2-1-2015

The Role of Edward VI in the Development of the English Reformation

Lisa Eaton-Adams
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_eatonadamsl@csl.edu

THE ROLE OF EDWARD VI IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

By
Lisa Eaton-Adams
February 2015

Approved by _____
Ronald R. Feuerhahn Advisor

_____
Gerhard H. Bode Reader

_____
Robert A. Kolb Reader

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

THE ROLE OF EDWARD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION: COMMON AND CURRENT VIEWS

In England, the year of our Lord 1538 began with a surge of confidence. A few months before, on 12 October 1537, King Henry VIII's greatest desire had come to pass and his prayers had been answered when his third wife, Jane Seymour, had given birth to a healthy son, christened Edward. Since 1509, when Henry had been crowned king at the death of his father and subsequently married Princess Katherine of Aragon,[1] he had anxiously longed for a male heir. The failure of the three sons born to Katherine to survive the first few months of childhood led to Henry's eventual annulment of his marriage to Katherine on 23 May 1533.[2] The similar failure of Anne Boleyn to produce a healthy male heir led to her execution in 1536.[3] Henry's determination to have a male heir had not only led directly to his tumultuous sequence of marriages and the break with the Church of Rome, but also drove him to push for the legal grounds to declare his only surviving illegitimate son to be his legal heir and successor.

---

[1] Katherine had been baptized as 'Catalina' but her name was almost always called by some variation on Katherine (always with a 'K') in England. For a biographical sketch of the queen, see Appendix A.

[2] Henry had begun to pursue Anne Boleyn as early as 1525, and had begun to consider ways of disposing of Katherine the following year. In 1530 Katherine was banished from the royal court. In 1532 Henry and Anne were secretly married. After Anne became pregnant, a second, public, wedding ceremony was held on 25 January 1533 to ensure the legitimacy of the child to be born (Elizabeth, on 7 September 1533). Henry arranged for Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, to declare his marriage to Katherine to have been illegal, and it was thus technically terminated by annulment rather than divorce on 23 May 1533. Five days later Cranmer followed up this action by ruling that Henry's marriage to Anne was valid and legal. Henry subsequently referred to Katherine only as the Dowager Princess of Wales, though Katherine continued to call herself the Queen of England until her death on 7 January 1536.

[3] Anne was executed on 19 May 1536. In addition to bearing Elizabeth in 1533, Anne miscarried a male son in 1535 and gave birth to a premature stillborn son on 29 January 1536.

Henry had numerous affairs throughout his marriage to Katherine, and had produced one surviving son. Elizabeth Blount had born him an illegitimate son, Henry Fitzroy, on 15 (?) June 1519. The boy was made Duke of Richmond and Somerset in 1525. At the time of Fitzroy's death on 23 July 1536, the English Parliament was in the process of passing the Second Succession Act, which removed Mary and Elizabeth from the line of succession, and which gave Henry the power to designate anyone he chose as his successor. The general assumption, then and now, was that he had intended to name Fitzroy.

Henry's strong sense of a need for a male heir must be understood in the context of his times. The nation had only recently emerged from a long conflict over the succession to the English crown, known popularly today as the Wars of the Roses. The conflict began after the death of Henry V in 1422 and the succession to the throne of his nine-month-old son as Henry VI. Just before his death, Henry V had attempted to arrange for a conciliar form of government for the nation during the minority of his son. This arrangement worked for the first several years but eventually collapsed when it became clear that Henry VI was not capable of ruling the realm competently. The increasing tension between the two royal houses of York and Lancaster included several minor skirmishes over the following decades. Open warfare began with the First Battle of St. Albans (22 May 1455). After Richard, the Duke of York, who had been named Protector of the Realm in 1453 after the mental breakdown of Henry VI, was killed in battle on 30 December 1460, Henry's continuing mental incapacity led to his deposition (4 March 1461) and Richard's son Edward assumed the throne as Edward IV. In the continuing conflict, Henry VI was returned to the throne on 30 October 1470. After the Battle of Tewkesbury (4 May 1471) in which Henry's son and expected successor was killed, Henry VI was imprisoned and died during the night of 21/22 May 1471. Edward IV was re-crowned as king the following day (22 May 1471) and ruled until his death on 9 April 1483. Before his twelve-year-old son Edward (V)

could be crowned, his birth was declared illegitimate and his uncle Richard, Duke of Gloucester, was eventually crowned Richard III on 6 July 1483. Richard ruled until he was killed in the Battle of Bosworth on 22 August 1485, after which the crown was usurped by Henry Tudor, crowned Henry VII on 30 October 1485. The fighting over the succession continued in a more desultory fashion until 1497. Henry VII managed to retain the crown, in part by a series of judicial murders that eliminated all other possible claimants to the throne.

Henry VIII was determined to avoid the possibility of another bloody conflict over the succession by ensuring that he had a male heir. Thus the birth of an apparently healthy son who had lived for several months was a cause of great rejoicing, for Henry personally and for the nation.

Even those who were not close to the court shared the optimism that Henry felt. In the aftermath the years of civil strife and warfare that had preceded Henry VII's seizure of the crown, the arrival of a healthy male heir promised stability and peace. The nation was relieved that the Tudor dynasty was going to continue and that they were not going to have to worry about the uncertainties and the possible conflict that might arise from their being ruled by either of Edward's sisters, Mary or Elizabeth.

With each passing year the optimism grew, so that by the time of Henry's death on 28 January 1547 it was anticipated that the reign of Edward VI would continue the progress of Henry's reign, especially in the establishment of the Protestant form of Christianity.

> No one could deny that England was a very different realm to the one that Henry had inherited, but as his reign drew to a close, the reformers were already looking ahead to the next—and his heir Edward. Henry had been favourably compared to the Old Testament King Solomon, the builder of the Temple. … Now the parallels were being drawn once more, with the young Prince Edward being compared to the eight-year-old Old Testament King Josiah, who had destroyed idols and restored the true scripture to his people.
>
> Henry had left Edward with a golden inheritance; the prince stood on the cusp of

> becoming the greatest and most powerful English monarch history had witnessed. As men thought then, Edward should be recognized as a central figure in the Tudor age.[4]

It was not to be. The high optimism that attended Edward's accession now seems unwarranted. The period of Edward's reign is seldom remembered, overshadowed by the reigns of his father, Henry VIII, and those of his half-sisters, especially that of Elizabeth. Today the common view is that Edward VI (hereafter known as Edward) was not only politically irrelevant, but that he did not play any significant role in the development of the English Reformation. This view is implied in the brief description of Edward's reign given in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*:

> Having delegated his royal authority to the Privy Council, dominated first by the Protector, Somerset, and then by the Duke of Northumberland, he was himself of little account politically. … His reign is outstanding ecclesiastically for numerous reforms and alterations often forced on the Church by an Erastian government.[5]

The implied conclusion is that since the reforms were forced—the connotations of the term make its use questionable, but that is a separate issue—upon the church by the government, and since Edward was a minor, the government being dominated by the dukes of Somerset and Northumberland, Edward himself was therefore a negligible factor in the reforms implemented during his reign.

It is not within the scope of this paper to assess the secular politics or military developments of Edward's reign. What does concern us here is the question of the extent to which Edward was a factor in the development of the English Reformation. A fuller elaboration of the common view of Edward's insignificance for the English Reformation might bring together three factors that are sometimes mentioned as the basis for regarding him as a negligible figure.

---

[4] Chris Skidmore, *Edward VI: The Lost King of England,* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2007), 4.

[5] F. L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (Oxford:

(continued next page)

First, the period of Edward's reign is generally regarded as of little importance in the development of the English Reformation because of its context. As a summary of the first volume of W. K. Jordan's treatment of Edward's reign notes,

> This relatively short period … has been long neglected by historians, principally because the reign of the young, precocious, and short-lived Edward was caught, as it were, between the overweening personality and accomplishments of this father, Henry VIII, and the long and truly illustrious reign of his sister, Elizabeth.[6]

If this is true of Edward's reign in general, it is even more true of the view of Edward's reign in treatments of the English Reformation. In the latter Edward's reign is overshadowed by the initiation of the reform during his father's reign, by the attempt to re-assert Catholicism under Mary, and the by the final consolidation of the reforms under Elizabeth. Henry, who had initiated the reforms, had ruled from 1509–1547, for 38 years. Elizabeth, who consolidated the gains of the Reformation, reigned for 44 years, from 1558–1603. Mary's reign (1553–1558) was shorter even than Edward's but the turbulence associated with it, and which earned her the nickname 'Bloody Mary', has made it memorable. By contrast, Edward's reign (1547–1553) was not only short, but he never ruled independently, his government being guided in turn by the Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Northumberland. As a result, the period of Edward's reign is generally neglected, or treated in a cursory manner, in studies of the English Reformation.

A second factor in the common assessment of Edward's insignificance is the fact that the *Prayer Book of 1552*,[7] which Skidmore characterizes as the most important and lasting

---

Oxford University Press, 2005), 535.

