<sup>31</sup>Joseph Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1934), pp. 22-23.

spiritual authority of the Holy See, but they would not accept papal leadership in secular jurisdiction. The rulers sought worldly power, and, if the Pope desired this same worldly power, he would have to get it and maintain it in the cockpit of secular affairs. Even if it meant the breakup of Christendom, the temporal rulers would not stand for limitations of their power. Thus, the rise of nationalism and the territorial state precluded a struggle between the secular rulers and the papacy.

The Pope, as vicar of Christ, believed that all authority on earth was given to him and that temporal rulers were subservient to him, even in matters of secular jurisdiction. This principle had been one of the chief tenets of medieval political theory and was, perhaps, best expressed by John of Salisbury in The Statesman's Book (Policraticus). Because it was hard to draw any dividing line between secular and spiritual powers, the Pope attempted to assert his right to rule in both areas.

There could be no hard and fast line of delimitation between the spiritual and the temporal, for the two were mutually inter-dependent, and the convenient phrase, temporalia ad spiritualia ordinata, was devised to define those temporal matters, over which, as requisite to the due enjoyment of the spiritual, the Church claimed exclusive control. Moreover, it assumed the right to determine in doubtful matters the definition of this elastic term, and the secular ruler constantly found himself inconveniently limited in the exercise of his authority.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>Lea, "The Eve of the Reformation", pp. 655-56.

The Holy See reasoned that this was a traditional power of the papacy and that the rise of nationalistic feeling was not going to interfere with it. "As in the history of earlier times, so in the sixteenth century ecclesiastics clung, perhaps not unnaturally, to what they regarded as their strict rights, and looked on resistance to encroachment as a sacred duty."<sup>33</sup> From the point of view of the Catholic Church, the secular rulers were attempting to violate the established order of the world. The Roman hierarchy felt that if there was no clear rule as to who had the power then the power belonged to the universal body--the Church. Thus, the Church was far from willing to relinquish its status quo powers, despite the growing strength of the national monarchies, and, if they lost any power, it would have to be taken from them.

With the development of the national monarchy as a solid institution, the conflict of jurisdiction with the papacy became inevitable. Both institutions claimed such broad powers that there were bound to be areas of dispute. "The incompatibility between the papal pretensions and the royal prerogative was intensified not only by the development of the monarchies but by the increasing secularisation of the Holy See."<sup>34</sup> The spiritual institution was becoming more worldly, and the secular institution wanted an ideally

---

<sup>33</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, p. 51.

<sup>34</sup>Lea, "The Eve of the Reformation," p. 663.

complete control over its territory. Because the Church refused to compromise its position, the rulers were drawn towards an open conflict. The papacy had tradition on its side, but the monarchs had immediate control over their states.

The logical development of the pretension of the Roman Papacy to the illimitable temporal as well as spiritual sovereignty led to open revolt...a result of Papal despotism, the secular rulers of Europe, conscious of the consolidation and growth of their secular authority, endured the Papal pretensions with more and more impatience....At the opening of the sixteenth century, the rulers of Europe were in a mood to encourage any movement that promised to curtail the Papal claim to temporal sovereignty over them.<sup>35</sup>

The national monarchs felt that theirs was the rising tide of power and that, in order to strengthen their position, they needed to consolidate their power over the papal pretensions. Many of the areas of dispute were sources of revenue, which the Holy See wished to retain and the temporal rulers to gain for further power. Some of the areas of disputed jurisdiction were mortuaries, mortmain, sanctuary, benefit of clergy, tithes, the proving and administration of wills, and the citation and consideration of cases of slander and libel. Also the secular powers believed that they should have regulatory powers over the conditions for religious life and the conditions for matrimony and that the power to declare new holidays should no longer be in the hands of the Church. Thus, a definite area of conflict had arisen over the problem of jurisdiction.

---

<sup>35</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, pp. 466-67.

Benefit of clergy was one of the disputed areas of jurisdiction. Under the theory of benefit of clergy, ecclesiastics could not be tried in secular courts for secular crimes but only in church courts. Of course, this was a great hindrance to secular authorities. "The evil of this consisted not only in the temptation to crime which it offered to those regularly bred to the Church and performing its functions, but it attracted to the lower orders of the clergy, which were not bound to celibacy or debarred from worldly pursuits, numberless criminals and vagabonds, who were thus enabled to set the officers of justice at defiance."<sup>36</sup> The secular authorities found that the criminal element was joining the clergy to avoid prosecution, and there was very little that the authorities could do about it. It was extremely difficult to maintain order, when offenders could not be tried in the secular courts.

The exemption of all ranks of the clergy from the authority of secular tribunals was regarded by the civil authorities as a grave abuse subversive of social order and justice. No difference whatever the crime, the clergy could be tried only in the spiritual courts. At the same time the ecclesiastical courts could pronounce no judgements of blood and were notoriously lenient towards clerical offenders.<sup>37</sup>

The freedom of the priesthood from responsibility to secular authority restricted the power of the national monarchs, who were deprived of their full authority by the exemption

---

<sup>36</sup>Lea, "The Eve of the Reformation," p. 660.

<sup>37</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II., p. 468.

of ecclesiastics from civil justice. Thus, the Catholic Church, through benefit of clergy, maintained a severe restriction on the jurisdiction of civil authorities. Unless it was removed, crime could pay, for a member of the priesthood.

The payment of tithes was another conflict of jurisdiction, for the secular rulers hated to see so much income flowing into the Church. Tithes were another one of the traditional areas of Church jurisdiction and income. "It is true that tithes were originally only of moral obligation and could not be enforced by law."<sup>38</sup> However, through the course of years, tithes became compulsory. Not only were the people frequently irritated by the payment of tithes, but they were also displeased that they were outside civil administration. The power of the Catholic Church was maintained through such items, as tithes served as a constant reminder of the presence of the Church. The handling of purely administrative matters by the clergy was considered as being beyond their spiritual office by lay authorities. Yet, the clergy would not voluntarily relinquish what was held to be one of their traditional rights.

To the ecclesiastics of the period tithes were spiritual matters, and all questions arising out of them should be settled by archbishop or bishop in spiritual courts. The lawyer, on the other hand, maintained that though given to secure spiritual services, in themselves tithes were temporal,

---

<sup>38</sup>Smith, Pre-reformation England, p. 61

and therefore should fall under the administration of the State.<sup>39</sup>

Neither side was willing to yield what it felt to be its own prerogative. Nevertheless, the lack of compromise on these jurisdictional disputes was driving the Church further away from the growing temporal power of the territorial state.

Another power of the Holy See which aroused hostility against the Church was the payment of annates or first-fruits. This imposition removed more wealth from the country to Rome and in no way contributed to improving spiritual life. "Probably the imposition which pressed most heavily on the clergy and nation was the demand made by the See of Rome for the payment of 'Annates' or first-fruits, by which each bishop on his promotion was compelled to pay to the Roman Curia the entire proceeds of his first year's income before he could obtain the necessary bulls for his consecration."<sup>40</sup> The payment of annates for his consecration certainly did not fill a bishop with religious zeal. In fact, annates probably added to the worldliness of the bishops. The country's economic structure suffered to the extent of the wealth which had been paid to Rome, and it was just more money that the civil authorities would never be able to use. Certainly, religion, as a belief and ideal,

---

<sup>39</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, pp. 63-64.

<sup>40</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 22.

did not profit from this practice. Thus, the payment of annates was one more example of the corruption of the Roman hierarchy and another area in which papal jurisdiction overruled the temporal.

The Catholic Church, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was a systematized hierarchy. This hierarchy was charged with administering the doctrine of the Church, which had developed from primitive Christianity into a ceremony of formalized beauty. However, the Roman Church was faced with the problem of internal abuses, which desperately needed reform. The evils of pluralism, absenteeism, immorality, and simony existed within the Church. Other problems were the worship of relics, images, and saints and the commercializing of sin through the sale of indulgences and dispensations. Increasing secularization within the Church made reform more difficult, for the leadership of the Pope was turned towards worldly interests. Flick concluded that there were three reasons for the lack of reform in the Church, which were as follows:

1. The Popes either through blindness to their opportunities, or through indifference to the obvious implications of spiritual leadership, or through the allurements of ambition for political power, or through fear of the loss of Papal prerogatives, entertained no sympathy for a thorough-going reformation of the Church in all its departments and institutions.
2. The vast majority of the clergy, high and low, spiritual and secular, either through a lack of genuine religious zeal, or through a failure to appreciate the duties of their high spiritual calling, or through the fear of the loss of certain material benefits and a latitudinarian mode of living, or through sheer inertia, closed both eyes and ears to the warnings for the necessity of reform.

3. The laity--rulers, scholars, burghers, and common people--although they bore the burden of the financial abuses and were keenly alive to other evils, yet they likewise enjoyed certain advantages from the outgrown system, and consequently felt that the initiative for reformation should come from those who were officially appointed to direct the affairs of the Church.<sup>41</sup>

Thus, everyone knew that there was a need for reform, but nobody wanted to do anything about it. There was dissatisfaction with the Church in England but no overt leadership for reform. Nevertheless, the conflict between spiritual and temporal jurisdiction was the beginning of the end for the universality of the Church. It is quite probable that the Roman leadership misgauged the growth and power of the spirit of nationalism. The national monarchy had become an established fact, and it desired complete jurisdiction over the state's territory. The Church was faced with the loss of such areas of jurisdiction as annates, tithes, and benefit of clergy, or it could compromise with the temporal power. By refusing to consider compromise, the Catholic Church, in effect, started the reformation inspired by nationalism.

---

<sup>41</sup>Flick, The Decline of the Medieval Church, Vol. II, p. 463

## CHAPTER II

### HENRY VIII

The beginning of Henry's reign, in 1509, gave no indication that the English Church would break with the papacy. Through the frugality of his father, Henry VII, the young monarch ascended the throne with ample resources in the treasury. Parliament had only been called seven times in the preceding twenty-four years, and a tradition of strong government had been developed. In contrast to his father, who was respected and feared, Henry VIII enjoyed a great popularity among his subjects. His regal bearing, athletic ability, and intellectual curiosity made his accession a time for general celebration. Henry VIII had a superbly endowed body, with a beauty that commended itself to the taste of the times. Yet, his mental prowess was equally as striking. As Stubbs has commented:

His mental abilities I rank very high: he had been carefully educated by good scholars, and had made remarkable progress; not so great, Lord Bacon tells us, as his brother Arthur; but still remarkable at a remarkable time; he did not let his knowledge acquired in boyhood fade out of his mind; after his accession he must have continued his reading; his book against Luther, which, whatever assistance he may have received, was in conception and execution entirely his own, was an extraordinary work for a young king; and the intelligent interest which, down to the last, he showed in religious and other ecclesiastical questions, even when

he was most capricious and peremptory, evinces both memory and a real appreciation of subjects on which contemporary kings thought it sinful to think at all.<sup>1</sup>

It appeared that the young king's mental abilities were equal to his physical powers. "Henry was every inch a king; the king, the whole king, and nothing but the king."<sup>2</sup> Overbearing but regal, Henry VIII brought to the throne not only his dynamic personality but also his supreme sense of self-confidence. England had a ruler with a will.

The first focal point of religion in Henry's reign was the publication of his book, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum, or Defense of the Seven Sacraments against Martin Luther. The rise of Luther in Germany poised a threat to Catholicism, and Henry, as a good Catholic sovereign, met the challenge. Luther was expanding the range and sting of his writings against the papacy. In 1520, he wrote three manifestos: An den christlich Adel deutscher Nation: Von des christlichen Standes Besserung, To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation: Concerning the Improvement of Christian Society; Von der babylonischen gefangenschaft der Kirche, Concerning the Babylonian Captivity of the Church; and Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen, On the Freedom of a Christian Man.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>William Stubbs, Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887), p. 284.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 281.

<sup>3</sup>See Blayney, The Age of Luther, pp. 159-72, for further details on these three manifestos.

Luther was attempting to broaden his position to include a widespread program of reform, while Henry had assumed the burden of the Church's position.

It was evident that there were several reasons behind Henry's writing of this book. Of course, he desired to do what he could to stop the spread of the new heresy, which threatened to rend the unity of the Church. However, Henry also considered his own personal advancement in writing Assertio Septem Sacramentorum. "The attacks of Luther on the Church of Rome afforded Henry the opportunity which he desired of showing his devotion to the Church, making for himself a distinguished name as a theologian, and obtaining some title as a decisive mark of the papal favour."<sup>4</sup> Henry was interested in maintaining a high position among the princes of Christendom. Yet, there was, perhaps, another reason--stopping the spread of Lutheran doctrine in England. Luther's ideas were being discussed in the English universities, and this spread of his teaching was a danger to Catholicism.

At Oxford, as Warham, the old archbishop of Canterbury, was aware, discussions on the "new learning" of Martin Luther were taking place; while at Cambridge it was notorious that fellows of colleges and tutors were in the habit of meeting together to talk over the Lutheran ideas. So that their place of meeting came to be known as "Germany". Two Augustinian friars,

---

<sup>4</sup>J. Mainwaring Brown, "Henry VIII's Book, 'Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,' and the Royal Title of 'Defender of the Faith', " Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Vol. VIII, ed. Charles Rogers (London: for the Royal Historical Society, 1880), p. 244.

Miles Coverdale and Robert Barnes; three secular clerks, Thomas Bilney, Thomas Cranmer, Hugh Latimer; and two younger clerics not yet ordained to the priesthood, Matthew Parker and Nicholas Ridley, were conspicuous among the University dons at Cambridge who resorted to "Germany" in the years that followed immediately the publication of Luther's writings.<sup>5</sup>

Lutheran doctrine was being spread in the English universities (involving men who would be leading English reformers), and Henry VIII could have written his book for purposes of royal refutation against the subversion of Catholic faith.

Although Henry's authorship of this volume has been questioned, it can be concluded that, if he was not the sole author, he played a prominent part in the composition of the work. The book was mainly a rebuttal and attack upon Luther and was principally directed against Luther's work, Concerning the Babylonian Captivity of the Church. As Henry wrote:

There was a time when the faith had no need of defenders; it had no enemies. Now it has one who exceeds in malignity all his predecessors, who is instigated by the devil, who covers himself with the shield of charity, and, full of hatred and wrath, discharges his viperish venom against the Church and Catholicism....What similar pestilence has ever attacked the Lord's flock? What serpent can be compared with this monk who has written upon the Babylonish captivity of the Church?... To this scoffer of our old traditions who puts no faith in our holy fathers, or the ancient interpreters of our holy books, except when they agree with him; who compares the Holy See to the impure Babylon, treats as a tyrant the sovereign pontiff, and makes that holy name synonymous with Antichrist?<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 38.

<sup>6</sup>Albert Hyma, Renaissance to Reformation (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 541, quoting the 1652 Paris edition of Assertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum, p. 10.

Henry continued to abuse Luther in this tone throughout his work, and urged all true Christians to keep away from this new doctrine. To examine Henry's book further:

Troubling the whole Church as much as he could, and exciting the whole body to rebel against the head, to do which is as the sin of witchcraft, and to acquiesce in which is as the sin of idolatry. Seeing therefore, that Luther, moved by hatred, rushes headlong to his destruction, and refuses to submit himself to the law of God, but desires to establish a law of his own, it behoves all Christians to beware lest, as the apostle says, through the disobedience of one, many be made sinners; but on the contrary, by hating and detesting his wickedness, we may sing with the prophet, I hated the wicked and loved your law.<sup>7</sup>

In his attack on Luther, Henry was stressing the fundamental Catholic position. However, he would, in a few years, have cause to regret his statements on papal authority and submission to the law of God. His extreme statements on the duty of obedience to the Pope were probably written to receive a distinctive title from the papacy, for it was very doubtful that Henry had any intentions of inaugurating such inordinate obedience.

The publication of Henry's book in 1521 brought diversified reactions. Rome was pleased with the young king's rendition of the Catholic position.

The Pope declared it to contain stronger arguments than any that had appeared in the controversy. Campeggio styled it "Aureus Libellus," the Catholic world rang with its praises, and the printing presses in almost every civilized country produced editions of it.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Brown, "Henry VIII's Book, 'Assertio Septem Sacramentorum', and the Royal Title of 'Defender of the Faith'," pp. 259-60, citing from Henry's book, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 252.

Henry had won the unanimous approval of the papal party for his work. Luther, however, was far from pleased by Henry's efforts, and he forcefully denounced the king's book. As Hyma has recorded:

Luther in his characteristic style replied vehemently in the following words: "It is two years since I published a small book, entitled The Captivity of the Church in Babylon. It has annoyed the Papists, who have spared neither falsehoods nor abuse against me. I willingly forgive them.... The Lord Henry, not by the grace of God, king of England, has recently written in Latin against that treatise.... If a king of England spits his impudent lies in my face, I am entitled on my part to thrust them down his throat.... What astonishes me, is not the ignorance of King Henry--not that he understands less of faith and works than a block does about God; it is that the devil thus plays the clown by means of his Henry, although he knows well that I laugh at him."<sup>9</sup>

Thus, Luther issued a most abusive reply to Henry's work, but it must be remembered that Luther evidently found it easier to attack the author rather than his arguments.

Assertio Septem Sacramentorum had a well-founded theological base, and, therefore, it pleased Rome but displeased Luther.

One of the reasons behind Henry's book was his desire to secure some title from the Pope, and this desire was fulfilled. "The presentation of Henry's book to the Pope [Leo X], to whom it was dedicated, was responded to by a most laudatory address to the king's ambassador, the grant of an indulgence to all who should read the book, and

---

<sup>9</sup>Hyma, Renaissance to Reformation, pp. 541-42.

the title of Fidei Defensor to the royal author (Oct. 3, 1521)."<sup>10</sup> Henry had received his title, Defender of the Faith, in a papal bull that was complimentary to the extreme. However, Leo X died before the bull containing Henry's title reached England. So, in 1523, the king obtained confirmation of the title from Clement VII. Henry, it appeared, desired to have the title made hereditary, but the bull from Clement VII was rather ambiguously worded on this point. Therefore, the question of the continuance of the title rested on the word perpetuum. Despite the Pope's attempt to avoid the issue, Henry believed the title to be hereditary. A papal title was very important to the young monarch looking for prestige, and, if it was made hereditary, it could help to tighten the Tudor hold on the throne. As Holinshed commented:

On the second daie of Februarie [1523], the king as then being at Greenwich, received a bull from the pope, whereby he was declared Defendor of the Christian faith, & likewise his successors forever. The cardinall of Yorke sang the high masse that daie with all the pompous solemnitie that might be, and gaue cleane remission of sinnes to all that heard it.<sup>11</sup>

While Clement VII had not expressly stated it, Henry and England considered the title to be hereditary. The prestige of a papal title was important in an era of power

---

<sup>10</sup>Brown, "Henry VIII's Book, 'Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,' and the Royal Title of 'Defender of the Faith'," p. 244.

<sup>11</sup>Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Vol. III (London: printed for J. Johnson; F. C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Cadell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1808), p. 675.

politics. In 1543, after the break with Rome, Henry had the title, Defender of the Faith, made hereditary by act of Parliament.

There were, however, further ramifications from Assertio Septem Sacramentorum in England. Instead of providing a final answer to Lutheran doctrine, the book helped to expand the problem. "The controversy caused by this attack upon Lutheranism served to bring the views of both sides before the English people, who began to evaluate the issues for themselves in the light of their own interests."<sup>12</sup> The question had been laid before the people, and, whereas before they had little considered the ideas of Luther, they were brought into contact with the "new teaching" by Henry's arguments against it.

Still more important is the opinion of Tunstall, Bishop of London, on the effect of Lutheranism in England, which he expresses in a private letter to Erasmus in the year 1523. 'It is no question,' he writes, 'of some pernicious novelty; it is only that new arms are being added to the great band of Wycliffite heretics.'<sup>13</sup>

Thus, the influx of Lutheranism and the enlarged view of both sides through Henry's book brought a revival of the "heresy" of the Wycliffites or Lollards. In fact, the doctrine of Luther came to dominate the Wycliffites. As Trevelyan stated:

Although the new doctrines [Lutheranism] scarcely differed at all in essentials from Lollardry, they

---

<sup>12</sup>Grimm, The Reformation Era, p. 291.

<sup>13</sup>George Macaulay Trevelyan, England in the Age of Wycliffe (second ed.; New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899), p. 349.

appealed better to the politician and the man of learning.... Here, then, ends the history of Lollardry proper, not because it is extinguished but because it is merged in another party.<sup>14</sup>

Henry's book, albeit it presented the position of Catholicism, added to the controversy over Lutheranism by presenting the question to the English people. Therefore, it could be said that support of the papal authority had aided the spread of "heresy".

Henry VIII was married to Catherine of Aragon, widow of his brother Arthur, on June 11, 1509, less than two months after he succeeded to the throne and thirteen days before his coronation. Henry's councillors had hurried the marriage because they desired the king to produce an heir as soon as possible, because they wanted the Spanish money, and because they wished to fulfill the policy of Henry VII. In view of these matters, it was expedient to complete Henry's marriage to Catherine as rapidly as possible. Nevertheless, this hasty union profoundly affected the English nation. As Hackett related:

The trade with Flanders, the desire to add Boulogne to Calais, the negotiations with Burbon, the navy policy, the attitude towards the Vatican, the indignation with Luther, the essential friendliness with Charles against Francis--all that had inclined and colored the mind of England from 1509, involving two wars with France, had been insensibly but steadily promoted by the irrefragable reality of Henry's marriage to Catherine.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Trevelyan, England in the Age of Wycliffe, p. 350.

<sup>15</sup>Francis Hackett, Henry the Eighth (New York: Horace Liveright, 1929), P. 173.

By 1525, Henry had learned that marriage for the interests of the State was far removed from marriage in the interest of the ruler. Thus, Henry, despite the effect that the marriage had forced on England's policies, decided to rid himself of a queen six years his senior.

It was certain that Henry held some definite misgivings about his marriage. Early in his reign, Henry had received a lesson in diplomacy from his perfidious father-in-law, Ferdinand of Spain, which did not inspire marital bliss. Yet, Henry was even more disturbed over the lack of a male heir to the throne; Catherine's only surviving child was a daughter, Mary, born in 1516. "For years he gave his wife sympathy and hoped for better things, but he was seriously perturbed by the lack of a male heir; he must have known that the attempt of Henry I to set up Matilda had ended in disaster and that, if a woman could reign herself, his father had usurped the throne in 1185."<sup>16</sup> Considering the troubled times at the beginning of his father's reign and the not so far distant Wars of the Roses, Henry wanted a male heir to continue the Tudor line. History had shown in England that the placing of a woman on the throne was an invitation to civil war. Thus, Henry's paramount desire was the one thing Catherine could not give him--a son. Despite the lack of a male heir, Henry had another reason for desiring a divorce--the attraction

---

<sup>16</sup>J. D. Mackie, The Earlier Tudors: 1485-1558 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 325.

of another woman. This woman was Anne Boleyn. Henry had already possessed Anne's sister, Mary, and he was quite infatuated with the younger Boleyn sister. "Anne, however, withstood his advances, and was not to be won, except by pledges which a married man had no right to give; and the king was considering now how to make these pledges good, either by obtaining from the Pope (in consideration of his merits towards the Holy See) a licence for bigamy, or a declaration of nullity on the theory that there was a flaw in the dispensation of his first marriage."<sup>17</sup> The king, for either love interests or national interests, had come to the parting of the ways with Catherine.

Henry thought that he would have little trouble in securing his desires from the papacy, for Rome had a record of leniency in such matters.

Henry's sister, the Queen of Scotland, after living for years in the most open adultery with the husband of another woman, had no trouble in securing the favorable action of Rome only a month or so before Henry began his proceedings; nor did her paramour meet with more opposition when he applied for his divorce.

Henry IV of Castile could have no children by his wife, so the Pope allowed him another wife on the basis that if this did not result in children he should go back to his first consort. Alexander VI (Pope) in 1498, only thirty years previous to Henry's demand, had allowed a divorce to a King of France for the sole reason that that monarch could then marry the ruler of Brittany and so bring that province under his rule.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>James Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century From the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary Vol. IV of A History of the English Church, ed. by W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1903) p. 86.

<sup>18</sup>Frederick Chamberlin, The Private Character of Henry the Eighth (New York: Ives Washburn, 1931), pp. 326-27.

Past history showed Henry that he could expect favorable action from the papacy. His sister Mary had received two divorces from popes, and Clement VII was not considered to be a strong pope. The Church had been far from steadfast in holding to the sacred contract of holy matrimony. "The papacy had dissolved dozens of marriages without a qualm, just as it had declared Clement himself to have been born in wedlock to suit the papal rule against illegitimate children."<sup>19</sup> If the problem of Clement's bastardy could be disposed of so easily, papal principles should not have blocked the way to Henry's divorce. Yet, it was an era when state necessity was the rule of law, and other roads led to Rome besides Henry's.

In 1526, war had broken out, with the forces of Clement VII and some of the Italian states fighting against the Emperor, Charles V. Charles was the nephew of Catherine of Aragon and, of course, was interested in any intentions Henry might have had concerning a divorce from his aunt. In 1527, the Emperor's army was successful, and the devastation of the "Sack of Rome" followed. Charles was in a position to virtually dictate papal policy to Clement.

About this time Charles was informed of Henry VIII's schemes of divorce; on the 31st of July [1527] he instructed Lannoy to speak to the Pope on this business, but with caution, lest greater complications should arise if the Pope were to hold out a bait to King Henry in the matter or enter into any mischievous practical

---

<sup>19</sup> Hackett, Henry the Eighth, p. 179.

understanding with him. Charles wished Clement to make any further advance in the business of the divorce impossible by the issue of Briefs to Henry VIII. and Wolsey.<sup>20</sup>

Clement VII was in a poor situation for bargaining. Charles, although he didn't trust Clement, held the upper hand. However, on December 6, 1527, Clement fled from Rome and imperial restraint to Orvieto. Helpless for the moment, Clement could only hope for the future. As Creighton commented on Clement's hopes:

There was, however, a troublesome piece of business which the English king had laid before him, from which, perhaps, some advantage might be gained. Clement little knew that his attempts to manage that business for the purpose of his political necessities were destined to bring upon the Papacy more irretrievable disaster than the revolt of Germany.<sup>21</sup>

The Pope was seeking a means of advantage, in order to rebuild his political position, and the divorce question seemed to be a logical choice, as there were two sides to maneuver--one against the other. Thus, Clement probably did not even consider the possible loss of England from the Church, when he sought a solution to his political problems in the divorce.

Henry was far from inactive in his search for freedom from the ties of wedlock. In fact, an immediate settlement was his principal concern.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ludwig Pastor, The History of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages, Vol. IX, ed. Ralph Francis Kerr (4th Ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), p. 453.

<sup>21</sup> M. Creighton, A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome, Vol. VI (new ed.; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901), p. 363.

As a first step, in May [1527] he allowed himself to be cited in private before Wolsey as Legate and called upon to justify his marriage. Nothing came of this proceeding, except that on June 22 Henry shocked his wife by telling her that they must part company, as he found by the opinion of divines and lawyers that they had been living in sin.<sup>22</sup>

In placing himself before Wolsey, Henry was beginning to take overt action, and his statement to Catherine of his feelings all but cancelled out any hope of reconciliation. In September 1527, the king sent his secretary, Knight, to Rome with a draft Bull for a dispensation to contract a fresh marriage, either without a dissolution of the marriage to Catherine (i.e. bigamy) or after a legal divorce. Cardinal Wolsey, however, convinced Henry to abstain from demanding a dispensation involving bigamy, and the two of them drew up a new draft, although Henry had already dispatched another secret draft to Knight. This secret draft contained a clause to dispense Henry from the impediment of affinity in the first degree caused by his previous illicit and adulterous intercourse with Anne Boleyn's sister. Knight obtained the Bull that Henry desired on December 17, 1527, but it was only a conditional Bull--absolutely worthless until proof of the invalidity of the marriage to Catherine was established.

Knight, on his journey home, received the jointly composed draft Bull of Henry and Wolsey, which turned him once again towards Orvieto. In addition to the joint draft,

---

<sup>22</sup> James Gairdner, "Henry VIII," The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1904) p. 428.

Knight had a draft of a Decretal Bull that would transfer the adjudication of the case to Wolsey. If Clement placed this power in Wolsey's hands, Wolsey could relieve the Pope of the whole unpleasantness and, incidentally, retain his stature with Henry. The draft Decretal Bull presented five points, which the Pope was to declare to be sufficient to invalidate the dispensation of Julius II, if substantiated. As Pastor stated:

On the English side five points were raised to invalidate the dispensation of Julius II. of the 26th of December 1503:--

1. The Bull states falsely that Henry VIII. wished for the marriage with Catherine, whereas his father, Henry VII., without his son's knowledge, had procured the Bull.

2. The reason adduced for the issue of the dispensation, the maintenance of peace between England and Spain, was null or at least insufficient, as the two States had not been previously at war.

3. Henry VIII. was at the time (1503) only just twelve years old, and therefore not yet capable of a marriage dispensation.

4. The dispensation had lapsed, for at the time of the consummation of the marriage one of the persons, between whom peace was to be maintained by this alliance, Isabella, Queen of Castille, was dead.

5. Henry VIII. had protested against the marriage with Catherine before its consummation, and thereby had renounced the benefits of the dispensation.<sup>23</sup>

The draft, giving Wolsey the power to declare null and void the dispensation of Julius II, if the validity of one of the five points was proven, was laid before Clement at the end of December by Knight and Gregorio Casale. The Pope, although he appreciated the dangers to the succession

---

<sup>23</sup> Ludwig Pastor, The History of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages, Vol. X, ed. Ralph Francis Kerr (4th ed.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1938), pp. 252-53.

caused by the lack of a male heir, found the demands of the English envoys too immoderate. They did obtain a commission for Wolsey and the Illyrian prelate Stafileo, which omitted the declaration that the five points, if substantiated, were sufficient to declare the marriage null and void. This omission eliminated the possibility of a definite decision on the marriage in England.

In an attempt to receive terms more favorable to Henry's cause, two more envoys, Stephen Gardiner and Edward Fox, were sent to Orvieto. They sought the decretal commission in its original form, not for Wolsey or Wolsey and Stafileo, but a Papal Legate, preferably Campeggio, to try the case with Wolsey. The English envoys carried on negotiations with the papacy during March and April of 1528. However, they had to be content with the Bulls of Commission of the 13th of April and the 8th of June, both of which were drawn up in similar terms to allow for the possibility of Wolsey and Warham (Archbishop of Canterbury) as well as for Wolsey and Campeggio. As it fell to Campeggio to go to England, the second Bull only was used.

By this Bull the Cardinals received full powers thoroughly to examine whatever could be brought forward for or against the marriage of Henry and Catherine, and especially for or against the dispensation of Julius II.; then, after hearing both sides, to take summary proceedings, according to the just circumstances of the case and their convictions, to be valid and legal or invalid and null, if judgement should be called for by one of the parties. In case of invalidity, in the same summary proceedings, the decree of divorce was to be declared and liberty be given to the King and Queen to contract a fresh marriage, but in such-wise that, if it seemed good to the Cardinals, the

children of the first marriage, as well as those of the second, should be declared legitimate, and their legitimacy protected from all question under the usual punishments and censures of the Church.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, the proceedings would come to England, but Wolsey would not be able to handle the matter alone. The Pope was attempting to preserve Catholic unity under very trying circumstances. This is pointed out by the clause for declaring the princess Mary legitimate, if the Cardinals thought it to be a good policy. "A divorce meant the displacement of a Catholic queen of England...but still more it meant the supercession of the Catholic princess Mary as heir to the throne of England by someone unknown."<sup>25</sup>

Clement felt that, in the event of a divorce, Mary's legitimacy might make it possible for the Church to retain England. Also, Charles V might be slightly pacified, in the event of a divorce, by Mary's retention of her legitimacy. Clement desired to make the best of a bad situation and keep England within the Church.

Campeggio began his journey in July of 1528, under instructions from Clement to prolong it as much as possible. With him, he brought the Decretal Bull that Wolsey had desired, but the Pope had given implicit instructions that he was to retain the document in his possession and destroy

---

<sup>24</sup>Pastor, The History of the Popes, Vol. X, pp. 257-58.

<sup>25</sup>Chamberlin, The Private Character of Henry the Eighth, p. 328.

it at the right moment. The Legate's object was to delay the process of the divorce and work for a reconciliation of the royal pair. In no case was he to pronounce a final verdict without the expressed approval of the Pope. Suffering severely from the gout, Campeggio arrived in London on October 7, 1528. On the day following his first audience with the king on October 22, Campeggio was visited by Henry, who offered the suggestion that Catherine should renounce her rights and retire to a convent to expedite the divorce. On the 24th, Catherine flatly refused the proposition that she should betake herself to a cloister. "A Spaniard, a daughter of the Catholic King, she certainly could not have admitted to all the world that she had been anointed and crowned unlawfully, that for four-and-twenty years she had been her husband's concubine, while in her inmost heart she believed in the validity of her marriage."<sup>26</sup> Also on October 24, Campeggio showed Henry the Decretal Bull, at the king's request, but the Bull at no time left the Cardinal's hands and no one, except Henry and Wolsey, saw it. Through the winter, the divorce question moved slowly, if at all, as neither side seemed ready to convene the commission as a court.

Not until May 31, 1529, was the court of the two Legates constituted, and the two principals were cited to appear on the 18th of June. At the first session, Catherine

---

<sup>26</sup>Pastor, The History of the Popes, Vol. X, p. 263.

lodged a protest against the court's jurisdiction, and, when the Legates pronounced themselves competent to sit on the matter, the queen withdrew herself from the proceedings. Thus, the case continued, with the pleading of one side only. Only John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, appeared for the queen. Despite this interruption, the case progressed quite rapidly; yet, no decision was given. As Gairdner commented:

The proceedings were pushed on till July 23, when Campeggio, in conformity with the Roman practice at that time of year, declared the court prorogued till the beginning of October. What this implied was clear. No one expected it to meet again, and the king for a while seemed to have dismissed the idea of prosecuting his suit for a divorce any further.<sup>27</sup>

This failure, from Henry's point of view, practically ended the king's hopes of receiving a legally sanctioned divorce from Rome. In Italy, a Consistory had determined that the grounds of Catherine's appeal were strong enough to transfer the case to the judicial court of the Rota at Rome. Thus, the powers of the Legates in England were ended.

Wolsey had failed, and Henry caused him to pay for the miscarriage of the divorce suit. Wolsey was indicted of a praemunire in the King's Bench, and he confessed. The great seal was taken from him and given to Sir Thomas More. "He relied on success as an ultimate justification; and inasmuch as success had not followed, he was obliged to

---

<sup>27</sup>Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 95.

bear the necessary fate of a minister who, in a free country, had thwarted the popular will, and whom fortune deserted in the struggle."<sup>28</sup> Along with the loss of his political power, Wolsey was deprived of Winchester, St. Albans and York House. He was allowed to go free and sent to the archbishopric of York, which he retained. However, Henry learned of further involvement of the Cardinal with the papacy, and Wolsey was arrested on November 4, 1529, to be brought to the Tower. Wolsey never was imprisoned, though, for he died in the abbey of St. Mary at Leicester, before he could be brought to London. The minister, who had colored so much of the foreign policy of Henry's reign, was dead.

In 1530, Henry was to return once more to his search for a divorce. Thomas Cranmer, a young Cambridge scholar, showed the king that the Scriptures supported his divorce. For example:

Thou shall not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife, it is thy brother's nakedness.<sup>29</sup>

The Scriptures also supported the divorce by offering an explanation of the lack of a male heir.

And if a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing; he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness, they shall be childless.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>James Anthony Froude, History of England from The Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Vol. I, (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1850-1870), pp. 147-48.

<sup>29</sup>Levit. XVIII. 16.

<sup>30</sup>Levit. XX. 21.

Yet, even if Arthur had not consummated the marriage, the Scriptures presented ample reason for the divorce.

If a damsel be betrothed to a husband still remaining a virgin, and shall be lain with by another man, both of them shall be stoned to death, and she punished for an adulteress, he for humbling his neighbor's wife.<sup>31</sup>

Armed with this proof from the Scriptures and other arguments, Cranmer led the English appeal to the universities of Europe; there they might find an authority which could vie with the Pope in the interpretation of Scripture. The results of this survey were most gratifying to Henry. As Collette stated:

The judgment of the English bishops (except Fisher, Bishop of Rochester) had been obtained 4th April 1530, declaring the nullity of the King's marriage with Catherine. The decision was approved of, ratified, and confirmed by--

The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.--8th April 1530.

The University of Orleans.--7th April 1530.

The Faculty of the Civil and Canon Law at Angers.--7th May 1530.

The Faculty of Divines at Bruges.--10th June 1530.

The Divines of Bologna.--10th June 1530.

The University of Padua.--10th July 1530.

The celebrated Faculty of Sorbonne at Paris.--2nd July 1530.

The Divines of Ferrara.--29th September 1530.

The University of Toulouse.--1st October 1530.

By the most famous Jewish Rabbis, and by a large number of the Canonists in Venice, in Rome itself, and many other places.<sup>32</sup>

Henry hoped that these favorable opinions from some of the leading universities in Europe would increase the pressure

---

<sup>31</sup>Deut. XXii. 24.

<sup>32</sup>Charles Hastings Collette, The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, D.D., the First Reforming Archbishop of Canterbury (London: George Redway, 1887), pp. 50-51.

on the papacy to grant the divorce. Also, Henry was able to show parliament these opinions as part of a general consensus in favor of his cause, if the papacy would not give the king satisfaction, then England would act by itself. Clement was still under the influence of Charles V, and he would hesitate to take any action detrimental to the interests of the Emperor. The Pope wanted Henry to come to Rome to seek his divorce, but the sovereign of England refused to submit to the judgment of a foreign "prince" in that "prince's" territory. Thus, the divorce question was still a stalemate in 1530.

Henry, tiring of waiting for papal action, determined to achieve the divorce through English means. This necessitated control of the English Church by the monarch and the compliance of parliament. Henry accomplished these purposes in two important steps--first, the submission of the Clergy in 1532 and second, the act in restraint of appeals in 1533. The effect of the submission of the Clergy was to achieve the complete subordination of the Church to the State. "By the terms of this, the clergy must make no new constitutions, canons, or ordinances without the royal licence; the existing body of ecclesiastical law must be reviewed by a committee of thirty-two, half clerical, half lay, all chosen by the king; the laws approved by the majority of the committee must receive the royal assent before they became valid."<sup>33</sup> Thus, the clergy

---

<sup>33</sup>Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 355.

lost their independence to the crown through their own action in convocation. The act in restraint of appeals was a check, through parliament, on the submission of the clergy, for it eliminated the danger of an appeal to Rome. Although this act was beneficial in ending the supposed jurisdiction of the Pope in England, it served more immediate purposes. "It destroyed the validity of Queen Catherine's appeal; it placed a legal power in the hands of the English judges to proceed to pass sentence upon the divorce; and it is open to the censure which we ever feel entitled to pass upon a measure enacted to meet the particular position of a particular person."<sup>34</sup> Despite any resentment felt towards Henry for so blatantly using parliament to serve his own ends, it must be remembered that he had waited a good number of years for papal action, and that Anne Boleyn's pregnancy necessitated not only a public marriage but also the ceremonies of coronation. Under these circumstances, Henry was forced to act in the most expedient manner.

The death of Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, on August 22, 1532, opened the way for Henry to place a man with his views on the divorce in this province. The man selected was Thomas Cranmer. On February 21, 1533, Clement issued the Bull for Cranmer's consecration, and he was duly consecrated on March 30, 1533.

---

<sup>34</sup>Froude, History of England, Vol. I, p. 414.

It is, however, a fact that Cranmer refused to accept the Pope's Bull for his consecration, but delivered it over to the King, as he did not consider this form necessary to the validity of his appointment; and on taking the oath of fidelity to the Pope, before his consecration, which was the custom of the day, he accompanied it with a public protest; "That he did not admit the Pope's authority any further than it agreed with the express Word of God; and that it might be lawful for him at all times to speak against him, and to impugn his errors when there should be occasion." This he thrice repeated in the presence of official witnesses.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, Henry had an archbishop to carry out his divorce, but it was more important, perhaps, that Cranmer, through his protest, stated that he felt there were definite limitations on papal authority. This statement by a high-ranked cleric showed that the authority of the Church of Rome was on the wane in England.

The first important action of the new archbishop concerned the divorce question. As Fuller stated:

Cranmer was now settled in his archbishopric, and the first eminent act of his office was exercised in the King's divorce. A court was called in the priory of Dunstable in Bedfordshire, as a favorable place, indifferently distanced, but five miles from Ampthill, where queen Katharine resided. With Cranmer were the bishops of London, Winchester, Bath, and Lincoln [Gardiner, Stokesley, Clerk, and Longland] with many other great prelates. These summoned queen Katharine to appear before them, full fifteen days together, on whose refusal they not only adjudged her contumacious, but also pronounced her match with the king as null and unlawful by scripture; and soon after it was proclaimed that henceforward none should call her queen, but the dowager of prince Arthur.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>Collette, The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, p. 56.

<sup>36</sup>Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain; from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the Year M.DC. XLVIII, Vol. III, ed. J. S. Brewer (new ed.; Oxford: The University Press, 1845), pp. 73-74.

Henry's objective had been accomplished, at the cost of the breach with Rome. The divorce was accomplished on May 23, 1533, and Clement, on July 11, 1533, gave sentence against Henry, pronounced the marriage with Ann Boleyn null and void and their children, if any, to be illegitimate, and laid the King under greater excommunication. Henry had till September (later extended into October) to restore Catherine; if he should not, he would be under the full effect of excommunication. The excommunication of the English monarch marked the end of Catholic unity in England and the submission of the Church to the power of the State.

The break with Rome, occasioned by the divorce of Catherine of Aragon for Anne Boleyn, forced the issue of the royal supremacy upon Henry VIII. Although Henry disliked the interferences of papal policies in English affairs, the more immediate needs of the divorce question led to the establishment of the royal supremacy. However, the events that led up to the establishment of the royal supremacy were begun even before the final settlement of the divorce problem. "In December, 1530, the attorney-general filed in the court of king's bench an information against the whole body of the clergy for having violated the statutes of provisors and praemunire by recognising the legatine authority of Cardinal Wolsey."<sup>37</sup> Despite the

---

<sup>37</sup>H. A. L. Fisher, The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of Henry VIII.: 1545-1547, Vol. V of The Political History of England, ed. William Hunt and Reginald L. Poole (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1928), p. 307.

fact that Wolsey would not have accepted the office without the king's acquiescence, Henry was determined to use this situation to move against the clergy, and praemunire was a powerful weapon. As Powicke commented:

The terrible weapon of praemunire,...had its humble beginnings as a method of procedure against elusive persons who defied the jurisdiction of the royal courts in cases where Papal claims to provision had affected royal rights; it was merely subsidiary to the Statute of Provisors, just as the Statute of Provisors was merely intended to strengthen the hands of the royal judges in their administration of the law. This legislation could be and frequently was made inoperative by royal dispensation, if it suited the Crown not to act upon it. Gradually the Statutes of Praemunire were interpreted to justify action against the exercise of foreign or private jurisdiction without royal consent.<sup>38</sup>

Henry desired to secure money from the Church in case of war with Spain and to weaken papal power in England.

Praemunire was an effective means to achieve these purposes.

The clergy in convocation voted a substantial supply of over a hundred thousand pounds to the king. However,

Henry also wanted another title for the crown. As Fuller has related:

But the king would not be so satisfied with the payment of the money, except also they would acknowledge him to be Supreme head of the Church. This was hard meat, and would not easily down amongst them; however, being thoroughly debated in a synodical way, both in the upper and lower houses of convocation, they did in fine agree on this expression, *cujus [ecclesia Anglicanae] singularem protectorem, unicum*

---

<sup>38</sup>F. M. Powicke, The Reformation in England (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), pp. 13-14.

et supremum Dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius, majestatem recognoscimus.<sup>39</sup>

Although Henry did not receive the exact title he desired-- "Supreme Head after God", his position, as regarded the Church in England, was considerably strengthened. This easy victory over the clergy, quite probably, led Henry to the conclusion that he might be "pope" in England. The divorce question had awakened the king to the inherent dangers of a Church dependent on a foreign leader, and he saw the natural advantages of national religion controlled by the ruler.

Following this triumph of 1531, Henry expanded his program for control of the Church in 1532. However, the burden of the attack was shifted from the king to parliament.

The praemunire of 1531 was to be followed by a great parliamentary campaign against ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. Both manoeuvres formed part of a common plan, the object of which was to intimidate the pope, to enrich the crown, and to subject the Church.<sup>40</sup>

It was advantageous for the king to attack the Church through parliament, because the employment of this national body brought a sense of strong support behind Henry's policies. Rather than a dissatisfied monarch, it was a nation protesting. Thus, Henry began to marshall the

---

<sup>39</sup>Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, p. 65. The Latin is translated in effect by Fisher, The History of England, p. 308, as follows: "their singular protector, only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ allows, even Supreme Head".

<sup>40</sup>Fisher, The History of England, pp. 310-11.

forces of the State in the wake of his concept of the royal supremacy.

On March 18, 1532, the king was presented a "supplication against the ordinaries"; this document from commons listed twelve grievances against the clergy. The commons felt that there were abuses by the clergy in the power of convocation to frame canons and exact penalties without the consent of the laity, in the proctors and in the delays of the Courts of Arches and Audience, and in the trivial and vexatious cases of the ordinaries against the poorer lay people. Also the fees of the clergy were cause for complaint, especially--excessive fees in spiritual courts, exactions by the parish clergy for sacraments, and delays and fees in the probate of wills. The excessive number of holy days observed and the provision of infants to benefices were other causes of complaint. "The House of Commons, in casting their grievances into the form of a petition, showed that they had no desire to thrust forward of themselves violent measures of reform; they sought rather to explain firmly and decisively what the country required".<sup>41</sup> Yet, even if the commons had no desire to initiate reform, they opened the way for Henry to take further action. Thus, the king referred the petition to convocation for a reply.

The ordinaries responded with an answer which traversed the points on the commons' indictment and defended the

---

<sup>41</sup>Froude, History of England, Vol. I, p. 202.

legislative power of convocation. This reply displeased both king and commons, and a second answer was framed, which, while upholding the Church's power to make rules concerning faith, indicated the clergy was willing to ask the king's consent to publish and enforce the rules of the Church. This offer of compromise was held to be unacceptable. Convocation attempted to draft a further compromise, but it was too late. On May 10, 1532, convocation was informed that it must assent to three articles, effecting the submission of Church to State. The terms of these articles decisively limited the power of convocation.

In the first place the clergy must promise to enact no new constitutions, canons, or ordinances without royal licence. In the second place, the existing body of ecclesiastical law must be submitted to a committee of thirty-two, half lay, half clerical, but all chosen by the king, so that any ordinances found to be contrary to God's law or the laws of the realm should be abolished. Thirdly, the laws approved by the majority of the committee should receive the king's assent.<sup>42</sup>

The acceptance of these articles by convocation would seriously weaken the position of the Church; however, on May 15, after some negotiation and debate, the clergy submitted to the demands.<sup>43</sup> "Relying on the King's religious zeal and great learning, the clergy promised that they would promulgate or execute no ordinance unless by royal consent".<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Fisher, The History of England, p. 313.

<sup>43</sup>See Henry Gee and William John Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), pp. 176-78, for the document of the submission of the clergy.

<sup>44</sup>Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 40.

Albeit the clergy hoped that the king's interest in matters theological would work to their benefit, the Church's power to control the ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been broken. Henry now had the legal might to further limit the papal power within his realm, and the resistance of convocation, once broken, could never be as strong again. The advancement of Henry's concept of the royal supremacy was in the ascendancy, and, significantly, on May 16, 1532, Sir Thomas More, successor to Wolsey, resigned the great seal.

Further reform was made in 1532 by the conditional restraint of annates or first-fruits by parliament. Great sums had been paid to Rome for first-fruits of archbishoprics and bishoprics, and the nation was thereby impoverished. Parliament charged that some 160,000 pounds had been paid in annates since the second year of the reign of Henry VII, and the purpose of the act was to stop this drain on English resources. As the act stated:

It is therefore ordained, established, and enacted, by authority of this present Parliament, that the unlawful payments of annates, or first-fruits, and all manner contributions for the same, for any archbishopric or bishopric, or for any bulls hereafter to be obtained from the Court of Rome, to or for the aforesaid purpose and intent, shall from henceforth utterly cease, and no such hereafter to be paid for any archbishopric, or bishopric, within this realm, other or otherwise than hereafter in this present Act is declared; and that no manner person nor persons hereafter to be named, elected, presented, or postulated to any archbishopric, or bishopric, within this realm, shall pay the said annates, or first-fruits, for the said archbishopric, or bishopric, nor any other manner of sum or sums of money, pensions, or annuities for the same, or for any other like exaction, or cause, upon pain to forfeit to our said sovereign lord the king, his heirs and successors, all manner his goods and chattels forever, and

all the temporal lands and possessions of the same archbishopric, or bishopric, during the time that he or they which shall offend contrary to this present Act, shall have, possess, or enjoy the archbishopric or bishopric, wherefore he shall so offend contrary to the form aforesaid.<sup>45</sup>

This act helped to weaken the influence of the Pope in England, and, if the clergy resisted, Henry would profit from the acquisition of goods, lands, and possessions. The act also provided for the consecration of archbishops and bishops in England without the consent of Rome. However, the act was conditional, and the king had until Easter 1533 or the next meeting of parliament to decide and declare, by his letters patent, whether the act or any part thereof should be executed or held as void and of none effect. Thus, the conditional aspects of this act were closely related to the divorce question; Henry wanted to demonstrate to the papacy that, if his marriage was not annulled, he had the power to stop the flow of papal revenues from England.

In 1533, Henry struck once more at the papal power in England. The divorce question was headed for settlement outside the jurisdiction of Rome, and the king wished to lessen the effect of possible retaliatory action from the Pope. Within the framework of this purpose, the act in restraint of appeals was passed by parliament in February of 1533. This act ended the danger of appeals to a foreign power, and it claimed that such appeals were in restraint of justice. As the act stated:

---

<sup>45</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 181. The complete text of the act can be found in the same source, pp. 178-86.

And notwithstanding the said good statutes and ordinances made in the time of the king's most noble progenitors, in preservation of the authority and prerogative of the said imperial crown, as is afore-said; yet nevertheless since the making of the said good statutes and ordinances, divers and sundry inconveniences and dangers, not provided for plainly by the said former acts, statutes, and ordinances, have arisen and sprung by reason of appeals sued out of this realm to the see of Rome, in causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorces, right of tithes, oblation and obventions, not only to the great inquietation, vexation, trouble, cost and charges of the king's highness, and many of his subjects and residents in this his realm, but also to the great delay and let to the true and speedy determination of the said causes, for so much as the parties appealing to the said Court of Rome, most commonly do the same for the delay of justice.<sup>46</sup>

Because of the delays and dangers of appeals to Rome, parliament decreed that all causes determinable by spiritual jurisdiction were to be determined by the king's courts, temporal or spiritual. With all appeals to be tried within the realm, the king had greater control over the clergy, who were required to celebrate service and administer sacraments, notwithstanding any interdict or prohibition from the papacy. If they refused to carry out their spiritual duties, they were liable to a year's imprisonment, and the advocacy or abetment of a papal mandate would invoke the penalties of praemunire. "In other words the duty of a priest to administer the Sacraments was to be a civil as well as a spiritual duty; nonperformance was made an offence under an Act of Parliament."<sup>47</sup> This act helped to set apart the

---

<sup>46</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 188-89. The complete text of this act can be found in the same source, pp. 187-95.

<sup>47</sup>Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 40.

English Church as a unit sufficient unto itself. The elimination of the possible danger of appeals to Rome by this act gave Henry the degree of authority over the Church of England that he needed to go ahead with the divorce, and his separation from Catherine of Aragon followed this act of parliament in 1533.

The solution of the divorce question and the break with Rome in 1533 hastened the institutionalizing of the king's theory of the royal supremacy. In 1534, the concepts and theories of the break with Rome and the royal supremacy were processed into legal forms through acts of parliament. The first of these acts was the ecclesiastical appointments act--the absolute restraint of annates, election of bishops, and letters missive act.<sup>48</sup> The tone of this act indicated the width of the breach between England and Rome. As Dixon commented:

The "Pope's Holiness" of former statutes was constantly henceforth "the Bishop of Rome, otherwise called the Pope"....Whereas the Act about Annates which was made two years before reserved certain payments for bulls procured from the see of Rome on the election of every bishop, this Act extinguished all such payments without reserve; it forbade bulls, breves, or any other thing to be procured from Rome, and confined the elections of bishops entirely within the kingdom.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, not only was the Pope's title degraded but also the Holy See definitely lost the important annates income from

---

<sup>48</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 201-209, for the text of this act.

<sup>49</sup>Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Vol. I (third ed., revised; Oxford: The University Press, 1895) p. 181.

England. The confining of the elections of bishops to the kingdom necessitated the setting-up of an election system. Authority was given to the custom in which the deans and chapters elected, under royal licence, a person designated in a letter missive from the king. Failure to elect within twelve days of the receipt of the licence and letters missive would place the chapter under a praemunire and forfeit the right of nomination to the king. Also, the persons elected were required to take an oath of fealty to the king before their consecration. Henry was rapidly changing the concept of the Church--State relationship in England.

Further definition was given to the break with Rome by the Act forbidding papal dispensations and the payment of Peter's pence.<sup>50</sup> As Gairdner commented:

A second Act abolished Peter's pence and all other payments to Rome, on the ground that the realm was not subject to any laws made by any authority outside it; and the Archbishop of Canterbury was empowered to grant all such licences and dispensations as the king had been used to obtain from the See of Rome. Exempt monasteries were to be subject to the king's visitation instead of the pope's, and any one suing to Rome for faculties of any kind incurred a praemunire.<sup>51</sup>

This act cut away the principal roots of the papal power in England, for not only was another source of papal revenue (Peter's pence) stripped from Rome but also the licencing and dispensation power of the Pope was abolished in Henry's

---

<sup>50</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 209-32, for the text of this act.

<sup>51</sup> Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 145-46.

kingdom. Yet, the most important aspect of this act was, perhaps, the granting to the king of the right of visitation of the monasteries, even those previously exempt from such action unless by papal order. It was this power that made possible the later dissolution of the monasteries. Thus, a great share of the papal power had been transferred to the English king.

Another important step towards the achievement of the royal supremacy was the act for the submission of the clergy and the restraint of appeals.<sup>52</sup> This act embodied the concessions of 1532 that convocation made to the crown and reaffirmed the act in restraint of appeals of 1533. One of the main purposes of the act was to discourage the clergy from debating controversial theological issues, as well as to prevent them from creating new Church law without the king. As Fisher has commented on the details of the act:

Convocation was only to be assembled by royal writ, and was to promulgate no new canons save with royal assent. A commission named by the king was to reform the canon law; nor should any canon be enforced which should run counter to the king's prerogative or to the customs, laws, and statutes of the realm. While no appeals were to go to Rome under penalty of praemunire there was to be an appeal from the archbishop's court to the king in chancery. Religious houses which were exempt from episcopal control should appeal direct to the same royal tribunal.<sup>53</sup>

This act helped to tighten royal control over the monasteries, by having them appeal to the king rather than to

---

<sup>52</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 195-200, for the text of this act.

<sup>53</sup>Fisher, The History of England, p. 326.

Rome. Also, this act linked the royal supremacy to the royal prerogative; the clergy could, perhaps, have shown that their canons were not repugnant to the laws of the realm, but the exact limits of the king's prerogative defied definition. Therefore, there was very little the clergy could have done to prevent the establishment of the royal supremacy.

As the second session of parliament in 1534 met in November, Henry's concept of the royal supremacy became an actuality with the passage of the supremacy act. The act was as follows:

Albeit the king's majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations, yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirp all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same; be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia; and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining; and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's

religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm; any usage, custom, foreign law, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding.<sup>54</sup>

This act was a positive statement by parliament of the royal supremacy, and it was, perhaps, more satisfying to Henry than the unwilling assent of a desperate convocation. Full powers of visitation were guaranteed to the king by the act, along with all powers and privileges accruing to the title of supreme head of the Church of England. Thus, the supremacy act was the culmination of the legal establishment through parliament of Henry's concept of the royal supremacy and the relationship of Church to State.

The concept of the royal supremacy brought, of necessity, a defense or rationale of its principles by the writers of Henry's time. The people had to be dissuaded from the habit and tradition of papal supremacy over matters ecclesiastical. In 1534, one of the first books to defend Henry's concept was De Vera Differentia Regiae Potestatis et Ecclesiasticae, et quae sit ipsa Veritas ac Virtus utriusque, which was attributed, without certainty, to Edward Fox. As Allen has commented on this book:

The claims of the Pope having been rather quickly disposed of, the writer goes on to assert that the Church, as such, has no power to make law and no coercive authority, 'no power to constrain or to punish'....God, it is asserted, gave power to Jewish kings to see that divine law was kept; He authorized them to appoint and to punish and depose priests. It is clear that, in

---

<sup>54</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 243-44.

God's own kingdom of the Jews, the clergy were subject to the King; and no ground existed for saying that under the new dispensation the Church is any more independent of secular authority than it was then. We need not be troubled about what Cannon Law may say, since the Church never had any rightful power to make law. St. Paul's text in Romans can only refer to the civil ruler; and he excepts no one from the obedience he demands 'neither Peter nor Paul, nor priest nor bishop, nor cardinal nor patriarch nor Pope'.... It is, even, absurd to maintain that the secular magistrate has no authority in relation to things spiritual. For it is the function of civil authority to punish evildoers; and what does this involve if not spiritual jurisdiction? It is clear, he concludes, that the care of the Church of God must from the beginning have been committed to the civil magistrate, and that he will have to make account for it to God. This indeed, in the words of the translation, is 'the proper and chief use of Princes'.<sup>55</sup>

The argument of the author of De Vera Differentia was mainly based on Scripture; if the Scriptures showed that the Pope's claims were unfounded and that the clergy had no claim to any coercive authority, the authority for spiritual jurisdiction had to rest with the temporal ruler. By returning to the Old Testament and primitive Christianity, a rationale could be developed for the authority of princes over priests. Thus, it was the Pope who had usurped the rightful power of the civil authority, and Henry was returning the Church to its proper place.

Henry's position was also defended by Gardiner, who brought forth a slightly different view of the royal supremacy than that held by the author of De Vera Differentia.

Gardiner, now Bishop of Winchester, in his book On True Obedience [1535], also vigorously defended the justice

---

<sup>55</sup>J. W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, (New York: The Dial Press Inc., 1928), pp. 100-01.

of Henry's new title, and claimed for him almost unlimited powers over the Church. The king is, he says, "a prince of his whole people, not of part of it, and he governs them in all things, not in some only; and as the people constitute the Church of England, so he must needs be the supreme head of the Church as he is the supreme head of the people."<sup>56</sup>

Of course, Gardiner's conception of the royal supremacy was based upon his theory of the English Church. "The Church of England, says Gardiner, is 'nothing else but the congregation of men and women of the clergy and of the laity, united in Christ's profession'."<sup>57</sup> Thus, the Church was nothing apart from the people that constituted it and, as such, was merely another part of the realm. The king, head of the realm, had to control all of the parts of his kingdom. Therefore, because the Church in England was only a representation of the people that composed it, Henry, as the sovereign head of the nation, was supreme in ecclesiastical matters. Gardiner had added logical assertion to the evidence of the Old Testament and primitive Christianity presented by the author of De Vera Differentia.

The ecclesiastical writers, in trying to justify the royal supremacy, were concerned, however, more with proving the invalidity of papal claims than with what was implied in the royal supremacy. Christopher St. Germain, a lawyer of considerable repute now known chiefly for his

---

<sup>56</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, pp. 48-49.

<sup>57</sup> Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, p. 163.

controversy with Sir Thomas More on the royal supremacy, was much closer to the implications of the royal supremacy, for it was fundamentally a question of the legal limits of the civil authority.

St. Germain of course took the view that all punitive and coercive power, all property and office and all rights and claims connected with them are 'temporal' things. All temporal authority belongs to the Crown and, if it has been granted away, may be resumed. By the Act of Supremacy the King 'hath, as I take it, no new power given him in anything'. Any privileges or exemptions that the clergy legally enjoy by virtue of custom or acquiescence, must be conceived as derived from the Crown and if they prove detrimental to the commonwealth, may and should be abolished.<sup>58</sup>

St. Germain held the view that all civil authority rested with the king, and, thus, the royal supremacy was merely the restoration to the king of temporarily granted powers and privileges. He had to assume that the Church was no more than a part of the realm composed of the whole body of professing Christians. "The Church Catholic has, itself, no common organization and no common head: for all practical purposes every localized or national Church is a Church Catholic."<sup>59</sup> In other words, if the national Church followed the essentials of faith of the Church Universal, it was a Church Catholic because it held to these essentials, not because of any relationship with Rome. The Pope's authority had been assumed from what belonged of right to the king

---

<sup>58</sup>Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, p. 105, citing from St. Germain's An Answer to a Letter and referring to his Treatise concerning the division between the spiritualtie and the temporaltie.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid. p. 166.

of England. "It was accepted no doubt that the law of God should inform the commands of the temporal authority, but as Saint-Germain [sic] taught, it was for 'the king's grace in his parliament to expound scripture, and so decide what the irrefragible law of God is; for the king with his people have the authority of the Church'."<sup>60</sup> As a legal question, the royal supremacy was part of the rising feeling of nationalism in the sixteenth century. St. Germain evidently believed that the king in parliament held unlimited civil authority, which was extendable over the Church. Unity of the realm under the ruler was the legal view, and, to maintain this unity, the king had to be supreme in ecclesiastical as well as temporal affairs. Thus, the legal and ecclesiastical writers provided ample justification for Henry's seizure of the traditional spiritual powers of the Church.

The control over the clergy that was inherent in the concept of the royal supremacy was demonstrated by the royal injunctions of 1536 and 1538. Thomas Cromwell, the king's vicar-general, issued these injunctions in the name of the king. The tone of the injunctions of 1536 was quite strong, and they were directed towards the maintenance of the royal supremacy. As Dixon commented on the injunctions of 1536:

Under the well-known name of injunctions he [Cromwell] published this year a set of stringent regulations in which the clergy found many new duties laid upon them: and when, by the weight of royal authority, they

---

<sup>60</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 424.

were compelled not only to receive with submission, but to publish to their flocks the rebukes with which they were chastened, it may be acknowledged that the art of lecturing the clergy reached great excellence at an early period. Upon pain of deprivation, sequestration, or such other penalty as might seem good to the King or his Vicegerent [sic], they were ordered to read these injunctions openly and deliberately to their parishioners once every quarter of the year; and to observe and keep them.<sup>61</sup>

Through these injunctions, the clergy became the means of carrying the royal supremacy to the people. Every Sunday for three months they were to preach against the pretended power of the Pope, and, at least twice a quarter, they were to expound the king's articles in their sermons. Also the clergy were ordered to forbear superstitious ceremonies and not to teach them to their people. However, they were to see that the young of the parishes were taught to say the Creed, the Pater Noster, and the Ten Commandments in English, and, in their sermons, the clergy were to recite the same little by little until the whole was learned. Thus, these injunctions were quite explicit about what the clergy were to do under the headship of the king.

The injunctions of 1538, issued by Cromwell for the king, were, if anything, more severe in tone than those of 1536. As Dixon related:

Several contemptuous expressions regarding the ceremonies of the old religion, which were admitted into them, revealed a spirit which had been more prudently concealed in the former admonitions of the reign. The

---

<sup>61</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 441.

clergy were addressed directly, and commanded to obey both these and the former injunctions upon pain of additional penalties.<sup>62</sup>

By 1538, the velvet touch was gone from the iron force of the royal supremacy. Yet, the progress started for the religious education of the laity in 1536 was furthered by the injunctions of 1538. Every person who came to confession in Lent was to be examined as to whether he could repeat the Creed, Pater Noster, and Ten Commandments in English, before he could be admitted to the sacrament of the altar. Requirements for preaching were set up to instruct the people against superstitions and to exhort them to works of charity, mercy, and faith. The injunctions showed that the theory of the royal supremacy would work in practice and that Henry had established himself as head of the Church of England.

The royal supremacy had progressed from theory to practice with no more than token opposition from the clergy, and, apparently, the people were satisfied with the new arrangement. As Carter wrote:

We must also bear in mind that even anti-ecclesiastical legislation was welcomed at this time, owing to the wealth, immunities, and oppressive exactions of the clergy; so that the rejection of the Pope's authority and jurisdiction was by no means unpopular. Bishop Tunstall informed Cardinal Pole in 1536 that he was mistaken in asserting the Act to be contrary to the wishes of the people, adding that "If the King

---

<sup>62</sup> Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Vol. II, (Third ed., revised; Oxford: The University Press, 1895), p. 81.

at this day should go about to renew in his realm the abolished authority of the Bishop of Rome, I think he would find much more difficulty to bring it about in his Parliament and to induce his people to agree thereunto than anything he had ever purposed."<sup>63</sup>

The Church had abused its authority, and the people were not particularly sorry to see the Pope's power wane. Thus, with the acceptance of the populace and the lack of opposition by the clergy, Henry was able to establish his theory of the royal supremacy as a component part of the civil authority in England. Henry VIII, urged on by the divorce problem, had combined the spiritual and temporal authority and placed the English Church in a state of schism with the tradition of papal jurisdiction.

One of the most controversial events of Henry's reign was the dissolution of the monasteries. This action struck the very center of the Roman religion in England; yet, from the king's point of view, it was certainly justifiable. The monasteries had become isolated centers of the popish belief, after the assertion of the royal supremacy. "The principle with which the papal monks started in England, was the one which Augustine inaugurated and which his successors followed with sleepless industry, viz.: Roman conversions, rather than Catholic ones--Italian conversions, rather than English ones--conversions gainful to their own pockets, rather than conversions to the common cause of Christianity."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 34.

<sup>64</sup> Thomas Winthrop Coit, Lectures on the Early History of Christianity in England with Sermons Delivered on Several Occasions (New York: Daniel Dana, Jr., 1859), p. 167.

Thus, the monks had been traditionally directed towards Rome and papal authority. For the unity of his kingdom and less principled reasons, Henry decided that the monasteries had to bow before the force of the royal supremacy.

There were several causes behind the decision to disband the monasteries in England. Perhaps, the primary one was the king's lack of funds in the treasury. "The king wanted money for his own extravagances, and he wanted money to stiffen the loyalty of his subjects."<sup>65</sup> Loyalty could be insured through money, but, more important, Henry needed money in case there were any foreign repercussions from the establishment of the royal supremacy. However, 1535 was a poor agricultural year, and the corn yield was only a third of an average crop. "So pitiable was the state of the country that the farmers of royal lands were quite unable to pay their rents, and Thomas Crumell [sic] was unwilling to exasperate the people by levying the taxes, which had been granted by the authority of Parliament."<sup>66</sup> Thus, because the nation could not support further taxation, the king was forced to seek other sources of revenue, and the logical choice was the monasteries.

Another reason for the dissolution of the monasteries was the need to suppress areas of papal influence in England.

---

<sup>65</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 76.

<sup>66</sup> Francis Aidan Gasquet, Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries: An Attempt to Illustrate the History of their Suppression, Vol. I (Fourth Ed.; London: John Hodges, 1889), p. 245.

The king's vicar-general, Thomas Cromwell, advocated this policy. "In determining to strike a blow at the monastic bodies Cromwell [sic] had a double object--to overthrow the papal system in its strongholds, and to finger some of the riches with which the piety of ten centuries had endowed them."<sup>67</sup> Thus, the profit motive was augmented by the danger of allowing the Pope's authority to be maintained in England. Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, concurred in this view. "Cranmer supported the suppression of the monasteries because he wanted the religious Orders abolished."<sup>68</sup> The major forces of the government and the secular clergy were combined against the regular clergy. The destruction of this strongest area of papal support would, in effect, guarantee the maintenance of the royal supremacy in England, and this destruction could be achieved by the dissolution of the monasteries.

The cause of the dissolution that was to be offered for popular approval was the existence of immorality and other abuses within the monastic system. The grounds of abuses by the monks were numerous. As Carter noted:

The monasteries had, in fact, outlived their day. They were no longer, as formerly, havens of refuge for those desiring to lead holy lives in a semi-barbarous age, nor were the monks still the leaders of learning or even

---

<sup>67</sup> Gasquet, Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries: An Attempt to Illustrate the History of their Suppression, Vol. I, p. 247.

<sup>68</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 76.

of scientific agriculture. Again, the masses for souls in purgatory, which had been the main object of the foundation of many houses, fostered a doctrine which, with the rise of the Reformers, was being seriously questioned and largely discredited. Monasteries were also usually the nurseries of superstition, as the feigned miracles which had excited the sarcasm and contempt of Erasmus were nearly always encouraged by the monks. Their abuse of the rights of sanctuary was justly complained of as affording protection for criminals of the worst kind, while even their just fame for hospitality and almsgiving often tended by its indiscriminate method to create a wandering pauper class.<sup>69</sup>

This system, which had been created for the immediate needs of the Middle Ages, was out of date with the changing times of the sixteenth century. A state of decline was prevalent in the monasteries, and they were regarded by the king as liabilities to the nation. They kept alive superstition and encouraged belief in feigned miracles. Also, their abuse of the privileges of sanctuary seriously hindered the civil authority. Thus, from the point of view of the crown, the dissolution of the monasteries would remove a dangerous and outworn antiquity.

The charge of immorality in the monasteries could be proven from papal evidence. Of course, many of the complaints against the monasteries were for laxity and mismanagement, with few implications of immorality. "But still there is too much evidence of scandal of the gravest kind, and those not only in the less important convents, withdrawn from the notice of the world; Archbishop Morton, acting in 1489 under powers of inquiry sanctioned by Pope Innocent VIII., brought a terrible indictment against the Abbot of

---

<sup>69</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 51.

St. Alban's in which with some of its dependent cells and nunneries, dissipation and license of the grossest kind had been openly encouraged."<sup>70</sup> The Pope must have heard reports of monastic corruption in England to have ordered a special commission of inquiry. The regular clergy were exempt from episcopal visitation, except under extraordinary instructions from Rome. Innocent VIII must have felt that the situation poised a danger to the organization of the Church. The following letter by Archbishop Morton to the Abbot of St. Albans pointed out the corruption and immorality in that monastery.

John by Divine permission, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, Legate of the Apostolic See, to William, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Albans, greeting.

We have received certain letters under lead, the copies whereof we herewith send you, from our most holy Lord and Father in Christ, Innocent, by Divine Providence Pope, the eighth of that name. We therefore, John, the Archbishop, the visitor, reformer, inquisitor, and judge therein mentioned, in reverence for the Apostolic See, have taken upon ourselves the burden of enforcing the said commission; and have determined that we will proceed by, and according to, the full force, tenor, and effect of the same.

And it has come to our ears, being at once publicly notorious and brought before us upon the testimony of many witnesses worthy of credit, that you, the Abbot aforementioned, have been of long time noted and diffamed, and do yet continue so noted, of simony, of usury, of dilapidation and waste of the goods, revenues, and possessions of the said monastery, and of certain other enormous crimes and excesses hereafter written.

---

<sup>70</sup>W. W. Capes, The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, Vol. III of A History of the English Church, ed. W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1903), p. 301.

In the rule, custody, and administration of the goods, spiritual and temporal, of the said monastery, you are so remiss, so negligent, so prodigal, that whereas the said monastery was of old times founded and endowed by the pious devotion of illustrious princes, of famous memory, heretofore kings of this land, the noble progenitors of our most serene Lord and King that now is, in order that true religion might flourish there, that the name of the Most High, in whose honor and glory it was instituted, might be duly celebrated there;

And whereas, in days heretofore, the regular observance of the said rule was greatly regarded, and hospitality was diligently kept;

Nevertheless, for no little time, during which you have presided in the same monastery, you and certain of your fellow-monks and brethren (whose blood, it is feared, through your neglect, a severe Judge will require at your hand) have relaxed the measure and form of religious life; you have laid aside the pleasant yoke of contemplation, and all regular observances--hospitality, alms, and those other offices of piety which of old time were exercised and ministered therein have decreased, and by your faults, your carelessness, your neglect and deed, do daily decrease more and more, and cease to be regarded--the pious vows of the founders are defrauded of their just intent--the ancient rule of your order is deserted; and not a few of your fellow-monks and brethren, as we most deeply grieve to learn, giving themselves over to a reprobate mind, laying aside the fear of God, to lead only a life of lasciviousness--nay, as is horrible to relate, be not afraid to defile the holy places, even the very churches of God, by infamous intercourse with nuns, etc., etc.<sup>71</sup>

Gross corruption existed within some of the English monasteries during the fifteenth century, as this letter showed.

---

<sup>71</sup>James Anthony Froude, Short Studies on Great Subjects (New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1868), pp. 333-34. The letter goes on to describe further corruption of immoral lives, promotion of the worthless and the vicious, publicly living with harlots and mistresses, and robbery of Church goods, including the extraction of the precious stones from the Shrine of St. Alban.

Yet, no punishment was forthcoming for the Abbot of St. Albans. "After all this, the Abbot was not deposed; he was invited merely to reconsider his doings, and, if possible, amend them."<sup>72</sup> Thus, even under an extraordinary commission, Church discipline was not able to effectively check corruption, and this evidence of corruption and immorality under papal control was to add strength to the results of the visitations that preceded the dissolution of the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII.

There existed considerable precedent from preceding reigns for the king taking action against the monasteries. This was especially true in the cases of the alien priories, which were under the control of continental abbeys (a result of the Norman Conquest) and were established to forward money out of England. As Dixon has recorded:

Under King John all the priories alien, as those were called which were cells or dependencies of continental abbeys, to the number of eighty-one, were sequestrated, and their yearly revenues taken for the King's necessities. Under Edward the First the same communities, which then numbered nearly one hundred, were seized again during a war with France; and lest their monks should be of any assistance to his enemies, the King moved them twenty miles from the sea-board. On the pretext of every new French war the same process of sequestration was repeated by the following sovereigns, and the revenues of the sequestrated houses went to pay the army, until by Henry the Fifth they were finally

---

<sup>72</sup>Froude, Short Studies on Great Subjects, p. 335.

suppressed, part of their possessions being bestowed on other monasteries and on schools, and part being granted or sold, though not in perpetuity, to the laity.<sup>73</sup>

Albeit these were foreign priories, their suppression set a definite precedent for Henry to follow. Also, since the establishment of the royal supremacy, the Pope was, in effect, looked upon as a foreign "prince". The suppression of the order of Knights Templar by papal order was carried out during the reign of Edward II, and, as Henry had annexed the papal authority in England, he was legally justified in suppressing the monasteries on behalf of the civil authority. Thus, precedent lent its weight to the king's desire to dissolve the monastic system.

Further precedent for the dissolution of the monasteries was established by Cardinal Wolsey, during his time in power. Wolsey determined to rival other great churchmen as a founder of an Oxford college, and the easiest way to secure the necessary money for this undertaking was by the dissolution of monasteries. Some twenty-four of the smaller religious houses were suppressed to establish the Cardinal's college. As Fuller commented:

For the first breach is the greatest in effect; and abbeys having now lost their virginity, (diverted by the pope to other,) soon after lost their chastity, prostituted by the king to ordinary uses.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 321. Also, see Gasquet, Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, Vol. I, Chap. II, pp. 40-66, for further details concerning precedents for the suppression of monasteries in England.