[6] W. K. Jordan, *Edward VI: The Young King, The Protectorate of the Duke of Somerset* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), summary from the inside of the dust jacket.

[7] The *Book of Common Prayer* is variously referred to both by this longer title and the shorter title of *Prayer Book*, with and without an indication of the edition, commonly given in the form of the date of publication (as in *Prayer Book of 1552*). In addition, while authors generally italicize the longer form of the title, there is no consistent practice with regard to the italicization of the shorter form. This study will generally employ the shorter form of the title and will italicize it. The title *Prayer Book* (without a date) will be employed when speaking of the work in general. The date will be given only when it is necessary to distinguish between editions, and when the date is given it will be considered as part of the title and therefore italicized. When citing other authors, the form of the title and

(continued next page)

achievement of the English Reformation during the reign of Edward VI,[8] was developed by others with minimal input from the king. If the king did not contribute to the most important religious development during his reign, it is presumed, he cannot be regarded as a significant figure.

The third reason that Edward is commonly thought to have been an insignificant factor in the development of the English Reformation during his reign is the combination of his age and the brevity of his reign: Edward was nine years old when he became king in 1547 and ruled for only a little over six years.[9] As a result, it is taken for granted that those who served as Edward's guardians and guides during his reign, primarily the Lord Protector, the Duke of Somerset, and later the Duke of Northumberland, were the real driving force behind the changes that took place during the period.

Despite these factors, there remain those who suggest that Edward's reign should be looked at more closely. The biographer Chris Skidmore maintains that Edward's reign was one of the most important and dynamic times in Tudor history. His reign, Skidmore maintains, was densely packed with dramatic events that took place during a time of radical and religious turmoil.[10] Assuming that we are willing to grant Skidmore's assessment of the high drama of Edward's reign, the mere fact that it was a period of great activity does not, by itself, warrant the conclusion that Edward should be regarded as a significant figure in the history of the English

---

its italicization as employed by the author will be followed.

[8] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 232.

[9] Edward was born on October 12, 1537 and was crowned on Feb. 20, 1547. He died on July 6, 1553 of uncertain causes. At the time of his death he was widely thought to have been poisoned, a common assertion in cases of the sudden or unexpected death of monarchs at the time. Most modern historians have accepted the view that Edward was generally a sickly boy who died of tuberculosis, though a variety of other medical diagnoses have been asserted by various authors. In particular, Loach has challenged the prevailing view, citing evidence that Edward was generally healthy and active, and that he died of a severe infection of the lungs rather than tuberculosis Jennifer Loach, *Edward VI,* Yale English Monarchs, ed. George Bernard and Penry Williams, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 161–163.

[10] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 4.

Reformation. For Edward to be regarded as a significant figure it must be shown that Edward himself contributed to the progress that occurred during the period of his reign. Before we turn to the question of how to assess Edward's possible contributions to the English Reformation, however, it is necessary to explore the reasons that he is seen as a negligible figure in more detail.

The Neglect of the Contributions of Edward's Reign to the English Reformation

There has always been some debate about exactly when the English Reformation began. Despite the early influence of Lutheran ideas in England, clearly, the English Reformation cannot be said to have begun before 1521, when Henry wrote his anti-Lutheran work *The Defense of the Seven Sacraments* and was rewarded with the title *Fidei Defensor* (Defender of the Faith) by Pope Leo X. The gradual development of Henry's desire to divorce his first wife, Katherine of Aragon, so that he could marry Anne Boleyn, who had arrived at Henry's court in 1522, is generally regarded as the circumstance that lead to the initiation of the Reformation in England. But Henry's progress toward this conclusion happened slowly. The years following Katherine's last pregnancy (1518) saw Henry grow increasing restless in his desire for a male heir. She had conceived six times, but had produced only one child that had survived more than two months, and that a girl, Mary. In 1519 one of Henry's mistresses bore him a healthy son, but that child was illegitimate and could not be his heir under English law.

Henry's desire to be rid of Katherine, which was primarily motivated by Henry's political and dynastic need for a male heir, was increasingly presented (and perhaps understood) by Henry in religious terms, the lack of a male heir being characterized by Henry as a divine judgment upon him for having married his brother's widow in contravention of the proscription of Lev. 20:21, "If a man takes his brother's wife, it is impurity. He has uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless," (ESV). Henry's request of 1527 to Pope Clement VII to have

his marriage annulled reflects his continued submission to the Church of Rome at that time. It was Clement's rejection of Henry's request that set in motion the series of events that are now seen collectively as the English Reformation.[11]

The central theological issue in the earliest stages of the English Reformation was not, as in Germany, the doctrine of justification, but rather the doctrine of papal supremacy. For this reason the first explicitly theologically-driven act of the English Reformation was Henry's 1529 indictment and subsequent arrest of his Chancellor, Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, for violating the 1392 (and earlier 1353) Statute of *Praemunire*, which prohibited the assertion of any other legal authority (in this case that of the Papacy) over that of the King of England.[12] In the same year (1529) Henry summoned what was to become known as the Reformation Parliament, which in several sessions lasting through 1536 passed a series of laws establishing the primacy of the English king over the church in all matters, legal, financial, and theological. The leadership of the pro-Reformation Thomas Cromwell in the House of Commons resulted in his appointment to the Privy Council in 1530. His subsequent elevation to the position of chief minister in 1532 ensured that those who promoted reform measures would have the support of the civil authority. Ecclesiastical support for the reform was secured by the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to the position of Archbishop of Canterbury in the same year. Under the influence of these two figures, Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer, the Reformation in England became broader in scope than Henry had initially envisioned.

---

[11] This does not take into account other strictly theological developments that would eventually merge with, and in some cases conflict with, Henry's interests. Most notable of these is the sermon preached by Robert Barnes in St. Edward's Church in Cambridge on Christmas Eve of 1525. This sermon, in which Barnes accused the Church of Rome of heresy, is commonly regarded as the first openly evangelical sermon to be preached in England, and for some marks the beginning of the English Reformation.

[12] For a summary of the background and use of the Statutes of *Praemunire*, see Cross, *Oxford Dictionary*, 1322–1323.

Thus while the determination of a starting-point for the English Reformation may be debated, it is self-evident that it was well under way by the time of the accession of Edward in 1547. The re-assertion of Roman Catholicism by Mary (1553–1558) after Edward's death and the subsequent restoration and firm establishment of Protestantism under Elizabeth (1558–1603) have both overshadowed the contributions of Edward's reign in the popular imagination, and to a lesser extent also in academic treatments of the subject.

The limited importance in the popular mind of the period of Edward's rule for the English Reformation, particularly when compared to that of Henry's reign, is reflected in the article "Timeline of the English Reformation" in Wikipedia. As of January 10, 2015 the "Timeline" listed 61 events between Henry's petition for divorce in 1527 and his death in 1547, but only three events during the entire reign of Edward.[13]

Some recent studies have begun to address this imbalance by calling attention to the importance of Edward's reign in consolidating and extending the advances begun under Henry, which has become better-recognized in the scholarly community. This work needs to continue, and a greater effort needs to be made to get this insight into more popular or entry-level treatments of the English Reformation.

The *Book of Common Prayer*

It is generally recognized that the single most important development in the English Reformation during the reign of Edward was the *Prayer Book of 1552*. As Skidmore asserts:

> The 1552 Prayer Book was the high-water mark for Edward's Reformation, marking 'the greatest single achievement of Edward's reign'. Its legacy would live on into our own times, for it was the model for the Elizabethan Book, which was only slightly

[13] "Timeline of the English Reformation," *Wikipedia*, accessed on January 10, 2015, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_the_English_Reformation. The three events listed during the reign of Edward are the publication of Thomas Cranmer's *First Book of Homilies* (1547) and the two editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1549 and 1552).

> changed in 1662 and became the liturgy for the Church of England for the next four centuries.[14]

One reason for this assessment of the importance of the *Prayer Book* is reflected in the observation of Jordan describing the significance of the *Prayer Book* as a reflection of the theological developments that took place during Edward's reign:

> The second *Book of Common Prayer* undoubtedly represents the furthermost limit of the movement of the Church of England toward evangelical Protestantism. Perhaps even more importantly, it ordained liturgy—a service of worship—which broke radically with the remembered past and in consequence must have caused great spiritual and habitual dislocation in the parish churches across the realm.[15]

Another, somewhat more practical, view of the reasons for the importance of the *Prayer Book* is offered by Skidmore:

> And it was in Edward's reign that the words of ceremonies so well known to us now, and which form a crucial aspect of our national culture and identity, were created. The Book of Common Prayer, first published in 1549 and revised again in 1552, brought a new tone of authority to the prose of the English—works that act almost as a subtext to the background of the lives of generations were forged here; for example, whilst the medieval marriage service used to include the wife's promise to be 'bonner and buxom in bead and at the board', it was in Edward's reign that for the first time that both partners were required both to 'love, cherish and obey', and the wedding vows still spoken to this day, 'for better for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health', were first set down.[16]

Granted that Edward was not a direct contributor to the *Prayer Book*, some scholars have nevertheless recognized that Edward's encouragement and enthusiastic promotion of the *Prayer Book* played an important role in securing its place in the Church of England. This observation needs further development and wider recognition.

---

[14] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 232.

[15] W. K. Jordan, *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power. The Dominance of the Duke of Northumberland* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 348.

[16] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 8.

Edward's Age and the Influence of His Guardians

The argument most commonly offered in support of the view that Edward was a negligible factor in the course of the English Reformation is the fact that, because of his young age, for his entire reign the power of government lay in the hands of a regency council, headed first by the Lord Protector, his uncle Edward Seymour, 1st Duke of Somerset, and later by the President of the Council, John Dudley, 1st Earl of Warwick and (from 1551) Duke of Northumberland. Jennifer Loach expresses the common view:

> Edward was obviously too young to rule himself and the history of his reign must therefore be the history of those who ruled in his name. Somerset, the first of these, had established himself as protector immediately after the death of Henry VIII.[17]

While there seems no doubt that Edward's guardians dominated the civil administration during his reign, the whole question of the degree of their influence over his religious views is less clear. Both men were clear supporters of the Reformation, and most writers appear to take it for granted, offering little supporting evidence, that a young man in Edward's position would have unformed opinions and be dominated by those who acted as his guardians. Because of the importance placed upon this matter, and the complexity of the developments, it is necessary to review the chief developments of the period that each of the dukes governed in order to assess their character and contributions in relation to those of Edward.

The Arrangements of Henry's Will

In order to understand the events that shaped the early years of Edward's reign, it is necessary to set them in the context of the intentions of his father, as expressed in the will of Henry VIII. As Loach observes, "The 1536 Succession Act empowered the king, by his will, to

---

[17] Loach, *Edward VI,* 39.

appoint guardians in case the king was a minor."[18] Henry had drawn up such a list, last revising it in 1544.[19] However, the events surrounding the accusation, trial, and conviction of the Earl of Surrey for treason in December of 1546 convinced the king that it was necessary to revise the arrangements he had made.

> Henry must have realized what was at stake, for though he was not yet in the grave, already the fate of his son was at risk—too young to rule himself, Edward would be an easy target for the unbridled ambitions of politicians and courtiers, and would remain so unless precise guidelines were drawn up on how a regency council should rule during his minority.[20]

After Henry died on 28 January 1547, an examination of his will made it clear that Henry had taken steps to attempt to protect his son and his kingdom. Henry's will appointed sixteen executors, who were also to form the Edward's Regency Council.[21] They were to handle the government of Edward and the realm until Edward was eighteen. Henry's will also provided an additional twelve men who were to be "of the council" and assist the councilors as need required. Most of the men appointed by Henry's will were either already members of his own Privy Council or were other officers of state.[22]

---

[18] Loach, *Edward VI*, 17.

[19] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 44.

[20] Ibid.

[21] There is no consistency in how this council is referred to by the various authors. The Council was largely composed of members of Henry's Privy Council, so that it is often called Edward's Privy Council. Others refer to it as the Regency Council since it was established to govern during his minority. Its charge would end with Edward's maturity, at which point he would have doubtless have selected his own Privy Council. In his diary Edward himself refers to it simply as "the Council" or "my Council" or rarely "my Privy Council." However named, there is only one council that functioned during Edward's reign, though its composition did change over the course of the years.

[22] W. K. Jordan (*Young King*, 56–57) notes that all of the sixteen executors were "new men, careerists, who had gained wealth and power in the late years of Henry VIII because of their devotion to the monarchy and because they all accepted without reservation the constitutional implications of the Act of Supremacy." Moreover, he observes, eight were of the evangelical camp and strongly committed to the Protestant cause, and four more were political careerists without strong religious convictions, but who could be counted on to support the Protestant cause as the will of the majority. Only four of the sixteen could be described as Henrician Catholics who had any sympathy at all for the conservative, Catholic, position.

What is noteworthy about this arrangement is that Henry did not desire that any one person should undertake the role of Edward's guardian and regent. Specifically, Katherine's role as regent, which had been defined in Henry's previous will and of which she was aware, was revoked in his last will. As Skidmore observes,

> Henry's intentions were clear: all voices were equal and decisions were to be taken by a majority vote with no one individual acting supreme. With the regency council, Henry sought to create a realistic framework of government, seemingly free from manipulation, to act in Edward's name. It was to be a constitution for the new reign.[23]

That Henry's intention of having the governing authority of the realm shared equally by the members of a Regency Council during the period of Edward's minority were undermined by those closest to him after his death is unquestioned, as we shall see below. Given the other questionable activity related to Henry's will, this should hardly be surprising.[24]

The Protectorate of the Duke of Somerset

The date of the birth of Edward Seymour is uncertain.[25] What is certain is that he was the older brother of Jane Seymour, the third wife of Henry VIII and mother of Edward. After Jane married Henry VIII, Somerset[26] was elevated to the positions of Viscount Beauchamp (1536),

---

[23] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 45.

[24] The three chief controversies surrounding Henry's will are the problems of who actually created the list of executors and counselors named in the will, the insertion of the so-called unfulfilled gifts clause, and the question of why Henry did not personally sign the will. Skidmore (*Edward VI*, 44–48) makes a strong case that Sir William Paget, Henry's secretary, worked closely with Edward Seymour, later Duke of Somerset, either to influence the king or to modify personally the list of executors to ensure that their party predominated the regency council, to insert the unfulfilled gifts clause to make it possible for them to transfer considerable wealth into their own hands—that the clause was a late insertion to the will Paget himself acknowledged, though he claimed it was done to comply with a verbal order of the king on his deathbed—and to forge the signature of Henry using a stamp of Henry's signature often employed for the signing of public documents in the King's name. While the will claimed to have been signed by the king of 30 December 1546, the official record of the use of the stamp makes it clear that the stamp was used to sign the will sometime after 27 January 1547, the day before Henry's death.

[25] Edward Seymour is said by some sources to have been born around 1500, but is more likely to have been born around 1506. He was the third of the nine children of Sir John Seymour (1474–1536) and his wife Margery Wentworth (c.1478–c. October 1550).

[26] Seymour was not elevated to the position of Duke of Somerset until his consolidation of power as Lord Protector after Henry's death. Nevertheless, for the sake of continuity, and to avoid confusion, he will be referred to as Somerset throughout this work.

Earl of Hertford (1537), and Warden of the Scottish Marches (1537). Despite his sister's death 12 days after the birth of Henry's son Edward,[27] Somerset remained a loyal servant and favored retainer of the king. He was appointed one of the 16 executors of Henry's will, and thus a member of the regency council created by the will.

The exact process by which Somerset became Lord Protector is unclear. That he was working behind the scenes to secure his position even before Henry's death seems certain from the reminder that he received from William Paget, the secretary to Henry VIII, two years later:

> Remember what you promised me in the gallery at Westminster before the breath was out of the body of the king that dead is. Remember what you promised immediately after, devising with me concerning the place which you now occupy. . . . And that was to follow mine advice in all your proceedings more than any other man's.[28]

Somerset also persuaded Paget that only the portion of Henry's will related to the succession be read aloud to Parliament, omitting the provisions that would have revealed Henry's intentions regarding the Regency Council.[29]

On 31 January 1547, only three days after Henry's death and the very day his death was announced to Parliament, the Regency Council met and voted that Somerset should, "be preferred in name and place before others, to whom as to the state and head of the rest all strangers and others might have access," and that he was to have "first and chief place among us, and also the name and title of the Protector."[30] Edward himself described events in this way:

---

[27] That Queen Jane's death was due to complications arising from the birth is unquestioned. The exact cause of death remains debated. At the time, her attendants were accused of allowing her to catch a cold. Today her death is generally attributed to some form of puerperal fever, a post-partum infection that led to septicemia, delirium, and death. David Loades, *The Tudors: History of a Dynasty* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2012), 31.

[28] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 49. W. K. Jordan (*Young King*, 57) also acknowledges that the duke and Paget had agreed on a disposition of power that was a violation of the King's will.

[29] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 49–50.

[30] From J. R. Dasent, et al., eds., *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, New Series Vol. II (1547–1549) (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1890–1964), 5, as quoted by Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 50.