<sup>74</sup>Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, p. 25.

Under the sanction of Clement VII, Wolsey was allowed to divert the resources of these monasteries to educational purposes. If Henry desired to divert the revenue and property of the English Monasteries to temporal uses, his was the authority, backed by former examples, to take the requisite action.

With sufficient motivation and precedent behind him, Henry was ready for the next step--the visitation of the monasteries. "The general visitation of the monasteries began with the month of October in the year 1535."<sup>75</sup> It was necessary to gather proof of the abuses within the monastic system, before they could be suppressed. The commission for the visitation came from the king, and the visitors proceeded under the guidance of the vicar-general, Cromwell. These agents were equipped with a set of eighty-six articles of inquiry and with twenty-five injunctions--with the power to add more. As Fisher commented:

The articles of inquiry were minute, comprehensive, and well adapted to check the multifarious abuses which were suspected to exist in the exempted monasteries for which they were specially designed. The injunctions were so framed as to be provocative of disobedience or surrender. Taken in combination, these two instruments demanded a standard of loyalty and discipline which imposed a severe strain upon the conscience and cohesion of the monastic community.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 324, Gairdner, in his The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 164, placed the beginning of the visitations in July, 1535.

<sup>76</sup>Fisher, The History of England, p. 372.

The visitors, under the king's authority, commanded the heads of the religious houses to preach the king's succession and against the feigned power of the Pope. The monks and nuns might neither leave the grounds nor receive visitors, and there was to be but one entrance to the monastery (the foregate) watched by a porter specially appointed for that purpose. Also, all monks and nuns under age twenty-four were to be released from their vows and discharged, and, if any of the injunctions were infringed, any member of the community was open to denounce the violator to the king, the vicar-general, or his deputy. However, despite the harsh tone of the above requirements, some of the measures were intended to inspire reform. For example, a chapter from the New or Old Testament was to be read by one of the brethren at each reflection. Also, for one hour a day, a lesson in Holy Scripture was to be kept in the convent to which all were compelled to resort, and the monks were expressly forbidden to show any relics or feigned miracles for increase of revenue. Thus, although the articles were designed to find suspected abuses and the injunctions were strict to encourage disobedience, they showed marked tendencies for reform through a return to the principles and lessons of the Scriptures.

The question of whether or not the reports of the visitors were verifiable was not important to Henry and Cromwell; they wanted proof to enable them to move against the monasteries, and proof they got. Visitorial accuracy

was not requisite to the suppression of the monasteries from the view of the royal supremacy. The panoramic scope of a general visitation certainly left the investigation open to charges that some of its evidence was manufactured to serve the ends of the king. The visitors, however, appeared to be quite thorough in their reports, especially as concerned immorality. As Dixon related:

In a Gilbertine nunnery he [Layton] found two nuns "not barren:" whose misfortunes came of the subprior and a serving man. Neither the unfortunates, nor their sisters, nor their two prioresses, would confess this; an old beldame told the tale; and when the visitor threatened the prioresses for their concealment, they said that by their oath of religion they were sworn never to divulge the secret faults committed among them, but only to their own religious visitor. At Hardwood, in Bedfordshire, he found four or five nuns and a prioress: one of them had two fair children; another had one child, "and no more."<sup>77</sup>

Such statements as this certainly pointed towards grave immorality in the religious houses. Further, the refusal of the sisters and the prioresses to speak the truth to the visitor pointed out the fact that religious houses were a danger to the effective control of the royal supremacy. Of course, it was quite probable that the visitors in their zeal accused some nuns falsely and that some of the nuns were "wickedly seduced" to provide charges of immorality.<sup>78</sup> Nevertheless, the charges, exaggerated or not, provided sufficient evidence for the suppression of the monasteries.

---

<sup>77</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 336.

<sup>78</sup>See Gasquet, Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, Vol. I, pp. 200-07, for further details concerning the false accusation of nuns.

The results of the general visitation were successfully employed in the dissolution of the smaller monasteries in 1536. The visitors continued their work, however, until the larger monasteries were dissolved in 1539. These latter visitations appeared to be more concerned with the profit that could be derived from the monastic property than with the seeking out of real or pretended abuses. Witness the report to Cromwell of the visitation of the monastery in Glastonbury in 1539:

Please it your lordship to be advertised, that we came to Glastonbury on Friday last past, about ten of the clock in the forenoon; and for that the abbot was then at Sharpham, a place of his a mile and somewhat more from the abbey, we, without any delay, went into the same place, and there examined him in certain articles. And for that his answer was not then to our purpose, we advised him to call to his remembrance that which he had then forgotten, and so declare the truth, and then came with him the same day to the abbey, and there anew proceeded that night to search his study for letters and books; and found in his study secretly laid, as well a written book of arguments against the divorce of the king's majesty and the lady dowager, which we take to be a great matter, as also divers pardons, copies of bulls, and the counterfeit life of Thomas Becket in print; but we could not find any letter that was material. And so we proceeded again to his examination concerning the articles we received from your lordship, in the answers whereof, as we take it, shall appear his cankered and traitorous heart and mind against the king's majesty and his succession. And so with as fair words as we could, we have conveyed him from hence into the tower, being but a very weak man and sickly. And as yet we have neither discharged servant nor monk; but now the abbot being gone, we will, with as much celerity as we may, proceed to the despatching of them. We have in money 300 [pounds] and above; but the certainty of plate and other stuff there as yet we know not, for we had not opportunity for the same, but shortly we intend--God willing--to proceed to the same; whereof we shall ascertain your lordship as shortly as we may.

This is also to advertise your lordship, that we have found a fair chalice of gold, and divers other parcels of plate, which the abbot had hid secretly from all such commissioners as have been there in times past; and as yet he knoweth not that we have found the same. It may please your lordship to advertise us of the king's pleasure by this bearer, to whom we shall deliver the custody and keeping of the house, with such stuff as we intend to leave there convenient to the king's use. We assure your lordship it is the goodliest house of that sort that we ever have seen. We would that your lordship did know it as we do; then we doubt not but your lordship would judge it a house meet for the king's majesty and for no man else: which is to our great comfort; and we trust verily that there shall never come any double hood within this house again.

Also this is to advertise your lordship, that there is never a one doctor within that house; but there be three bachelors of divinity, which be but meanly learned, as we can perceive. And thus our Lord preserve your good lordship.

From Glastonbury, the 22nd day of September, 1559,  
 Yours to command,  
 Richard Pollard,  
 Thomas Moyle,  
 Richard Layton.

To the right honourable  
 and their singular good  
 lord, my lord Privy Seal,  
 this be delivered.<sup>79</sup>

Although the visitors successfully collected evidence against the abbot (he was later executed for treason), they did not demonstrate any widespread corruption in the monastery at Glastonbury. In fact, their report was primarily concerned with the money and plate to be gained through the dissolution of this religious house. Henry had broken the monastic system with the dissolution of the smaller houses, and he

---

<sup>79</sup> C. R. N. Routh (comp.), They Saw It Happen: An Anthology of Eye-witnesses' Accounts of Events in British History 1485-1688 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957), pp. 29-30.

was now ready to reap the spoils, as this visitation report shows. The visitations had served their purpose; they provided justifiable grounds for the suppression of the monasteries.

When parliament met on February 4, 1536, it received a digest of the report of the visitors. The visitors had done their work well, and, shortly thereafter, parliament passed the act for the dissolution of the lesser monasteries, placing the cause for their action on the abuses existing within the religious houses. As the preamble of the act stated:

Forasmuch as manifest sin, vicious, carnal, and abominable living is daily used and committed commonly in such little and small abbeys, priories, and other religious houses of monks, canons, and nuns, where the congregation of such religious persons is under the number of twelve persons, whereby the governors of such religious houses and their convent spoil, destroy, consume, and utterly waste, as well their churches, monasteries, priories, principal houses, farms, granges, lands, tenements, and hereditaments, as the ornaments of their churches, and their goods and chattels, to the high displeasure of Almighty God, slander of good religion, and to the great infamy of the king's highness and the realm, if redress should not be had thereof. And albeit that many continual visitations hath been heretofore had by the space of two hundred years and more, for an honest and charitable reformation of such unthrifty, carnal, and abominable living, yet nevertheless little or no amendment is hitherto had, but their vicious living shamelessly increaseth and augmenteth, and by a cursed custom so rooted and infested, that a great multitude of the religious persons in such small houses do rather choose to rove abroad in apostasy than to conform themselves to the observation of good religion; so that without such small houses be utterly suppressed and the religion [religious persons] therein committed to the great and honorable monasteries of religion in this realm, where they may be compelled to live religiously for reformation of their lives, there can else be no [redress nor] reformation in that behalf.

In consideration whereof, the king's most royal majesty, being supreme head in earth, under God, of the Church of England, daily finding and devising the increase, advancement, and exaltation of true doctrine and virtue in the said Church, to the only glory and honour of God, and the total extriping and destruction of vice and sin, having knowledge that the premises be true, as well by the compts of his late visitations as by sundry credible informations; considering also that divers and great solemn monasteries of this realm, wherein, thanks be to God, religion is right well kept and observed, be destitute of such full numbers of religious persons as they ought and may keep, hath thought good that a plain declaration should be made of the premises, as well to the lords spiritual and temporal as to other his loving subjects the commons in this present parliament assembled.

Whereupon the said lords and commons, by a great deliberation, finally be resolved, That it is and shall be much more to the pleasure of Almighty God, and for the honour of this his realm, that the possessions of such small religious houses, now being spent, spoiled, and wasted for increase and maintenance of sin, should be used and converted to better uses, and the unthrifty religious persons so spending the same to be compelled to reform their lives; and thereupon most humbly desire the king's highness that it may be enacted by authority of this present parliament, that his majesty shall have to him and to his heirs forever, all and singular such monasteries, etc.

His majesty shall have and enjoy, etc., (as it followeth in the printed statute).<sup>80</sup>

The report of the visitors had influenced parliament to extend the royal supremacy through the suppression of the monasteries. The king was to gain all the ornaments, jewels, goods, chattels, and debts of the monasteries for his use and enjoyment. All religious houses under a clear yearly value of two hundred pounds were granted to Henry and his

---

<sup>80</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, pp. 371-73. Also, see Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 257-68, for the full text of this act.

heirs. However, occupation and pensions were guaranteed to all monks and nuns not transferred to other houses, and the rights of the founders were safeguarded. As Fisher commented on the effect of this act:

By this measure some 376 houses were dissolved, and an annual revenue estimated of about 32,000 [pounds] was obtained for the crown, in addition to the plate, jewels, and other household effects of the communities so condemned. The number of people, masters and servants, who lost their living by the act is computed by Stow to have amounted to 10,000,<sup>81</sup> and of these possibly 2,000 were monks or nuns.

Thus, not only did Henry receive the profits so necessary to his treasury but also he had considerably lessened the number of centers of papal resistance to the royal supremacy.

The dissolution of the smaller religious houses, probably, broke the will to resist the king inside the monasteries. An increasing number of abbots and priors yielded their houses to the king rather than undergo the trials of visitation. In 1537, some of the larger houses were suppressed, because their revenue exceeded the limit prescribed in the Act to poverty and wickedness. Nor was this the end, as Gairdner commented:

In the following year (1538) the suppression of the monasteries was carried further. Several of the Abbots and priors were induced to make formal surrenders, which were often, no doubt, voluntary in one sense, since pensions were more acceptable than visitations.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup>Fisher, The History of England, p. 380.

<sup>82</sup>Gairdner, "Henry VIII", p. 448.

Thus, the unrelenting policy of the king and Cromwell gradually wore down the resistance of the monasteries, as the results of the visitations showed the advantages of bowing to the royal will and accepting a pension.

In 1539, the final blow was struck against the monastic system in England. Parliament passed the act for the dissolution of the greater monasteries.<sup>83</sup> This act confirmed the surrender of all the religious houses which had dissolved themselves since the act of 1536, and it empowered Henry to extend the provisions of that act to all of the remaining monasteries. Thus, on March 23, 1540, the last monastery, Waltham Abbey, surrendered to the king. Monastic life in England was at an end; the system could not be adjusted to the changing times. As Froude commented:

The more sincerely 'religion' was professed, the more incurable was the attachment to the Papacy. The monks were its champions while a hope remained of its restoration. In the final severance from Rome the root of their life was divided; and the body of the nation, orthodox and unorthodox alike, desired to see their revenues applied to purposes of national utility. They were given over by parliament, therefore, to the king's hands.<sup>84</sup>

The religious houses had outlived their usefulness in England; Henry desired unity and needed profits, accordingly the monasteries were suppressed.

---

<sup>83</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 281-303, for the text of this act.

<sup>84</sup> James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Vol. III (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1858), p. 391.

The most immediate effect of the dissolution of the monasteries was the uprisings or rebellions of the people. These uprisings occurred mainly in the North of England, and they were directed against the policy of suppression, not against the king. The uprisings started after the dissolution of the smaller monasteries in 1536. The first was in Lincolnshire, where the dissolution of the monasteries of Louth Park and Legbourne practically coincided with the arrival of the commissioners for a parliamentary subsidy. "Lincolnshire broke out into general insurrection and demanded the restoration of monasteries, the removal of heretical bishops like Cranmer and Latimer, and the punishment of wicked ministers like Cromwell and Rich."<sup>85</sup> However, the rising in Lincolnshire was more of a demonstration than, in any sense, a rebellion; the people were striving to retain what they considered to be their traditional way of life. Horncastle and Louth joined in this general uprising, and a commission was issued to the Duke of Suffolk to lead an army against the rebels, for the king would not bow to the least of their demands. The rebels yielded to the king's show of force, and, in March, 1537, forty-six of the principal rebels found death upon the scaffold.

A more serious uprising occurred in October, 1536, in Yorkshire--the Pilgrimage of Grace. For the most part, the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace were ecclesiastical.

---

<sup>85</sup>Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 179.

As Gasquet related:

The suppression of the abbeys was felt to be a blow to religion in those parts no less than a hardship to the poor, and a detriment to the country at large. The royal supremacy was looked upon as founded only on Henry's whim and as a pretension without precedent in history, while the renunciation of papal authority was held to be subversive of the principal of unity in the Christian Church, and the first step towards diversity of doctrine and practice.<sup>86</sup>

The people of Yorkshire felt that they had a cause worth fighting for--the preservation of the old way. They were led by Robert Aske, a man of haughty demeanour and considerable ability. However, after seizing control of York and Pomfret, the rebels entered into negotiations with the king's forces. The rebels drew together a catalogue of their demands at Pomfret, which they presented to the Duke of Norfolk at Doncaster, and negotiations were held there. "A free general pardon and the promise of a parliament to be held in some place appointed by the King within the year, were the concessions on which the pilgrims were invited to lay down their arms."<sup>87</sup> These proposals by Norfolk were accepted by the rebels. However, some of the men of the North, under the urging of John Hallom, moved against Hull and Scarborough seeking to strengthen their position against possible reprisals. The effort resulted in disaster, and the

---

<sup>86</sup> Francis Aidan Gasquet, Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries: an Attempt to Illustrate the History of their Suppression, Vol. II (Third ed.; London: John Hodges, 1889), p. 101.

<sup>87</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, pp. 470-71.

leaders of the Pilgrimage of Grace were imprisoned and executed. Thus, the free parliament was never held; Cromwell remained at the head of the administration, and the uprising had been for nought.

There were other effects from the dissolution of the monasteries, which, while not as spectacular as the uprisings in the North, were of greater consequence to the whole of England. The suppression of the religious houses brought a change to the economic life of Henry's realm.

As Grimm commented:

The dissolution of the monasteries, about six hundred in all, greatly accentuated the economic and social discontent of the lower classes. Probably two thousand monks and nuns and eight thousand laborers attached to the monasteries were directly affected.<sup>88</sup>

Thus, many were taken from their traditional livelihood and turned adrift to swell the ranks of the poor and unemployed. Also, the dissolution removed the existing sources of charity to which the people could have appealed. "Not only were the channels through which all relief flowed to the people destroyed, but the very fountain head of the accumulated charity of previous generations was dried up at its source when the property of the religious houses was... swept into the capacious purse of Henry."<sup>89</sup> The revenue that had previously gone to the support of the poor was transferred to the support of the king. With more people forced

---

<sup>88</sup> Grimm, The Reformation Era, p. 300.

<sup>89</sup> Gasquet, Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries, Vol. II, p. 507.

into unemployment by the suppression of the religious houses, the removal of the only significant source of charity presented a serious problem. Yet, outside of the uprisings in the North, there was no overt expression of dissatisfaction with the king's policies. "The dissolution must have caused much suffering and inconvenience, but it did not create a proletariat."<sup>90</sup> The people had little choice but to accept their lot, considering the results of the Northern uprisings; however, the economic dislocations caused by the dissolution were to remain with the realm for a long time.

If the suppression of the monastic system harmed the lower classes, it also helped to create a new upper class, which supported Henry's stand against the Pope and the monasteries. As Clayton stated:

The possession of abbey lands induced a favourable attitude to non-papal religion. Many important families in England, families of the new ruling class, the Cecils and the Russels, may be named--became Protestant and anti-papal, and remained aggressively Protestant and anti-papal. All these families were richly endowed with monastic property and indeed were of no great account before they were thus endowed.<sup>91</sup>

Becoming propertied, the new ruling class was strongly in support of Henry's policies, for he had provided the opportunity for them to rise to power. Of course, the old traditions died hard among the people. "But the transfer of so much land and local interest to laymen whose rights were

---

<sup>90</sup>Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 23.

<sup>91</sup>Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 77.

protected by the Crown and were dependent upon the new settlement in Church and State did much to shake the traditional order of things, to break down the old connexions in local life, and to give a powerful vested interest in the maintenance of the royal supremacy."<sup>92</sup> Henry protected his new revenues and changes in the old order in the best way possible; he gave the newly arisen upper class a vested interest in maintaining the king's program. Thus, although the lower classes suffered from the change, Henry had a firm group of supporters, who were vitally interested in promoting the policies of nationalism and supremacy that were advocated by the king.

The passing of the monastic system from England, as much as it was due to the royal will, was also caused by the lack of firm resistance from the Clergy. As Clayton commented:

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. Other qualities are also displayed and other motives; covetousness, avarice, and lust of power.<sup>93</sup>

Thus, what had once been a movement of force and purpose, dedicated to the Christian life, had become mere groups of men submerged in their own petty interests. "The cause of

---

<sup>92</sup> Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 27.

<sup>93</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 68.

a united Christendom was not left without witness; yet it is to be observed that, with two great exceptions, only two or three cartloads of monks were willing to die for it."<sup>94</sup>

Despite what may be said about the actions of Henry, Cromwell, and the visitors, the system had suffered internal decay. When principles were lost, the monasteries had to vanish. Thus, the monastic system passed from English life.

Henry had subjugated the papal authority and the secular clergy to the royal supremacy, and he had suppressed the religious houses of the regular clergy. However, his attitude towards the doctrine and ritual of the Church remained, for the most part, uncompromisingly Catholic, despite the fact that he was unchurched by the Pope. His Catholic position had developed while England was still under the supremacy of Rome, and it was, perhaps, best reflected by his proclamation against advanced Protestant books in 1530. As Gasquet related:

In 1530 the king by proclamation forbade the reading or possession of some eighty-five works of Wycliffe, Luther, Oecolampadius, Zwingle, Pomeranus, Bucer, Wesselius, and indeed the German divines generally, under the heading of "books of the Lutheran sect or faction conveyed into the city of London." Besides these Latin treatises, the prohibition included many English tracts, such as A book of the Old God and the new, the Burying of the Mass, Frith's Disputation concerning Purgatory, and several prayer-books intended to propagate the new doctrines, such as Godly prayers; Matins and Evensong with the seven Psalms and other heavenly psalms with commendations; the Hortulus Animae in English, and the Primer in English.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup>Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 3.

<sup>95</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, p. 214.

Henry was protecting his realm against foreign "heresies" through the power of the throne, and, by Henry's command, the convocation of Canterbury compiled a list of prohibited heretical books; the first catalogue of which contained some fifty-three tracts and volumes. "All these are condemned as containing false teaching, plainly contrary to the Catholic faith, and the bishops add: 'Moreover, following closely in the footsteps of our fathers, we prohibit all from selling, giving, reading, distributing, or publishing any tract, booklet, pamphlet, or book, which translates or interprets the Holy Scripture in the vernacular... or even knowingly to keep such volumes without the licence of their diocesan in writing'."<sup>96</sup> Henry and the bishops were attempting to strengthen the realm against the attack on the traditional teachings of the Church, emanating mainly from Germany. Thus, the forces of Church and State, although separate unto themselves at the time, were combined to protect the purity of the faith.

After 1530, during the period of the establishment of the royal supremacy, Henry was less concerned with doctrine and ritual in the Church. His main interest was dissolving the juxtaposition of the king's power with the papal authority and replacing it with the royal will alone. When his plans were an accomplished fact, Henry turned to the problem of providing doctrine and ritual for his

---

<sup>96</sup>Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation, p. 215.

national Catholic Church, for, during the intervening years, foreign "heresies" had found a chance to seek establishment in England. This religious disquietude in the realm was expressed in the protestation of the clergy of the lower house of the convocation of Canterbury in 1536.<sup>97</sup> Some of the items of their protest were as follows:

i. That it is commonly preached, taught, and spoken, to the slander of this noble realm, disquietness of the people, damage of Christian souls, not without fear of many other inconveniences and perils, That the sacrament of the altar is not to be esteemed: for divers light and lewd persons be not ashamed or afear'd to say, Why should I see the sacring of the high mass? Is it any thing else but a piece of bread, or a little predie round robin?

ii. Item, That they deny extreme unction to be any sacrament.

.....

v. Item, That all ceremonies accustomed in the Church, which are not clearly expressed in scripture, must be taken away, because they are mens inventions.

.....

xv. Item, That images of saints are not in any wise to be revered; and, that it is plain idolatry and abomination to set up any lights before any images, or in any place of the church the time of divine service, as long as the sun giveth light.

.....

xvii. Item, That it is as lawful to christen a child in a tub of water at home, or in a ditch by the way, as in a font-stone in the church.

.....

---

<sup>97</sup> See APPENDIX A for the full text of this protestation. The protestation was, probably, directed against the Anabaptists or the Lutherans, for the Wycliffite movement was mainly absorbed by the Lutherans.

xxvi. Item, The confession auricular, absolution, and penance, are nother necessary nor profitable in the Church of God.

.....

xxix. Item, That it is sufficient for a man or woman to make their confession to God alone.

.....

xlvi. Item, That prayers, suffrages, fasting, or almsdeeds, do not help to take away any sin.

.....

lxi. Item, That the singing or saying of mass, matins, or evensong, is but a roaring, lowling, whistling, mumming, conjuring and juggling: and the playing at the organs a foolish vanity.

.....

liv. Item, That it is sufficient and enough to believe, though a man do no good works at all.<sup>98</sup>

The English clergy was objecting to the influx of Protestant tenets among the people of the kingdom. The break with Rome was accepted in its broader sense by many of the people, and, accordingly, they thought that the outward forms and doctrines of Catholicism should be banished. Henry desired unity in his realm, which, of necessity, demanded a definite doctrine and ritual for the English Church. Thus, the diversity of ideas accruing from the establishment of the royal supremacy necessitated direct action by the crown to prevent further dispersion of foreign doctrines in England.

On July 12, 1536, convocation, under the urging of Cromwell and the king, passed the first English confession

---

<sup>98</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, pp. 129-34.

of faith, the first authorized formulary of the Church of England. It was entitled the Articles to Christian Quietness or, simply, the Ten Articles.<sup>99</sup> The doctrine established by the Ten Articles was, for the most part, Catholic, within the framework of the royal supremacy. As the Ten Articles stated concerning the sacrament of the altar:

As touching the sacrament of the altar, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross for our redemption. And, that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very selfsame body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament.<sup>100</sup>

From the basic tenets of Catholic dogma, the Church of England built a formulary of faith. As Gairdner commented on the achievement of this formulary:

This was done in Ten Articles not greatly at variance with the beliefs hitherto received, though dissuading the use of the term Purgatory, and omitting all notice of four out of the Seven Sacraments. This omission of course attracted some observation. But as to their positive contents Cardinal Pole himself found little fault with these Articles, his main objection being to the Authority by which they were set forth.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup>See APPENDIX B for the full text of the Ten Articles.

<sup>100</sup>Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, p. 152.

<sup>101</sup>Gairdner, "Henry VIII," p. 446.

Of course, the Ten Articles were intended as a compromise between the old and the new learning, for the Articles retained much of Catholicism to please the Catholics but still held forth hope of further reform to those of a reforming nature. In other words, those who thought the Church was going to be destroyed were pacified, and the active reform party was conciliated by the slight tendencies towards Lutheranism in the document. "But, above all, the device was found useful for its immediate purpose, to dissipate the suspicion that the King had brought the kingdom into a schism; and when the time came, to help to quell the insurrection [i.e. the Pilgrimage of Grace] which the demolition of the monasteries was about to raise against him."<sup>102</sup> Thus, the Ten Articles were a useful compromise that helped Henry to develop the desired unity in his realm.

The reformers were satisfied by the Ten Articles, for they believed that the Church was moving, albeit slowly, in the right direction. "The issue of these ten articles was regarded by the Reformers as a great step towards the purification of the Church, as not only were the four mediæval Sacraments of Orders, Confirmation, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction ignored, but the gross abuses connected with the worship of saints and images were discouraged, and the demoralising system of Indulgences tacitly condemned."<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 412.

<sup>103</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 57.

Although the removal of the four mediaeval sacraments still left the three that were most basic to Catholic dogma-- Baptism, Penance, and the sacrament of the altar, the reformers were glad to see some of the superficialities (in their opinion) stripped from the doctrine of the Church. Also, the correction of abuses was welcomed by those who thought that the Church had lost the purity of primitive Christianity.

In the Ten Articles, Henry VIII accomplished two primary purposes: first, a definite doctrine was established against which heresies could be measured, and, second, the unity of the realm was promoted through a compromise that did not greatly displease either side. As Hackett commented:

The essence was to rearrange Catholic dogma as a bordelure around regal supremacy, but not to upset too many prejudices in so doing. If the displacement of the Pope was calculated to give cumfort to the Lutherans, and if the omission of four of the sacraments had the vague suggestion of radicalism, Henry's Ten Articles took care not to disturb the sort of thing that simple people hold by--the fast days, the holidays, and the mass.<sup>104</sup>

Henry, through convocation, had established an acceptable formulary of faith for the Church of England without violating his Catholic beliefs. The old order stood, for the most part, with only a change of leadership--king for Pope.

The omission of four sacraments in the Ten Articles of 1536 led to the publication in 1537 of a treatise called The Institution of a Christian Man or the "Bishops' Book",

---

<sup>104</sup>Hackett, Henry the Eighth, pp. 295-96.

in which the four were rediscovered. This book was the result of the discussions in convocation of that year and was a reaction from the policy of the Ten Articles. As Gairdner commented on the book's contents:

It was divided into four parts, being expositions, first, of the Apostles' Creed; second, of the Seven Sacraments; third, of the Ten Commandments; and fourth, of the Paternoster and Ave, with two separate articles added from the former book [the Ten Articles], the first on Justification and the second on Purgatory. Justification was set forth as due entirely to the merits of Christ, but involving an obligation to good works afterwards; and the Romish doctrine of purgatory was repudiated, but prayers for departed souls were declared to be laudable.<sup>105</sup>

The English Catholics were highly pleased by this return to the full Seven Sacraments, but the "Bishops' Book" placed a limitation on the teaching of the other four. "The Seven Sacraments were, indeed reaffirmed, but all 'bishops and preachers' were instructed to teach the people the difference, 'in dignity and necessity,' between the Three Sacraments of Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance, 'instituted of Christ, as certain instruments necessary for our salvation,' and the other four."<sup>106</sup> Yet, the "Bishops' Book" was basically a reaffirmation of the principles of Catholic dogma. This was especially shown in the doctrine of the ministry. As Davies related:

The doctrine of the ministry in the Bishops' Book is the most exhaustive in all the Anglican formularies

---

<sup>105</sup>Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 188.

<sup>106</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 57.

of the sixteenth century. Its essence is contained in the first paragraph: 'As touching the sacrament of holy orders, we think it convenient, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge, first, how that Christ and his apostles did institute and ordain in the New Testament, that besides the civil powers and governance of kings and princes (which is called potestas gladii, the power of the sword) there should also be continually in the church militant certain other ministers or officers, which should have special power, authority, and commission, under Christ to preach and teach the Word of God unto his people; to dispense and administer the sacraments of God unto them, and by the same to confer and give the graces of the Holy Ghost; to consecrate the blessed body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar; to loose and absolve from sin all persons which be duly penitent and sorry for the same; to bind and to excommunicate such as be guilty in manifest crimes and sins, and will not amend their defaults; to order and consecrate others in the same room, order, and office, whereunto they be called and admitted themselves; and finally, to feed Christ's people, like good pastors and rectors (as the apostle calleth them), with their wholesome doctrines; and by their continual exhortations and admonitions to reduce them from sin and iniquity, so much as in them lieth, and to bring them unto the perfect knowledge, the perfect love and dread of God, and unto the perfect charity of their neighbours'.<sup>107</sup>

Thus, the "Bishops' Book" was definitely Catholic in its statement of the duties of the clergy and the importance of receiving the sacraments from members of the clergy who had taken orders.

Henry, in spite of his preponderantly Catholic beliefs, did not give the royal assent to The Institution of a Christian Man, and it was published with no other authority

---

<sup>107</sup> E. T. Davies, Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950), p. 5, citing from the "Bishops' Book" as found in Lloyd, Formularies of Faith put forward by authority during the reign of Henry VIII, p. 101.

than the signatures of the two archbishops, the diocesan bishops, twenty-five doctors, and the fact that it had been printed at the king's press. Theologically, the book was another compromise, for both sides, Protestant and Catholic, found parts that pleased them and their aims. As Dixon commented:

On the one hand, the New Learning were gratified by seeing Faith put before Sacraments, by the immense length at which the question of Faith was treated, by the large allowance given to Original Sin, and by the scrupulous care with which the several elements of Justification were weighed against one another. On the other hand, the Old Learning perceived with hope and pleasure that the four doubtful Sacraments of Confirmation, Matrimony, Orders and Extreme Unction, which had been omitted in the former Articles, were restored to their place, and completed the received number of seven.<sup>108</sup>

Yet, despite the hopes of the reformers, the Church of England under Henry VIII was assuming a Catholic tone in its doctrine and ritual, for the sacraments were more easily communicated to the people than theological questions, such as justification by faith alone.

In 1539, after the uprisings in the North had been quieted, Henry turned to parliament for an expression of greater Catholic orthodoxy in the doctrine of the Church of England. The result was the Six Articles which received the royal assent on June 28, 1539.<sup>109</sup> These articles were definitely Catholic in the forms of religion they presented. As Fuller has related the essential parts of the Six Articles:

---

<sup>108</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 525.

<sup>109</sup> See APPENDIX C for the text of the Six Articles.

i. That in the sacrament of the altar, after consecration, no substance of bread or wine remaineth, but the natural body and blood of Christ.

ii. That the communion in both kinds is necessary ad salutem, by the law of God to all persons.

iii. That priests after orders received, may not marry by the law of God.

iv. That vows of chastity ought to be observed [by the law of God].

v. That it is meet and necessary that private masses be admitted and continued in churches.

vi. That auricular confession must be frequented by people, as of necessity to salvation.<sup>110</sup>

The Six Articles or the act for abolishing of diversity of opinions definitely favoured the old order, and it, probably, marked a reaction in the king's mind. The slight advances of the reformers were vanquished by this first act for uniformity of religion within the realm. So strong were the penalties imposed for diversity that the reformers called the Act "The Bloody Bill" and "The Whip with Six Strings". As Fisher commented on these penalties:

To deny transubstantiation was heresy, punishable by the stake; to preach, teach or opine against the other five articles was a felony without benefit of clergy. The marriage of priests and professed persons was declared void, and it was made a felony for a priest to keep a woman to whom he had been married or betrothed. Persons declining to receive the sacrament or to confess were liable on the first offence to fine and imprisonment, on the second to death.<sup>111</sup>

Henry was determined to establish uniformity to his national

---

<sup>110</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, p. 178.

<sup>111</sup> Fisher, The History of England, p. 436.

Catholic Church, with strict penalties to discourage dissent. The slight progress towards reformation that was embodied in the Ten Articles and the "Bishops' Book" was set back by the Six Articles. As Fuller commented on the Six Articles:

Laws bad, as penned, worse, as prosecuted, which by some bishops' extensive interpretations were made commensurate to the whole body of popery.<sup>112</sup>

Thus, through the Six Articles, the religion of Rome was re-established in England under the headship of the king.

The Six Articles made England a basically Catholic nation, and this theological position was supported in the "King's Book". "In 1543, largely through his [Gardiner's] influence, the Bishops' Book was succeeded by the King's Book, A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, in which the sacraments were discussed more fully and, to Cranmer's chagrin, the tone was more orthodox."<sup>113</sup> This book received the royal sanction and had a preface written in the king's name. It was more condensed in its exposition of the creeds than the "Bishops' Book" and more explicit generally about the sacraments; where the former had only had a single paragraph on the sacrament of the altar, the "King's Book" contained a long and elaborate exposition on transubstantiation. This new formulary was intended to end religious debate in England and to establish true and

---

<sup>112</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, p. 179.

<sup>113</sup> Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 70.

uncorrupted doctrine. "According to the preface to the Latin edition published for the benefit of foreigners in 1545, it was a true statement of the old Catholic doctrine free from both the leaven of papacy and the poison of heresy; and it was in fact a well-arranged presentation of the orthodox views except on the point of the papacy and the papal power of indulgence."<sup>114</sup> Thus, Henry had chosen his position for religious uniformity, and, except for the limitations of the royal supremacy as regarded papal authority, it was orthodox Catholicism; anyone who went beyond this limit was in heresy.

Despite the decision of the king, a diversity of religious opinion remained in England, as some preachers stood for the old and others for the new. This conflict could only lead to verbal strife or worse. As Powicke related on Henry's reaction to this conflict:

The result was described by the King himself in the famous speech, preserved in Hall's chronicle, which he made to Parliament on Christmas Eve 1545:

I see and hear daily that you of the clergy preach one against another, teach one contrary to another, inveigh one against another, without charity or discretion. Some be too stiff in their old mumpsimus, others be too busy and curious in their new sumpsimus. Thus, all men always be in variety and discord and few or none preach truly and sincerely the word of God, according as they ought to do.<sup>115</sup>

Yet, beyond strictly maintaining uniformity and harshly punishing heresy, the king could do little; the people had

---

<sup>114</sup>Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 430.

<sup>115</sup>Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 71.

begun to seek their own religious answers. The old traditions and the force of the royal will would hold most of the kingdom to the doctrine of orthodox Catholicism, but the reformers, their interests kindled from abroad, would continue to seek changes in the established forms.

During this latter part of Henry's reign, other advances were made in religion, notably the publication of an English Bible and an English Litany. The English Bible helped to spread the Scriptures to the people, at least until the king placed limits on who could read it. As Grimm commented:

A revision of this Mathew's Bible [of 1537] by Miles Coverdale, called the Great Bible, was accepted, and in May, 1541 Henry proclaimed that a copy of it be made accessible in every parish church. Since Cranmer supplied the introduction for this addition [sic] of 1540 and five subsequent editions, the Great Bible was also named after him. Parliament, in 1543, forbade women and ignorant persons to read the Bible, even in their homes.<sup>116</sup>

The publication of the Bible in English was a great boon to the reformers who preached salvation through the Scriptures alone, and this might have been one reason for the limitation of its circulation by the king, through parliament. Nevertheless, its publication in English was one of the great intellectual changes of Henry's reign.

In 1544, Cranmer, at the bidding of Henry, made an English translation of the Litany, with such grace and power that it was a lasting monument to his ability. "In the year

---

<sup>116</sup>Grimm, The Reformation Era, pp. 300-301.

following a collection of English prayers was added to the Litany, a service for morning and evening, and for the burial of the dead; and the king, in a general proclamation, directed that they should be used in all churches and chapels in the place of the Breviary."<sup>117</sup> Thus, Henry's national Catholic Church was placing its doctrine in the national language. This action served to quicken the interest of the nation in religion, and raised the hopes of the reformers. Truly, these translations of the Bible and Litany into English were marked advances for the Church of England.

As with the establishment of the royal supremacy, the development of the doctrine of the Church of England brought the persecution of those who did not follow the king's commands. As Clayton commented:

Heresy and treason were the unpardonable offences in Henry's mind. Heresy was the denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass. Treason was to question that the king was rightly head of the Church. Public expression of treason, or even the refusal to affirm the royal supremacy, brought death--a traitor's death. Publicly to deny the Catholic teaching on the Mass and to continue obstinately in that denial was to incur death by fire, the penalty for heresy.<sup>118</sup>

The Protestants were prosecuted under the Six Articles, and the "popish" Catholics were dealt with severely by the royal supremacy. Whether it was for heresy or treason, those who

---

<sup>117</sup> James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Vol IV, (London: John W. Parker, and Son, 1858), pp. 483-84.

<sup>118</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 52.

sought to challenge the dictates of the royal will found death. The temporal-spiritual authority of the king was supreme in England.