> The next day, being the [31st] of [January] he was brought to the Tower of London, where he tarried the space of three weeks; and in the mean season the Council sat every day for the performance of the will and at length thought best that the Earl of Hertford should be made the Duke of Somerset.... Also they thought best to choose the Duke of Somerset to be Protector of the realm and Governor of the King's person (to which *crossed out*) during his minority, to which all the gentlemen and lords did agree, because he was the King's uncle on his mothers side.[31]

Yet this declaration did not give Somerset plenipotentiary authority; it merely established him as *primus inter pares* designated to represent the group to the public. It was also not passed without opposition.[32] To secure his position further, Somerset promised numerous benefits to the other members of the council. This appears to have secured him their support, though, as Loach has noted, "There can be little doubt that their willingness to do so was encouraged by a promise of substantial distribution of titles and lands. ... almost all the executors received handouts."[33]

With this support secured, Somerset took further steps to consolidate his position and increase his power. Skidmore summarizes the developments:

> On 1 March 1547 the executors and assistants of the will were amalgamated to create a single Privy Council. On 12 March, with only seven members present, it requested a new commission granting the board full authority during Edward's minority. Somerset's powers were also extended, and he was now given full power and authority to decide matters 'both private and public, as well as in outward and foreign causes'. He could add or remove councilors at will and convene the council 'as he shall think meet to call unto him from time to time'. He could even act without its approval. In effect, he had become *de facto* king.[34]

Regardless of how he came to have controlling authority in the kingdom, there can be no doubt whatsoever of the result of Somerset's machinations. With almost unrestricted power to act in the name of the king, Somerset employed his power to carry out his own program. As Loach summarizes his activities, "Autocratic by temperament, he was to run Edward's

---

[31] W. K. Jordan, ed., *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI* (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1966), 4.

[32] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 53.

[33] Loach, *Edward VI*, 26–27.

government as a private fiefdom, using his own men and rewarding them from the king's coffers."[35]

Given Somerset's position and authority, it would be helpful for understanding Edward's position to examine Somerset's personality as well as his political and theological priorities. Unfortunately, while his strength of character is generally accepted, the quality of his character is difficult to assess at this distance, owing to the strong feelings that he evoked. Loach summarizes one common view of Somerset:

> Few sixteenth-century politicians have received more favorable treatment from twentieth-century historians than Somerset. … [H]e has been portrayed by most English and Americans as an idealist, concerned primarily with reform of church and state: indeed, some have created a liberal dreamer who would not have felt out of place at early meetings of the Fabian Society.[36]

In this perspective she specifically has in mind the views of Somerset's character expressed by A. F. Pollard and W. K. Jordan. Jordan speaks for both when he writes,

> Somerset possessed a high view of human nature; he sought to build an England which would have provided a fitter habitation for Christian men; and he wanted neither courage nor resolution as he sought to translate his vision into social reality. He was without administrative ability, he was naive in his judgement of men and events, and he was on occasion reckless and improvident in his uses of power. All this is true, but the Duke of Somerset remains none the less a very great man whose magnanimity and high idealism were never to be forgotten as Englishmen spoke in quiet corners, in the fields, and on the sea of the age of the 'Good Duke'.[37]

Examining the same evidence, and writing three decades after Jordan, Loach reaches a very different view of Somerset's character.

> The real Somerset was, however, very different from the character whom historians have created in their own image. He was, to begin with, neither modest or self-effacing. … [He] had two gilt maces carried before him and he even took the royal

---

[34] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 65–66.

[35] Loach, *Edward VI*, 39.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Jordan, *Young King*, 523.

> jewels from Katherine Parr and allowed his wife to wear them. He was extremely interested in money, a fact admitted even by Pollard, and in his pursuit of material advantage he could be both ruthless and cold-hearted.[38]

The conflict between these two readings of Somerset's character extends also to views of his policy priorities and theological commitments. All agree that Somerset was a military man with a strong concern for maintaining the strong military and naval forces that Henry had established.[39] On other matters there is considerable disagreement. For example, Somerset is widely credited with a strong interest in education, largely on the basis of his continuance of the policy begun under Henry to reform the universities. The university visitations of 1548–49, in addition to a focusing on assessing university finances, appear to have had two primary emphases: the promotion of a revision of the curriculum that emphasized the skills needed for the secular administration of the country at the expense of theological education, and the promotion of Protestant theology, especially at Oxford, where a strong pro-Catholic sentiment prevailed. Those who, like Jordan, emphasize the strength of Somerset's concern for education generally cite a quotation attributed to Somerset by the 16th-century writer W. Harrison:

> If learning decay, which of wild men maketh civil, of blockish and rash persons wise and godly counselors, if obstinate rebels obedient subjects, and of evil men good and godly Christians; what shall we look for else but barbarism and tumult?[40]

Yet here also contemporary authors have found scope for reassessing Somerset's policies. Parry has argued that Harrison's quotation from Somerset reflects Harrison's views more than those of Somerset himself.[41] Loach has gone further. Reviewing his personal property and

---

[38] Loach, *Edward VI*, 39–40.

[39] Indeed, M. L. Bush (*The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London: Hodder & Stoughton Educational, 1975)) presents Somerset as a man preoccupied with the problem of England's security position vis-à-vis Scotland.

[40] W. Harrison, *Description of Britain*, as cited by Jordan, *Young King*, 352.

[41] G. T .R. Parry, "Inventing 'The Good Duke' of Somerset," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xl (1989), 370–380.

spending patterns, she notes that he apparently owned only two books, that "there is little to suggest intellectual pursuits, although large sums were spent on jewellery and plate, and on building," and that he was an inveterate gambler.[42] Beyond these observations, she notes that the actions of the Lord Protector did not always conform to the rhetoric of the Lord Protector:

> One of the stated purposes of the dissolution of the chantries was to be the 'erecting of grammar schools to the education of youth in virtue and godliness, the further augmenting of the universities, and better provision for the poor and needy', but in the event most of the money went directly into the coffers of the crown; only those lands that were already used for the maintenance of schools appear to have been preserved.[43]

Noting the one rare case of an associate of Somerset founding a school (and that during Henry's reign) she observes that, "in general Somerset and his circle are not distinguished for their interest in schools."[44] Thus she concludes that, despite the continuance of Henry's program of university reform, "There is, then, little evidence to support the view that Somerset was particularly committed to the advancement of education."[45]

Of more direct and immediate concern for this study are the views of Somerset on spiritual and theological matters. If Somerset were a strong and forceful advocate of the theology of the Reformation, then there would be better grounds for asserting his influence over Edward in matters relating to theology and the church. As W. K. Jordan rightly observes,

> In the new government, formed with such speed and sureness of touch by Seymour [i.e. Somerset] and Paget, the power vested in the Lord Protector was very great and included—almost all men of whatever complexion of faith would have agreed—the ordering of the church, the settling of doctrine, and the extirpation of error. The question of the personal faith of the Protector and his own inclination with respect of

[42] Loach, *Edward VI*, 40–41.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid., 42.

[45] Ibid.

> the governing of the church were then matters of the greatest moment to the whole of the realm.[46]

Some have questioned the depth of his personal piety, or at least the public expression of his faith. Christopher Haigh has asserted, "Somerset himself had evangelical inclinations, and he cultivated a Protestant mode: he ran a Protestant household, and became a correspondent of Calvin. But his stylized pious pose was probably adopted for political advantage."[47] Even W. K. Jordan, who clearly is among Somerset's strongest modern advocates must admit that

> Somerset was an undoubted Protestant of moderate and Erastian persuasion. Without any particular interest in theological matters and in no way disposed toward precision of doctrinal definition, either for the church or for himself, his views were probably very close to Cranmer, though his thinking was more directly influenced by Calvinism than was that of the Archbishop.[48]

While arguing that Somerset possessed a "quiet and moderate" faith that "encompassed a deep and devout personal piety," Jordan acknowledges that he was nonetheless criticized by John Knox for being "cold in hearing God's word" and was questioned by many others for his unwillingness to push the reform of the church aggressively forward.[49] Jordan, however, interprets this in the most positive way possible:

> [T]here is a deeper and more important explanation of Somerset's moderation and apparent diffidence in matters of faith. Though he was personally devout, though he was undoubtedly and steadily Protestant in faith, he was also a most tolerant man who simply did not believe that force was a proper or useful instrument in religious policy.[50]

Again, Loach interprets matters differently. She acknowledges Somerset's restraint in matters of persecution but attributes the lack of persecution in the first part of Edward's reign

---

[46] Jordan, *Young King*, 125.

[47] Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 169.

[48] Jordan, *Young King*, 125.

[49] Ibid., 126.

[50] Ibid.

primarily to the influence of Cranmer, "But the bulk of the praise for this toleration should go to Cranmer, who carried out some very delicate interrogations with tact and sympathy...."[51]

To Cranmer also she attributes one of the chief distinctive characteristics of the early phase of Edward's reign, the increasing opposition to the use of images in the churches.

> Yet, although in these respects [i.e. the continued extraction of wealth from the church and religious institutions] there was continuity in attitudes towards the Church between Henry VIII in his latter years and Somerset, under the leadership of Archbishop Cranmer there was a very marked change of direction in matters of faith and practice. This first became apparent over the question of images. Cranmer encouraged apparently spontaneous outbreaks of iconoclasm in London and Southampton in the first months of Edward's reign He uttered phrases hostile to images in the course of his sermon at Edward's coronation. ... Cranmer apparently told the king that his tasks were 'to see ... God worshipped, and idolatry destroyed, the tyranny of the bishop of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed.' This last phrase was startling, for the Henrician Church had set its face only against 'abused' images.[52]

Whichever interpretation of the overall character of Somerset is correct, all parties agree that while he was a man of genuine personal piety of a Protestant kind, he was not the sort of man to aggressively assert or forcibly impose his will upon others in matters of religion. Loach summarizes the general trend of the religious developments of Edward's reign in the period of the Protectorate of Somerset in these terms:

> Much of the religious change of this period—change that was sanctioned by the protector even if it was not initiated by him—should be seen primarily as an attempt to consolidate the royal supremacy and to extend lay control over the Church, rather than as an effort to move the Church in a specifically Protestant direction.[53]

One area of the relationship between the civil authority and the church under Somerset that contributed to the growing discontent with his protectorate was his continuance of Henry's policy of extracting funds from the churches and religious institutions. As Loach notes:

---

[51] Loach, *Edward VI*, 46.

[52] Ibid., 48–49.

[53] Loach, *Edward VI*, 47.

> Many bishops and their cathedrals were raided during the protectorate: Lincoln lost thirty manors, Bath and Wells twenty, Norwich twelve and Exeter nine. (Indeed, Felicity Heal has characterized Somerset's attitude toward the church as 'essentially acquisitive', noting that even when his main purpose was to secure additional funds for the crown, 'the choice of dioceses to be assailed seems to have been determined largely by his own personal concerns'.)[54]

Nor was this his only fault. Somerset's pretentions to royal dignity were so pronounced that even W. K. Jordan, one of Somerset's most strident modern proponents, has been forced to admit, "There can be no doubt that Somerset confused his own nature and personality with that of the King, and that he was all too prone to speak as if he were the King...."[55]

These factors, combined with other causes of unrest in the kingdom, including the economic impact of the wards with Scotland and France, the anger over the introduction of the *Prayer Book* (see the section below) and a popular uprising over the problem of land enclosures, contributed to a widespread and growing resentment toward his conduct as Lord Protector. Somerset had reportedly become so mistrustful that he could not see two councilors speaking together without becoming jealous.[56] These factors all led to an eventual *coup d'etat* that brought down Somerset.

When he learned at the beginning of October 1549 that the Privy Council had decided to confront him about the changes that they saw as necessary to amend the governance of the kingdom, Somerset sent out a proclamation commanding men to come to Hampton Court to defend the king. Edward was quickly transferred to Somerset's own lodgings, and Somerset told a crowd that had gathered there that the lords intended to make Lady Mary the regent and take

---

[54] Ibid., 48. For this information Loach cites Felicity Heal, *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 131. Another element of Somerset's behavior that reflects both his attitude toward money and his lack of enthusiasm in promoting Protestantism in general is the fact that, unlike both Cranmer and Edward, Somerset did not use the funds at his disposal to assist Protestant scholars who had fled to England to escape persecution under Emperor Charles V (Loach, *Edward VI*, 47).

[55] Jordan, *Young King*, 495.

the protectorship away from him. He then fled with Edward to Windsor Castle. Edward himself described the events in his journal.

> In the meantime in England there arose a great unrest, likely to increase much if it had not been foreseen. The Council, about 19 of them, were gathered in London, thinking to meet with the Lord Protector and making him amend some of his disorders. He, fearing his state caused the secretary [Petre] in my name to be sent to the lords to know why they had gathered their powers together and that if they meant to talk to him then they should come in a peaceable manner. The next morning, being the 6th of October, and a Saturday, he commanded that the armour be brought down out of the armoury of Hampton Court, about 500 harnesses, to arm both his and my men, and for the gates of the house to be barred and for people to be raised. People came abundantly to the house. That night at 9 or 10 o'clock at night, I went to Windsor with all the people. There was much watch kept every night. The lords sat in open places in London, calling for gentlemen before them, and declaring the causes of their accusations against the Lord Protector, and caused the same to be proclaimed. After which time few came to Windsor except my own men of the guard, which the lords wanted fearing the rage of the people so recently quieted. Then the Protector began to negotiate with letters, sending Sir Phillip Hoby, lately come from being ambassador in Flanders, to see to his family; he brought on his return a very gentle letter to the Protector, which he delivered to him, another to me, another to my household, to declare the Protector's faults, ambition, vain glory, entering into rash wars during my youth, negligence in regard to Ambleteuse, enriching himself from my treasury, following his own opinion and doing all by his own authority, etc, etc. These letters were openly read and immediately the lords came to Windsor, took him and brought him through Holborn to the Tower. Afterwards I went to Hampton Court where they appointed, by my consent, six lords of the Council to be attendant upon me, at least two, and four knights; for lords there the Marquis of Northampton, the earls of Warwick and Arundel, Lords Russell, Saint John and Wentworth; the knights being Sir Andrew Dudley, Sir Edward Rogers, Sir Thomas Darcy, Sir Thomas Wroth. Afterward I came through London to Westminster. … The Lord Protector lost, by his own agreement and submission, his protectorship, treasurership, marshalship, all his moveables and nearly £2,000 worth of land, by an Act of Parliament.[57]

Having agreed, doubtless under duress, to the loss of his political influence and position, Somerset remained imprisoned in the Tower of London for several months. He was released early in 1550. Edward noted in his diary for 31 March 1550, "My Lord Somerset was delivered

---

[56] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 135.

[57] Jonathan North, ed., *England's Boy King: The Diary of Edward VI 1547–1553* (Welwyn Garden City: Ravenhall Books, 2005), 36–40.

of his bonds and came to court."[58] On 10 April Edward recorded that Somerset was restored to the Council,[59] by then under Northumberland's leadership. On 14 May he was taken into the Privy Council.[60] During this period Somerset undertook several tasks on the behalf of the King, including the negotiations with the Bishop of Winchester over the adoption of the *Prayer Book*. On 16 February 1551 Edward recorded an investigation of rumors that there was an effort to get Somerset re-appointed as Lord Protector.

In October of 1551, a purported attempt to overthrow the government by Somerset led to his arrest and subsequent execution. On 7 October, Edward recorded hearing of a conspiracy by Somerset to overthrow Northumberland and execute him and others.[61] In the following days, Somerset was told that he was suspected in the matter but he denied any involvement in the events. On 16 and 17 of October Somerset and a number of others, including his wife, were arrested and sent to the Tower. Somerset was tried on 1 December 1551. He was acquitted of treason but found guilty of intending the death of Northumberland. He was executed on 22 January 1552. Of his death, Edward recorded only that, "the Duke of Somerset had his head cut off upon Tower Hill between eight and nine o'clock in the morning."[62]

The Leadership of the Duke of Northumberland

With the arrest of Somerset, the Council took over the governance of both Edward and England. The chief gentleman, responsible for the direct supervision of the young king, was replaced by four gentlemen affiliated with the opponents of Somerset.[63] In addition six attendant

---

[58] Ibid, 45.

[59] Ibid, 46.

[60] Ibid, 53.

[61] Ibid, 110.

[62] North, *Boy King*, 132.

[63] Under the circumstances this was a reasonable precaution. Somerset had taken the king to Windsor under armed guard in an attempt to use possession of Edward's person as leverage to resist the Council and protect his
(continued next page)

lords were appointed, two of whom were to be in attendance upon the king at all times.[64] Furthermore, the number of military guards in the two units assigned to protect the king was increased.[65] After Somerset's formal deposition from the office of Lord Protector on 27 January 1550, there followed a further inevitable reorganization of Edward's domestic life. Among the changes that followed was a further effort to increase the security of the king's person by requiring that members of the Council should be with him at all times. Thus, as Edward recorded in his diary for 20 April 1550:

> Order taken for the Chamber that three of the outer Privy Chamber gentlemen should always be here, and two lie in the palat and fill the room with one of the four knights; that the esquires should be diligent in their office, and five grooms should be always present, of which one to watch in the bedchamber.[66]

Whether or not any of these changes made the person of the king more secure, or even whether the king's security arrangements needed enhancing, the one thing that certainly resulted from these changes was the consolidation of access to the king, and thus of power in the realm, in the hands of the opponents of Somerset on the Privy Council, and especially in the hands of the man who became Lord President of the Council on 2 February 1550, John Dudley.

John Dudley, the Earl of Warwick since 1547, was a proven military leader and a leading member of the Council.[67] Like many others on the Council and in the nobility, Dudley had gradually grown disaffected with the administration of Lord Protector Somerset. As one of the

---

own position. It is unclear whether the members of Edward's household had supported this move, but they had been put in place by Somerset, and were presumably loyal to him.

[64] Edward records the immediate changes to his household arrangements in a lengthy undated diary entry from the fall of 1549. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 17–19. He also notes that not all of these appointments were successful, the Earl of Arundel being shortly thereafter dismissed for "plucking down of bolts and locks at Westminster, giving of my stuff away, etc.," (Ibid., 19.).