Henry was satisfied with partial reform of papal abuses in England; he had no desire to change Catholic doctrine. The establishment of the royal supremacy had secured the Church to the State and made the civil authority dominant in the realm. As Fuller related:

Indeed, power and profit being the things politic princes chiefly desire, king Henry had already attained both by his partial reformation. Power, by abolishing the pope's usurpation in his dominions; profit, by seizing on the lands and goods of suppressed monasteries. And thus having served his own turn, his zeal wilfully tired to go any further, and (only abolishing such popery as was in order to his aforesaid designs) he severely urged the rest on the practice of his subjects.<sup>119</sup>

Having attained his desired power, Henry had no reason to carry church reform further; besides, he was satisfied with Catholic dogma. "Henry VIII had not the slightest intention of departing from the recognized teaching of medieval Catholicism."<sup>120</sup> Henry would hold his realm to the doctrine of the old belief, as long as he did not have to recognize the authority of a foreign "prince". Thus, during Henry's reign, the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England remained, for the greater part, Catholic.

The Church in England underwent two profound changes

<sup>119</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, p. 177.

<sup>120</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 33.

in the reign of Henry VIII: first, the royal supremacy was placed over the Church, and, second, the religious houses of the regular clergy were suppressed. By these changes, the authority of the Pope in England was ended, and much of the wealth and lands of the Church was given over to the crown. However, the acts against the Apostolic See and the suppression of the monasteries constituted merely a legal or political, and in no sense a doctrinal, reformation. Thus, at the end of Henry's reign, England remained basically Catholic.

## CHAPTER III

### EDWARD VI

In January, 1547, Henry VIII, the innovator of the political reformation, was undeniably dying. "On Monday, the 31st, Wriothesley announced with tears to the parliament that the king was dead."<sup>1</sup> Thus, the tide of time had brought death to the creator of national Catholicism in England, and, by the terms of his will, the throne was to pass to his nine year old son, Edward. As Strype commented:

The same Day King Henry expired, the said Earl of Hertford, accompanied with Sir Anthony Brown, Master of the Horse, and a great Number of Noblemen, with Knights Pensioners, Esquires and Gentlemen, did ride in their best manner, with all speed, to the Court of Prince Edward, to attend upon His Grace there, as on their Sovereign Lord, according to the Last Will and Testament of his said Illustrious Father. Which was, That the true Title of the Crown of England should appertain, undoubtedly, to his said most dearly Beloved Son, and right Heir Apparent, then Prince Edward, now most worthily named, Our Sovereign Lord, etc. and King of England, etc.<sup>2</sup>

With the death of Henry, the terms of his will were explicitly followed, and Edward, the son of Henry and his third wife,

---

<sup>1</sup>Fisher, The History of England, p. 480.

<sup>2</sup>[John Strype], Historical Memorials, chiefly Ecclesiastical, and such as concern Religion and the Reformation of It, Vol. II (London: printed for John Wyat, 1721), p. 11. If, as Strype states, this was done on the day of Henry's death, it was, probably, three days before the announcement to parliament.

Jane Seymour, ascended the throne of England. The coronation was held on February 28, 1547. The extreme youth of the monarch necessitated the appointment of a protector, and this office was filled by the Earl of Hertford, a maternal uncle of the king. Before the coronation, the new Lord Protector was made Duke of Somerset. Thus, under the guidance of the Lord Protector and the privy council, the power of the crown was given to Edward VI.

Edward, despite his few years, had been prepared for the position he now assumed. "From the moment of his birth, at Hampton Court, on 12 October 1537, he had been surrounded with all the attention due to the long-expected heir to the English Crown."<sup>3</sup> Never as strong physically as his father, Edward's natural inclination seemed to be towards his studies, and he was regarded as quite precocious. In fact, his tutors were most astonished at Edward's excellent progress.

The manner in which their labours were blessed is thus described by William Thomas, afterwards clerk of the council, himself a learned man. In a work entitled *The Pilgrim*, he says, "If ye knew the towardness of that young prince, your hearts would melt to hear him named, and your stomach abhor the malice of them that would him ill. The beautifullest creature that liveth under the sun; the wittiest, the most amiable, and the gentlest thing of all the world. Such a capacity in learning the things taught him by his schoolmasters, that it is a wonder to hear say. And finally, he hath such a grace of posture, and gesture in gravity, when he comes into

---

<sup>3</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 478.

a presence, that it should seem he were already a father, and yet passes he not the age of ten years. A thing undoubtedly much rather to be seen than believed."<sup>4</sup>

Evidently, Edward learned English, French, Latin, and Greek from his masters, and it was quite probable that he had some knowledge of Spanish and Italian. In addition to his studies, Edward was very interested in religion, and he held the Bible in the highest reverence, as was manifested at his coronation.

Bale relates, upon the authority of credible witnesses, that when three swords were brought to be carried in the procession, as emblematical of his three kingdoms, the king said there was one yet wanting. The nobles inquiring what it was, he answered, The Bible, adding, "That book is the sword of the Spirit, and to be preferred before these swords. That ought in all right to govern us, who use them for the people's safety by God's appointment. Without that sword we are nothing, we can do nothing, we have no power. From that we receive whatsoever it is that we at present do assume. He that rules without it, is not to be called God's minister, or a king. Under that we ought to live, to fight, to govern the people, and to perform all our affairs. From that alone we obtain all power, virtue, grace, salvation, and whatsoever we have of divine strength." When the pious young king had thus expressed himself, he commanded the bible to be brought with the greatest reverence, and carried before him.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, Edward VI displayed the talents of a fine ruler; he was not only quick and desirous of learning but also of a pious and religious nature. However, the effective control of the government of England was in the hands of the Lord Protector

---

<sup>4</sup>Writings of Edward the Sixth, William Hugh, Queen Catherine Parr, Anne Askew, Lady Jane Grey, Hamilton, and Balnaves, Vol. III of British Reformers (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 18---), p. 2.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, p. 6.

and a council of twenty-six, for Somerset had persuaded Edward to abrogate his father's will and grant supreme power to this counciliar government. The council was composed, for the most part, of members of the new ruling class that had been created during the later part of the reign of Henry VIII. It was certain that the principle of the royal supremacy, as developed by Henry, would be maintained by the new government, and it was quite likely, considering the increased influence of men like Cranmer, that there would be further reformation in the Church of England during Edward's reign. National Catholicism was a noxious form of worship to the reformers, who desired further reform for the doctrine and ritual of the English Church. Thus, Edward's reign was to be a time of continuing change.

The doctrine of the royal supremacy, as established by Henry VIII, was the cornerstone of the national monarchy in England. In regard to this view, it was certain that the council would attempt to add greater scope to the royal supremacy during Edward's reign. This policy was advanced shortly after the young king's coronation. As Holinshed related:

Also shortly after his coronation, the king's majesty by the advice of his uncle the lord protector and other of his private council, minding first of all to seeke Gods honor and glorie, and therevpon intending a reformation, did not onely set forth by certeine commissioners, sundrie injunctions for the remoouing of images out of all churches, to the suppressing and auoiding of idolatrie and superstition within his realmes and dominions, but also caused certeine homilies or sermons to be drawne by sundrie godlie & learned men, that the same might be read in churches to the people,

which were afterward by certeine of these commissioners sent foorth as visitors, accompanied with certeine preachers, thoroughout the realme, for the better instruction of the people, published and put in vse.<sup>6</sup>

The injunctions of Edward VI were addressed to the king's subjects generally, both clergy and laity.<sup>7</sup> They were, at least in part, a reproduction of the two former sets of injunctions issued by Henry VIII and cromwell. Some of the injunctions, as abstracted by Fuller, were as follows:

i. That all ecclesiastical persons observe the laws for the abolishing the pretended and usurped power of the Bishop of Rome, and confirmation of the king's authority and supremacy.

ii. That, once a quarter at least, they sincerely declare the word of God, dissuading their people from superstitious fancies of pilgrimages, praying to images, etc.; exhorting them to the works of faith, mercy and charity.

iii. That images abused with pilgrimages and offerings thereunto be forthwith taken down and destroyed, and that no more wax candles or tapers be burnt before any image; but only two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament shall remain still, to signify that Christ is the very light of the world.

.....

xi. That if they have heretofore extolled pilgrimages, relics, worshipping of images, etc., they now openly recant and reprove the same as a common error, groundless in scripture.

.....

xix. That no person henceforth shall alter any fasting-day that is commanded, or manner of common prayer or divine, (otherwise than specified in these injunctions,) until otherwise ordered by the king's authority.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Vol. III, p. 867.

<sup>7</sup>See Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, pp. 10-16, for the thirty-six injunctions of Edward in abstracted form.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid, pp. 10-12.

The king and council were strengthening the independent position of the Church of England by reaffirming the policy against papal authority that had been formulated during the reign of Henry VIII. The "superstitions" of the old way exerted considerable pressure upon the people to return to their former position of subservience to the Pope, and the authority of the temporal government (king, protector, and council) would be weakened to the extent that the powers of Bishop of Rome were maintained or regained. Of course, the removal of the objects of superstitious veneration--images, relics, and pilgrimages--would tend to enhance the royal supremacy, as the old traditions were mainly retained in these popular manifestations. Therefore, Edward's injunctions were primarily necessitated by the desire to maintain the royal supremacy in religious matters.

The strong statement against the old religion in the injunctions made a guide for correct doctrine necessary. This was achieved in the Book of Homilies. "The Book of Homilies was a collection of twelve discourses, the preparation of which had been suggested as early as 1542, and a first draft laid by Cranmer before Convocation next year at the time the book of "Necessary Doctrine" [the "King's Book"] was published, the object being to check the extravagance of ignorant preachers; but it had not been authorised by Convocation, and it was now put forth simply by authority of the Council."<sup>9</sup> The council, having discredited the old religion

---

<sup>9</sup>Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 247.

in the injunctions, was attempting to create a new order under the royal supremacy through the Book of Homilies. In other words, by providing discourses or sermons in English for the Church of England, the council was directing religion into the course charted by the royal supremacy. Thus, their position was strengthened by this provision for a new formulary in English to take the place of the former traditions, for the people could be more easily diverted to the new policy, based as it was on the vernacular language of the times.

Despite the addition of the Book of Homilies in English, it was still necessary for the government to move against the images that fostered the old traditions in the churches. Cranmer pointed the way that the government must follow in his speech at Edward's coronation. "Your majesty is God's vicegerent, [sic] and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed; the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed."<sup>10</sup> In Cranmer's opinion, the king, as supreme head of the Church of England, was obliged to prevent the old traditions from interfering with the royal supremacy. Thus, in February, 1548, an Order of Council was issued for the removal of all images from the churches. This action went beyond the command in the injunctions of 1547 which called for the removal of those images which had been abused by

---

<sup>10</sup>Writings of Edward the Sixth, p. 5, citing Cranmer's address at Edward's coronation.

pilgrimages and offerings. "There was probably truth in the reasons alleged for this: that fierce contention arose everywhere about images, whether this or that of them had been abused by kissing, censing, offerings, or pilgrimages; and that many images, which by the tenor of the Injunctions had been taken down, were set up again when the Visitors had gone."<sup>11</sup> If the government met with resistance in attempting to remove the abused images, it was certainly a wiser policy, from the point of view of the royal supremacy, to remove them all and dispense with the need for justification of abuse of the image. The most effective banishment of the old belief was through the suppression of its traditions and symbols. So Balleine:

Belief in purgatory would never die so long as the walls of every church displayed its torments and its terrors. The worship of the saints would linger on, if ten thousand windows were allowed to proclaim the legends of their miracles and mercies. If the choice lay between pure religion and the preservation of certain interesting archaeological curiosities, there could be no doubt which it was right to sacrifice, even though it meant a shock to the feelings of old-fashioned folk in the villages.<sup>12</sup>

To advance pure religion and the royal supremacy, it was requisite for the king and council to suppress the remains of the religion of Rome in England. While this policy may not have commanded the approval of many of the common people, it was pertinent to the strengthening of the national

---

<sup>11</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. II, p. 492.

<sup>12</sup>Balleine, The Laymen's History of the Church of England, p. 113.

monarchy. Thus, to secure the position of the boy-king and his reigning council, the removal of the images from the churches was an essential maneuver, for the old traditions violated the Church-State relationship decreed by the concept of the royal supremacy.

In 1549, a change in the government was brought by the fall of Somerset, the Lord Protector. If one man could be singled out, the Earl of Warwick was mainly responsible for Somerset's fall. In October, 1549, Warwick, recently victorious over the Norfolk rebels, had control over the council, which in turn controlled London. Somerset fled to Windsor, and, on the seventh of October, he was proclaimed a traitor. He was brought from Windsor on October 7, 1549, and placed in the Tower. Gairdner commented:

The Protectorate was at an end. Somerset had fallen from power without a contest. He had, no doubt, weakened himself by arbitrary conduct and unwillingness to hear counsel--which was one of the matters charged against him when he was in the Tower.<sup>13</sup>

However, Somerset was handled quite leniently, for he was released from the Tower in February upon giving surety of 10,000 pounds that he would not approach the king unless sent for. In April, 1550, he was readmitted to the council, but his troubles were far from at end. On October 16, 1551, Somerset was again arrested and sent to the Tower. Warwick, recently created Duke of Northumberland, was once more in the ascendancy. Somerset was brought to trial on the first

---

<sup>13</sup>Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 274.

of December in Westminster Hall. "Under the Act of Unlawful Assemblies the late Protector was charged, under various counts, with having treasonably collected men in his houses for an ill intent, as to kill the Duke of Northumberland; with having devised the death of the Lords of the Council; with having intended to raise the city of London to assault the Lords of the Council; and, finally, with having purposed to resist his arrest."<sup>14</sup> Somerset was on trial for his life on charges of treason, and he was also indicted on the last three counts for felony. His trial lasted nine hours, and he was acquitted of treason but condemned for felony--the technical difference being that he would be hanged instead of beheaded. However, the death prescribed in the sentence was changed; thus, on January 22, 1552, Somerset was beheaded on Tower Hill. Northumberland had disposed of his most serious rival for the control of the council and greatly extended his personal power.

A clear indication of the dominance of the royal supremacy over religion in England was shown by Edward's action in allowing the Dutch Church to be established in London. "On the twenty-fourth of July [1550], king Edward by his letters patent, at the request of John a Lasco, free baron of Lasco in Poland, did, by the consent of his council, give and grant the whole church of St. Augustine's, near

---

<sup>14</sup>

James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Vol. V (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1850), p. 380.

Broad Street in London, (the choir excepted, formerly possessed by marquis Paulet,) unto the superintendent and ministers of the Dutch Church, and other strangers in London, to have and to hold for them, their heirs and successors, in frank-almonage, to be a meeting-place for them, therein to attend God's word and sacraments."<sup>15</sup> This grant to foreigners for the establishment of their own church demonstrated the power of the royal supremacy in Edward's reign. Yet, it was more than the control of royal supremacy that attracted foreign reformers to England. The pious nature of the young king was held in great value by the foreign protestants, especially by such leaders as Bucer and Bullinger. "The foreign protestants were anxious to engage the co-operation of Edward, and offered to wave some minor points of discipline if a general union could be effected."<sup>16</sup> Considering the enmity between England and the Holy See, a union with these foreign protestants would probably have been to the advantage of king and council, and, although no such union was arranged during Edward's reign, the opportunity for such an agreement had come from the royal supremacy. Thus, the effective control of the royal authority over religion provided for a broader scope of relations with foreign dissenters from the tradition of papal supremacy.

---

<sup>15</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, pp. 74-75.

<sup>16</sup> Writings of Edward the Sixth, p. 10.

In 1552, the royal supremacy was directly invoked to restore church goods to the crown. Many of the people had, with the changes in religion, taken church property for their own use, and the crown's revenue was in this way indirectly lessened. As Fuller commented on this situation of 1552:

Lately information was given to the king's council, that much costly furniture which was embezzled might very seasonably (such the king's present occasions) and profitably be recovered; for private men's halls were hung with altar-cloths, their tables and beds covered with copes instead of carpets and coverlets. Many drank at their daily meals in chalices; and no wonder if, in proportion, it came to the share of their horses to be watered in rich coffins of marble. And, as if first laying of hands upon them were sufficient title unto them, seizing on them was generally the price they had paid for them.<sup>17</sup>

The people had seen a way in which they might profit directly from the religious changes--appropriating church goods. Yet, the king's council was searching for new areas in which the royal revenues might be raised. "The most lamentable of them was the determination of the Council to search 'all the shires of England' for the remaining Church goods: in accordance with which an entirely illegal inquisition was set on foot to rescue for the Treasury from the pillage of private men whatever might be spared by the simplicity to which the divine service was now reduced."<sup>18</sup> The council planned a visitation, based on the existing inventories of church goods and ornaments in England. The goods remaining

---

<sup>17</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, pp. 96-97.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Vol. III (Third ed.; London: Henry Frowde, 1902), p. 446.

in the churches would be compared with the inventory lists, and the commissioners had the power to imprison all persons who resisted their demands. The commissioners carried out their instructions with a great deal of zeal and exactitude. Thus, despite the previous despoliation by the people, the commissioners were able to raise the revenues in the royal treasury, even though those who had seized goods attempted to hide their ill-gotten wealth. As Fuller related:

However, the commissioners regained more than they expected, considering the distance of time and the cold scent they followed so many years after the dissolution. This plate and other church utensils were sold, and advanced much money to the exchequer.<sup>19</sup>

Through the royal supremacy, the council was able to raise the king's revenues. During the reign of Edward VI, the principle of the royal supremacy, as developed by Henry VIII, was used to the crown's advantage. The dominance of the temporal power in England certainly allowed for an expanded scope of governmental activity, and the royal supremacy not only advanced this power but also helped to finance it.

The doctrine and ritual of the Church of England underwent profound changes during the reign of Edward VI. The forementioned Book of Homilies of 1547 marked the start of the transference of the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England into vernacular English. "Of this work it may be sufficient to say that, though a collection of sermons cannot be held to have actually superseded a formal confession of

---

<sup>19</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 103.

faith, it bore strongly against the Necessary Doctrine [the "King's Book"], for it ignored the sacramental system of the Church."<sup>20</sup> In its twelve discourses, the Book of Homilies made no mention of the sacrament of the altar, and it contained only incidental allusions to two of the other six. This lack of exposition of the sacraments was emphasized by the fact that they did not have even a single Homily devoted to themselves exclusively. Thus, a change from the formularies of Henry's time was begun in the first year of Edward's reign.

On March 8, 1548, a new Order of Communion was brought forth by a commission of bishops and doctors which had been nominated by the council.<sup>21</sup> This sacramentary called for communion in both kinds and introduced a general confession to be repeated by all the people--the first break with secret or auricular confession. It was primarily designed to promote a uniform manner of communion throughout the realm. Carter commented on its contents:

It provided for an English service to be added to the Latin mass, no variation from which was permitted until the priest himself had received the Sacrament, after which the communicants for the first time heard in their own tongue the Invitation, the Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, and Prayer of Humble Access, which are so familiar today.

---

<sup>20</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. II, p. 422.

<sup>21</sup> See Joseph Ketley (ed.), The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1522: with other Documents set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI (Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), pp. 1-8, for The Order of the Communion and the proclamation that accompanied its publication.

What, however, proved most objectionable to the clergy of the "old learning," as directly denying the necessity of auricular confession, was the option freely allowed, of making "a humble confession to God and the general confession to the Church," instead of the "auricular and secret confession to the priest" which had heretofore been obligatory.<sup>22</sup>

These changes were, at the time, felt to be very great, and they marked the sure movement towards reformation that prevailed at the beginning of Edward's reign. However, it was more of an invasion than an assault upon the old traditions, for, in effect, the priest's part was modified in modifying the part of the people. Thus, though the object was greater unification of the service, the immediate result was greater variety and discord, which foreshadowed the further struggle between the old order and the new.

The continuing of diversities in worship, despite the new Order of Communion, brought forth the first Edwardine Act of Uniformity on January 21, 1549.<sup>23</sup> It was an effort to end religious controversy within the realm, which was regarded as a serious problem. The act stated:

Where of long time there has been had in this realm of England and in Wales divers formas of common prayer, commonly called the service of the Church; that is to say, the Use of Sarum, of York, of Bangor, and of Lincoln; and besides the same now of late much more divers and sundry forms and fashions have been used in the cathedral and parish churches of England and Wales, as well concerning the matins or Morning Prayer and the Evensong, as also concerning the Holy Communion, commonly

---

<sup>22</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 69.

<sup>23</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 358-66, for the text of this Act.

called the Mass, with divers and sundry rites and ceremonies concerning the same, and in the administration of other sacraments of the Church; and as the doers and executors of the said rites and ceremonies, in other form than of late years they have been used, were pleased therewith, so other, not using the same rites and ceremonies, were thereby greatly offended.<sup>24</sup>

This first Edwardine Act of Uniformity was designed to remove the inconveniences of diversity of worship through the use of one uniform order of prayer embodied in the Book of Common Prayer, the use of which was enjoined throughout the realm. The public services, which hitherto had been left to the freedom of the old diocesan Uses, were placed in one correct form by Act of parliament. "The principle which had advanced hitherto under the shadow of the royal prerogative, now suddenly stood forth in the light of absolute legislation; and men could no longer fail to be impressed to some extent at least with regulations which invaded the practice of their lives."<sup>25</sup> Thus, this act of parliament sought to end religious multiformity in England and presented the means to achieve this purpose in the Book of Common Prayer.

The first Book of Common Prayer was promulgated into national usage by the first Edwardine Act of Uniformity,

---

<sup>24</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 358.

<sup>25</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. III, p. 2.

although it occasioned considerable controversy in the House of Lords.<sup>26</sup> As Carter commented on this controversy over the prayer book:

It had been preceded by a remarkable three days' debate in the House of Lords on the nature of the Eucharist, which is important as evidence that Cranmer and the Reforming bishops had already abandoned both the medieval and Lutheran views of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist: "Our faith," said Cranmer, "is not to believe Him to be in the bread and wine, but that He is in Heaven."<sup>27</sup>

The dogma of transubstantiation was one of the great theological questions of the time, and the position presented by Cranmer and the other reforming bishops was definitely counter to the beliefs of the old order. Cranmer held that the change in the Communion was inward, being not in the bread but in the receiver. In addition to the changing views on transubstantiation, the framers of the first Book of Common Prayer had other objectives in mind. Thus Procter:

---

<sup>26</sup>A capacious debate has arisen over the question of whether or not the first Book of Common Prayer was approved by convocation. As the records of convocation for this time were destroyed in the "Fire of London", the evidence of clerical approval rests with a letter from Edward VI to Bonner and the young king's Answer to the Devonshire rebels which implied that the book was approved by the whole clergy of the realm, but there was no mention of the matter in the documents of the time, such as the first Act of Uniformity, and, as this was a new case--no Use for the whole English Church having been made before, it was quite likely that it was put in effect without the approbation of convocation.

<sup>27</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 72.

The objects of the compilers of this first English Book of Common Prayer are stated in 'the Preface':-- that the whole realm should now have but one 'Use' in Divine Service; that the rubrical directions, 'the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie,' should be simplified; that the Psalms should be all repeated in their order, instead of a few being 'said daily, and the rest utterly omitted;' that the Lessons should include 'the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof,' in a continuous course, and the reading of the chapters should not be interrupted by 'Anthems, Responds, and Invitatories;' that nothing should be read but 'the very pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded upon the same;' and that all should be in the English tongue.<sup>28</sup>

For the most part, the reformers desired a return to the ideals of the primitive Church, with a greater reliance upon the Scriptures as the spiritual pathway to salvation. Also, they promoted the use of the vernacular in the ceremonies of worship of the English Church. Thus, the reformers created a service book in English that stressed Scriptural fundamentalism, as opposed to the blatant formalism of the Roman Catholic Church.

Although the first Book of Common Prayer displayed a conservative regard for antiquity, it was definitely designed for the advancement of religious reform in Edward's kingdom. Perhaps, the book's greatest contribution was its simplification of the forms of worship. "Simplicity and reason were consulted in reducing the daily prayers to a single volume, to a volume capable of containing also the Missal and the Occasional Offices; and thus ridding the

---

<sup>28</sup>Francis Procter, A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices (fifteenth ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1881), pp. 26-27.

Christian worship of the large diversity of volumes that had been in use."<sup>29</sup> The Windsor Commission, in preparing the Book of Common Prayer, had, at least, reduced the various Uses of England to a single-volume formulary of faith. However, their work caused disruptions among the common people, brought-up in the ways of the old order. "The prohibition of the old service books, the compression of the separate offices of Matins, Lauds, Prime, Vespers, and Compline into the two services of Matins and Evensong, the very important departures from the Missal in the new Communion Office, and, above all, the adoption of the use of the vernacular in all public worship, amounted to the changes in the conduct of divine service which must have appeared to conservative and illiterate persons little short of a revolution."<sup>30</sup> The changes that were, of necessity, required in compiling an English prayer book to supplement the national Church were matters of some concern to the populace. Yet, the forces of Reformation were determined to advance, and, in juxtaposition to those who felt the changes to be radical and revolutionary, there were others who felt that the first prayer book did not go far enough on the pathway to reform.

One of the most serious changes invoked by the first Book of Common Prayer was the new order of "the Supper of

---

<sup>29</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. III, pp. 15-16.

<sup>30</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 73.

the Lord and Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass", for it was, at least in part, a rejection of one of the most important parts of the basic doctrine of the old tradition. "According to the traditional and universal practice of Christendom the mass, by whatever name it may be called, was the great public service of worship."<sup>31</sup> The reverence in which the mass was held would make even the slightest alterations in the accustomed rites unpopular in Edward's kingdom. Thus, the question was how far did the communion service in the first Book of Common Prayer deviate from the traditional form of the mass. The rejoinder was laid in the new service; the main part of which was as follows:

Then shall the Priest turnyng him to gods boord, knele down, and say in the name of all them, that shall receyue the Communion, this prayer following.

We do not presume to come to this thy table (O mercifull lord) trusting in our owne righteousnes, but in thy manifold and great mercies; we be not woorthie so much as to gather up the cromes under thy table; but thou art the same lorde whose propertie is alwayes to haue mercie; Graunt us therefore (gracious lorde) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries, that we may continuallye dwell in hym, and he in us, that our synfull bodyes may bee made cleane by his body, and our soules washed through hys most precious bloud. Amen.

Then shall the Priests firste receiue the Communion in both kindes himselfe, and next deliuer it to other Ministers, if any be there presente, (that they may be ready to helpe the chiefe Minister,) and after to the people.

And when he deliuereth the Sacramente of the body of Christe, he shall say to euery one these woordes.

---

<sup>31</sup>Francis Aidan Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer (London: John Hodges, 1890), p. 189.

The body of our Lorde Jesus Christe whiche was geuen for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto euerlasting lyfe.

And the Minister deliuering the Sacramēt of the bloud, and geuing euery one to drinke once and no more, shall say,

The bloud of our Lorde Jesus Christe which was shed for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto euerlastyng lyfe.

If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he folow with the Chalice; and as the Priest ministereth the Sacramēt of the body, so shall he (for more expeditiō) minister the Sacrament of the bloud, in fourme before written.

In the Communion tyme the Clarkes shall syng,

O lambe of god, that takeste away the sinnes of the worlde: have mercie upon us.

O lambe of god, that takeste away the synnes of the worlde: graunte us thy peace.

Beginning as soone as the Prieste doeth receyue the holy Communion, and when the Communion is ended, then shall the Clarkes syng the post Communion.<sup>32</sup>

Despite the differences found in the Communion of the first Book of Common Prayer from the former traditional rites, the basic dogma of transubstantiation could still be implied from the new forms, for the bread and the wine were taken as the body and blood of Christ. Yet, even though this primal principle was represented more in the literal than in the symbolic sense, the tone of this first Edwardine communion service evidenced a departure, at least to some degree, from the forms of Catholicism. Thus, the emphasis

---

<sup>32</sup>The First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI 1549, reprinted from a copy in the British Museum (London, Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, [1888]), pp. 205-206.

of primitive Christianity found in this vernacular prayer book was a positive step towards reformation in the Church of England.

By its very nature, the first Book of Common Prayer was bound to raise diverse reactions in Edward's realm, for, in trying to hold to a middle way, the book was tolerable but displeasing to both sides. So Mackie:

Compromise, especially compromise founded upon variant interpretations, could not endure. The introduction of the new liturgy produced the rising in the West Country of men to whom the unfamiliar English, and the simplicity of the rite, made the worship of God seem 'like a Christmas game', and among the learned it soon became apparent that Cranmer could not maintain his middle position.<sup>33</sup>

Amongst the learned, there was variance of opinion concerning the first Book of Common Prayer, as some maintained that its reforms did not reach the crux of the religious problems while others stated that it could be adapted to the basic tenets of Catholic dogma. Clayton noted:

It retained too much of the Mass, authorised still too many ceremonies, and could in fact, it was contended, be used by Catholics. So Stephen Gardiner endeavoured to prove in his struggle to maintain a Catholic interpretation of the first Prayer Book.<sup>34</sup>

If, as Gardiner maintained, the first Edwardine prayer book was capable of being reconciled with the medieval doctrine of transubstantiation, it was far removed from the ideal of the more advanced reformers. Yet, many who held to the old faith, disdaining this process of theological rationalization, continued their former religious practices in secret.

---

<sup>33</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 515.

<sup>34</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 93.

Thus, albeit the first Book of Common Prayer did encourage theological debate and discussion, it only served to widen the differences between the followers of the old practices and those who desired innovations leading to further reform.

The common people reacted more directly and violently to the doctrinal alterations of the prayer book, and the book must be considered as one of the major causes of the uprisings of 1549, along with the economic dislocations that resulted from the inclosure of land and the excesses of government. As Dixon commented:

The new Prayer Book appeared to be the signal of a religious war. In the hour when it was first used, five or six counties rose in arms. In the west there were great risings; and in Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Norfolk; even the subjugated Yorkshire was not unstirred....In the west indeed, in the country of the Poles and Montagues, the ancient faith was strong; and it was when the Act for Uniformity inured, and the accustomed order of Divine Service was altered by the new book; it was when they found themselves exposed to a new Visitation, with the abrogation of nearly all the ceremonies of their Churches, that the men of Devonshire and Cornwall flew to arms.<sup>35</sup>

The people were ill-disposed towards any rationalization of their beliefs, and, knowing what they desired, they sought to re-establish the old traditions through force. Evidently, the populace had a deeper attachment to the former religion than the king and council had estimated. This profound desire to return to the dogma of Catholicism was especially witnessed in the western rebellions in Cornwall and Devon, and it was reflected in the articles that were drawn up by

---

<sup>35</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. III, p. 43.

the western rebels. "It is the restoration of the Mass, in Latin, as before, and without communicants which the rebels demand; and also the reservation of the sacrament over the high altar, 'there to be worshipped as it was wont to be;' the giving of holy bread and holy water every Sunday; palms and ashes at the accustomed time; the setting up again of images in every church, 'and all other ancient old ceremonies used heretofore by our mother the church'."<sup>36</sup> In accordance with their wishes to return to a more Catholic form of worship, the rebels were highly dissatisfied with the innovations of the first Book of Common Prayer. They rejected the new service as being like a mere game and sought the restoration of services in Latin, for it was alleged that certain of the Cornishmen could understand no English. If the western rebellions demonstrated the dislike of the common people for religious innovations, the uprisings in the east likewise showed a marked religious intensity. This can be noted in the Norfolk rebellion, led by Robert Kett. "One [Thomas] Conyers, a vicar in the city [Norwich], they had for their chaplain; and were so religiously rebellious, that prayers morning and evening were read amongst them."<sup>37</sup> Thus, in both the east and west of Edward's realm, the populace was moved by a pious zeal to right what they considered to be the wrong of Reformation. However, after some sorry

---

<sup>36</sup> Clayton, *The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain*, p. 101.

<sup>37</sup> Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, Vol. IV, p. 43.

moments, the forces of the crown prevailed, and, with the deaths of the leaders of the eastern and western rebellions, the outward resistance to the reformed liturgy ceased.

With peace secured in the kingdom, archbishop Cranmer could once more turn his thoughts towards reform in the Church of England. It was a certainty that the archbishop was planning further innovations in religion. "In 1550 he [Cranmer] had published his famous treatise, entitled The Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ, in which he asserted the Scriptural doctrine of a real spiritual Presence to all worthy receivers of the Sacrament in opposition to the Lutheran and Roman theories of a Corporal Presence or Transubstantiation."<sup>38</sup> This work represented Cranmer's attempt to set forth clearly and plainly his judgement as to the true nature of the Lord's Supper. He was refuting the traditional Catholic dogma, which held that, after the words of consecration, nought remained, neither bread nor wine, but the very substance of Christ's flesh and blood.

In contradistinction to this, the Archbishop maintains that "although Christ in His human nature substantially, really, corporeally, naturally, and sensibly be present with His Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually He is here present. For in water, bread, and wine He is present, as in signs and sacraments." It is plain from these extracts that Cranmer was not only led to renounce the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but that he, with equal wisdom, judgement, and appreciation of the Holy Scriptures and

---

<sup>38</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 77.

of the ancient Church, rejected the Lutheran tenets of Consubstantiation, and of the anti-Sacramental theories of Zuinglius and OEcclampadius.<sup>39</sup>

Cranmer recognized the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but he refused to designate or define the mode of that presence. In other words, he refused to subscribe to the theory that the Corporal Presence of Christ was present in the presentment of the sacrament. Thus, Archbishop Cranmer was, perhaps, closer to the doctrinal position of primitive Christianity as to the meaning of Christ when He said: "This is my body, do this in remembrance of me," than was the formalized rite of Catholicism, and Cranmer's belief in a spiritual or symbolic presence of Christ certainly foretold of further innovations in the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England.

One of the first actions taken by Cranmer for further reform was against the elaborate ceremonies used in the consecration of officials of the Church. "A new Ordinal was published in March 1550, abolishing or greatly simplifying many of the rites contained in the medieval Pontificals, and only making provision for the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons."<sup>40</sup> This Ordinal was designed to rid the Church of England of the traditional formalism of the consecration ceremonies of Catholicism. No part of the

---

<sup>39</sup> Collette, The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, p. 289.

<sup>40</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 75.

ancient rites displayed quite the genius of ceremony that was found in the directions for conferring the several clerical degrees. As Dixon related:

The ordination of ostiaries, lectors, exorcists, acolytes and subdeacons, the ordering of the higher grades of deacons and priests, and the consecration of bishops, often taking place, except the last, as successive parts of the same function, seemed designed to have composed a series of ennobling spectacles. Varied groups of bowing and saluting figures, appearing and retiring, falling and rising, before the altars, amid the chapels and pillars of spacious edifices, carried gradually forward the expression of forms and the porrection of symbols, in devices so intricate as to require the frequent consultation of the directing volumes of the Pontificals, less anything should be omitted or performed amiss.<sup>41</sup>

The Ordinal of 1550 reduced, where it did not abolish, the numerous ceremonies of ordination, and it omitted the ceremonies for the lesser orders or grades of the ministry, while retaining greatly simplified rites for deacons, priests, and bishops. Yet, the new Ordinal retained all that was necessary to convey the clerical character, along with preserving the difference between the clerical degrees. Thus, the Ordinal returned to the tenets of primitive Christianity and restored simplicity and piety in the place of magnificent forms.

It was not, however, until 1552 that the progress of Church reform was further extended by the second Edwardine Act of Uniformity.<sup>42</sup> "This Act imposed upon the clergy under

---

<sup>41</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. III, p. 189.

<sup>42</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 369-372, for the text of this act.

penalties a revised Prayer Book, and subjected to imprisonment laymen who should attend services other than those contained in the new book."<sup>43</sup> One of the main objects of this second Act of Uniformity was to secure a greater degree of church attendance throughout the realm or to encourage, through force if necessary, recusants to attend the services of the Church of England. The problem, to the leaders of the English Church, was to lead the populace back from their own sensuality to a knowledgable and due fear of God. The Act of Uniformity provided:

For reformation hereof, be it enacted by the king our sovereign lord, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the feast of All Saints next coming, all and every person and persons inhabiting within this realm, or any other the king's majesty's dominions, shall diligently and faithfully (having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent) endeavour themselves to resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed, or upon reasonable let thereof, to some usual place where common prayer and such service of God shall be used in such time of let, upon every Sunday, and other days ordained and used to be kept as holy days, and then and there to abide orderly and soberly during the time of the common prayer, preachings, or other service of God there to be used and ministered, upon pain of punishment by the censures of the Church.<sup>44</sup>

Thus, the second Edwardine Act of Uniformity must be regarded as an attempt to further the unity of the Church of England throughout the realm. Yet, the act was more than a unifying

---

<sup>43</sup>J. R. Tanner, Tudor Constitutional Documents A.D. 1485-1603 with an Historical Commentary (second ed.; Cambridge: The University Press, 1930), p. 116.

<sup>44</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 369-70.

measure, for it called for the revision of the first Book of Common Prayer, which was to advance the Reformation of the English Church to greater heights than had been previously achieved during the reign of Edward VI.

The sole authorization for the second Book of Common Prayer was the statement in the second Edwardine Act of Uniformity requesting that the prayer book be "made fully perfect". However, the revision went so far as to create the second prayer book, which was first put into use on November 1, 1552. The principal reason for such a sweeping revision was the conflict that had developed between the Conformists and the Nonconformists, who were greatly influenced by the teachings of foreign Protestantism, over the ritual of the Church of England. One of their prime disputes was the conflict over kneeling. This divergence of opinion necessitated the inclusion--on October 27, 1552, by the king's command--of the portion of the second prayer book that became known as the "Black Rubric". It retained the direction to kneel, but it was worded so as to conciliate the Nonconformists. The "Black Rubric" asserted, in effect, that the posture of kneeling did not indicate that any adoration was being offered unto the elements of the sacrament or to any real and essential presence of the natural body of Christ. "The history of this Rubric affords sufficient evidence that its introduction was intended as a concession to pacify the foreigners, who never ceased to characterise kneeling to

communicate as a superstitious and idolatrous act."<sup>45</sup> Thus, the influence of the foreigners and their adherents, the Nonconformists, on the second Book of Common Prayer brought forth a definition of the act of kneeling, which completely divorced this rite from any suggestion of Catholic formalism.