[65] Loach, *Edward VI*, 94–95.

[66] Entry in the diary of Edward VI for 20 April 1550. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 26. The 'palat' to which Edward refers is the Pallet Chamber, the room set aside as sleeping quarters for those whose duty it was to guard the person of the king at night.

[67] For biographical background information on John Dudley, see Appendix A.

members of the Council who was troubled by Somerset's dictatorial manner and his use of the office for personal financial gain, Dudley (commonly called Warwick because of his title), became involved in, and is frequently described as the leader of, the plot to overthrow the Lord Protector.[68]

It is noteworthy for the question of assessing Dudley's character that he allied himself with the conservative, i.e., traditional Catholic, elements on the council and in the nobility to build the support necessary to overthrow Somerset. Whether he was, as Jordan suggests, "the consummate master of the arts of conspiracy,"[69] it is certainly true that, in the aftermath of the suppression of the rebellion in Norfolk, Dudley began to work with other members of the Council who actively sought to remove Somerset. In this process, Dudley first made common cause with the disaffected conservative leaders and later discarded them.

> Initially, he obtained the support of the Catholic opposition in his endeavor to overthrow Somerset. Later, however, he turned against the Catholics in order to stabilize his own power base. He urgently needed the support of all forces of reform in the country—from the king, an avid Reformation supporter, to the great landowners and noblemen, whose interest in change was more pragmatic—in order to make up for the ruinous policies of the past decade, as well as to consolidate his own position.[70]

Allison Weir goes further, claiming that Dudley secretly contacted Mary to attain her support for the coup.[71] Moreover she notes Mary's distrust of Dudley's integrity:

---

[68] Against those who have depicted Dudley as the central mover in the plot to overthrow Somerset stands the fact that he did not immediately emerge as the successor to Somerset. Instead, another member of the Council took control. Thomas Wriothesley, 1st Earl of Southampton, took the center stage and directed all the Council's activities in the waning months of 1549. As Skidmore (*Edward VI*, 148) observed, "Every man repaireth to Wriothesley, honoreth Wriothesley, sueth unto Wriothesley. The preacher John Ponet later remarked, with no decision being taken without his advice." Dudley began to emerge as the leader of the Council after the turn of the year when Wriothesley's health began to fail.

[69] Jordan, *Young King*, 496.

[70] Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*, trans. Stephen E. Buckwalter (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 231-232.

[71] Alison Weir, *The Children of Henry VIII* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1996), 93. It is certainly possible that Dudley contacted Mary as part of his attempt to build as wide a consensus as possible for the removal of Somerset. Given Somerset's consolidation of power and his dictatorial attitude, this was only to be expected. One

(continued next page)

> Mary did not trust Dudley. He had converted to Protestantism years before, but it appeared that his religious views were chiefly dictated by pragmatism, for he told the French ambassador that he loathed the reformed faith.[72]

Moreover, Weir does not hesitate to attribute Dudley's actions to his duplicity:

> Warwick in his devious way, had no intention of setting up a Catholic administration because he was in no doubt that the King, who would come of age in a few short years' time, had by now firmly and passionately embraced Protestantism. Dudley's England would be the kind of Protestant state that Edward wished it to be, if that is what it would take to keep Dudley in power. Edward would be forever grateful and the Earl's future dominance assured.[73]

Whatever Dudley's faults, he seems to have been genuinely troubled by Somerset's consolidation of power. In token of this, he declined to be named Lord Protector, and eventually accepted the less assuming title of President of the Council. For the remainder of Edward's reign, Dudley (made Duke of Northumberland in October 1551) directed the affairs of England competently, initiating a variety of much-needed military, economic, and political reforms. "Dudley was a politician who traded on normality, and the keynote of most aspects of his policy was achieving stability and reconstruction."[74] And if in the process he made his share of political enemies, he at least generated less open hostility to himself and to the government's policies than had accompanied Somerset's Protectorate. While it is reasonable to assume that Northumberland used his political and personal skills to consolidate his position and used his position to his own material benefit, there is no evidence that he did either to a greater degree than Somerset before him or others after him. In short, there seems to be little contemporary evidence to warrant the vehemence of the historical judgment of his character such as that offered by Alison Weir:

---

must exercise some caution in evaluating any of Weir's statements regarding Dudley/Northumberland. Given her unremittingly negative view of his personality, she tends to put the worst possible interpretation on his every action.

[72]Ibid. Unfortunately Weir does not supply the source of this quotation, and so it is impossible to evaluate the veracity of this claim.

[73] Ibid., 93–94.

[74] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 2000), 55.

> … John Dudley was arguably the most evil statesman to govern England during the sixteenth century. He was greedy and rapacious, corrupt, cruel, and unscrupulous. His dark good looks and charismatic vitality were often marred by a cold and arrogant manner, although he could exercise charm when he wanted to; the adolescent King was one of those who quickly succumbed to his blandishments.[75]

For our purposes, the central question with regard to the period of Northumberland's leadership is the extent of his involvement in the religious developments of the second half of Edward's reign. To answer this question requires some consideration of Northumberland's own religious views. There is no doubt of Northumberland's professed support for the Protestant cause. Nevertheless, it is commonplace to question the integrity of his views for two major reasons. First, as we have noted above, he initially appealed to Catholic elements for support for the overthrow of Somerset. Second, when faced with execution under Mary he recanted and re-converted to Catholicism.

Immediately after Edward's death Northumberland worked to fulfill his dead master's wishes (and doubtless also to promote his own interests) by attempting to ensure that Jane Grey would succeed the king upon the throne. On 24 July, the day after Mary was declared to be the queen, he was arrested and subsequently imprisoned in the Tower. He was tried on 18 August, condemned, and sentenced to death three days later. Awaiting his death, he asked for an opportunity to make confession. The Catholic Bishop Stephen Gardiner, himself imprisoned during Edward's reign but made Lord Chancellor under Mary, attended him in prison. No account of their conversation has been preserved, but Northumberland received communion under the Catholic order in a public service held on the 21st of August. He was required to make a public statement at the end of the service. He said, "Truly, I profess here before you all that I have received the sacrament according to the true catholic faith, and the plague that is upon the

---

[75] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 92.

realm and upon us is that we have erred from the faith these sixteen years...."[76] Despite Mary's delight at this statement, Northumberland was beheaded the following day.

Most of those who question the integrity of Northumberland's religious convictions assert that his motivation for embracing Protestantism was the desire for personal advancement. Allison Weir is among the most critical, writing of Dudley:

> ... he knew that his future success depended on allying himself with the radical Protestant faction, headed by extremists such as John Knox and John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester. There is no doubt that Dudley embraced such doctrines, not only to gain favor with his young master, but also as a means of feathering his nest, for the radicals were demanding the closure of chantries and shrines, and there were pickings to be had.[77]

Yet such an assertion fails to account for the fact that Dudley and his family had embraced the Protestant cause before many of the other upper nobility in the early 1530s, had carefully raised his children in the Protestant faith, and that to this confession he had "remained constant all through the alarms of Henry VIII's reign."[78] Against those who hasten to use Dudley's recantation under sentence of death as evidence of a life-long duplicity in matters of religion, Diarmaid MacCulloch observes:

> And it is worth taking seriously the testimony of John Bale, a connoisseur of evangelicals who was not inclined to suffer hypocrites gladly, however highly placed. In dedicating one of his vintage anti-papist diatribes to Northumberland in 1552, Bale ended up with testimony which is specific beyond mere flattery: 'I have always known the same a most mighty, zealous, and ardent supporter, maintainer, and defender of God's lively word.'[79]

Whatever the truth about the sincerity and depth of Dudley's religious convictions, his recantation of the faith ensured that, after the re-establishment of Protestantism under Elizabeth, Northumberland would become the scapegoat for the evils, errors, and failures of Edward's reign

---

[76] Loades, *Intrigue and Treason*, 134–135.

[77] Weir, *Children*, 96.

[78] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 52.

just as his father had become the scapegoat for all the unpopular policies of Henry VII. This oversimplification has hardened into historical dogma under the influence of later writers:

> Early Protestant tradition, stemming from the propagandists John Ponet and John Foxe, saw Somerset as 'the good duke', a phrase apparently invented by Ponet in 1556 in his angry political tract *A short treatise of politike power*. Twentieth century historiography was kept on this path by the powerful advocacy of that accomplished Tudor biographer, A.F. Pollard, echoed later in the work of W.K. Jordan. It followed that if there was a good duke, the man responsible for his removal must be the bad duke; this was also a stance that Ponet had pioneered, styling Dudley equally snappily 'the Alcibiades of England'—spoilt, flashy, cynical and treacherous, an authoritarian and unprincipled politician.[80]

To be fair to Northumberland, his reversion to Catholicism was no more or less an act of spiritual dishonestly than the actions of the majority of those who had served on the Council under Edward, and who similarly capitulated under the pressure of Mary's reign. Most famous of these was Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, who likewise re-converted to Catholicism under the threat of death. However, by recanting this action just before he was burned at the stake when it clear that his re-conversion and public embrace of Catholic doctrine and the authority of the Pope had failed to prevent his execution, Cranmer assured his long-term reputation as a Protestant martyr. Perhaps David Loades has provided the fairest assessment of Northumberland's religious convictions:

> Beneath the panoply of power, and in the face of death, Northumberland was a simple man, not unintelligent, but quite unintellectual. He may well have drifted into Protestantism by way of political opportunism, and it had little hold upon him because he had no theological understanding.[81]

Whatever one believes about the character of the Duke of Northumberland and the depth of his religious convictions, it seems clear that he was not the sort of man to have aggressively promoted the cause of the Reformation in England against strong opposition, especially in the

---

[79] Ibid., 53.

[80] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 42.

more radical direction that it began to take during the latter part of Edward's reign. Northumberland was a soldier, not a theologian, and not even a politician properly speaking. Thus, the direction of the religious developments that occurred during the period of his leadership cannot be attributed primarily to him. To the extent that he supported and promoted them, it may well have been not so much because they were his own views but because they were the views of the king that he served. Thus David Loades may be right when assessing Northumberland's position by saying:

> Consequently, one of the most important aspects of the Earl of Warwick's regime as president of the council was his promotion of a strong Protestantism, and that depended less upon his own convictions than upon his reading of the king's mind. He knew his young master as well as anyone, and was as sure as he could be that if he wished to retain the favour of the adult king, it could only be by that means.[82]

Whatever his personal views, promoting the will of the King that he served was nothing less than Northumberland's duty, and he cannot fairly be faulted for doing it. Whatever his motivation, Northumberland went along with what MacCulloch has described the "accelerated and more relentless pace of religious change"[83] that characterized the period of his leadership as President of the Council under Edward VI. The fact that he may have done so in order to satisfy his master the king is less important as a statement about Northumberland and more important as a statement about the significance of the influence of Edward.

---

[81] Loades, *Intrigue and Treason*, 135.

[82] Loades, *Intrigue and Treason*, 76.

[83] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 56.

CHAPTER TWO

EDWARD'S CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENTS DURING HIS REIGN

In order to understand the nature and extent of Edward's contribution to the course of the English Reformation during his reign, it will be necessary to begin with a sense of the *status quo* at the end of his father's reign. We have already noted that the Henrician phase of the English Reformation was primarily driven by Henry's need for a legitimate heir to the throne. As a result, the major theological issues for this phase of the English Reformation were not, as in Germany, the doctrine of justification and the question of how a person may be reconciled to God, but rather the doctrine of papal authority and the question of the constitution and organization of the church.

As the new self-proclaimed head of the church in England, Henry was a practical man, and a conservative politician. He sought to change only those things that were necessary to be changed into order to serve his interests. Otherwise he sought stability and the unity of his realm above any form of theological idealism. As Diarmaid MacCulloch notes:

> Henry loved to present himself as occupying the middle ground in the turbulence of the European Reformations. When making a keynote speech to Parliament in December 1545, an occasion which proved to be his swansong on the public stage, Henry denounced both those who 'be too stiff in their old mumpsimus' and those who were 'too busy and curious in their new sumpsimus', and he was so overcome by his own plea for his subjects to unite in religious harmony between two extremes that he dissolved into tears.[84]

[84] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 4. The speech to which he refers was given in the House of Lords on 24 December 1545. The term *mumpsimus* refers to the practice of adhereing to or continuing to repeat an error, even when the error has been pointed out, or to the person who does so. By contrast, the term *sumpsimus* refers to the (often pedantic) insistence upon adhereing to a technically correct form, or a precisely correct practice, in the face of *(continued next page)*

Henry's attempt to maintain this precarious balance was made more difficult by his own lack of a clear theological position. He embraced some elements of the evangelical theology, such as the rejection of the doctrine of purgatory and the suppression of some traditional religious practices that he deemed idolatrous, but opposed other key elements of the evangelical theology, specifically the doctrine of justification by faith alone and also the notion that the clergy should be able to marry.[85] Attempting to summarize Henry's theological views, MacCulloch observes, "To describe this religious mixture as theologically ambiguous is to indulge in courtier-like understatement. The spiritual portrait of Henry VIII would have been a mask of Janus."[86]

We cannot here trace in detail the see-sawing course of the tidal shifts in policy produced by this Janus at the helm, with its sometimes imprisonment and execution of evangelicals and sometimes imprisonment and execution of traditionalists. Except for the question of the headship of the church there was very little consensus on the future course of the church at the time of Henry's death. Much of the upper nobility and of the senior clergy were traditionalist, maintaining what came to be called "the old faith" in all matters except for papal supremacy (and not a few who only grudgingly under compulsion of law accepted Henry's position on that question). This conservative element also predominated among the common people, especially outside of London and the southeast of England.[87] The strength of this segment of the nation is

---

a common, though technically incorrect habit, belief, or usage. These terms had come into use about the beginning of the 16th century, and were in common usage in the Tudor period.

[85] The question of the extent to which actions such as the dissolution of the monasteries were driven by a genuine theological conviction or by the financial requirements of his government is beyond the scope of his study, though not without interest or significance.

[86] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 6.

[87] MacCulloch cites the studies by John Fines that suggest that the supporters of the evangelical cause during Edward's reign were concentrated in London and the southeast. According to Fines, 17 percent of evangelicals lived primarily in London, 14 percent in Essex, and 12 percent in Kent. Suffolk and Norfolk together comprise another 15 percent. "So overall, the capitol and the southeastern seaboard counties make up nearly three fifths of the total," (Ibid., 110). The southwestern counties of Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall combined comprise only about

(continued next page)

reflected in the numerous rebellions against the religious policies of both Henry and Edward, and by the eventual easy manner in which Mary was able to claim the throne with the widespread support of both the populace and the nobility. Against these were the new men, especially in the universities and among those clergy who were more recent university graduates, and the younger set that had gathered around King Henry from the earliest days to support his rejection of papal authority. These embraced a much wider range of evangelical views and sought a full-scale reform of theology and church practice.

In one area Henry was more consistent; he appointed and promoted to episcopal positions those who reflected and promoted his own moderate reforming position.

> And in the last fifteen years of the reign it is evident that great care was being taken in episcopal appointments and translations in order to strengthen even further the Erastian complexion of the episcopal bench and to introduce new and safe men with at least moderate reforming convictions. It is most significant that of the twenty-seven men who were appointed to sees in the second half of the reign, all save five were drawn from gentle families or from the burgher aristocracy, the two classes which lent the most fervent support to the religious policy of the crown.[88]

These men, Jordan maintains, failed to anticipate the theological changes that would inevitably follow from the constitutional changes that they supported, and were unprepared to oppose them effectively when they did later emerge.

The general evangelical trend in religious matters came to a halt beginning in 1538, and the pendulum began to swing back in the direction of the Catholic clergy. By 1539 matters had progressed to the point that Henry thought it was time to bring theological innovation to a halt.

2.5 percent. Of these figures, MacCulloch observes, "What we are looking at in Fines's figures is a sample only, and no expanded version of it will ever tell us the exact extent of evangelical strength in early Tudor England. Nevertheless, the sample is reasonable enough in size to give an idea of the regional distribution of those who favoured the Edwardian changes," (MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 209).

[88] Jordan, *Young King*, 19. Jordan further notes that of the forty-six bishops holding office from 1536 to 1551, twenty-two of them were educated in law, and were primarily legal rather than theological thinkers. These bishops, he notes, "tended simply to transfer their allegiance from the Pope to the King, while vigorously opposing any proposal to change the institutional structure of worship." This contrasts with, "almost the whole of the group of eighteen reforming bishops, men who wished doctrinal as well as constitutional change, were drawn from the

(continued next page)

> For the Pilgrimage of Grace and the now strident demands for true Reformation had frightened Henry quite as much as the conservative bishops, who now felt strong enough to urge the passage of the Six Articles Act. These severe and rigidly conservative measures replaced the Ten Articles of 1536, which may be regarded as a first effort to find a somewhat hazily defined middle ground on which both parties could stand.[89]

From 1539 to just before Henry's death in 1547 the traditionalist party, generally held the upper hand. This faction, led by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, managed to get Robert Barnes and several other evangelical leaders condemned and executed.[90] Many others were forced to flee England for the continent to avoid prosecution. Moreover, they undermined the influence of Thomas Cromwell with the King and advocated the charges against him that led to his execution in 1540. More generally, their rigid enforcement of the Six Articles slowed any further theological development in the church in England.

However, beginning in 1543 three factors began to erode their influence with the King, and thus their control over developments in the church. The first was the marriage of Henry to the last of his six wives, the openly Protestant Catherine Parr.[91] Catherine undoubtedly influenced

---

regular clergy and had taken their degrees in divinity," (Jordan, *Young King*, 20).