The second Book of Common Prayer likewise brought a change to the point of view of transubstantiation maintained in the first prayer book. "The second Prayer Book removed all ambiguity as far as Transubstantiation was concerned, while it left open to all good Protestants on the continent the door of inter-communion with the reformed church of England."<sup>46</sup> The foreign Protestants in England were helping to lead Edward's realm to a religious position that would stand in juxtaposition to their own. This required a doctrinal alteration concerning the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. As Procter commented:

In the book of 1549 the Communion Service had been so constructed as to be consistent with the belief of a real, and perhaps of a substantial and corporal presence. But the alterations in 1552 were such as to authorize and foster the belief that the consecrated elements had no new virtues imparted to them, and that Christ was present in the Eucharist in no other manner than as He is ever present to the prayers of the faithful.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Herbert Mortimer Luckock, Studies in the History of the Book of Common Prayer (second ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1882), pp. 105-106.

<sup>46</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p.95.

<sup>47</sup> Procter, A History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 36.

The second prayer book had by-passed the point at which it might be reconciled with the teachings of Catholic dogma on transubstantiation. The major part of the revised communion service as presented in the second Book of Common Prayer was as follows:

Then shal the Priest, kneling down at  
Goddes borde, say in the name of all  
them that shal receiue the Communion,  
this praier folowyng.

We doe not presume to come to this thy table (O mercyfull Lorde) trustinge in our owne righteousnesse, but in thy manifolde and greate mercies: we bee not worthy, so much as to gather up the crommes under thy table: but thou art the same Lorde whose propertie is alwayes to haue marcy: graunt us therefore (gracious lord) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christe, and to drinke his bloud, that our synfulle bodyes maye be made cleane by his body, and our soules wasched through his most precious bloud, and that we may euermore dwel in him, and he in us. Amen.

Then the Priest standing up shal saye, as  
foloweth.

Almighty God oure heauenly father, whiche of thy tender mercye dydest geue thine onely sonne Jesus Christ, to suffre death upon the crosse for our redemption, who made there (by hys one oblacion of hymselfe once offered) a full, perfecte and sufficiente sacrifice, oblacion, and satisfaccion, for the synnes of the whole worlde, and dyd institute, and in hys holye Gospell commaund us to continue, a perpetuall memorye of that his prescious death, untyll hys comynge agayne: Heare us O mercyfull father we besche thee; and graunt that wee, receyuing these thy creatures of bread and wyne, accordinge to thy sonne our Sauicoure Jesus Christ's holy institucion, in remembraunce of his death and passion, maye be partakers of his most blessed body and bloud: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, tooke bread, and when he had geuen thanks, he brake it, and gaue it to his Disciples, sayinge: Take, eate, this is my bodye which is geuen for you. Doe this in remembraunce of me. Lykewyse after supper he tooke the cup, and when he had geuen thanks, he gaue it to them, sayinge: Drinke ye all of this, for this is my bloud of the new Testament, whiche is shed for you and for many, for remission of synnes: do this as oft as ye shal drinke it in remembraunce of me.

Then shall the minister first receyue the Communion in both kyndes hymselfe and next deliuer it to other ministers, yf any be there present (that they may help the chief minister,) and after to the people in their handes kneling.

And when he delyuereth the bread, he shall saye.

Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thankesgeuing.

And the Minister that delyuereth the cup, shal saye,

Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ's bloude was shed for thee, and be thankfull.

Then shall the Priest saye the Lordes prayer the people repeating after him euery petition.<sup>48</sup>

The only recognition accorded to the presence of Christ in the sacrament by the new prayer book was symbolic, a remembrance of faith. Thus, the reformers had overcome one of the basic tenets of the old tradition.

The second book of Common Prayer had destroyed any remains of compromise that existed between the first prayer book and the old beliefs. Of course, this was most apparent in reference to the communion. "On comparing the first with the second Communion office what is obvious at first sight is, that whilst the former, in spite of the substantial changes which had been made in the ancient mass, manifested a general order and disposition of parts similar to the mass

---

<sup>48</sup> The Second Prayer-Book of King Edward VI 1552, reprinted from a copy in the British Museum (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, [1888]), pp. 168-69.

itself, the latter was changed beyond recognition."<sup>49</sup> Although the changes in the communion service were, perhaps, the most obvious departures from the former ritual to be found in the new prayer book, there were other important changes. Thus Clayton:

In the new book the communion was no longer "commonly called the Mass." Every allusion to the sacrifice for living and dead was cut out, and the canon of the Mass was broken up beyond any piecing together. The accustomed vestments were forbidden, and a surplice only might be worn by the officiating minister. All prayers for the dead, all invocation of saints, all prayers to Our Lady were forbidden.<sup>50</sup>

Greater simplicity, in keeping with the traditions of primitive Christianity, was provided for the Church of England by the second prayer book. The new book compromised the positions of the Conformists and the Nonconformists and, by so doing, rejected the principles of Catholicism maintained by the old traditions. Cranmer and the king had, for better or for worse, cast the lot of England with the ideas of the foreign reformers.

To supplement and further the reforms of the second Book of Common Prayer, the Forty-two Articles of Religion, the great Edwardine formulary, were published in 1553.<sup>51</sup> Although much of the work on the articles had been done in 1552, their publication was delayed until 1553. As Burnett

---

<sup>49</sup> Gasquet and Bishop, Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer, p. 288.

<sup>50</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 97.

<sup>51</sup> See APPENDIX D for the text of the Forty-two Articles of Religion.

commented on this delay:

It seemed to be a great Want that this was so long delayed, since the Old Doctrine had still the Legal Authority on its side. One Reason of delaying the publishing [of] them, probably was, that the King in whose Name, and by whose Authority they were to be published, might be so far advanced in Years, and out of the Time of Pupillage, that they might have the more Credit, and be of the more Weight: For though it was a Point settled in Law, that the King's Authority was at all Ages the same, yet the World would still make a Difference in their Regard to Things passed while he was a Child, and those Things Authorized by him when he was in the 16th Year of his Age.<sup>52</sup>

In order to make the doctrinal innovations of the second prayer book and the articles of lasting efficacy, it was of paramount importance to give them all the authority of law that could be mustered to their support. Thus, the publication of the Articles was delayed until the seriousness of the king's illness forced their publication. The Forty-two Articles of Religion were drawn up by Cranmer and published through the authority of king and council, with neither parliament nor convocation adding the weight of their approval. However, the title of the published articles implied that they had been agreed upon in convocation, and when Cranmer challenged this statement, the archbishop was informed that the articles were authorized while convocation was in session, which led to the rationalization that the articles were set forth in the time of convocation.

Despite their authorization problems, the articles served the need for which they were created; they supplied

---

52

Gilbert [Burnett], Lord Bishop of Sarum, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Vol. III (London: printed for J. Churchill, 1715), p. 210.

the dogma necessary to support the liturgy that had been established for the Church of England. "Their uncompromising protestantism was stated with the minimum of offence, and place was found for free will and for good works, as well as for justification by faith."<sup>53</sup> The supremacy of the reform innovations over the old traditions was secured to Edward's realm by the Articles, for, of the seven sacraments, baptism and communion alone were retained, and transubstantiation was singularly condemned. The article that, perhaps, adopted the most advanced reforming position was the one on the Lord's Supper, which was as follows:

[29] Of the Lords Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christs death. Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a communion of the body of Christ; likewise the Cup of blessing is a communion of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine, into the substance of Christs Body and Blood, cannot be proved by holy Writ: but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

For as much as the truth of mans nature requireth that the body of one and the selfsame man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place, therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time, in many & divers places: and because, as holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe, or openly confess the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christs flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

---

<sup>53</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 522.

The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not commanded by Christs Ordinance to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshiped.<sup>54</sup>

This article on the Lord's Supper reaffirmed the concept that Christ's presence in the communion was to be taken in the spiritual or symbolic sense only. This position was advanced on the grounds that there was neither Scriptural basis nor command by Christ's Ordinance for the doctrine of transubstantiation or for the formalism of the Eucharist as practised by Catholicism. Also, holding that the body and spirit were two separate entities combined:—"whereof is one Christ very God and very Man"--the former human and the latter divine joined into one, the articles advanced the concept that the body and blood of Christ could not be transformed but were taken up into heaven, as the holy Scriptures say, until the time of Judgement and the end of the world. Thus was the old religion rejected by the Church of England.

However, for the most part, the tone of the Forty-two Articles of Religion was moderate. "The moderation with which it was declared that, like the great Eastern Churches, the Church of Rome had erred both in worship and faith, without errors specified; and that General Councils might err, and sometimes had erred, was as dignified as amazing: and the same spirit may be admired, when neither images nor

---

<sup>54</sup> A Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions Ecclesiastical; with other Publick Records of the Church of England Chiefly in the Times of K. Edward VI. Q. Elizabeth, K. James, & K. Charles I. Published to Vindicate the Church of England, and to promote Uniformity and Peace in the Same (London: printed for Robert Pamlet, 1675), p. 49.

pictures, nor saints, but only the worshipping, the adoration, the invocation of them are denied to have the warrant of Scripture: and when Purgatory and pardons are termed not, as now, Roman, but scholastic doctrines."<sup>55</sup>

The broad soft touch of Cranmer lay upon them, and even the declaration for holding services in the vernacular, as St. Paul said, was not offensive. Also, it was only in things believed to be of necessity that the Church was denied to have the power to decree against or beyond the Scriptures. Thus, far from being rash rantings, the Forty-two articles of Religion must be considered as one of the great formularies of Christian faith.

The glory of the transition of the Church of England was dimmed by the illness of the young "Joshua"--Edward VI. "In the year 1552, the king was attacked by the measles and the small-pox."<sup>56</sup> It is probable that Edward never recovered from the effects of this seige of sickness. Certainly, by the beginning of 1553, he was far from well. As Froude commented:

Edward with varying health had arrived at the age fatal to the male Tudors, the age at which Prince Arthur had died, at which his brother the Duke of Richmond had died. The cough to which he was always subject had increased in the late winter.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. III, p. 522.

<sup>56</sup>Writings of Edward the Sixth, p. 15.

<sup>57</sup>Froude, History of England, Vol. V, p. 481.

The consumption that infested the king's lungs grew steadily worse, and, on his death-bed, Edward's religious nature was most clearly discernible in his prayer.

LORD God, deliuer me out of this miserable and wretched life, take me among thy chosen; howbeit not my will, but thy will be doone. Lord, I commit my spirit to thee, oh Lord thou knoweth how happie it were for mee to be with thee; yet for thy chosens sake if it be thy will, send me life and helth, that I maie trulie serue thee. Oh my Lord blesse thy people, and saue thine inheritance. Oh Lord God, saue thy chosen people of England. Oh my Lord God defend this realme from papistrie, and mainteine thy true religion, that I and my people maie praise thy holie name. And therewithall he said, I am faint, Lord haue mercie vpon me, and take my spirit.<sup>58</sup>

With this prayer, on July 6, 1553, Edward died. The promise shown by the young king would never reach its fulfillment, and, against his wishes, the kingdom would return to the old religion under his sister, Mary.

The reign of Edward VI was one of religious innovations and reform progress. The doctrine of the royal supremacy was strengthened and used to remove images from the churches and for the recovery of church ornaments, which helped to strengthen the treasury. Religious reform was greatly advanced, and the Church of England moved from the national Catholicism of Henry VIII to a more Protestant doctrine. At the beginning of Edward's reign, changes were wrought to have the services in the vernacular and communion in both kinds. With the advent of the second Book of Common

Prayer and the Forty-two Articles of Religion, the doctrine of transubstantiation was repudiated, Thus, Edward's brief reign must be marked as a period of change, although it was not granted time to give its innovations lasting effect.

## CHAPTER IV

### MARY

With the death of Edward VI in 1553, the succession passed, by the terms of Henry's will, to Mary, daughter of Henry VIII by his first marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Mary, raised in the traditions of Catholicism, was more a part of the old order than of the new. As Stone has commented:

Perhaps Mary's greatest misfortune was that she was born fifty years too late. Her virtues and her faults were those of a past, or rapidly passing, age. She belonged by every fibre of her nature to the old order, while the world about her was holding out eager arms to the Renaissance, to the new life that was so well worth living, the new learning that added a fresh impetus to intellectual pursuits, to the new religion that was to lead men away from the purgative into the illuminative way, abolishing good works as snares of the Evil One.<sup>1</sup>

Mary represented the reactionary element in a world of change and advancement. Her actions and reactions were plain, clear-cut, and unmistakable. Yet, she possessed the undaunted courage and a certain amount of the good-natured joviality, which were characteristic of the Tudors. As Mackie noted, concerning her personality:

---

<sup>1</sup>J. M. Stone, The History of Mary I. Queen of England (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1901), p. 216.

She had the clear conviction that the thing she wanted was right in itself and that because it was right she was entitled to seek it by all the means in her power without undue attention to scruple. From her mother she inherited a passionate devotion to the Roman Church which remained utterly unshaken by suffering, by success, and by intellectual questionings.<sup>2</sup>

Mary was thirty-seven at the time of her accession, and it was highly unlikely that any of her preformed concepts would change. Thus, Henry's second child to ascend the throne of England was endowed with the traditions of the old learning, especially with a reverence for Catholicism, and she was prepared to enforce her will upon the populace.

A plot had been formulated by Northumberland at the end of Edward's reign to exclude Mary from the succession to the throne, but, unfortunately for the lot of the reformers, it failed. Fuller related:

King Edward, tender in years, and weak with sickness, was so practised on by the importunity of others, that, excluding his two sisters, he conveyed the crown to the lady Jane [Grey], his kinswoman, by that which we may well call the testament of King Edward, and the will of the duke of Northumberland. Thus through the pious intents of this prince, wishing well to the Reformation; the religion of Queen Mary, obnoxious to exception; the ambition of Northumberland, who would do what he listed; the simplicity of Suffolk, who would be done with as the other pleased; the dutifulness of the lady Jane, disposed by her parents; the fearfulness of the judges, not daring to oppose; and the flattery of the courtiers, most willing to comply,--matters were made as sure as man's policy can make that good which is bad in itself. But the commons of England, who for many years together had conned loyalty by heart out of the statute of succession, were so perfect in their lesson, that they would not be put out of it by this new-started design;

---

<sup>2</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 534.

so that every one proclaimed Mary next heir in their consciences, and few days after king Edward's death all the project miscarried: of the plotters whereof some executed, more imprisoned, most pardoned, all conquered, and Queen Mary crowned.<sup>3</sup>

Northumberland had discovered that, when the time had arrived to meet Mary's challenge for the throne, he could not muster the requisite strength to strike boldly at his opponents and still hold London securely. Northumberland, perhaps because of the means of his rise to power, was distrusted by his own adherents, and the common people lent no encouragement to his cause. "Besides the fact that the support of Lady Jane meant the continuance of the odious and tyrannical policy of Northumberland, there is no doubt that the majority of the people were still in favour of the 'old religion,' while Mary's assurance to the men of Suffolk, that she would make no change in religion, but be contented with the private exercise of her own faith, greatly allayed the apprehensions of the Protestant party from her accession."<sup>4</sup> The party that had been held together only by Northumberland's powerful will wavered and collapsed. The duke was in the field with a force of over 3,000 men, but he declined battle with the vastly superior array of Mary's supporters, which numbered around 30,000. Meanwhile, with Northumberland gone from the city, several members of the council met and, summoning the lord mayor with his attendance, proclaimed Mary queen

---

<sup>3</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, pp. 135-36.

<sup>4</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, pp. 91-92.

in London on July 19, 1553. The ill-advised attempt of Lady Jane Grey had come to nought; Northumberland's power was crushed, and Mary was supreme.

Queen Mary was crowned on October 1, 1553, and, before the end of the month, she had dispelled some of the popular feeling in her favour by announcing on October 29, 1553, that she would marry Philip of Spain. She brushed aside a delegation from both houses of parliament with the blunt assertion that her marriage was her own affair. Although England looked askance at the prospect of a Spanish king, Mary was married to Philip on July 25, 1554, with all the traditional rites of the Roman Catholic Church. "The ceremonies were marked by the old English splendour; the queen's ring was 'a plain hoope of gold' because 'maydens were so married in olde tymes', and the 'faire ladyes and the moeste beutifull nimphes of England' were in attendance."<sup>5</sup> Yet, despite the grandeur of the ceremonies, the marriage was unpopular with the English people. "The match of Queen Mary with Philip king of Spain was not as commonly talked of as generally distasted."<sup>6</sup> Several uprisings occurred in the realm around the time of the queen's marriage, the most notable being that led by Sir Thomas Wyatt, but they were shortly suppressed. The force of Mary's will was able to secure the marriage she desired, but it was unable to provide

---

<sup>5</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 541.

uller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 165.

Philip with the heir that would unite England with the Empire. So Fuller:

As queen Mary was not over fair, king Philip was not over fond, especially after he began to despair of issue from her.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, in 1555, Philip left England for gaiety in the Netherlands, much to the despair of the queen, and all that Mary gained from the Spanish marriage was the alienation of many of her subjects.

The accession of a Catholic queen foreboded ill for those who desired the maintenance and continuation of reform in the Church of England. From her childhood, Mary had been trained in the old religious tradition. "There was in the Queen an instinct for formal worship that made it as natural as breathing for her to work for a restoration of the old faith."<sup>8</sup> However, despite her desire for a return to the forms of Catholicism, Mary, at least at the beginning of her reign, apparently intended no oppression in her work of restoring the traditional faith and worship. In fact, the mildness with which she entered upon her reign was surprising to some, who had thought that she would reap a terrible revenge. As Fuller commented on the relative positions of both religions--the old and the new:

The protestants had possession on their side, and the protection of the laws lately made by king Edward, and still standing in free and full force unrepealed....

---

<sup>7</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 243.

<sup>8</sup> Daniel Henderson, The Crimson Queen: Mary Tudor (New York: Duffield and Green, 1933), pp. 112-13.

The papists put their ceremonies in execution, presuming on the queen her private practice and public countenance, especially after she had imprisoned some protestant and enlarged some popish bishops, advancing Stephen Gardiner to be lord chancellor.<sup>9</sup>

Therefore, at the beginning of Mary's reign, the two religious ways stood in juxtaposition to each other, with the principle advantage of the Catholic rites being in the queen's personal preference for them.

Queen Mary's first proclamation about religion was published on August 18, 1553.<sup>10</sup> The principal cause of this proclamation was the problem of religious diversity, which evil had plagued the realm in times past and appeared again to be much renewed. "Being now settled on the throne, she declared that she could not hide that religion which she had professed from infancy, and wished others to observe it also; but she would use no compulsion till further orders were taken by common consent, and she warned any would-be disturbers of the peace that they would be severely dealt with."<sup>11</sup> While this document professed toleration, it intimated that persuasion would not always be the only means that the queen would employ. Mary was quite emphatic in stating her belief in the desirability of the restoration of Catholicism, but her declaration that there would be no use of compulsion at the time was moderate, even if a later

---

<sup>9</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 149.

<sup>10</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 373-76, for the text of this document.

<sup>11</sup> Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 318.

use of force could be implied from it. As the proclamation stated:

And yet she doth signify unto all her majesty's loving subjects, that of her most gracious disposition and clemency, her highness minds not to compel any her said subjects thereunto, unto such time as further order, by common assent, may be taken therein; forbidding nevertheless all her subjects of all degrees, at their perils, to move seditions or stir unquietness in her people, by interrupting the laws of this realm after their brains and fancies, but quietly to continue for the time till (as before is said) further order may be taken; and therefore wills and straitly charges and commands all her said good loving subjects to live together in quiet sort and Christian charity, leaving those new-found devilish terms of papist or heretic and such like, and applying their whole care, study, and travail to live in the fear of God, exercising their conversations in such charitable and godly doing, as their lives may indeed express that great hunger and thirst of God's glory and holy word, which by rash talk and words may have pretended; and in so doing as they shall best please God and live without dangers of the laws, and maintain the tranquillity of the realm, whereof her highness shall be most glad, so if any man shall rashly presume to make any assemblies of people, or at any public assemblies or otherwise shall go about to stir the people to disorder or disquiet, she minds, according to her duty, to see the same most severely reformed and punished, according to her highness's laws.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, Mary's first proclamation on religion attempted to adopt a middle position, while favouring Catholicism; the queen, although decreeing that there would be no immediate compulsion concerning religious practices, left the way open for enforcing the rites of the old tradition upon the realm. The proclamation was directed towards ending religious diversity and insuring the peace of the kingdom, and the question was whether these ends would be secured by further

---

<sup>12</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 374.

action that would reunite England with the Church of Rome.

Mary's first parliament met on October 5, 1553, and, in its second session during the later part of October, Mary's first act of repeal was passed.<sup>13</sup> This act repealed nine acts concerning the Church and religion passed in the reign of Edward VI, which action, to all intents and purposes, restored the religious status quo that existed at the death of Henry VIII in 1547. As Stone commented on the passage of this act:

The debate lasted two days in the Lower House, two-thirds of which consisted of friends of the new doctrines. Nevertheless, the bill passed without a division, and Cranmer's ingenious compromise between Catholicism, Lutheranism and Calvinism was abolished.<sup>14</sup>

The purpose of this act was to slow the growth of diversity of religious opinions and sects, which, at least in the judgment of the crown, were causing great unquietness and discord within England. The Act was attacking the innovations in the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England that had been set forth during the reign of Edward VI in the place of the rites of Catholicism. This first act of repeal abolished nine of the acts of King Edward's parliaments, including the two Edwardine Acts of Uniformity, and, having voided the reformation achieved by Cranmer, the act re-established the religious services held at the end of the

---

<sup>13</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 377-80, for the text of this act.

<sup>14</sup> Stone, The History of Mary I., p. 260.

reign of Henry VIII. As the act stated concerning this ritualistic reversal:

And be it further enacted by the authority afore-said, that all such divine service and administration of sacraments as were most commonly used in the realm of England in the last year of the reign of our late Sovereign lord King Henry VIII shall be, from and after the twentieth day of December in this present year of our Lord God 1553, used and frequented throughout the whole realm of England and all other the queen's majesty's dominions; and that no other kind nor order of divine service nor administration of sacraments be, after the said twentieth day of December, used or ministered in any other manner, form, or degree within the said realm of England, or other the queen's dominions, than was most commonly used, ministered, and frequented in the said last year of the reign of the said late King Henry VIII.<sup>15</sup>

Although the ceremonies of Henry's time were restored, there was no mention of papal authority in Mary's first repeal act, and the realm was, instead of being reunited with Rome, returned to the national Catholicism that had been fostered by Henry VIII. Thus White:

That the nation at large would not admit a return to an acknowledgment of papal supremacy was clearly evinced by the reception of Mary's bill for the abrogation of all religious laws passed during her brother's and her father's reigns. Parliament could and did repeal the religious acts passed by Edward's parliaments, it could re-establish a Catholic, non-papal Church, it could restore the Mass and the celibacy of the clergy, but it would countenance no Pope, no punishment for non-conformity, no relinquishment of Abbey lands.<sup>16</sup>

Mary was not able to get her first parliament to agree to the restoration of the papal supremacy over the Church of

---

<sup>15</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 379.

<sup>16</sup> Beatrice White, Mary Tudor (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), p. 229.

England. The first repeal act affected the preceding seven years of religious legislation, but it made no mention of the abolition of the papal authority. Thus, Mary's first repeal act did not complete a Roman Catholic restoration, although it abolished much of the progress of the Reformation.

Having taken the first step towards the restoration of the Roman faith, Mary exercised the royal prerogative to advance beyond the acts of her first parliament. On March 4, 1554, The Marian injunctions were issued by the authority of the queen.<sup>17</sup> Parliament had restored the former worship, but Mary desired further uniformity in the Church of England. "It was time that the former discipline should be restored also; that the canon law, which had been virtually suspended since the submission of the clergy in the days of Henry, should have course again; and that, as the laws allowing marriage of priests had been repealed, married priests should be dealt with, though not so much by a retrospective use of the repealing statute, as by the mere force of the restored discipline."<sup>18</sup> The main discipline that Mary sought to restore was the celibacy of the clergy. Those who were married were to be deprived, and the fruits and profits of their benefices and ecclesiastical promotions were to be sequestered. However, the queen stated that clerical widowers

---

<sup>17</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 380-83, for these injunctions of queen Mary.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Vol. IV (London: Henry Frowde, 1891), p. 132.

and those who would profess to abstain should receive more lenient treatment. The injunctions also brought back some of the ceremonies and traditions of the Church. Some of these injunctions decreed:

11. Item, that all and all manner of processions of the Church be used, frequented, and continued after the old order of the Church, in the Latin tongue.

12. Item, that all such holy days and fasting days be observed and kept, as was observed and kept in the latter time of King Henry VIII.

13. Item, that the laudable and honest ceremonies which were wont to be used, frequented, and observed in the Church be also hereafter frequented, used, and observed.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, the Marian injunctions not only supplemented the acts concerning religion of Mary's first parliament but also extended the queen's movement for the restoration of the English Church with Roman Catholicism.

The reconciliation of England with the Church of Rome, including the acceptance of the papal authority, occurred during the session of Mary's third parliament, which began on November 12, 1554. The arrival of cardinal Pole, the papal legate, at Whitehall on November 24 signified the readiness of the process of re-establishment. On November 28, the cardinal addressed a joint session of parliament assembled at Whitehall and declared the object of his legation. The matter of restoration now passed into the hands of parliament, as Gairdner related:

This the Speaker declared again next day to the Commons, and the two Houses agreed in a supplication to the king

---

<sup>19</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 382.

and queen to procure through the cardinal their pardon from the pope, and reunion with the Church of Rome. This supplication was adopted unanimously by the Lords; in the Commons only one member, Sir Ralph Bagnall, objected, on the ground that he had sworn to the laws of Henry VIII.<sup>20</sup>

On St. Andrew's Day, then, November 30, 1554, the supplication was presented to the queen, and Mary sought the cardinal to absolve the realm from its schism. The cardinal's moment had arrived:

He [Pole] moved to rise; Mary and Philip, seeing that the crisis was approaching, fell on their knees, and the assembly dropped at their example; while, in dead silence, across the dimly-lighted hall came the low, awful words of the absolution.

'Our Lord Jesus Christ, which with his most precious blood hath redeemed and washed us from all our sins and iniquities, that he might purchase unto himself a glorious spouse without spot or wrinkle, whom the Father hath appointed head over all his Church, --he by his mercy absolves you, and we, by apostolic authority given unto us by the Most Holy Lord Pope Julius the Third, his vicegerent [sic] on earth, do absolve and deliver you, and every of you, with this whole realm and the dominions thereof, from all heresy and schism, and from all and every judgment, censure, and pain for that cause incurred; and we do restore you again into the unity of our Mother the Holy Church, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'<sup>21</sup>

Thus, Mary's resolution was rewarded, and the schism of the English Church from Rome was at an end.

With Pole's granting of absolution, the schism was at end, and Mary's parliament carried forth the restoration

---

<sup>20</sup>Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 344-45.

<sup>21</sup>James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Vol. VI (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1860), p. 287.

by passing the second Marian Act of repeal.<sup>22</sup> The act was of such prodigious length that it was not completed and passed until January 4, 1555. It repealed the religious acts passed by parliament during the reign of Henry VIII since 1529. "The effect of the whole Act was to restore the authority of the Pope to what it was before in the realm; and to restore the jurisdiction of the bishops."<sup>23</sup> The papal authority once more encompassed England. After specifically citing acts of Henry's parliaments that were to be repealed, the second repeal act made a general decree against all anti-papal legislation, which was as follows:

And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all clauses, sentences, and articles of every other statute or Act of Parliament, made since the said twentieth year of the reign of King Henry VIII, against the supreme authority of the pope's holiness or See Apostolic of Rome, or containing any other matter of the same effect only, that is repealed in any of the statutes aforesaid, shall be also by authority hereof from henceforth utterly void, frustrate, and of none effect.<sup>24</sup>

Through this second Marian Act of repeal, the papal supremacy was re-established throughout the realm, and the hopes of the former reformers of Henry's and Edward's reigns that Mary would follow a policy of moderation and freedom for the Church of England were doomed.

However, the re-establishment of the papal supremacy

---

<sup>22</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 385-415, for the text of this act.

<sup>23</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. IV, p. 291.

<sup>24</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 392-393.

was not the only objective of the second repeal act, for it was a double statute, and the second part of the act was concerned with the "establishment of all spiritual and ecclesiastical possessions and hereditaments conveyed to the laity." Those who had risen to power through the seizure of Church land and property would tolerate the restoration of Catholicism, but they wanted it made clear that they were to retain title to the lands that had passed from spiritual to secular hands during the reign of Henry VIII. "There was no great objection felt to a return to the old regime if it were made quite clear that the owners of monastic lands were perfectly secure in their titles."<sup>25</sup> In effect, then, the provisions of the act to maintain the former Church lands in lay possession was a measure to insure the realm against disquietude and served to bring about the restoration without further incident. Yet, although the provisions of the repeal act concerning church lands helped to reunite England with Rome, they limited the effect of the restoration, for, without possession of its former lands, the Church could not command the position that it held within the kingdom prior to 1529. The return of the seized monastic lands was to be a matter of personal judgment rather than a requirement of law, and, under these conditions, the English Church regained little of its former property. "No church lands were restored save the few surrendered at the bidding of conscience

---

<sup>25</sup> Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 347.

and nearly all these were surrendered by the Queen."<sup>26</sup> Thus, Mary was able to carry out the sweeping maneuvers that returned England to the old traditions, but, when it came to reconstructing the practical details of the restoration of Catholicism--such as the return of the Church lands, the queen was beset with many difficulties.

The re-establishment of Catholicism, through the acts of repeal and the absolution given by cardinal Pole, granted Mary an ample basis for taking more direct action against the reformers. Parliament aided her cause by passing an act on December 18, 1554 to revive the former heresy acts that had been directed against the Lollards. This revival act follows:

For the eschewing and avoiding of errors and heresies, which of late have risen, grown, and much increased within this realm, for that the ordinaries have wanted authority to proceed against those that were infected therewith: be it therefore ordained and enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the statute made in the fifth year of the reign of King Richard II, concerning the arresting and apprehension of erroneous and heretical preachers, and one other statute made in the second year of the reign of King Henry IV, concerning the repressing of heresies and punishment of heretics, and also one other statute made in the second year of the reign of King Henry V, concerning the suppression of heresy and Lollardy, and every article, branch, and sentence contained in the same three several Acts, and every of them, shall from the twentieth day of January next coming be revived, and be in full force, strength, and effect to all intents, constructions, and purposes for ever.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 107.

<sup>27</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 384.

Through the revival of these former heresy acts, Mary and the civil authority received the means for taking punitive action against those of a Protestant persuasion, whether they were reformers or nonconformists. Albeit the restoration of Catholicism had been the queen's primary goal, the re-establishment brought justification for establishing uniformity of belief under the papal authority, for this had been the old way. The realization of Mary's fondest religious desires was the unquestioning allegiance of her kingdom to the Church of Rome. If the fulfillment of these desires necessitated the use of force and persecution under the revived heresy acts, Mary was prepared to take these steps for the benefit of her realm and the greater glory of God.

Certainly, Mary had sufficient grounds for repression of the prominent reformers and nonconformists on charges of treason, stemming from the attempt to change the succession, but the queen preferred prosecution for heresy. As Clayton commented:

Had Cranmer and Ridley been executed as traitors, such men [Anglican Protestants] could have urged no ground for complaint. Both these prelates had endeavoured to exclude Mary from the throne in spite of her acknowledged right of succession. Both were involved in the plot of Northumberland for giving the crown to Lady Jane Grey. It was recognised that death was the penalty for treason--where treason failed. But Mary Tudor thought very little of treason and very gravely of heresy. To have plotted to keep her from becoming queen was but a small matter when compared with the persistence of these bishops--all of them ordained as Catholic priests--in declaiming publicly against the Mass and against the doctrine of Transubstantiation.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain,

Mary's predominant interest in the destruction of heresy, to the practical exclusion of treason, was a departure from the practice of her father, Henry VIII, who had charged papal Catholics with treason and Protestants with heresy. The emphasis of Mary's onslaught against the Protestants was on the doctrinal question of transubstantiation, which was certainly not as strong a point of attack as treason, for any ritualistic problem was opened, by its very nature, to varying interpretations. In other words, there was greater room for doubt in the minds of the people, when persecutions were conducted over doctrinal issues instead of for disloyalty to the civil authority. As Carter stated:

It should be carefully borne in mind that these Marian martyrs were condemned for heresy, and not for treason or disloyalty to the Government...and that the chief point in their "heresy" was the denial of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Although they were required to accept the supremacy of the Pope, a glance at their trials will show that it was their views on the Eucharist which was the main point at issue.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, the Marian persecutions were not based on treason nor on the denial of the papal authority but were instead conducted over the inflammatory issue of the corporal presence or transubstantiation.

The scope of the Marian persecutions was prodigious, and the fires were lit and re-lit throughout England, as high and low alike went to the flames for their beliefs. The number that suffered their final agonies during the last years of Mary's reign has been variously estimated to be

---

<sup>29</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 103.

between 250 and 350 persons; Thomas Brice, in The Register of the Martyrs published in 1559, set the figure at 292.<sup>30</sup>

Nor were the persecutions limited to the living alone during the reign of "Bloody" Mary. "War was waged not only on the living but on the dead: At Cambridge the bodies of Bucer and Fagius were exhumed and burnt at the stake; the body of 'Peter Martyr's' wife, Catherine Cathie, was cast upon the dunghill of the dean of Christ Church; the body of John Tooley, who had been executed for robbery, was dug up and burnt because the malefactor had denounced the bishop of Rome as he stood by the gallows."<sup>31</sup> However, the Marian persecutions, whether of the living or the dead, did not bring peace and unity to England. "The result of the policy of persecution was not the peace that had been hoped, but a fiercer outburst of recrimination, violence, and treasonous publications."<sup>32</sup> The Protestants gained solidarity through their persecution by the forces of Catholicism, much to the unrest and disquietude of the realm. In fact, Mary's heresy policy, instead of uniting her kingdom, produced a greater division between the people

---

<sup>30</sup> See Thomas Brice, The Register of the Martyrs, as reprinted in Tudor Tracts: 1532-1588 (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1903), pp. 259-88. A. F. Pollard, in his introduction to Tudor Tracts, stated that Brice's tract was published at London in 1559 and that, as it was written some years before Foxe's Book of Martyrs and almost immediately after Mary's death, it is probably the most trustworthy list we possess.

<sup>31</sup> Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, p. 553.

<sup>32</sup> H. F. M. Prescott, Mary Tudor (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953), p. 303.

and the English Church. So Powicke:

The result was a cleavage between laity and clergy; the ashes of three hundred martyrs lay between them. The episcopal bench and the ranks of the clergy could be purged, but the laity remained as they had always been.<sup>33</sup>

The people were shocked by the large number burnt and by the burning of bishops; instead of feeling increased loyalty to the Church of Rome, they were seized by a sense of revulsion. Thus, Mary's policy of persecution resulted in a greater alienation of the common people from the English Church.

Although many of the prominent Protestant leaders perished in the queen's fires--notably Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer, others were able to escape to the continent, where they became known as the Marian exiles. However, many of the exiles who escaped by flight the extremity of the persecution, did little by their conduct to add to the safety of the bolder or less fortunate Protestants who remained in England. As Dixon commented:

Some of them, like Becon, left behind them, or as they fled discharged, like Bale, a drench of bitter language upon the Latin Mass and the other observances, which their brethren were opposing at the peril of their lives. Some of them, as Ponet and Knox, wrote political books and libels in which the character and the rule of the Queen and the Spaniard were handled with equal freedom: some were not unconcerned with the plots.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 108.

<sup>34</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. IV, p. 684.

Not only did the direct actions of the exiles endanger those who had remained behind, but they also indirectly exposed many of their brethren at home through their endeavour to raise money to supply those abroad and the continued intercourse between them. In attacking the queen, the exiles often adopted extreme positions. Thus Grimm:

The most radical of the many attacks made by the exiles upon Queen Mary came from the pen of John Ponet, formerly bishop of Winchester, whose A Shorte Treatise of Politike Power was published in 1556, probably at Strassburg. Like Francis Hotman, who was also a resident at Strassburg at that time and who later published the Franco-Gallia, Ponet argued that the individual Christian must obey God rather than the inferior civil power. If necessary, he may go so far as to kill a tyrant if God gives him the command.<sup>35</sup>

Of course, the application of Ponet's political theory to the religious problem in England could only add to the unquietness of the realm. His theory advanced a justification of rebellion on religious grounds--under the command of God. However, Mary, with her ultimate belief in the right of the restoration, could not allow the doctrine of Ponet's theory to interfere with the use of the civil authority in the re-establishment of Catholicism, and she, of necessity, used persecution and suppression to prove the position of the royal authority was above political theorizing. Thus, the Marian exiles, in attacking the restoration from their position of safety on foreign shores, did

---

<sup>35</sup> Grimm, The Reformation Era, pp. 463-64.

little to aid the cause of their persecuted brethren in England.

One of the most interesting aspects concerning the Marian exiles was the dissensions that arose among them, for these Protestants, who had fled from persecution of their beliefs, could hardly agree on the basic tenets of doctrine, once they were secure across the sea. "The very Book of prayers, service, and offices which their countrymen at home were braving gaols and faggots to defend, was to them the cause of strife: it was depraved and abandoned by some of them: and it could not be forgotten afterwards that the controversy concerning the worship of the Church, behind which lay the question of Church government, had been carried to extremity among them in a mean and miserable contest."<sup>36</sup> The pettiness of their arguments, which even reached the rationalization that they should not observe the Book of Common Prayer because it had been forbidden by the government of Mary in England, brought discredit to the very principles their brethren were dying for at home. Lacking a truly unifying force, the Marian exiles, though perhaps unwittingly, followed the path to theological diversity.

Perhaps, the most striking example of religious diversity and controversy among the Marian exiles was the congregation at Frankfort, Germany. The English exiles were admitted there on the understanding that they would come to

---

<sup>36</sup>

Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. IV, pp. 685-86.

an agreement in point of doctrine with the French Protestants led by Valérand Poullain. "This led to a reconsideration of the English service-book, already once revised at home, and the omission in use of many details in the administration of the sacraments as superfluous and superstitious."<sup>37</sup> This reconsideration of the prayer book brought subsequent abrogations of the service by the exiles at Frankfort. As Fuller has related concerning the changes they wrought:

i. They concluded that the answering aloud after the minister should not be used.

ii. The litany, surplice, and other ceremonies in service and sacraments, they omitted both as superfluous and superstitious.

iii. In place of the English confession, they used another, adjudged by them of more effect, and framed according to the state and time.

iv. The same ended, the people sung a psalm in metre, in a plane tune.

v. That done, the minister prayed for assistance of God's Spirit, and so proceeded to the sermon.

vi. After sermon, a general prayer for all states, and particularly for England, was devised, which was ended with the Lord's prayer.

vii. Then followed a rehearsal of the articles of belief; which ended, the people sung another psalm, as before.

viii. Lastly, the minister pronounced the blessing, "The peace of God" etc., or the like; and so the people departed.<sup>38</sup>

The Marian exiles at Frankfort had adopted a more extreme Protestant position than the one set forth by Cranmer in the second Book of Common Prayer. In keeping with this extreme position and after they had failed to secure Haddon, the

---

<sup>37</sup> Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, p. 391.

<sup>38</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, pp. 209-10.

Frankfort congregation brought John Knox from Geneva to be their minister. Also, many of the members of this congregation had English copies of the bare Genevan service, which went well with their growing dislike of ceremonies. "This Genevan form was offered to Knox for public use; but he wisely refused to use it unless it were accepted by the other English churches; and, as he could not use the Prayer Book of England, there was a deadlock for a short time, before the arrival of the ambulatory Lever: Who being elected one of the ministers, assembled the congregation, and proposed to their consent an order of his own, to be on trial with himself for three months."<sup>39</sup> However, it was found that Lever's form was not altogether fit for a right reformed Church, and the congregation chose to disregard it. Because of the unsettled state of this controversy over which form of worship to use, the Book of Common Prayer was submitted to Calvin for his judgment as to its fitness as a service book. As Fuller has related on Calvin's opinion:

Take Mr. Calvin's judgement herein from his own letter, bearing date the 20th of January [1556] following:  
 "In the Liturgy of England I see there are many tolerable foolish things; by these words I mean, that there is not that purity which were to be desired. These vices, though they could not at the first day be amended, yet, seeing there was no manifest impiety, they were for a season to be tolerated. Therefore it was lawful to begin of such rudiments or abcedaries, but so that it behoved the learned, grave, and Godly ministers of Christ to enterprise further, and to set forth something more filed from rust, and purer."

---

<sup>39</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. IV, p. 691.

This struck such a stroke, especially in the congregation of Frankfort, that some therein, who formerly partly approved, did afterward wholly dislike, and moe, who formerly disliked, did now detest, the English Liturgy.<sup>40</sup>

In Calvin's opinion, the Book of Common Prayer was trifling and childish, but the worst that he believed it to contain were tolerabiles ineptiae. Backed by this judgment, Knox drew up a new order of worship, but a second party in the congregation, led by Dr. Richard Cox, would not agree to Knox's work. In the struggle that followed, Knox lost and eventually returned to Geneva, while the remainder of the congregation stayed in Frankfort and used the revised English form. Thus, the Marian exiles, far from remaining steadfast to the belief they left England to avoid being persecuted for, tried, for the most part, varying forms of worship that tended towards extreme Protestant positions and that would provide further religious diversity in England.

Mary, the restorer of Catholicism--the "Crimson Queen" of persecution, died on November 17, 1558. Never had a person been so dedicated as Mary was to the reuniting of the Church of England with Rome. Clayton commented:

For the one steady purpose that held Mary Tudor throughout the short five years of her reign, a purpose from which she could not be turned, was the restoration of the Catholic Faith in England and the return of the English people to the Catholic unity. It was a purpose hateful to a minority, no less resolutely set on the establishment of new forms of faith. Zealously Mary held to her purpose, and was sustained by it. Neither the implacable opposition of Protestants, of all

---

<sup>40</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 215.

denominations, nor the doubtful attitude of the landlords of abbey lands could persuade Mary Tudor that anything was of such urgent importance as the return to the Faith.<sup>41</sup>

Because of her utter devotion to the cause of the restoration and the Catholic unity of the realm, Mary turned loose the forces of persecution. If the fires had to be lit and re-lit day after day, the queen was prepared to pay that cost for her goal of a complete re-establishment of the Catholic faith. "For the first and last time the true Ultramontane spirit was dominant in England; the genuine conviction that, as the orthodox prophets and sovereigns of Israel slew the worshippers of Baal, so were Catholic rulers called upon, as their first duty, to extirpate heretics as the enemies of God and man."<sup>42</sup> So great was the crown's sense of duty that a figure of around 300 Protestants was not too high an estimation of the effect of the policy of persecution. As Fuller has said of the plight of the Protestants:

In David's expression, there was but a step between them and death [1 Sam. xx. 3.]; which step also had been stepped, had not one instantly stepped aside; I mean the seasonable death of queen Mary.<sup>43</sup>

Certainly, the death of Mary greatly eased the minds of Protestants, and the policy of force and fire had served to

<sup>41</sup>Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 113.

<sup>42</sup>Froude, History of England, Vol. VI, p. 530.

<sup>43</sup>Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 200.

arouse the common people against the Church of Rome. It was ironic that the persecutions carried on for the sake of unity brought greater discord, but such was the case. "Sermons from the stake had been far more convincing than sermons from the pulpit."<sup>44</sup> Thus, albeit she had devoted her whole energy to the cause, Mary had been unable to restore Catholic faith and unity throughout the realm, and the Protestants profited more from the persecutions than did the Church of Rome.

---

<sup>44</sup> Balleine, The Laymen's History of the Church of England, p. 120.

CHAPTER V  
ELIZABETH I

With the death of Mary on November 17, 1558, Elizabeth I, the last and the greatest of the Tudors, ascended the throne of England. When she succeeded her half-sister, there was no hint of the splendor that would enhance her reign. The realm was divided by the religious controversy, and the treasury was to all practical purposes empty. However, Elizabeth was a Tudor, and her predecessors had overcome what were almost as insurmountable difficulties. As Black commented on her appearance and character:

As for the queen, what contemporaries saw was a tall, 'comely rather than handsome' woman of twenty-five summers, with fair hair, 'fine' eyes, and a delicate 'olive' complexion. While, in some respects, she took after her mother, Anne Boleyn, her temperament and bearing were those of her imperious father, in whom, we are told, she 'gloried'. Close beneath her winsome, debonaire exterior lay the terribilita of the Tudor 'lion'.<sup>1</sup>

Elizabeth maintained the traditional Tudor characteristics of charm and temperament, and hers was a commanding presence.

"Authority rather than dignity characterized her manner."<sup>2</sup>

Albeit she swore like a man, Elizabeth's dress was strictly

---

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Black, The Reign of Elizabeth: 1558-1603 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup>Katharine Anthony, Queen Elizabeth (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929), p. 78.

feminine, for rings, fans, combs, embroidery, pearls, veils, and laces garnished her daily attire. Thus, despite the fact that her life had bred suspicion as her second nature, Elizabeth was endowed with this world's wisdom--resourceful, self-reliant, prudent, and morally courageous in moments of crisis.

At least until the time of her coronation--January 15, 1559--Elizabeth was an unknown quantity. It was a certainty that she would make changes, but what shape, form, or directions these innovations would take could only be considered within the broad frame of possibility. Religious changes were considered imminent, but what position would be adopted was not known. "Elizabeth continued to attend mass, although she ordered Bishop Oglethorpe, the only bishop whom she could persuade to perform the coronation ceremony, not to elevate the Host."<sup>3</sup> The queen had previously asked Bishop Oglethorpe not to elevate the Host on Christmas day, 1558, and, on his refusal to mutilate the rubric in this way, she left the chapel as soon as the reading of the Gospel was concluded. At the service subsequent to the coronation, Elizabeth once more left before the elevation of the Host, as Oglethorpe refused her command, and she refused to receive communion in one kind only, according to the traditional rite. Yet, it was regarded as a certainty that the queen was definitely not in favour of the prevailing Calvinism of the time. Religious changes were a necessity, as the disorder of the status quo could not long be maintained, but the form that

---

<sup>3</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 115.

they would assume was unknown.

With Elizabeth, as with her father, the concept of the royal supremacy was a vital part of the functional operation of the civil authority. The first overt invocation of the royal supremacy in religious matters was the proclamation to forbid preaching issued on December 27, 1558.<sup>4</sup> This proclamation permitted certain parts of the service (Gospel, Epistle, Ten Commandments, Litany, Lord's Prayer, and the Creed) to be in English, and it limited teaching and preaching by lay and clerical officials alike to these aforementioned parts of the service that were to be given in the vernacular tongue. "The prohibition seemed to be aimed at restraining Protestant hotheads, but it equally achieved the purpose of silencing Catholic preachers and crippling their power for making mischief."<sup>5</sup> Through her exercise of the royal supremacy, Elizabeth had effectively limited both religious extremes from advancing their doctrinal proposals upon the nation at large. According to the proclamation, its purpose in limiting preaching and forwarding services in the vulgar language was the advancement of religion within the realm. As the act stated:

The true advancement whereof to the due honour of Almighty God, the increase of virtue and godliness, with universal charity and concord amongst her people, her

---

<sup>4</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 416-17, for the text of this proclamation.

<sup>5</sup>J. E. Neale, Queen Elizabeth (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1934), p. 58.

majesty most desireth, and meaneth effectually, by all manner of means possible, to procure and to restore to this her realm.<sup>6</sup>

All offenders to the queen's proclamation to advance religion through limiting preaching were to be duly punished, both for the offense and as an example to prevent any further disobedience to "her majesty's so reasonable commandment". Thus, Elizabeth had, through her proclamation, placed the control of religion in the hands of the civil authority--the queen and parliament, for she had effectively restricted religious extremes by decreeing what should be preached and in what language.

Elizabeth's first parliament opened on January 25, 1559, and it appeared that alterations in religion were to be submitted to the judgment of the nation's representatives. "Sir Nicholas Bacon, in his opening speech, explained that 'her Majesty's desire was to secure and unite the people of the realm in one uniform order to the glory of God and to general tranquillity'; and for this purpose she required them to avoid 'contumelious and opprobrious words, as heretic, schismatic, and papist, as causes of displeasure and malice, enemies to concord and unity, the very marks they were now to shoot at'."<sup>7</sup> The queen was seeking unity of religion in her kingdom, but she wished to avoid a general uproar and controversy in the process, if possible. This first act passed by

---

<sup>6</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 417.

<sup>7</sup>Black, The Reign of Elizabeth, p. 9.

parliament towards this goal was the Act of Supremacy of 1559.<sup>8</sup> This act was one of repeal and revival, for it repealed the great statute of Philip and Mary that had restored the papal jurisdiction, and, at the same time, it specifically revived ten statutes of Henry VIII, although it confirmed the repeal of all the other statutes of Henry that had passed from law during the reign of Philip and Mary. "The effect of this confirmation of repeal was to annul the title of Supreme Head, and at the same time to render necessary some new machinery to secure the royal supremacy in things ecclesiastical."<sup>9</sup> The first step in this securing of the royal supremacy was the annexation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the crown. As the act stated:

And that also it may likewise please your highness, that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority have heretofore been, or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall forever, by authority of this present Parliament, be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.<sup>10</sup>

Through the Supremacy Act, the crown had been granted the rights of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which were a natural

---

<sup>8</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 442-58, for the text of this act.

<sup>9</sup> Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Vol. V (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902), pp. 58-59.

<sup>10</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 447.

corollary to the concept of the royal supremacy.

As the Act of Supremacy also abolished all foreign jurisdiction and authority within the realm, an oath of supremacy was devised and required of all office holders, spiritual and temporal. The oath denied all foreign jurisdiction, without referring specifically to the Bishop of Rome, and it furthered the cause of royal authority in religious matters. The oath stated:

'I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that the queen's highness is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other her highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, has, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the queen's highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges, and authorities granted or belonging to the queen's highness, her heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm. So help me God, and by the contents of this book.'<sup>11</sup>

The queen was acknowledged by this oath to be supreme governor of all things, both civil and ecclesiastical, within the royal jurisdiction. While those who attacked the supremacy were liable to the penalties of treason on the third offense, the supremacy oath was not as comprehensive as that required during the reign of Henry VIII. "Henry's oath of supremacy

---

<sup>11</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 449.

might be tendered to any subject, and to decline it was high treason; Elizabeth's oath was to be obligatory only on persons holding spiritual or temporal office under the Crown, and the penalty for declining was the loss of such office."<sup>12</sup> The Elizabethan oath, although not as harsh as that of Henry, provided effective governmental control by demanding the sworn loyalty of all persons holding spiritual or secular office. Thus, the Supremacy act restored the concept of the royal supremacy over the ecclesiastical as well as the temporal realm, regaining what had been lost or given away during Mary's reign, and it re-invoked the principle of no foreign jurisdiction or authority (especially papal) in England.

In midsummer of 1559, the progress of religious reform was carried further through the injunctions of Elizabeth.<sup>13</sup> These injunctions were based on the injunctions of Edward VI that were issued in 1547; however, there were some differences between them, which were wrought by the course of time. "Edward insulted, but Elizabeth not, the old usages by several somewhat contemptuous expressions: Edward enumerated some customs or ceremonies which, having ceased, were not rehearsed by Elizabeth: while Elizabeth repeated Edward's rebukes of some which may, having ceased, have been restored by Mary."<sup>14</sup> Elizabeth softened the harsh coarseness of Edward's

---

<sup>12</sup> Edward Spencer Beesly, Queen Elizabeth (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1906), p. 14.

<sup>13</sup> See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 417-42, for the text of Elizabeth's injunctions.

<sup>14</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, pp. 131-32.

injunctions, and, through her "new" injunctions--those items that did not appear in Edward's decrees, she brought further scope to the command of the civil authority over the ecclesiastical jurisdiction under the doctrine of the royal supremacy. Some of the more important of these injunctions were as follows:

II. Besides this, to the intent that all superstition and hypocrisy crept into divers men's hearts may vanish away, they shall not set forth or extol the dignity of any images, relics, or miracles; but, declaring the abuse of the same, they shall teach that all goodness, health, and grace ought to be both asked and looked for only of God, as of the very Author and Giver of the same, and of none other.

III. Item, that they, the persons above rehearsed, shall preach in their churches, and every other cure they have, one sermon every month of the year at the least, wherein they shall purely and sincerely declare the word of God, and in the same exhort their hearers to the works of faith, as mercy and charity especially prescribed and commanded in Scripture; and that the works devised by man's fantasies, besides Scripture (as wandering of pilgrimages, setting up of candles, praying upon beads, or such like superstition), have not only no promise of reward in Scripture for doing of them, but contrariwise great threatenings and maledictions of God, for that they being things tending to idolatry and superstition, which of all other offences God Almighty doth most detest and abhor, for that the same most diminish His honour and glory.

.....  
 XXIII. Also, that they shall take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses; preserving nevertheless, or repairing both the walls and glass windows; and they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses.

.....  
 XXXI. Item, that no man shall wilfully and obstinately defend or maintain any heresies, errors, or false doctrine, contrary to the faith of Christ and His Holy Spirit.  
 .....

XXXVII. Item, that no man shall talk or reason of the Holy Scriptures rashly or contentiously, nor maintain any false doctrine or error, but shall commune of the same, when occasion is given, reverently, humbly, and in the fear of God, for his comfort and better understanding.

.....  
 [The injunctions closed with four appended directions, part of which was as follows:]

Item, where also it was in the time of King Edward VI used to have the sacramental bread of common fine bread, it is ordered for the more reverence to be given to these holy mysteries, being the sacraments of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that the same sacramental bread be made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon, of the same fineness and fashion round, though somewhat bigger in compass and thickness, as the usual bread and water, heretofore named singing cakes which served for the use of the private Mass.<sup>15</sup>

Elizabeth's injunctions reiterated the supremacy of the civil authority throughout her realm, for they were specifically dictated decrees for ordering religious matters in England. Those of the old traditions that were re-established by Mary (especially those that tended to redevelop superstition) were dropped, along with the symbols of complex ceremonies. However, there was, at least to some extent, a compromising nature explicit in the injunctions. This was reflected in the appended direction about the sacramental bread. "Concerning the Sacramental bread, the direction of the Prayer Book, which these Injunctions enforced, that it should be 'such as is usual to be eaten at table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread,' was set aside by an order of these Injunctions themselves, that it should be the same as the bread and wafer that served for the private Mass;

---

<sup>15</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 419-40.

but somewhat bigger and thicker."<sup>16</sup> This setting aside of the Book of Common Prayer represented the establishment of a further order in the Church through the royal supremacy, and it was a compromise measure, for it retreated from the advanced Edwardine position that had been established in the prayer book to a middle way between the old and the new. Thus, the queen's injunctions helped to provide for more direct royal control over ecclesiastical matters.

The most prominent overt action taken by the forces of Catholicism against the royal supremacy was the rebellion in the North of 1569.

Thomas Piercy, earl of Northumberland, and Charles Nevil, earl of Westmoreland, brake out into open rebellion against the queen; lords of right noble extraction and large revenue, whose titles met with their estates in the northern parts, and indeed the height of their honour was more than the depths of their judgment. These intended to restore the Romish religion, set free the queen of Scots, pretending much zeal for the liberty of the people and honour of the nation, complaining of queen Elizabeth her neglect of the ancient nobility, and advancing mean persons to the places of highest trust and command; though indeed, could she have made her noblemen wise, as she did her wise men noble, these earls had never undertaken this rebellion.<sup>17</sup>

The movement gained force and momentum, as the rebels moved towards Durham under the banners of the old religion. "As soone as they entred Durham, they went to the minister, where they tare the bible, communion bookes, and other such as were

---

<sup>16</sup> Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, pp. 136-37.

<sup>17</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 345.

there."<sup>18</sup> The rebels' purpose was the restoration of the Marian religion, and they started by destroying what outward signs of the new order they could. Their principal demands were liberty of conscience--that Catholics might hear Mass and not attend Protestant services, and the release of Mary queen of Scots and her recognition as successor to Elizabeth. They forced towns to assemble and join their cause, armed and unarmed alike, under threat of burning and spoiling. However, with the arrival of royal forces in the field, their faith in their cause was not enough to sustain them. It appeared the rebels had only had the bravado of the unopposed. "But hearing how the garrisons of Carlisle and Berwick were manned against them on their backs, and the earl of Sussex [Thomas Ratcliffe] advancing out of the south with an army to oppose them, their spirits quickly sunk; and being better armed than disciplined, wanting expert commanders, (how easily is a rout routed!) they fled northwards, mouldered away without standing a battle."<sup>19</sup> With the disintegration of their rebellion, the two leaders, Northumberland and Westmoreland, fled to presumably safer parts. Westmoreland escaped into Flanders, but Northumberland, after fleeing to Scotland, was sold to the English by the new Scottish Regent, Morton, and subsequently beheaded at York on August 22, 1572. Elizabeth was determined that all thoughts of rebellion must

---

<sup>18</sup> Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Vol. IV, p. 235.

<sup>19</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 346.

be driven out of the minds of the people who lived in the area where the uprising occurred. According to Dixon:

The vengeance taken by the Queen upon the population of the region of the rebellion was horrible. When fear and resentment stirred a Tudor, up sprang a fountain of blood. The revenge of Henry after the Pilgrimage of Grace, of Mary after the rebellion of Wyatt, was not more ferocious than Elizabeth's visitation of Northumberland's insurrection.<sup>20</sup>

It was estimated that nearly a thousand persons in the region met death because of the rebellion, and it was feared that new commotions would be started out of sheer despair. It was said that the number of offenders was so great that there were few innocent left to try the guilty. Thus, rebellion was met with death and ruin; Elizabeth had proven that the power of the royal supremacy could withstand the direct assault of the forces of Catholicism and preserve the control of the civil authority over ecclesiastical matters.

Elizabeth's reign was not marked by the persecutions for heresy that so dominated Mary's rule. One reason for this was the measure of persuasion that was used to enforce church attendance. Clayton tells us:

The laity were persuaded to attend the new Anglican service by a method hitherto unknown in the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline. They were taxed for non-attendance.<sup>21</sup>

The tax was kept just high enough that it was economically feasible for the people to attend rather than pay the government

---

<sup>20</sup>Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Vol. VI (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902), pp. 237-38.

<sup>21</sup>Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 134.

for not going. The continual income drain caused by this tax made non-attendance the option of the wealthy only, and it lowered the Catholic resources in England while adding economic strength to the system they were opposing. However, Elizabeth was not unprepared to take sterner measures against heresy, but, as heresy was an act of resistance to the royal supremacy and the civil authority in matters ecclesiastical, heretics were prosecuted for treason against the realm. In the words of Powicke:

After the first clean sweep of the episcopal bench and the first visitations, there was little persecution of any kind until the later years of Elizabeth's reign; and the Catholic and Protestant martyrs of those years were the willing or unwilling victims of the laws which protected the Queen against treason or the Church against schism. That they died for their faith they could truly claim, and legal argument about the occasion of their death may well appear to be callous and ironical quibbling in the presence of their heroic suffering. Yet it was of great moment for the future of toleration that in the eye of contemporary law their religion made them traitors, to use Champion's phrase, and not heretics.<sup>22</sup>

Through the force of law, those who disagreed with the dogma of the Church of England were guilty of treason. Not only did the concept of toleration begin with prosecution for disobedience to the laws of the state, instead of for personal belief, but also Elizabeth's reign avoided the stigma that had earned her predecessor the name of "Bloody" Mary. Also, resistance to the attendance requirements could lead to treason for supporting a foreign power; Clayton tells us:

Non-attendance at the Protestant Sunday morning service in church was a sign of allegiance to the pope, the pope

---

<sup>22</sup>Powicke, The Reformation in England, pp. 124-25.

who had declared Elizabeth to be no queen. Therefore non-attendance was sheer disloyalty to the queen, and disloyalty was high treason.<sup>23</sup>

After Elizabeth's excommunication of Pius V in 1569, a sterner view was held against non-attendance, and, as the Pope was considered a foreign "prince", attendance at church services was one way to prove one's innocence of treason by the Catholic belief in papal supremacy. Thus, Elizabeth, through the concept of the royal supremacy, persecuted for treason those who would have been found guilty of heresy by the standards of the previous reign, and, in this way, the queen avoided the popular revulsion that was felt towards the policies of her half-sister.

The beginnings of the Elizabethan reform of doctrine and ritual in the Church of England was seen in the passage of the Act of Uniformity by parliament in 1559.<sup>24</sup> The purpose of the act was to re-establish formal doctrine and ritual for the Church through the revival of the Book of Common Prayer. As this restoration of the prayer book came immediately after the Act of Supremacy, it may have been intended to avoid the violent debate that had attended the question of the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters. "At such a moment relief might be found in what could be called a mere act of restoration, and the Edwardian Book,

---

<sup>23</sup>Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 157.

<sup>24</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 458-67, for the text of this act.

however unfamiliar, was already ennobled by the blood of martyrs."<sup>25</sup> Rather than create further controversy by the drafting of a new prayer book, the Act of Uniformity revived the little known second prayer book of the reign of Edward VI. The act stated:

Where at the death of our late sovereign lord King Edward VI there remained one uniform order of common service and prayer, and of the administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies in the Church of England, which was set forth in one book intituled: The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies in the Church of England; authorized by Act of Parliament holden in the fifth and sixth years of our said late sovereign lord King Edward VI, intituled: An Act for the uniformity of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments; the which was repealed and taken away by Act of Parliament in the first year of the reign of our late sovereign lady Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion:

Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the said statute of repeal, and everything therein contained, only concerning the said book, and the service, administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies contained or appointed in or by the said book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming; and that the said book, with the order of service, and of the administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies, with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this statute, shall stand and be, from and after the said feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, in full force and effect, according to the tenor and effect of this statute; anything in the aforesaid statute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding.<sup>26</sup>

The Act of Uniformity, in addition to restoring the Book of Common Prayer, also imposed a fine of a shilling a Sunday for non-attendance of the re-established services. In this way, the restored doctrine was supported by economic pressure on

---

<sup>25</sup>F. W. Maitland, "The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation," The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II (Cambridge: The University Press, 1934), p. 569.

<sup>26</sup>Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 458-59.

the populace for obedience. Thus, the Act of Uniformity expedited the settlement of doctrinal worship without causing a great religious controversy through the restoration of the second Edwardine Book of Common Prayer.

Although the Elizabethan prayer book was a revival of the Edwardine prayer book of 1552, there were several important alterations. Procter points out:

The first rubric now directed 'the Morning and Evening Prayer to be used in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel,' instead of 'in such place as the people may best hear'. The second rubric had forbidden all ecclesiastical vestments but the rochet and the surplice: the minister was now directed, at the time of Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, to use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of K. Edward VI. In the Litany the words, 'from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities,' were omitted; and the suffrage for the Queen was altered by the addition of the words, strengthen in the true worshipping of thee, in righteousness, and holiness of life.<sup>27</sup>

The accustomed place meant for the saying of prayers was the choir, where the prayers were said during the three and a half years that the first Edwardine prayer book was in use. The ornaments rubric brought back the Eucharistic vestments and repealed the prohibition against wearing alb, vestment, or cope of 1552. The removal of the strong language used against the Apostolic See was part of the general tendency of Elizabeth to seek a middle way in religious matters and avoid the pitfalls that extreme positions were heir to. Yet, one of the points of compromise of the Edwardine prayer book was

---

<sup>27</sup> Procter, A History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 59.

dropped from the Elizabethan service. "The 'black rubric' at the end of the Communion Service was omitted."<sup>28</sup> The non-conformists would have to accept the kneeling at communion without the rationale of this rubric. However, the most important change in the Elizabethan prayer book was, perhaps, the alteration made in the communion service. The service in the prayer book of Elizabeth was as follows:

Then shall the priest knelynge downe at Gods borde say in the name of all them that shall receyue the communion, this prayer folowing.

We do not presume to come to this thy table (O Merciful Lorde) trustinge in oure owne rightuousnesse, but in thy manifolde and greate mercies, we be not worthy so muche as to gather up the crōmes under thy Table, but thou arte the same Lord, whose property is alwaies to have mercy. Graunt us therefore gracious Lorde, so to eate the fleshe of thy deare sonne Jesus Christ, and to drinke his bloude, that oure synful bodies may be made cleane by his body and our soules washed through his most precious bloud, and that we may euermore dwell in him, and he in us.

Then the priest standing up, shal say as foloweth.

Almighty God our heauenly father whiche of thy tender mercye, diddest geue thine onely Sonne Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Crosse for our redēption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered,) a ful perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the synnes of the whole worlde, and didde institute, and in his holy gospel commaunde us to continue a perpetual memory of that his precious deathe, untyll his comminge againe: Heare us O merciful father, we besech thee, and graunt that we receiuyng these thy creatures of breade and wine, accordinge to thy sonne cure sauicour Jesu Christes holy institution, in remembraunce of his death and passion, may be partakers of his moste blessed body and bloude, who in the same night that he was betrayed, toke bread, and when he had geuen thankes, he brake it, and gaue it to his disciples, saying: Take, eate, this is my bodie, whiche is geuen for you. Doe this in remembraunce of me. Likewise after supper, he toke the cuppe, and when he had geuen thankes, he gaus it to them, saying: Drinke ye all of this, for this is my

---

<sup>28</sup> Balleine, The Layman's History of the Church of England, p. 121.

bloude of the new Testament, whiche is shedde for you and for many, for remission of sinnes, doe this as oft as ye shall drinke it, in remembraunce of me.

Then shall the minister fyrste receyue the Communion in both kyndes him selfe, and next deliuer it to other Ministers (yf any be there present, that they may helpe the chief minister) and after to the people in their handes kneling. And when he deliuereth the breade, he shall saye.

The bodie of our lord Jesu Christ which was geuen for thee, preserue thy body and soule into euerlastinge life, and take, and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ died for thee, feede on him in thine heart by faith with thankes geuyng.

And the minister that deliuereth the cuppe shall saye.

The bloude of our lorde Jesu Christ which was shedd for thee, preserue thy body and soule into euerlasting life. And drinke this in remembraunce that Christes bloude was shedde for thee, and be thankful.

Then shal the priest say the Lordes prayer, the people repetyng after hym euery peticion.<sup>29</sup>

The Elizabethan communion service was a combination of the services of the two prayer books of Edward's reign. As Beesly commented:

The first sentence, implying real presence, belonged to Edward's first Prayer-book; the second, implying mere commemoration, belonged to his second Prayer-book. The Prayer-book of 1559 simply pieced the two together with a view to satisfy both Catholics and Protestants.<sup>30</sup>

The first Prayer book of Edward that was reconcilable with the dogma of Catholicism and the second Edwardine Book of Common Prayer that represented the denial of the doctrine

---

<sup>29</sup>The Book of Common Prayer: Commonly Called the First Book of Queen Elizabeth, Printed by Grafton 1559 (London: William Pickering, 1844), Folio 86.

<sup>30</sup>Beesly, Queen Elizabeth, p. 15.

of transubstantiation were combined in Elizabeth's prayer book, as the queen sought a non-controversial middle way for the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England. Thus, in Elizabeth's reign, the Book of Common Prayer that was developed by Cranmer in 1552 was re-established, but the several alterations made in this service book adapted it to the changed conditions, and it was now more acceptable to the populace, excepting those of extreme religious views.

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the great Elizabethan formulary, were passed by convocation in 1563.<sup>31</sup> The Thirty-nine Articles were derived from the Forty-two Articles of Edward's reign, but the fierceness that was found in the Edwardine Articles was softened in their Elizabethan counterpart. As Dixon commented on the composition of the Articles:

They dogmatise without arguing: they affirm without offering proof: they deal neither in expostulation nor rebuke. They are not apologetic. Completeness of form is their character. If they receive any additions, it was to make them more complete: the excisions which they suffered were to improve their form. They were narrowed into breadth, and widened by compression.<sup>32</sup>

The Thirty-nine Articles represented an expression of faith complete in and of themselves. They achieved that higher plane in religious dogmatics where harangue and haggle were left below in their depths. "For the main they agree with those set forth in the reign of king Edward the Sixth, though

---

<sup>31</sup>See APPENDIX E for the text of the Thirty-nine Articles.

<sup>32</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, p. 396.

in some particulars allowing more liberty to dissenting judgements: for instance, in this king's Articles it is said that it is to be believed that Christ went down to hell 'to preach to the spirits there'; which last clause is left out in these Articles, and men left to a latitude concerning the cause, time, and manner of his descent."<sup>33</sup> In leaving more for the individual to decide for himself, the new articles tended to remove themselves from controversy and contention. They were far from abstract, but, by being capable of varying interpretations, they were paramount to their objective--a national statement of faith. Convocation, which had for so long resisted religious innovations, assented to these articles without the usual controversy that attended doctrinal change. The achievement of the Thirty-nine articles must be considered as a triumph of liberal toleration that sought unity for the Church of England. "The secret of their success was the generous and liberal spirit which presided at the discussions, aiming at inclusive rather than exclusive definition, and at the brevity of toleration rather than a prolixity of anathema."<sup>34</sup> The clarity and inclusive moderation of the Thirty-nine Articles can truly be seen when they are placed in juxtaposition to the Decrees of the Council of

---

<sup>33</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 317.

<sup>34</sup> W. H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., Vol. V of A History of the English Church, ed. W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911), p. 97.

Trent, the statement of militant Catholicism. These edicts, which were issued around the time of the articles, were notable for their denunciation, their declarations of purpose, and their systematic anathemas. As Fuller stated:

It is observable these Articles came forth much about the time wherein the Decrees of the Council of Trent were published, truth and falsehood starting in some sort both together, though the former will surely carry away the victory at long running; many of which Decrees began with lying, and all conclude with cursing, thundering anathemas against all dissenters; whilst these our Articles, like the still voice, only plainly express the positive truth.<sup>35</sup>

Albeit Fuller may, perhaps, have overstated his support of the English Church, the articles fared well by comparison with the other doctrinal statements of the time. Thus, the Thirty-nine Articles were, as a formulary of faith, a more than adequate statement of moderation and inclusiveness that was designed to promote the unity and national character of the Church of England.

The question of transubstantiation, one of the great controversies of the Edwardine articles, was handled with greater tact and aplomb in the Elizabethan formulary. Hyma points out:

The version of 1552 does indeed contain a clause which is absent from that of 1563. In this clause the believer is told that inasmuch as Christ's body cannot simultaneously be present in a great many places, it is not present in the eucharist. The Thirty-Nine Articles say that Christ's body is eaten spiritually, hence there is no fundamental difference between the two versions.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, p. 318.

<sup>36</sup> Hyma, Renaissance to Reformation, p. 562.

While there was no fundamental doctrinal difference between the two sets of articles on the question of transubstantiation, the Elizabethan formulary stated its position in a less controversial form. The Elizabethan position of a spiritual sacrament of faith achieved a higher plane than the Edwardine article, which sought to prove the debatable point of whether Christ's presence in the sacrament was possible in relation to the number of places He would have to be. The position of Edward's articles rested on the dual concept of Christ, both very man and very God. The Elizabethan articles stood upon the more abstract principles of a spiritual presence and receiving by faith, which allowed a greater latitude of toleration and comprehensiveness. The Elizabethan article explained:

XXVIII. Of the Lords Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the Love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death: Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Christ: and likewise the Cup of Blessing, is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ: but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many Superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not by Christs Ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> A Collection of Articles, Cannons, Injunctions, etc. Together with several Acts of Parliament concerning Ecclesiastical Matters; some whereof are to be Read in Churches (London: Charles Bill, 1699), pp. 11-12.

The Thirty-nine Articles, in rejecting the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, presented a dogma based on the concept of a spiritual presence and receiving the sacrament through faith, as opposed to the "superstition" of the old tradition, but they declined argument of the theory of corporal presence, which would have led them into a position of controversy and rebuke. The Thirty-nine Articles established a theological middle way for the Church of England. Grimm said:

In general, the Thirty-nine Articles occupied a theological position midway between Lutheranism and Calvinism, a position held by Martin Bucer, the Strassburg divine who had come to England and had exerted a strong influence upon the development of English Protestantism. Despite the compromises embodied in the new confession, no deviations in doctrine were to be permitted.<sup>38</sup>

Yet, even though no deviations in doctrine were permitted, the inclusiveness of the Thirty-nine Articles permitted a large degree of interpretation within the framework of the doctrine of the English Church. Thus, the Elizabethan Articles were a comprehensive document, and their breadth of dogmatic position allowed for the greater unity of the Church of England. Truly, diversity was discouraged and conformity encouraged by the moderation and toleration of the Thirty-nine Articles.

Although the articles were passed by convocation in 1563, they did not receive the force of an act of parliament until 1571. After Elizabeth's excommunication by Pius V in 1569, it was no longer politically feasible to avoid a

---

<sup>38</sup>Grimm, The Reformation Era, p. 467.

declaration by parliament supporting the articles, and this was done in the Subscription Act of 1571, which called for the subscription of ecclesiastical persons to the Thirty-nine Articles under penalty of deprivation. Fuller commented on the tardy eventual action of parliament on the articles:

But some nine years after, viz. anno 1571, the parliament confirmed these Articles so far, that every clerk should, before the nativity of Christ next following, subscribe the same; and hereafter every person promoted to an ecclesiastical living should, within a time prefixed, publicly in the time of divine service, read and profess his consent to the same, on pain of deprivation ipso facto, if omitted.<sup>39</sup>

By 1571, the Thirty-nine Articles had received the sanction of parliament. The Elizabethan formulary, with its clear expression of doctrine, was firmly established as the dogmatic instrument of the Church of England.

During the reign of Elizabeth, the Church of England had two great apologists to support its new doctrines, John Jewel and Richard Hooker. John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury, gave a concrete statement of the position of the English Church in his celebrated Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae, published in 1562. Dixon noted:

The purpose was extensive, to declare the whole manner of religion in England; the theological orthodoxy, the purified simplicity of worship, which was now obtained. The style was clear, good, and remarkably forcible; the learning very great. By necessity the Apologia was as much an attack as a defense. The abuses of the Roman system were exposed to justify the rejection of it; and the apologist spoke with an earnestness of horror which

---

<sup>39</sup> Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. IV, pp. 318-19.

the world has ceased to feel. His abhorrence was not only the emotion of a sufferer, and of a divine, but of a literary critic and student.<sup>40</sup>

Jewel's work was directed towards the instruction of other nations in the position of England upon the alteration of religion, and, for this reason, it was written in Latin. It was designed to show that no charges of heresy could be brought against the Church of England, because the Church had only made such changes as were necessary, within its competence, and consistent with a universal Christian position. So Carter:

Similarly, his great aim in the Apology was to refute the charge of innovation and heresy which the Romanists had brought against the doctrine and position of the Reformed Church of England. He pointed out that all the early Fathers appealed only to the Scriptures as a test of orthodoxy, and he therefore challenged his opponents, if they wished to be called Catholics, to "convince and master them" by the Scriptures. "If we be heretics," he pertinently asks, "which refer all our controversies unto the Holy Scriptures, and in comparison of them set little by other things...how is it meet to call them which fear the judgement of the Holy Scriptures, and do prefer before them their own dreams and full cold inventions, and to maintain their own traditions have defaced and corrupted the ordinances of Christ and of the Apostles?" "We," he continues, "have restored the Lord's Supper according to the institution of Christ, and have made it to be a communion in very deed. They have made it a Private Mass. So that we give unto the people the Lord's Supper, they a vain pageant to gaze upon."<sup>41</sup>

The deference of the English Church to the Scriptures to settle matters of controversy was, to Jewel, witness of a more Christian religion than the formalism that the Church of

---

<sup>40</sup>Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, p. 319.

<sup>41</sup>Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 128.

Rome had built upon the foundation of primitive Christianity, "Owing to the changes which had been made, Anglicans had returned to the Catholic Church of Christ."<sup>42</sup> The English Church was departing from the errors of the Church of Rome, not from the concepts of Christianity. This movement towards scriptural fundamentalism was, at least in Jewel's opinion, expressly noticeable in the communion service, where the symbolic presentation of the Lord's Supper, received by faith was of greater religious import to the populace than the "pageant" of the Roman rite. Further, Jewel believed that no justification could be found for the papal authority. The bishop wrote:

And yet that there neither is, nor is it possible there should be, any one man who has the care of this whole Catholic church, for Christ is ever present with his church, and needs not a vicar, or sole and perfect successor; and that no mortal man can in his mind contain all the body of the universal church, that is, all the parts of the earth; much less can he reduce them into an exact order, and rightly and prudently administer its affairs....But then, that the bishop of Rome, or any other person, should be the head of the whole church, or a universal bishop, is no more possible, than that he should be the Bridegroom, the Light, the Salvation, and the Life of the Church; for these are the privileges and titles of Christ alone, and do properly and only belong to him.<sup>43</sup>

Examining primitive sources, Jewel concluded that the Pope had no honest authority and position as vicar of Christ, for it was wholly and completely the Church of Christ on earth,

---

<sup>42</sup>H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology: 1547-1603 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954) p. 25.

<sup>43</sup>Writings of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, Vol XI of British Reformers (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, [18--]), pp. 303-304.

not the Church of Rome. In maintaining this position, he agreed with St. Augustine that bishop is the name of a work or office and not a title of honour. The Pope, as any other lone man, could not be singled out for ministering to the whole Church, for this was the glory of Christ alone. Jewel proclaimed:

We have declared also, that we detest, as pernicious to the souls of men, and as plagues, all those ancient heresies that have been condemned by the old councils and Holy Scriptures; that we have reduced into practice again, as much as we can possibly, the ecclesiastical discipline, which our adversaries had much weakened; and that we punish all licentious courses of life and debauchery in manners, by our ancient and established laws, and that with as much severity as is fit and possible; that we preserve all kingdoms in the same state we found them, without any diminution or mutation, and preserve the majesty of our princes entire as much as we can possibly.<sup>44</sup>

Jewel believed in the maintenance of the civil authority, and he felt that religion could advance through close co-operation with and obedience to the doctrine of the royal supremacy. Thus, the Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae defended the position of the Church of England, both in its theological return to the principles of primitive Christianity and its subservience to the royal supremacy in the advancement of true reform.

The second great apologist for the Church of England, Richard Hooker, wrote his work, The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth I. The first four volumes were published in 1594, the fifth in 1597,

---

<sup>44</sup> Writings of John Jewel, p. 380.

and the remaining three after Hooker's death in 1599.

The Ecclesiastical Polity was intended to be an irenicon, a book of reconciliation, which all would accept as the basis of agreement. As has been finely said, 'he contrived to unite and hold in a real equilibrium a deep sympathy with the three great spiritual currents of his time. He was sincerely and deeply an evangelical, a Catholic, and a rationalist.' The peace of the church was the be-all and end-all of his endeavour.<sup>45</sup>

The Ecclesiastical Polity was a careful and correct exposition of the position of the Church of England, concerning both doctrine and polity. Hooker sought to justify, philosophically and logically, the Elizabethan ecclesiastical settlement and to show that the Scriptures, although a perfect standard of doctrine, were not intended to establish a uniform or immutable rule for discipline and government.

"He based his arguments upon reason as well as upon the authority of Scripture."<sup>46</sup> Hooker's learning was encyclopaedic, and he was unequalled as a controversialist in his time.

Hooker upheld the position of the English Church in denying the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. He believed in the concept of a symbolic or spiritual presence, as re-affirmed by the Church of England from the theories of Cranmer. As Carter related:

In commenting on the Sacraments, Hooker stated that what was "alone sufficient for a Christian man to believe" concerning the words "This is My Body," was that "This hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power,

---

<sup>45</sup>Black, The Reign of Elizabeth, p. 381.

<sup>46</sup>Grimm, The Reformation Era, p. 478.

is in verity and in truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby as I make Myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as My sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them My body;" and he carefully pointed out that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." "I see not," he says, "which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them."<sup>47</sup>

Hooker held that there was a "mystical participation" or the receiving of the spiritual presence of Christ through faith. It was in the receiver, not the substance, in which the presence of Christ was found, for, in Hooker's estimation, the worthy receiver would receive the symbolic presence of the Saviour through faith, but the unworthy receiver would receive only the elements of bread and wine and not the presence of Christ. Thus, Hooker adopted the view of primitive Christianity towards the communion service, which concept was maintained by the reformed English Church.

Concerning the relationship between Church and State, Hooker believed that they were inseparable. Woodhouse puts it this way:

Every member of the Church of England was also a member of the commonwealth, and vice versa, and so, as was the case when Constantine embraced the Christian faith, it was now wrong to speak of two separate and distinct societies....In England, at least, one society was both Church and commonwealth.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Carter, The English Church and the Reformation, p. 144.

<sup>48</sup> Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, p. 140.

From this point, Hooker reasoned that, as Church and State comprised the same society, the magistrate should be supreme in the government of both, which in the case of England gave full power to the royal supremacy of Elizabeth I. As Allen noted:

A commonwealth, in fact, is, or should be, always a kind of Church: if it be Christian it is a true Church. In such a commonwealth as that of England, it is impossible, Hooker argued, even to conceive of the Church as a distinct body. 'If all that believe be contained in the name of the Church, how should the Church remain by personal subsistence divided from the commonwealth, when the whole commonwealth doth believe?'<sup>49</sup>

The unity of the Church and the unity of the commonwealth were combined in the total concept of England as a society. As the queen was head of the State, she was head of the Church, for, as Hooker reasoned, Church and State were one and the same body. Thus, The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity defended the return to the concepts of primitive Christianity by the English Church and supported the concept of the royal supremacy as essential to the Elizabethan settlement and a part of the right relationship between Church and State.

The reign of Elizabeth I witnessed the religious settlement of the Church of England. The concept of the royal supremacy developed by Elizabeth's father, Henry VIII, was brought back in full force of operation. "The organization of the country resumed the solid and secular character by which, under Henry the Eighth, in the words of the statute

---

<sup>49</sup> Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, p. 196.

of supremacy, 'the realm was kept continually in good order;' and the interests of England were no longer to be sacrificed to the passions of religious partisans."<sup>50</sup> However, as greater order and control were secured, the Church of England was reformed by the Elizabethan settlement. The scope of the doctrine and ritual of the English Church was expanded, as the communion service combined the forms of presentment of the sacrament of the two Edwardine prayer books. Also, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, while derived from Edward's Forty-two Articles, showed greater moderation and toleration, which allowed for the expansion of unity within the Church of England. The English apologists, led by Jewel and Hooker, defended the Anglican faith as closer to the tenets of primitive Christianity than the formalized rites of the Church of Rome. The reign of Elizabeth I brought the settlement of the religious controversy that had been waged in England, through the expansion of the doctrine and ritual of the Church and the development of the theory of the inter-relationship of Church and State under the royal supremacy.

---

<sup>50</sup> James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Vol. VII (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863), p. 81.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

The Elizabethan settlement brought an end to the religious controversy that had consumed England since Henry VIII separated the English Church from the papal authority. Henry's desire for a male heir, combined with his desire to possess Anne Boleyn, made the king seek a divorce from Catherine of Aragon. When the Pope, Clement VII, refused to grant the divorce, Henry severed his marriage bonds to the queen through the English Church and the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. The divorce led to Henry's excommunication and the establishment of the Church of England outside the papal authority. In order to extend his authority over the Church, Henry developed the concept of the royal supremacy. Through parliament, Henry VIII made the Church subservient to the civil authority and ended all payments and appeals to Rome. Also, to quell a source of probable opposition and to gain greatly needed revenue for the crown, the king suppressed the religious houses, giving much of the Church lands to the new ruling class to insure their loyalty to the crown and the royal policies. Henry persecuted for treason Catholics who held to their belief in the Pope's supremacy, and for heresy, Protestants who

followed the innovations of the continental reformers. Through these persecutions, the king maintained the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical.

However, despite the separation of the English Church from the rule of Rome, Henry retained the basic tenets and dogma of Catholicism within the realm. Although the Ten Articles of 1536 omitted all notice of four of the traditional seven sacraments, the position of this first authorized formulary of faith for the Church of England was fundamentally Catholic. In 1539, the Six Articles were passed by parliament; they represented an even greater expression of Catholic orthodoxy in the doctrine of the English Church than had the Ten Articles. "The Whip with Six Strings" imposed severe penalties for religious diversity and definitely favoured the old order. Henry VIII made no significant changes in the doctrine of the Church. As Gairdner commented:

But, beyond the suspension of the canon law and the complete subjugation of the clergy to the civil power, he [Henry] was not anxious to make vital changes in religion; and both doctrine and ritual remained in his day nearly unaltered. The innovations actually made consisted in little more than the authorisation of an English Bible, the publication of some formularies to which little objection could be taken, and--what has not been mentioned above--the first use of an English Litany.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gairdner, "Henry VIII", p. 464.

The position adopted by the Church of England at the end of Henry's reign was national Catholicism--the substitution of the royal authority for that of the Pope. The king's will had asserted the rights of the temporal power over the ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

During the brief reign of Edward VI, a number of innovations were made in the Church of England, giving it a distinctly Protestant character. Under the power of the royal supremacy, the Edwardine injunctions called for the removal of the "objects of superstitious veneration" from the English churches; this move was calculated to weaken the old traditions, for it removed the popular manifestations through which the old beliefs were continued in the minds of the populace. Although the first Edwardine Book of Common Prayer issued in 1549 was held to be reconcilable with Roman Catholicism, the second prayer book of 1552 advanced a definitely Protestant Point of view. Also, the Forty-two Articles of Religion, the great Edwardine formulary, published in 1553 were a statement of uncompromising Protestantism. However, sufficient time was not given to Edward's reign to make these changes of lasting effect.

Clayton related:

Six years were allowed to the Protestant minority under Edward VI to uproot the old religion and bring in the new. The thing was manifestly impossible. Cranmer, Protector Somerset (who took Hooper for his chaplain) Dudley, Earl of Warwick (soon to be Duke of Northumberland), could exclude from the king's council all who stood where Henry stood, they could not change the hearts and minds of a whole nation in so short a time; nor could they persuade clergy and laity to

refashion gladly the habits and customs of Catholic usage in favor of new forms of public worship and strange disconcerting ceremonies brought over from the continent.<sup>2</sup>

Albeit the doctrinal changes made during the reign of Edward VI represented a rejection of the concept of national Catholicism developed by Henry VIII in favour of more Protestant forms of worship, the shortness of the young king's reign prohibited the permanent establishment of the dogmatic innovations of Protestantism.

The brief reign of Mary brought the restoration of the Church of England with the Church of Rome. The principal objective of the queen was the re-establishment of the Catholic faith in England. By the first Marian act of repeal passed by parliament in 1553, the Edwardine acts of religion were swept away, and the national Catholicism of the reign of Henry VIII was restored. The reconciliation of England with the papacy was achieved in 1554, when Cardinal Pole, the papal legate, absolved the realm from its schism, and parliament carried forth the restoration by passing the second Marian act of repeal, abolishing all anti-papal legislation back through the reign of Henry VIII and, in effect, restoring the authority of the Pope as it had been in 1529. However, Mary desired Catholic uniformity throughout the kingdom, and, under the act reviving the heresy acts that had been directed against the Lollards, the queen sought to

---

<sup>2</sup> Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, pp. 89-90.

end Protestantism in England. Approximately 300 martyrs suffered death for their beliefs. Nevertheless, the Marian persecutions did not bring the desired unity; instead the populace was filled with a sense of revulsion which undoubtedly influenced the return to Protestantism during the reign of Elizabeth. The rule of Mary had shown the inadequacy of deep convictions and pious motives to guide the State aright.

The reign of Elizabeth witnessed the settlement of the religious controversy that had plagued England since 1529. Elizabeth re-established the full force of the royal supremacy in religious matters, which had been defaulted to Rome during Mary's reign. The supremacy Act of 1559 annexed the rights of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the crown and abolished all foreign authority, especially papal, within the realm; likewise, the injunctions of Elizabeth furthered the scope of the royal supremacy and temporal control of religion. Whereas Henry VIII had persecuted Protestants for heresy and Catholics, who retained their belief in the papal authority, for treason and whereas Mary had harshly persecuted the reformers for heresy, Elizabeth regarded heresy as an act of resistance to the royal supremacy and the civil authority punishable as treason against the realm. This view of heresy as treason allowed Elizabeth to advance the religious settlement without incurring the hostile reactions that had accompanied the dual policy of her father, Henry VIII, and the "burnings" of her half-sister, Mary.

The doctrine and ritual of the Church of England reached a satisfactory position of compromise and moderation that allowed for a unified reformed Church under the rule of Elizabeth. "The ultra-Protestant changes in the Prayer-book of 1552 were followed by a recoil under Mary to the mass, and the ultimate compromise under Elizabeth indicated the stationary point at which the oscillations of the controversy tended at last to rest."<sup>3</sup> Rejecting the formalism that had developed in Catholicism, the Church of England returned to the tenets of primitive Christianity. The Lord's Supper was returned to the concept of a communion of the faithful rather than the offering up of Christ by the priest as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. The medieval doctrine of transubstantiation was denied, and the belief in a symbolic or spiritual presence of Christ received through faith was adopted by the Church of England. The Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion achieved the non-controversial middle way for the doctrine and ritual of the English Church. Thus, the Elizabethan settlement rejected the concept of national Catholicism advanced by Henry VIII in favour of a more Protestant form of Worship based on the Scriptures and the forms of primitive Christianity, but, at the same time, the settlement avoided the extremes of Protestantism that were a part of the Church in the reign of

---

<sup>3</sup>Froude, History of England, Vol. V, p. 147.

Edward VI. Religious unity was achieved through the compromise and moderation that formed a completeness of belief under Elizabeth.

A major part of the significance and justification of the English Reformation was to be found in the advancement and achievement of England after the religious settlement.

As Clayton noted:

Under the banner of Protestantism England was to become a world-wide power, a far-flung empire. Its ships would travel every ocean, its armies fight in every land. Its manufactures and commerce would bring riches beyond the dreams of avarice. Its poets and novelists would win immortality for English letters.

Protestants, viewing with satisfaction the use made of that world-wide power, the character of its imperial rule, the benefits of its commerce, and the glory of its literature, have held the Reformation justified.<sup>4</sup>

Undoubtedly, the English Reformation helped to unify the realm and opened the doorway to greater glories. The establishment of the royal supremacy over the whole kingdom empowered Elizabeth, after the settlement, to be victorious over the might and wealth of Spain. Also, the moderation of the settlement provided a starting point for greater religious toleration. Freed from the medieval doctrine and papal supremacy of the Church of Rome, England had developed a religious belief founded upon the Scriptures and faith. Therefore, the English Reformation was not only a brilliant achievement in itself, but it also led to the transcendent accomplishments of the British Empire.

---

<sup>4</sup>Clayton, The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain, p. 197.

## APPENDIX A

The Protestation in Convocation of the Clergy of the Lower House of the Province of Canterbury, 1536.<sup>1</sup>

The protestation of the clergy of the lower house, within the province of Canterbury, with declaration of the faults and abuses which heretofore have, and now be within the same, worthy special reformation:

In very humble and reverent manner, with protestation, That we the clergy of the lower house within the province of Canterbury, neither in word, deed, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, intend any thing, to speak, attempt, or do, which in any manner of wise may be displeasent unto the king's highness, our most dread sovereign lord, and supreme head of the church of England; but in all things, according to the command of God, to be most obedient to his grace, to whom accordingly we submit ourselves, minding in no wise by any colourable fashion to recognixe, privily or apertly, the bishop of Rome, or his usurped authority, or in any wise to bring in, defend, or maintain the same, into this noble realm, or dominions of the same: but that the same bishop of Rome, with his usurped authority, utterly forever with his inventions, rites, abuses, ordinances and fashions, to be renounced, forsaken, extinguished and abolished; and that we sincerely addict ourselves to Almighty God, his laws, and unto our said sovereign lord the king, our supreme head in earth, and his laws, statutes, provisions and ordinances made here within his grace's realm. We think in our consciences and opinions these errors and abuses following to have been, and now to be, within this realm, causes of dissension worthy special reformation. It is to wit,

i. That it is commonly preached, taught, and spoken, to the slander of this noble realm, disquietness of the people, damage of Christian souls, not without fear of many other inconveniences and perils, That the sacrament of the altar is not to be esteemed; for divers light and lewd persons be not ashamed or afearred to say, Why should I see the sacring of the high mass? Is it any thing else but a piece of bread, or a little predie round robin?

ii. Item, That they deny extreme unction to be any sacrament.

---

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, pp. 128-36.

iii. Item, That priests have no more authority to minister sacraments than the laymen have.

iv. Item, That children ought not in any wise to be confirmed of the bishops afore they come to the age of discretion.

v. Item, That all ceremonies accustomed in the church, which are not clearly expressed in scripture, must be taken away, because they are mens inventions.

vi. Item, That all those are antichrists that do deny the laymen the sacrament of the altar sub utraque specie.

vii. Item, That all that be present at mass, and do not receive the sacrament with the priest, are not partakers of the said mass.

viii. Item, That it is preached and taught, That the church, that is commonly taken for the church, is the old synagogue; and, that the church is the congregation of good men only.

ix. Item, It is preached against the Litany, and also said, That it was never merry in England sithence the Litany was ordained, and sancta Maria, sancta Catharina, etc. sunge and said.

x. Item, That a man hath no free-will.

xi. Item, That God never gave grace nor knowledge of holy scripture to any great estate or rich man, and that they in nowise follow the same.

xii. Item, That all religions and professions, whatsoever they be are clean contrary to Christ's religion.

xiii. Item, That it be preached and taught, That all things ought to be in common, and that priests should have wives.

xiv. Item, That preachers will in nowise conform themselves ad ecclesiam catholicam, nor admit or receive canonicos et probatos authores, but will have their own fancies and inventions preached and set forward.

xv. Item, That images of saints are not in any wise to be reverenced; and, that it is plain idolatry and abomination to set up any lights before any images, or in any place of the church the time of divine service, as long as the sun giveth light.

xvi. Item, That it is idolatry to make any oblations.

xvii. Item, That it is as lawful to christen a child in a tub of water at home, or in a ditch by the way, as in a font-stone in the church.

xviii. Item, That the water in the font-stone is alonely a thing conjured.

xix. Item, That the hallowed oil is no better than the bishop of Rome his grease or butter.

xx. Item, That priest's crowns be the whore's marks of Babylon.

xxi. Item, That the stole about the priest's neck is nothing else but the bishop of Rome's rope.

xxii. Item, That images, as well of the crucifix as of other saints, are to be put out of the church, and the relics

of saints in nowise to be revered. And, that it is against God's commandment, that Christian men should make courtesy or reverence to the image of our Saviour.

xxiii. Item, That it is no sin or offence to eat white meats, eggs, butter, cheese, or flesh in the lent, or other fasting-days commanded by the church, and received by consent of Christian people.

xxiv. Item, That it is lawful to eat flesh on Good Friday, as upon Easter day, or other times in the year.

xxv. Item, That the sinner offending in the lent, or other high feasts of the year, is worthy no more punishment than he that transgresseth in any other time.

xxvi. Item, That confession auricular, absolution, and penance, are nother necessary nor profitable in the Church of God.

xxvii. Item, That auricular confession is only invented and ordained to have the secret knowledge of men's hearts, and to pull money out of their purses.

xxviii. Item, That the ghostly father cannot give or enjoin any penance at all.

xxix. Item, That it is sufficient for a man or woman to make their confession to God alone.

xxx. Item, That it is as lawful at all times to confess to a layman as to a priest.

xxxi. Item, That confession is but a whispering in a priest's ear, and is as well to be made, a multitude being present, as secretly.

xxxii. Item, That it is sufficient that the sinner do say, I know myself a sinner.

xxxiii. Item, That bishops' ordinaries and ecclesiastical judges have no authority to give any sentence of excommunication or censure; ne yet to absolve or loose any man from the same.

xxxiv. Item, That it is not necessary or profitable to have any church or chapel to pray in, or to do any divine service in.

xxxv. Item, That the church was made for no other purpose, but other to keep the people from wind and rain, other else that the people upon Sundays and holidays should resort thither to have the word of God declared unto them.

xxxvi. Item, That buryings in churches and churchyards be unprofitable and vain.

xxxvii. Item, That the rich and costly ornaments in the church are rather high displeasure than pleasure or honour to God.

xxxviii. Item, That it is pity that ever the mass, matins, evensong, or any other divine service was made, or suffered to be read, said, or sung within any church, because it is only to the deluding of the people.

xxxix. Item, That saints are not to be invocated or honoured: and that they understand not, nor know nothing of our petitions, nor can be mediators or intercessors betwixt us and God.

xl. Item, That our lady was no better than another woman; and like a bag of pepper or saffron when the spice is out: and that she can do no more with Christ than another sinful woman.

xli. Item, That it is as much available to pray unto saints, as to hurl a stone against the wind: and that the saints have no more power to help a man, than a man's wife hath to help her husband.

xlii. Item, That dirige, commendations, mass, suffrages, prayers, almsdeeds, or oblations, done for the souls of them that be departed out of this world, be but vain and of no profit.

xliii. Item, That the souls departed go straight to heaven, other to hell.

xliv. Item, That there is no mean place between heaven and hell wherein souls departed may be afflicted.

xlv. Item, That if there be a place where they be punished, God is not yet born, nor he that shall redeem the world.

xlvi. Item, That prayers, suffrages, fasting, or almsdeeds, do not help to take away any sin.

xlvii. Item, That there is no distinction of sins after this sort, sin to be venial, and sin to be mortal.

xlviii. Item, That all sins, after that the sinner be once converted, are made by the merits of Christ's passion venial sins, that is to say, sins clean forgiven.

xlix. Item, That Almighty God doth not look for, nor yet require of a sinner after his conversion from sin any fasting, almsdeed, or any other penance; but only that the sinner be sorry for his sins, amending his life, and sinning no more.

l. Item, That hallowed water, hallowed bread, hallowed candles, hallowed ashes, hallowed palm, and such like ceremonies of the church, are of none effect, and to be taken as trifles and vanities to seduce the people.

li. Item, That holidays ordained and instituted by the church are not to be observed and kept in reverence, inasmuch as all days and times be like: and that servile works, as ploughing and carting, may be done in the same, without any offence at all, as in other ferial days.

lii. Item, That the singing or saying of mass, matins, or evensong, is but a roaring, howling, whistling, mumming, conjuring and juggling: and the playing at the organs a foolish vanity.

liii. Item, That pilgrimage, fasting, almsdeeds, and such like, are not to be used; and that a man is not bound to the church, but only to the preaching.

liv. Item, That it is sufficient and enough to believe, though a man do no good works at all.

lv. Item, That men be not content to preach of certain abuses found in pilgrimages, in fasting, in prayer, in invocation of saints, in reverencing of images, in almsdeeds, but they will have needs the thing itself taken away, and not enough the abuses to be reformed.

lvi. Item, That by preaching the people have been brought in opinion and belief, that nothing is to be believed except it can be proved expressly by scripture.

lvii. Item, That it is preached and taught, that forasmuch as Christ hath shed his blood for us and redeemed us, we need not to do any thing at all but to believe and repent, if we have offended.

lviii. Item, That there is of late a new confiteor made after this form, Confiteor Deo coeli et terrae peccavi nimis cogitatione, locutione, et opere, mea culpa. Ideo deprecor majestatem tuam, ut tu Deus deleas iniquitatem meam, et vos orare pro me.

lix. Item, That it is preached, that because auricular confession hath brought forth innumerable vices, it is clearly to be taken away.

lx. Item, That the canon of the mass is the comment of some foolish unlearned priest: and that the names of the saints there expressed are not to be rehearsed.

lxi. Item, That water running in the channel or common river is of as great virtue as the holy water.

lxii. Item, That holy water is but juggled water.

lxiii. Item, That the holy water is more savoury to make sauce with than the other, because it is mixed with salt; which is also a very good medicine for an horse with a galled back: Yea, if there be put an onion thereunto, it is a good sauce for a gible of mutton.

lxiv. Item, That no human constitutions or laws do bind any Christian man, but such as be in the Gospels, Paul's Epistles, or the New Testament: and that a man may break them without any offence at all.

lxv. Item, That besides seditious preaching, letting unity to be had, there are many slanderous and erroneous books that have been made and suffered to go abroad indifferently, which books were the more gladly bought, because of these words, cum privilegio, which the ignorant people took to have been an express approbation of the king, where it was not so indeed.

lxvi. Item, That where heretofore divers books have been examined by persons appointed in the convocation, and the said books found full of heresy and erroneous opinions, and so declared, the said books are not yet by the bishops expressly condemned, but suffered to remain in the hands of unlearned people, which ministereth to them matter of argument, and much unquietness within the realm.

lxvii. Item, That apostates, abjured persons, and of notable ill conversation, and infamed, have without license of the king's grace, or the ordinary, taken upon them to preach slanderously.

APPENDIX B

THE TEN ARTICLES, 1536.<sup>1</sup>

Henry the Eighth, by the grace of God, king of England and of France, defensour of the faith, lord of Ireland, and in earth supreme head of the church of England; to all and singular our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, greeting.

Amongst other cures appertaining unto this our princely office, whereunto it hath pleased Almighty God of his infinite mercy and goodness to call us, we have always esteemed and thought, like as we also yet esteem and think, that it most chiefly belongeth unto our said charge, diligently to foresee and cause, that not only the most holy word and commandments of God should most sincerely be believed, and most reverently be observed and kept of our subjects, but also that unity and concord in opinions, namely in such things as do concern our religion, may increase and go forthward, and all occasion of dissent and discord touching the same be repressed and utterly extinguished.

For the which cause, we being of late to our great regret credibly advertised of such diversity in opinions, as have grown and sprongen in this our realm, as well concerning certain Articles necessary to our salvation, as also touching certain other honest and commendable ceremonies, rites, and usages, now a long time used and accustomed in our churches, for conservation of an honest polity, and decent and seemly order to be had therein: minding to have that unity and agreement established through our said church concerning the premises. And, being very desirous to eschew, not only the dangers of souls, but also the outward unquietness, which, by occasion of the said diversity in opinions (if remedy were not provided) might perchance have ensued; have not only in our own person at many times taken great pain, study, labours, and travails, but also have caused our bishops, and other the most discreet and best learned men of our clergy of this our whole realm, to be assembled in our convocation, for the full debatement and quiet determination of the same. Where, after long and mature deliberation had of and upon the premises, finally they had concluded and agreed upon the most special points and articles, as well such as be

---

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, The Church History of Britain, Vol. III, pp. 141-59.

commanded of God, and are necessary to our salvation, as also divers other matters touching the honest ceremonies, and good and politic orders, as is aforesaid. Which their determination, debatement, and agreement, for so much as we think to have proceeded of a good, right, and true judgment, and to be agreeable to the laws and ordinances of God, and much profitable for the stablishment of that charitable concord and unity in our church of England, which we most desire, we have caused the same to be published, willing, requiring, and commanding you to accept, repute, and take them accordingly. And further, we most heartily desire and pray Almighty God, that it may please him so to illuminate your hearts, that you, and every of you, may have no less desire, zeal, and love to the said unity and concord, in reading, divulging, and following the same, than we have had and have in causing them to be thus devised, set forth, and published.

And for because we would the said articles, and every of them, should be taken and understanden of you, after such sort, order and degree, as appertaineth accordingly, we have caused by the like assent and agreement of our said bishops, and other learned men, the said articles to be divided into two sorts; whereof the one part containeth such as be commanded expressly by God, and be necessary to our salvation; and the other containeth such things as have been of a long continuance, for a decent order and honest polity, prudently instituted and used in the church of our realm, and be for that same purpose and end to be observed and kept accordingly, although they be not expressly commanded of God, nor necessary to our salvation. Wherefore, we will and require you to accept the same, after such sort as we have here prescribed them unto you, and to conform yourselves obediently unto the same; whereby you shall not only attain that most charitable unity and loving concord, whereof shall ensue your incomparable commodity, profit and lucre, as well spiritual as other; but also you shall not a little encourage us to take further travails, pains, and labours for your commodities in all such other matters as in time to come may happen to occur, and as it shall be most to the honour of God, the profit, tranquillity, and quietness of all you our most loving subjects.

#### The principal Articles concerning our Faith

First, As touching the chief and principal Articles of our Faith, it is thus agreed, as hereafter followeth, by the whole clergy of this our realm. We will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people by us committed to their spiritual charge, that they ought and must most constantly believe and defend all those things to be true which be comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible; and also in the three creeds or symbols, whereof one was made by the apostles, and is the common Creed which every man useth; the second was made by the council of Nice, and is said daily in the mass: and the third was made by Athanasius, and is

comprehended in the Psalm, Quicumque vult. And that they ought and must take and interpret all the same things, according to the selfsame sentence and interpretation, which the words of the selfsame creeds or symbols do purport, and the holy approved doctrines of the church do intreat and defend the same.

Item, That they ought and must repute, hold, and take all the same things for the most holy, most sure, and most certain and infallible words of God, and such as neither ought ne can be altered, or convelled by any contrary opinion or authority.

Item, That they ought and must believe, repute, and take all the articles of our faith contained in the said creeds to be so necessary to be believed for man's salvation. That, whosoever being taught will not believe them, as is aforesaid, or will obstinately affirm the contrary of them; he, or they, cannot be the very members of Christ, and his spouse the church, but be very infidels or heretics, and members of the devil, with whom they shall perpetually be damned.

Item, That they ought and must most reverently and religiously observe and keep the selfsame words, according to the very same form an manner of speaking, as the articles of our faith be already conceived and expressed in the said creeds, without altering in any wise, or varying from the same.

Item, That they ought and must utterly refuse and condemn all those opinions contrary to the said articles, which were of long time passed, condemned in the four holy councils, that is to say, in the council of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and all other since that time in any point consonant to the same.

### The Sacrament of Baptism

Secondly, As touching the holy sacrament of baptism, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought, and must of necessity believe certainly all those things which have been always by the whole consent of the church approved, received, and used in the sacrament of baptism; that is to say, that the sacrament of baptism was instituted and ordained in the New Testament by our Saviour Jesus Christ, as a thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life, according to the saying of Christ, No man can enter into the kingdom of heaven, except he be born again of water and the Holy Ghost [John iii. 5.].

Item, That it is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God, according to the saying of Christ, Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved [Mark xvi. 16.].

Item, That the promise of grace and everlasting life (which promise is adjoined unto this sacrament of baptism) pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children: and, that they

ought therefore, and must needs be baptized; and, that by the sacrament of baptism they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favor of God, and be made thereby the very sons and childern of God. Insomuch as infants and childern dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not.

Item, That infants must needs be christened, because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted, which cannot be done but by the sacrament of baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost, which exerciseth his grace and efficacy in them, and cleanseth and purifieth them from sin by his most secret virtue and operation.

Item, That childern or men, once baptized, can, ne ought ever to be baptized again.

Item, That they ought to repute and take all the Anabaptists and the Pelagians their opinions, contrary to the premises, and every other man's opinion agreeable unto the said Anabaptists' or Pelagians' opinions in this behalf, for detestable heresies, and utterly to be condemned.

Item, That men or childern having the Use of reason, and willing and desiring to be baptized, shall by the virtue of that holy sacrament obtain the grace and remission of all their sins, if they shall come thereunto perfectly and truely repentant, and contrite of all their sins before committed: and also perfectly and constantly confessing and believing all the articles of our faith, according as it was mentioned in the first article.

And finally, If they shall also have firm credence and trust in the promise of God adjoined to the said sacrament, that is to say, that in and by this said sacrament which they shall receive, God the Father giveth unto them, for his Son Jesus Christ's sake, remission of all their sins, and the grace of the Holy Ghost, whereby they be newly regenerated, and made the very childern of God, according to the saying of St. John, and the apostle St. Peter, Do penance for your sins, and be each of you baptized in the name of Jesu Christ, and you shall obtain remission of your sins, and shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [Acts ii.38.]. And according also to the saying of St. Paul, God hath not saved us for the works of justice which we have done, but of his mercy by baptism, and renovation of the Holy Ghost. Whom he hath poured out upon us most plentifully, for the love of Jesu Christ our Saviour, to the intent that we being justified by his grace, should be made the inheritors of everlasting life, according to our hope [Tit.iii.5.].

### The Sacrament of Penance

Thirdly, Concerning the sacrament of penance, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, that that sacrament was institute of Christ in the New Testament as a thing so necessary

for man's salvation, that no man, which after his baptism is fallen again, and hath committed deadly sin, can without the same be saved, or attain everlasting life.

Item, That like as such men, which after baptism do fall again into sin, if they do not penance in this life shall undoubtedly be damned; even so, whensoever the same men shall convert themselves from their naughty life, and do such penance for the same as Christ requireth of them, they shall without doubt attain remission of their sins, and shall be saved.

Item, That the sacrament of perfect penance, which Christ requireth of such manner persons, consisteth of three parties; that is to say, contrition, confession, and the amendment of the former life, and a new obedient reconciliation unto the laws and will of God; that is to say, exterior acts in works of charity, according as they be commanded of God, which be called in scripture, the worthy fruits of penance [Luke iii.8].

Furthermore, As touching contrition, which is the first part, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that the said contrition consisteth in two special parts, which must always be conjoined together, and cannot be dissevered; that is to say, the penitent and contrite man must first knowledge the filthiness and abomination of his own sin, unto which knowledge he is brought by hearing and considering of the will of God declared in his laws; and feeling and perceiving in his own conscience that God is angry and displeased with him for the same. He must also conceive not only great sorrow and inward shame that he hath so grievously offended God but also great fear of God's displeasure towards him, considering he hath no works or merits of his own, which he may worthily lay before God, as sufficient satisfaction for his sins. Which done, then afterward with this fear, shame and sorrow must needs succeed and be conjoined the second part, that is to wit, a certain faith, trust and confidence of the mercy and goodness of God, whereby the penitent must conceive certain hope and faith that God will forgive him his sins, and repute him justified, and of the number of his elect children, not for the worthiness on any merit or work done by the penitent, but for the only merits of the blood and passion of our Saviour Jesu Christ.

Item, That this certain faith and hope is gotten, and also confirmed and made more strong by the applying of Christ's words and promises of his grace and favour contained in his gospel, and the sacraments instituted by him in the New Testament. And therefore to attain this certain faith, the second part of penance is necessary, that is to say, confession to a priest, if it may be had; for the absolution given by the priest was institute of Christ to apply the promises of God's grace and favor to the penitent.

Wherefore, As touching confession, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us to their spiritual charge, that they ought, and

must certainly believe, that the words of absolution pronounced by the priest be spoken by the authority given to him by Christ in the gospel.

Item, That they ought and must give no less faith and credence to the same words of absolution, so pronounced by the ministers of the church, than they would give unto the very words and voice of God himself, if he should speak unto us out of heaven, according to the saying of Christ, Whose sins soever ye do forgive, shall be forgiven; whose sins soever ye do retain, shall be retained [John xx.23.]. And again in another place Christ saith, Whosoever heareth you heareth me [Luke x.16.].

Item, That in nowise they do contemn this auricular confession, which is made unto the ministers of the church, but that they ought to repute the same as a very expedient and necessary mean, whereby they may require and ask this absolution at the priest's hands, at such time as they shall find their conscience grieved with mortal sin, and have occasion so to do; to the intent they may thereby attain certain comfort and consolation of their consciences.

As touching to the third part of penance, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us to their spiritual charge, that although Christ and his death be the sufficient oblation, sacrifice, satisfaction, and recompense, for the which God the Father forgiveth and remitteth to all sinners, not only their sin, but also eternal pain due for the same; yet all men truly penitent, contrite and confessed, must needs also bring forth the fruits of penance, that is to say, prayer, fasting, almsdeeds: and must make restitution or satisfaction in will and deed to their neighbours in such things as they have done them wrong and injury in, and also must do all other good works of mercy and charity, and express their obedient will in the executing and fulfilling of God's commandments outwardly, when time, power, and occasion shall be ministered unto them, or else they shall never be saved. For this is the express precept and commandment of God, Do you the worthy fruits of penance [Luke iii.8.]. And St. Paul saith, Like as in times past you have given and applied yourselves, and all the members of your body, to all filthy living and wickedness, continually increasing the same; in like manner now you must give and apply yourselves wholly to justice, increasing continually in purity and cleanness of life [Rom. vi.19.]. And in another place he saith, I chastise and subdue my carnal body, and the affections of the same, and make them obedient unto the spirit [I Cor. ix.27.].

Item, That these precepts and works of charity be necessary works to our salvation, and God necessarily requireth that every penitent man shall perform the same whensoever time, power, and occasion shall be ministered unto them so to do.

Item, That by penance, and such good works of the same, we shall not only obtain everlasting life, but also we shall

deserve remission or mitigation of these present pains and afflictions in this world, according to the saying of St. Paul, If we would correct and take punishment of ourselves, we should not be so grievously corrected of God [1 Cor. xi.31.]. And Zacharias the prophet saith, Turn yourselves unto me, and I will turn again unto you [Zech. i.3.]. And the prophet Esay saith, Break and deal thy bread unto the hungry, bring into thy house the poor man, and such as want harbour. When thou seest a naked man, give him clothes to cover him with, and refuse not to succour and help the poor and needy, for he is thine own flesh. And if thou wilt thus do, then shall thy light glister out as bright as the sun in the morning, and thy health shall sooner arise unto thee, and thy justice shall go before thy face, and the glory of God shall gather thee up, that thou shalt not fall. And whensoever thou shalt call upon God, God shall hear thee: and whensoever thou shalt cry unto God, God shall say, Lo! here I am ready to help thee. Then shall thy light overcome all darkness, and thy darkness shall be as bright as the sun at noondays: and then God shall give unto thee continual rest, and shall fulfil thy soul with brightness; and shall deliver thy body from adversity: and then thou shalt be like a garden that most plentifully bringeth forth all kind of fruits, and like the well-spring that never shall want water [Isa. lviii.7,8,9, etc.].

These things, and such other, should be continually taught and inculcated into the ears of our people, to the intent to stir and provoke them unto good works, and by the selfsame good works to exercise and confirm their faith and hope, and look for to receive at God's hand mitigation and remission of the miseries, calamities, and grievous punishments which God sendeth to men in the world for their sins.

#### The Sacrament of the Altar.

Fourthly, As touching the sacrament of the altar, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and preceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very selfsame body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross for our redemption. And, that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very selfsame body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament. And, that therefore the said sacrament is to be used with all due reverence and honour; and that every man ought first to prove and examine himself, and religiously to try and search his own conscience before he shall receive the same, according to the saying of St. Paul, Whosoever eateth this body of Christ unworthily, or drinketh of this blood of Christ unworthily,

shall be guilty of the very blood and body of Christ. Wherefore let every man first prove himself, and so let him eat of this bread and drink of this drink; for whosoever eateth it or drinketh it unworthily, he eateth and drinketh to his own damnation, because he putteth no difference between the very body of Christ and other kinds of meat [1 Cor. xi.27, etc.]

### Justification

Fifthly, As touching the order and cause of our justification, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us to their spiritual charge, that this word justification signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God, that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ.

Item, That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared. Not as though our contrition, or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification: for the only mercy and grace of the Father promised freely unto us for his Son's sake Jesus Christ, and the merits of his blood and passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof. And yet, that, notwithstanding, to the attaining of the same justification, God requireth to be in us, not only inward contrition, perfect faith and charity, certain hope and confidence, with all other spiritual graces and motions; which, as we said before, must necessarily concur in remission of our sins, that is to say, our justification: but also he requireth and commandeth us, that after we be justified, we must also have good works of charity and obedience towards God, in the observing and fulfilling outwardly of his laws and commandments. For although acceptation to everlasting life be conjoined with justification, yet our good works be necessarily required to the attaining of everlasting life. And we being justified be necessarily bound, and it is our necessary duty to do good works, according to the saying of St. Paul, We be bound not to live according to the flesh, and to fleshly appetites; for if we live so, we shall undoubtedly be damned. And contrary, if we will mortify the deeds of our flesh, and live according to the Spirit, we shall be saved. For whosoever be led by the Spirit of God, they be the children of God [Rom. viii.12, etc.]. And Christ saith, If you will come to heaven, keep the commandments [Matt. xix.17.]. And St. Paul, speaking of evil works, saith, Whosoever commit sinful deeds shall never come to heaven [Gal. v.21.]. Wherefore we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that God necessarily requireth of us to do good works commanded by him, and that not only outward and civil works, but also the inward spiritual motions and graces of the Holy Ghost: that is to say, to dread and fear God, to love God, to have firm

confidence and trust in God, to invoke and call upon God, to have patience in all adversities, to hate sin, and to have certain purpose and will not to sin again, and such other like motions and virtues. For Christ saith, Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven [Matt. v. 20]. : that is to say, we must not only do outward civil good Works, but also we must have these foresaid inward spiritual motions, consenting and agreeable to the law of God.

Articles concerning the laudable ceremonies used in the Church of Christ; and first of Images.

As touching images, truth it is, that the same have been used in the Old Testament, and also for the great abuses of them, sometime destroyed and put down. And in the New Testament they have been also allowed, as good authors do declare. Wherefore, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us to their spiritual charge, how they ought and may use them. And first, that there be attributed unto them, that they be representers of virtue and good example. And, that they also be by occasion the kindlers and stirrers of men's minds, and make men oft to remember and lament their sins and offences, especially the images of Christ and our Lady. And, that therefore it is meet that they should stand in the churches, and none otherwise to be esteemed. And, to the intent that rude people should not from henceforth take such superstition as in time past, it is thought that the same hath used to do; We will, that our bishops and preachers diligently shall teach them, and according to this doctrine reform their abuses: for else there might fortune idolatry to ensue, which God forbid. And as for censuring of them, and kneeling and offering unto them, with other like worshippings, although the same hath entered by devotion, and fallen to custom, yet the people ought to be diligently taught, that they in nowise do it, nor think it meet to be done to the same images; but only to be done to God and in his honour, although it be done before the images, whether it be of Christ, of the cross, of our Lady, or of any other saint beside.

Of honouring of Saints

As touching the honouring of saints, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charges, that saints, now being with Christ in heaven, be to be honoured of Christian people in earth, but not with that confidence and honour which are only due unto God, trusting to attain at their hands that which must be had only of God. But, that they be thus to be honoured, because they be known the elect persons of Christ, because they be passed in godly life out of this transitory world; because they already do reign in glory with Christ;

and, most specially to laud and praise Christ in them for their excellent virtues, which he planted in them, for example of and by them to such as yet are in this world, to live in virtue and goodness; and also not to fear to die for Christ, and his cause, as some of them did. And finally to take them in that they may, to be the advancers of our prayers and demands unto Christ. By these ways, and such like, be saints to be honoured and had in reverence, and by none other.

### Of Praying to Saints.

As touching praying to saints, we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that albeit grace, remission of sin, and salvation, cannot be obtained but of God only, by the mediation of our Saviour Christ, which is only sufficient mediator for our sins; yet it is very laudable to pray to saints in heaven everlastingly living, whose charity is ever permanent to be intercessors, and to pray for us and with us unto Almighty God, after this manner:

"All holy angels and saints in heaven, pray for us, and with us, unto the Father, that for his dear Son Jesus Christ his sake, we may have grace of him, and remission of our sins, with an earnest purpose (not wanting ghostly strength) to observe and keep his holy commandments, and never to decline from the same again unto our lives' end." And in this manner we may pray to our blessed Lady, to St. John Baptist, to all and every of the apostles, or any other saint particularly, as our devotion doth serve us: so that it be done without any vain superstition, as to think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ; or that any saint doth serve of one thing more than another, or is patron of the same. And likewise we must keep holy-days unto God, in memory of Him and His saints, upon such days as the church hath ordained their memories to be celebrate, except they be mitigated and moderated by the assent and commandment of us the supreme head, to the ordinaries; and then the subjects ought to obey it.

### Of Rites and Ceremonies.

As concerning the rites and ceremonies of Christ's church; as, to have such vestments in doing God's service as be and have been most part used: as sprinkling of holy-water, to put us in remembrance of our baptism, and the blood of Christ sprinkled for our redemption upon the cross: giving of holy bread, to put us in remembrance of the sacrament of the altar, that all Christian men be one body mystical of Christ, as the bread is made of many grains, and yet but one loaf; and to put us in remembrance of the receiving of the holy sacrament and body of Christ, the which we ought to receive in right charity, which in the beginning of Christ's church men did more often receive than they use nowadays to

do: bearing of candles on Candlemas-day in memory of Christ the spiritual light, of whom Simeon did prophesy, as is read in the church that day: giving of ashes on Ash-Wednesday, to put in remembrance every Christian man in the beginning of Lent and penance, that he is but ashes and earth, and thereto shall return, which is right necessary to be uttered from henceforth in our mother-tongue always on the Sunday: bearing of palms on Palm-Sunday, in memory of the receiving of Christ into Hierusalem a little before his death, that we may have the same desire to receive him into our hearts: creeping to the cross, and humbling ourselves to Christ on Good-Friday before the cross, and there offering unto Christ before the same, and kissing of it in memory of our redemption by Christ made upon the cross: setting up the sepulture of Christ, whose body after his death was buried: the hallowing of the font, and other like exorcisms and benedictions by the ministers of Christ's church, and all other like laudable customs, rites and ceremonies, be not to be contemned and cast away, but to be used and continued, as things good and laudable, to put us in remembrance of those spiritual things that they do signify, not suffering them to be forgotten, or to be put in oblivion, but renewing them in our memories from time to time; but none of these ceremonies have power to remit sin, but only to stir and lift up our minds unto God, by whom only our sins be forgiven.

#### Of Purgatory.

Forasmuch as due order of charity requireth, and the Book of Maccabees and divers ancient doctors plainly shewen, that it is a very good and charitable deed to pray for souls departed; and forasmuch also as such usage hath continued in the church so many years, even from the beginning; we will, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that no man ought to be grieved with the continuance of the same; and, that it standeth with the very due order of charity, a Christian man to pray for souls departed, and to commit them in our prayers to God's mercy, and also to cause other to pray for them in masses and exequies, and to give alms to other to pray for them, whereby they may be relieved and holpen of some part of their pain. But, forasmuch as the place where they be, the name thereof, and kind of pains there also, be to us uncertain by scripture, therefore this, with all other things, we remit to Almighty God, unto whose mercy it is meet and convenient for us to commend them; trusting that God accepteth our prayers for them, referring the rest wholly to God, to whom is known their estate and condition. Wherefore it is much necessary that such abuses be clearly put away which under the name of purgatory hath been advanced, as, to make men believe that through the bishop of Rome's pardons souls might clearly be delivered out of purgatory and all the pains of it; or,

that masses said at scala coeli, or otherwise in any place,  
or before any image, might likewise deliver them from all their  
pain, and send them straight to heaven. And other like abuses.

## APPENDIX C

### The Six Articles Act, 1539.<sup>1</sup>

Where the king's most excellent majesty is, by God's law, supreme head immediately under Him of this whole Church and congregation of England, intending the conservation of the same Church and congregation in a true, sincere, and uniform doctrine of Christ's religion, calling also to his blessed and most gracious remembrance as well the great and quiet assurance, prosperous increase, and other innumerable commodities, which have ever ensued, come, and followed, of concord, agreement, and unity in opinions, as also the manifold perils, dangers, and inconveniences which have heretofore, in many places and regions, grown, sprung, and arisen, of the old diversities of minds and opinions, especially of matters of Christian religion, and therefore desiring that such a unity might and should be charitably established in all things touching and concerning the same, as the same, so being established, might chiefly be to the honour of Almighty God, the very Author and Fountain of all true unity and sincere concord, and consequently redound to the commonwealth of this his highness's most noble realm, and of all his loving subjects, and other residents and inhabitants of or in the same; has therefore caused and commanded this his most High Court of Parliament, for sundry and many urgent causes and considerations, to be at this time summoned, and also a synod and Convocation of all the archbishops, bishops, and other learned men of the clergy of this his realm, to be in like manner assembled.

And foreasmuch as in the said Parliament, synod, and Convocation, there were certain Articles, matters, and questions proponed and set forth touching Christian religion, that is to say:

First, whether in the most blessed Sacrament of the altar remaineth, after the consecration, the substance of bread and wine, or no.

Secondly, whether it be necessary by God's law that all men should be communicate with both kinds, or no.

Thirdly, whether priests, that is to say, men dedicate to God by priesthood, may, by the law of God, marry after, or no.

Fourthly, whether vow of chastity or widowhood, made

---

<sup>1</sup> Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 303-306.

to God advisedly by man or woman, be, by the law of God, to be observed, or no.

Fifthly, whether private masses stand with the law of God, and be to be used and continued in the Church and congregation of England, as things whereby good Christian people may and do receive both godly consolation and wholesome benefits, or no.

Sixthly, whether auricular confession is necessary to be retained, continued, used, and frequented in the Church, or no.

The king's most royal majesty, most prudently pondering and considering, that by occasion of variable and sundry opinions and judgments of the said Articles, great discord and variance has arisen, as well amongst the clergy of this his realm, as amongst a great number of vulgar people, his loving subjects of the same, and being in a full hope and trust that a full and perfect resolution of the said Articles should make a perfect concord and unity generally amongst all his loving and obedient subjects, of his most excellent goodness, not only commanded that the said Articles should deliberately and advisedly, by his said archbishops, bishops, and other learned men of his clergy, be debated, argued, and reasoned, and their opinions therein to be understood, declared, and known, but also most graciously vouchsafed, in his own princely person, to descend and come into his said High Court of Parliament and council, and there, like a prince of most high prudence and no less learning, opened and declared many things of high learning and great knowledge, touching the said Articles, matters, and questions, for a unity to be had in the same; whereupon, after a great and long, deliberate, and advised disputation and consultation, had and made concerning the said Articles, as well by the consent of the king's highness, as by the assent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and other learned men of his clergy in their Convocation, and by the consent of the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, it was and is finally resolved, accorded, and agreed in manner and form following, that is to say:

First, that in the most blessed Sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is present really, under the form of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary; and that after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread or wine, nor any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and man.

Secondly, that communion in both kinds is not necessary ad salutem, by the law of God, to all persons; and that it is to be believed, and not doubted of, but that in the flesh, under the form of bread, is the very blood; and with the blood, under the form of wine, is the very flesh; as well apart, as though they were both together.

Thirdly, that priests after the order of priesthood received, as afore, may not marry, by the law of God.

Fourthly, that vows of chastity or widowhood, by man

or woman made to God advisedly, ought to be observed by the law of God; and that it exempts them from other liberties of Christian people, which without that they might enjoy.

Fifthly, that it is meet and necessary that private masses be continued and admitted in this the king's English Church and congregation, as whereby good Christian people, ordering themselves accordingly, do receive both godly and goodly consolations and benefits; and it is agreeable also to God's law.

Sixthly, that auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the Church of God.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 306-19, for the enacting clauses of the Six Articles Act.

APPENDIX D

The Forty-two Articles, 1553.<sup>1</sup>

ARTICLES

Agreed upon in the Convocation,  
and published by the  
KINGS MAJESTY.

[1] Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

There is but one living and true God, and he is everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of his God-head there be three persons, of one substance, power and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

[2] That the Word, or Son of God, was made very Man.

The Son which is the Word of the Father, took mans nature in the Womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the God-head and Manhood, were joyned together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ very God and very Man, who truely suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for all sin of man both original and actual.

[3] Of the going down of Christ into Hell.

As Christ died and was buried for us, so also it is to be believed, that he went down into Hell; for the body lay in the Sepulchre until the Resurrection, but his Ghost, departing from him, was with the Ghosts that were in Prison or in Hell,

---

<sup>1</sup> A Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions Ecclesiastical; with other Publick Records of the Church of England Chiefly in the Times of K. Edward VI. Q. Elizabeth, K. James, & K. Charles I. Published to Vindicate the Church of England, and to promote Uniformity and Peace in the Same, pp. 41-52.

and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testifie.

[4] The Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of mans nature, wherewith he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge men at the last day.

[5] The Doctrine of holy Scripture is sufficient to Salvation.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it be sometime received of the Faithful as godly and profitable for an order and comeliness, yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an Article of Faith, or reputed requisite to the necessity of salvation.

[6] The Old Testament is not to be refused.

The Old Testament is not to be put away as though it were contrary to the New, but to be kept still; for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

[7] The three Creeds.

The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles Creed, ought thorowly to be received: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.

[8] Of Original or Birth-sin.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do now adays renew) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendred of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from his former righteousness which he had at his Creation, and is, of his own nature, given to evil; so that the flesh desireth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born in this world, it deserveth Gods wrath and damnation; and this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are baptized, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *φείνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the wisdom, some the sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them

that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath, of itself, the nature of sin.

[9] Of Free-will.

We have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will and working in us when we have that will.

[10] Of Grace.

The Grace of Christ, or the holy Ghost by him given, doth take away the stony heart, and giveth an heart of flesh; and although those that have no will to good things, he maketh them to will; and those that would evil things, he maketh them not to will the same: yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will: and therefore no man when he sinneth, can excuse himself as not worthy to be blamed, or condemned, by alledging that he sinned unwillingly, or by compulsion.

[11] Of the justification of man.

Justification by only Faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholsom Doctrine for Christian men.

[12] Works before Justification.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men mete to receive grace, (or as the School-Authors say) deserve grace of Congruity: but because they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

[13] Works of Supererogation.

Voluntary works besides, over and above, Gods Commandments, which they call works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and iniquity. For by them men do declare, that they do not only render to God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We be unprofitable Servants.

[14] No man is without sin but Christ alone.

Christ in the truth of nature was made like unto us in all things (sin only excepted) from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his Spirit. He came to be the Lamb

without spot, who by sacrifice of himself made once for ever, should take away the sins of the World: and sin (as St. John saith) was not in him. But the rest, (yea, although we be baptized and born again in Christ) yet we offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the ruth truth is not in us.

[15] Of sin against the holy Ghost.

Every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is not sin against the holy Ghost, and unpardonable: wherefore the place for penitents is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God, (we may) arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place for penitents to such as truly repent and amend their lives.

[16] Blasphemy against the holy Ghost.

Blasphemy against the holy Ghost, is when a man of malice and stubbornness of mind doth rail upon the truth of Gods Word manifestly perceived, and being enemy thereunto persecuteth that same; and because such be guilty of Gods curse, they entangle themselves with a most grievous and heinous crime; whereupon this kind of sin is called and affirmed, of the Lord, unpardonable.

[17] Of Predestination and Election.

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his own judgement, secret from us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankind, and to bring them to everlasting salvation by Christ, as vessels made to honor: whereupon such as have so excellent a benefit of God given unto them, be called according to Gods purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons by adoption: they be made like the Image of Gods only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by Gods mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindly their love towards God: so for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of Gods Predestination,

is a most dangerous downfall, where by the Devil may thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, although the decrees of Predestination are unknown unto us, yet we must receive Gods promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture: and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expresly declared unto us in the Word of God.

[18] We must trust to obtain eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.

They also are to be had accursed and abhorred that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved.

[19] All men are bound to keep the Moral Commandments of the Law.

The Law which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men as concerning the Ceremonies and Rites of the same, neither is it required that the civil precepts and orders of it should, of necessity, be received in any Commonweal; yet no man, be he never so perfect a christian, is exempt and loose from the obedience of those Commandments which are called Moral: wherefore they are not to be hearkned unto, who affirm that holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom they say they have learned such things as they teach, although the same be most eminently repugnant to the holy Scripture.

[20] Of the Church.

The visible Church of Christ, is a Congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christs Ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, and of Antioch, hath erred: So also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living, but also in matters of faith.

[21] Of the Authority of the Church.

It is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to Gods Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore although the Church be a witness and keeper of holy of [sic] Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same,

so beside the same ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

[22] Of the Authority of General Councils.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered, (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may erre; and sometimes have erred, not only in worldly matters, but also in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of the holy Scripture.

[23] Of Purgatory.

The Doctrine of School-Authors concerning Purgatory, Pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well as Images as of Relicks, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly feigned, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

[24] No man may Minister in the Congregation except he be called.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministring the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men, who have publick Authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers in the Lords vineyard.

[25] Men must speak in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.

It is most seemly and most agreeable to the Word of God, that in the Congregation nothing be openly read, spoken in a tongue unknown to the people; the which thing St. Paul did forbid, except some were present that should declare the same.

[26] Of the Sacraments.

Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people, with Sacraments most few in number, most easie to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is Baptism and the Lords Supper.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should rightly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholsom effect and operation, and yet not that of the

work wrought as some men speak; which word as it is strange and unknown to holy Scripture, so it engendreth no godly, but a very superstitious sense; but they that receive the Sacraments unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

Sacraments ordained by the Word of God, be not only badges and tokens of Christian mens profession: but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and Gods good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

[27] The wickedness of the Ministers doth not take away the effectual operation of Gods Ordinances.

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometime the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but do minister by Christs Commission and Authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Gods Ordinances taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of Gods gifts diminished from such, as by faith rightly received the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual, because of Christs institution and promise, although they be ministred by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of such, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offenses; and finally being found guilty by just judgement be deposed.

[28] Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not Christned: but it is also a sign and seal of our newbirth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church: the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, are visibly signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Custom of the Church to Christen young Children, is to be commended and in any wise to be retained in the Church.

[29] Of the Lords Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christs death. Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a communion of the body of Christ; likewise the Cup of blessing is a communion of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine, into the substance of Christs Body and Blood, cannot be proved by holy Writ: but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

For as much as the truth of mans nature requireth that the body of one and the selfsame man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place, therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time, in many & divers places: and because, as holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe, or openly confess the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christs flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not commanded by Christs Ordinance to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshiped.

[30] Of the perfect Oblation of Christ made upon the Cross.

The offering of Christ made once for ever, is the perfect redemption, the pacifying of Gods displeasure, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or sin, were forged fables, and dangerous deceits.

[31] The state of single life is commanded to no man by the Word of God.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded to vow the state of single life without marriage; neither by Gods law are they compelled to abstain from matrimony.

[32] Excommunicate persons are to be avoided.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and Excommunicate, ought to be taken, of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereto.

[33] Traditions of the Church.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the Diversity of

Countries, and mens manners, so that nothing be ordained against Gods Word. Whosoever through his private judgement willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that other may fear to do the like) as one that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

[34] Of Homilies.

The homilies of late given and set out by the Kings authority, be godly and wholsom, containing Doctrine to be received of all men, and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly.

[35] Of the Book of Prayers and Ceremonies of the Church of England.

The book which of very late time was given to the Church of England by the Kings Authority and the Parliament, containing the manner and form of praying and ministring the Sacraments in the Church of England: likewise also the book of ordering Ministers of the Church, set forth by the aforesaid Authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholsom Doctrine of the Gospel, but agreeable thereunto, furthering and beautifying the same not a little; and therefore of all faithful members of the Church of England, and chiefly of the Ministers of the word, they ought to be received and allowed with all readiness of mind and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the people of God.

[36] Of Civil Magistrates.

The King of England is supreme head in Earth next under Christ of the Church of England and Ireland.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Civil Magistrate is ordained and allowed of God, wherefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience sake.

The Civil Laws may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christians at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in lawful wars.

[37] Christian mens Goods are not common.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsly boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor according to his ability.

[38] Christian men may take an Oath.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesu Christ, and his Apostle James: so we judge that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophets teaching, in justice, judgement and truth.

[39] The Resurrection of the Dead is not yet brought to pass.

The Resurrection of the dead is not as yet brought to pass, as though it only belonged to the soul, which by the grace of Christ is called from the death of sin, but it is to be lookt for at the last day. For then (as Scripture doth most manifestly testifie) to all that be dead, their own bodies, flesh, and bone shall be restored, that the whole man may, according to his works, have either reward or punishment, as he hath lived virtuously or wickedly.

[40] The Souls of them that depart this life, do neither die with the bodies, nor sleep idley.

They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling, or perceiving until the day of judgement; or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall be raised up with the same, do utterly differ from the right belief, declared to us in holy Scripture.

[41] Hereticks called Millenarii.

They that go about to renew the Fable of the Hereticks called Millenarii, be repugnant to holy Scripture, and cast themselves headlong into a Jewish dotage.

[42] All men shall not be saved at the length.

They also are worthy of condemnation, who endeavor, at this time, to restore the dangerous opinion, that all men, be they never so ungodly, shall at length be saved, when they have suffered pains for their sins a certain time appointed by Gods Justice.

APPENDIX E

The Thirty-nine Articles, 1563.<sup>1</sup>

ARTICLES Agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London, in the year 1562 [sic]. For the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the stablishing of Consent touching True RELIGION.

I. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker, and preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. Of the Word or Son of God, which was made very man.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance of the Father, took mans nature in the Womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joyned together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

III. Of the going down of Christ into Hell.

As Christ died for us, and was buried: so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Collection of Articles, Cannons, Injunctions, etc. Together with several Acts of Parliament concerning Ecclesiastical Matters; some whereof are to be Read in Churches,  
pp. 3-15.

#### IV. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the Perfection of mans nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

#### V. Of the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one Substance, Majesty and Glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

#### VI. Of the Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for Salvation.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whole Authority was never any doubt in the Church.

#### Of the Names and Number of the Canonical BOOKS.

Genesis,	:	The 1. Book of Chronicles,
Exodus,	:	The 2. Book of Chronicles,
Leviticus,	:	The 1. Book of Esdras,
Numeri,	:	The 2. Book of Esdras,
Deuteronomium,	:	The Book of Hester,
Josue,	:	The Book of Job,
Judges,	:	The Psalms
Ruth,	:	The Proverbs,
The 1. Book of Samuel,	:	Ecclesiastes or Preachers,
The 2. Book of Samuel,	:	Cantica or Songs of Solomon,
The 1. Book of Kings,	:	4 Prophets the greater,
The 2. Book of Kings,	:	12 Prophets the less.

And the other Books (as Hierome faith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any Doctrine; Such are these following.

The 3. Book of Esdras,	:	Baruch the Prophet,
The 4. Book of Esdras,	:	The Song of the three Childern
The Book of Tobias,	:	The Story of Susanna,
The Book of Judith,	:	Of Bel and the Dragon,
The rest of the Book of:	:	The Prayer of Manasses,
Hester,	:	The 1. Book of Maccabees,
The Book of Wisdom,	:	The 2. Book of Maccabees.
Jesus the Son of Sirach,	:	



## XI. Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are Justified by faith only, is a most wholsom Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

## XII. Of good Works.

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of Gods judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

## XIII. Of Works before Justification.

Work done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-Authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

## XIV. Of Works of Supererogation.

Voluntary Works besides, over and above Gods Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare, That they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: Whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you say, we are unprofitable servants.

## XV. Of Christ alone without Sin.

Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things (sin only except) from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be a Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world: and sin (as St. John saith) was not in him. But all we the rest (although baptized and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us.

## XVI. Of Sin after Baptism.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God (we may) arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

## XVII. Of Predestination and Election.

Predestination to life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly Decreed by his Counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to Gods purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good words, and at length by Gods mercy they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the Godly consideration of Predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God. So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of Gods Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive Gods Promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture. And in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expresly declared unto us in the Word of God.

## XVIII. Of obtaining Eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.

They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his Life according to

that Law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

XIX. Of the Church.

The Visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is Preached, and the Sacraments be duly Ministered, according to Christs Ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

XX. Of the Authority of the Church.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith: And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to Gods Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore although the Church be a Witness and a Keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to Decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

XXI. Of the Authority of General Councils.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

XXII. Of Purgatory.

The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Addoration, as well of Images, as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

XXIII. Of Ministring in the Congregation.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the Office of publick Preaching, or Ministring the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this Work by men who have publick

Authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard.

XXIV. Of Speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People understandeth.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, or to Minister the Sacraments in a Tongue not understood of the People.

XXV. Of the Sacraments.

Sacraments ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of Christian mens Profession: but rather they be certain sure Witnesses, and effectual signs of Grace, and Gods good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed by the Scriptures: but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lords Supper, for that they have not any visible Sign or Ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholsom effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

XXVI. Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments.

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and some time the evil hath chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christs, and do minister by his Commission and Authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christs Ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of Gods gifts diminished from such, as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministred unto them, which be effectual, because of Christs Institution and Promise, although they be ministred by evil men.

Nevertheless it appertaineth to the Discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences: and finally being found guilty, by just judgement be deposed.

XXVII. Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a Sign of Profession, and Mark of Difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not Christned: but it is also a Sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church: the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly Signed and Sealed: faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of Prayer unto God. The Baptism of young childern is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the Institution of Christ.

XXVIII. Of the Lords Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the Love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christs Death: Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Christ: and the likewise the Cup of Blessing, is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ: but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many Superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not by Christs Ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

XXIX. Of the Wicked, which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lords Supper.

The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their Teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ: yet in no wise are they Partakers of Christ, but rather to their Condemnation do eat and drink the Sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

XXX. Of both kinds.

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay people: For both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christs Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

XXXI. Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

The Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both Original and Actual, and there is none other Satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous Fables, and dangerous Deceits.

XXXII. Of the Marriage of Priests.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by Gods Law, either to vow the state of Single life, or to abstain from Marriage: Therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to Marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

XXXIII. Of Excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.

That person which by open Denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the Unity of the Church, and Excommunicated, ought to be taken, of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by Penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

XXIV. Of the Traditions of The Church.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of Countries, Times, and mens Manners, so that nothing be ordained against Gods Word. Whosoever, through his private Judgement, willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God and be ordained and approved by Common Authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that other may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the Common Order of the Church, and hurteth the Authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the Consciences of the weak Brethren.

Every particular or National Church, hath Authority to ordain, change, and abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, ordained only by mans Authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

XXXV. Of Homilies.

The Second Book of Homilies, the several Titles whereof we have joyned under this Article, doth contain a godly and

wholsom Doctrine, and necessary for these Times as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the People.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1. Of the right Use of the Church.
2. Against Peril of Idolatry.
3. Of Repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
4. Of Good Works, first of Fasting.
5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
6. Against Excess of Apparel.
7. Of Prayer.
8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
9. That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be Ministered in a known Tongue.
10. Of the Reverent Estimation of Gods Word.
11. Of Alms doing.
12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
13. Of the passion of Christ.
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.
15. Of the worthy Receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.
16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.
17. For the Rogation Days.
18. Of the State of Matrimony.
19. Of Repentance.
20. Against Idleness.
21. Against Rebellion.

XXXVI. Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by Authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing that of it self is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are Consecrated, or Ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the Second year of the forenamed King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be Consecrated or Ordered according to the same Rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully Consecrated and Ordered.

XXXVII. Of the Civil Magistrates.

The Queens Majesty hath the chief Power in this Realm of England, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all Causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any Foreign Jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queens Majesty the chief Government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous Folks to be offended: we give not to our Princes the Ministring either of Gods Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen, do most plainly testifie: but that only Prerogative which we see to have been given always, to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself, that is, that they should rule all Estates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the Civil Sword the stubborn and evil Doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no Jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with Death for hainous and grievous Offences.

It is lawful for Christian Men, at the Commandment of the Magistrate, to wear Weapons, and serve in the Wars.

XXXVIII. Of Christian Mens Goods, which are not common.

The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the Right, Title, and Possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsly boast. Notwithstanding, every Man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give Alms to the Poor, according to his ability.

XXXIX. Of a Christian Mans Oath.

As we confess that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his Apostle: So we judge that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may Swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of Faith and Charity, so it be done according to the Prophets teaching, in Justice, Judgement and Truth.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his great appreciation to Dr. Donald Tilton of the Department of History and Political Science for his aid and assistance to the writer over the past two years, through his prudent advice and excellent guidance. It has certainly been a privilege to work under him.

The writer also wishes to express his indebtedness to the librarians and their staffs of the University of Rhode Island Library, the Redwood Library, and the John Hay and John Carter Brown Libraries of Brown University for their kind cooperation in the obtaining of materials.

To all the others, who, through their advice and encouragement, brought this thesis closer to its completion, the writer wishes to express his sincere gratitude.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, J. W. A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century. New York: The Dial Press Inc., 1928.
- Anthony, Katharine. Queen Elizabeth. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929.
- Balleine, G. R. The Layman's History of the Church of England. second ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.
- Beesly, Edward Spencer. Queen Elizabeth. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1906.
- Black, J. B. The Reign of Elizabeth: 1558-1603. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Blayney, Ida Walz. The Age of Luther: The Spirit of Renaissance-Humanism and the Reformation. New York: Vantage Press, 1957.
- The Book of Common Prayer: Commonly Called the First Book of Queen Elizabeth. Printed by Grafton 1559. London: William Pickering, 1844.
- Brown, Mainwaring J. "Henry VIII's Book, 'Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,' and the Royal Title of 'Defender of the Faith'," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Vol. VIII. Edited by Charles Rogers. London: for the Royal Historical Society, 1880.

[Burnett], Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum. The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. Vol. III. London: printed for J. Churchill, 1715.

Capes, W. W. The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Vol. III of A History of the English Church. Edited by W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1903.

Carter, C. Sydney. The English Church and the Reformation. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912.

Chamberlin, Frederick. The Private Character of Henry the Eighth. New York: Ives Washburn, 1931.

Clayton, Joseph. The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1934.

Coit, Thomas Winthrop. Lectures on the Early History of Christianity in England with Sermons Delivered on Several Occasions. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr., 1859.

A Collection of Articles, Cannons, Injunctions, etc. Together with several Acts of Parliament concerning Ecclesiastical Matters; some whereof are to be Read in Churches. London: Charles Bill, 1699.

A Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions Ecclesiastical; with other Publick Records of the Church of England Chiefly in the Times of K. Edward VI. Q. Elizabeth, K. James, & K. Charles I. Published to Vindicate the Church of England, and to promote Uniformity and Peace in the Same. London: printed for Robert Pamlet, 1675.

- Collette, Charles Hastings. The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, D. D., the First Reforming Archbishop of Canterbury. London: George Redway, 1887.
- Creighton, M. A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome. Vol. VI. new ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1901.
- Davies, E. T. Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950.
- Dixon, Richard Watson, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction. Vols. I, II, III, IV, V, VI. various eds. V.P.: V. Pub., V.D.
- The First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI 1549. reprinted from a copy in the British Museum. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, [1888].
- Fisher, H. A. L. The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of Henry VIII.: 1485-1547. Vol. V. of The Political History of England. Edited by William Hunt and Reginald L. Poole. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1928.
- Flick, Alexander Clarence. The Decline of the Medieval Church. Vol. II. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.
- Frere, W. H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Vol. V of A History of the English Church. Edited by W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt. London: Macmillan And Co., Limited, 1911.

Froude, James Anthony. History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. Vols. I, III, IV, V, VI, VII. London: V. Pub., V. D.

\_\_\_\_\_. Short Studies on Great Subjects. New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1868.

Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain; from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the year M. DC. XLVIII. Vols. III, IV. Edited by J. S. Brewer. new ed. Oxford: The University Press, 1845.

Gairdner, James, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century From the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary. Vol. IV of A History of the English Church. Edited by W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1903.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Henry VIII," The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan and Bishop, Edmund. Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer. London: John Hodges, 1890.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Eve of the Reformation: Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the Period Preceding the Rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900.

\_\_\_\_\_. Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries; an Attempt to Illustrate the History of their Suppression. Vols. I, II. various eds. London: John Hodges, 1889.

- Gee, Henry and Hardy, William John. Documents Illustrative of English Church History. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896.
- Grimm, Harold J. The Reformation Era: 1500-1650. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.
- Hackett, Francis. Henry the Eighth. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929.
- Henderson, Daniel. The Crimson Queen: Mary Tudor. New York: Duffield and Green, 1933.
- Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland. Vols. III, IV. London: printed for J. Johnson; F. C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Cadell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1808.
- Hyma, Albert. Renaissance to Reformation. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- Ketley, Joseph (ed.). The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552: with other Documents set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI. Cambridge: The University Press, 1844.
- Lea, Henry Charles. "The Eve of the Reformation," The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. I. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1902.
- Luckock, Herbert Mortimer, Studies in the History of the Book of Common Prayer. second ed. London: Rivingtons, 1882.
- Mackie, J. D. The Earlier Tudors: 1485-1558. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952.

- Maitland, F. W. "The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation," The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II. Cambridge: The University Press, 1934.
- Neale, J. E. Queen Elizabeth. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1934.
- O'Brien, John. A History of the Mass: and its Ceremonies in the Eastern and Western Church. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1879.
- Pastor, Ludwig. The History of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages. Vols. IX, X. Edited by Ralph Francis Kerr. fourth ed. V.P.: V. Pub., V.D.
- Powicke, F. M. The Reformation in England. London: Oxford University Press, 1941
- Prescott, H. F. M. Mary Tudor, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.
- Procter, Francis. A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices. fifteenth ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- Routh, C. R. N. (comp.) They Saw It Happen: An Anthology of Eye-witnesses' Accounts of Events in British History 1485-1688. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.
- The Second Prayer-Book of King Edward VI 1552. reprinted from a copy in the British Museum. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, [1888].
- Smith, H. Maynard. Pre-reformation England. London: Macmillan and Co., 1938.

- Stone, J. M. The History of Mary I. Queen of England. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1901.
- [Strype, John]. Historical Memorials, chiefly Ecclesiastical and such as concern Religion and the Reformation of It. Vol. II. London: printed for John Wyat, 1721.
- Stubbs, William. Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887.
- Tanner, J. R. Tudor Constitutional Documents A.D. 1485-1603 with an Historical Commentary. second ed. Cambridge: The University Press, 1930.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. England in the Age of Whycliffe. second ed. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1899.
- Tudor Tracts: 1532-1588. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1903.
- White, Beatrice. Mary Tudor. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.
- Woodhouse, H. F. The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology: 1547-1603. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.
- Writings of Edward the Sixth, William Hugh, Queen Catherine Parr, Anne Askew, Lady Jane Grey, Hamilton, and Balnaves. Vol. III of British Reformers. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, [18--].
- Writings of John Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury. Vol. XI of British Reformers. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, [18--].