[89] Ibid., 21. The Pilgrimage of Grace to which Jordan refers was a conservative (Catholic) uprising in Yorkshire in October of 1536. It opposed the promotion of evangelical-leaning teachings of the Ten Articles (issued that year) and the dissolution of the monasteries, which had recently begun. The Pilgrimage was the largest and best-known of a series of revolts against Henry's policies, especially his religious policies, during this general period. All of these revolts were suppressed by government forces. The Six Articles of 1539 reaffirmed the traditional Catholic position on the following matters of doctrine: transubstantiation, communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, observance of vows of chastity, permission for private masses, and the importance of auricular confession.

[90] Henry, in an attempt to make it clear that extremists of neither party would be tolerated, had a total of six men executed on the same day (30 July 1540). Barnes and two other Protestants were burnt at the stake for their heresy in rejecting of the Six Articles. Three Catholic priests were hanged for treason for their rejection of the supremacy of the king over the church.

[91] Catherine was raised in the traditional Catholic faith. It is uncertain at what point she began to embrace evangelical teaching. However, the three books that she published during her lifetime, *Psalms or Prayers* (published anonymously in 1544), *Prayers or Meditations* (1546), and *The Lamentations of a Sinner* (1548) and all reflect an evangelical piety. *The Lamentations of a Sinner* is the most aggressive in condemning Roman teaching and in advocating the evangelical doctrine of salvation by grace through faith alone. English translations of the last two of these works may be found in *Writings of Edward VI, William Hugh, Queen Catherine Parr, Anne Askew, Lady Jane Grey, Hamilton, and Balnaves* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1836).

the King's thinking, and especially in relation to the education of Edward and Elizabeth, to whom she was especially close.

The second factor that contributed to the gradual erosion of royal support for the conservative faction was their tendency to push beyond what Henry was willing to tolerate in the enforcement of doctrine. It first became apparent that they were overreaching when they failed in their attempt to bring charges of heresy against Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. This action is sometimes called the Prebendaries' Plot because, even though it was organized by Stephen Gardiner, its main feature was the accusations of five prebendary canons of Cranmer's own Cathedral in Canterbury. These five brought charges of heresy against the Archbishop because of his failure to teach in accordance with the traditionalist theology of the Six Articles. Cranmer survived the plot because of the King's personal support. Moreover, the effort began to cause Henry to question the reliability of his advisors, especially Gardiner. A second example of this tendency was the arrest, torture, condemnation, and execution of the devout Protestant Anne Ayscough (Askew) in 1546. This event, which shocked many in the royal circles, was aimed not just at the punishment of Ayscough, but included the attempt on the part of the Catholic authorities to get her to implicate other women of the royal court, including Queen Katherine. This event is generally taken as the point at which Henry concluded that it was necessary to curb the power of the traditionalist party.

W. K. Jordan suggests that a third factor that contributed to the gradual erosion of royal support for the conservative faction was Henry's growing recognition that only a Protestant predominance could ensure the security of his son's succession:

> Henry remained a moderately orthodox Roman Catholic and every reason suggests that he would have preferred that the realm to which he had given brilliant and dominating leadership might remain so as well. But his mind, all his blustering and all his choleric rages notwithstanding, was in fact coldly pragmatic, and he sensed correctly that there was a drift in events wholly beyond his control, that forces which he had sought to exploit for no other reason than to bring leverage on the papacy

> could not for much longer be restrained, and that the mantle of authority could descend to his son, protecting him for at least a season, only if the nation which he was to rule was moderately Protestant.[92]

For all these reasons, Henry took two steps in the last years of his life that were to give the evangelical faction the upper hand at his death. First, and perhaps most importantly, in 1544 Henry placed the education of his son primarily in the hands of two men of noted Protestant sympathies: Richard Cox, educated at Cambridge and a close associate of Cranmer, and John Cheke, a noted humanist and Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge. In addition to these, Jean Belmain was later chosen to serve as Edward's tutor in French. Belmain was a firm Calvinist, and Jordan suggests that, "There is reason to believe, indeed, that Belmain … may have influenced the development of strongly held Protestant sentiments in the boy."[93] Secondly, Henry removed several of the leading conservatives out of positions of power in his administration. Stephen Gardiner fell out of favor after the execution of Anne Ayscough, in part because of his attempt to connect certain ladies of the court, including perhaps Queen Katherine herself, with the same charges that led to Anne's condemnation. Another leading conservative advisor of the King, the Duke of Norfolk, was removed after his son became involved in a treasonous plot. These developments left the evangelical faction in the ascendant at the time of Henry's death.[94]

---

[92] Jordan, *Young King*, 27. Jordan subsequently expands on this theme: "Edward's very legitimacy and title were safe and unsullied only in a Protestant settlement of faith and ecclesiastical constitution. Moreover, Henry VIII undoubtedly sensed, with that half-intuitive understanding of his people that marked all the great Tudors, that Protestantism possessed the initiative in England, that it enjoyed the support of the best minds of the realm, and was gaining a rapidly expanding following amongst the gentry and the urban mercantile aristocracy. He still felt strong enough to delay if he could not halt this sweep of change; his son could not do so without endangering the very basis of order in the state" (Ibid., 41).

[93] Jordan, *Young King*, 42.

[94] Another of Henry's most influential Catholic-leaning advisors, Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton and since 1544 Henry's Lord Chancellor, was forced out of the Council immediately after the coronation. He was re-admitted to the Council some months later and remained an opponent of Somerset, in whose downfall he certainly participated. In the first few months after downfall, Wriothesley played a leading role in the Council until his sickness, and eventual death, made it possible for Northumberland to take over the leadership of the Council. Ibid., 69–72.

This, then, was the situation of the church as Edward became king. It had undergone a fundamental change with respect to its constitution and administration but only a very limited change with respect to its theological position. The majority of the clergy and the laity, especially outside of London, clung firmly to the traditional doctrine and worship practices of Catholicism which, through the enactment of the Six Articles, remained the law of the land. Among these were more than a few who would have preferred even to roll back the limited changes instituted during Henry's reign, including the re-establishment of papal authority. Against this majority stood a minority of highly-placed and well-educated leaders in the church and among the nobility who desired to see further theological Reformation, following developments on the continent. While this faction had the temporary advantage of dominating the high ranks of royal officialdom, it was far from certain which party would ultimately prevail in the struggle for power that would inevitably ensue. A major factor in this outcome would be the desires, convictions, and character of the child of nine who had just inherited the throne.

The Scope and Direction of the Reformation

In the previous section we have noted the very conservative approach to changes in the doctrine and practice that prevailed in England under Henry, and which were the *status quo* at the time of Edward's accession. Our examinations of the development of the *Prayer Book* and of the events surrounding the restrictions on Mary's use of the Mass that are to come will show that there were strong conservative forces in the nation and in the church that were opposed to further theological development. Nevertheless, there were also those elements that sought to advance the cause of the theological Reformation of the church in England, especially in the direction of the more radical branch of the Reformation on the continent.

> Before Henry's death there began a gradual infiltration into England of Protestant concepts more advanced than those of Luther. Having at first engaged the interests of university theologians, they presently extended to a new generation of Bible-reading

> lay people. Deriving mainly from Zurich, Strasbourg and Geneva these ideas became increasingly dominated by the intellect of John Calvin.[95]

Despite these tendencies, and given the strong and polarized factions present in the nation and the church, the future course of the church was far from clear at the time of Edward's accession. The single most important factor in determining that course would be the will of the king. If, like his father, Edward were to favor a conservative approach in an attempt to maintain order and unity in the realm, the conservative faction would likely prevail and the *status quo* of the end of Henry's reign would continue. If Edward were to lean more strongly in the direction of evangelical theology, then the Protestant faction would likely prevail and the theological development of the English Reformation would continue.

The following sections will illustrate that over the short course of his reign Edward would become increasingly committed to, and supportive of, the Protestant cause. He encouraged and promoted the reform of worship in an increasingly Reformed direction. He asserted strongly Protestant views in his attempts to reform the Order of the Garter and suppress the use of the Mass by his sister Mary. The *Oxford Companion to British History* summarizes these developments:

> The position at Henry's death was an uneasy stalemate: the king's quarrel had been with papal authority rather than the rites and doctrines of the catholic church. But a series of measures during Edward's reign pushed England into the protestant camp. Catholic bishops were replaced by reformers. Persecution of protestants ceased and a number of continental reformers made their way across the Channel. The Act of Six Articles, which had represented a shift back towards catholicism, was repealed. The chantries followed the monasteries into dissolution, thus putting even more property into the hands of the gentry and aristocracy. The new Prayer Book of 1549, though not going far enough for many protestants, shocked Devon and Cornwall catholics into revolt. The revised prayer book of 1552 and Cranmer's Forty-Two Articles of 1553 moved the Church of England nearer to calvinism.[96]

---

[95] A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1989), 222.

[96] J. A. Cannon, "Edward VI," in *The Oxford Companion to British History*, ed. by John Cannon (Oxford:

(continued next page)

Beyond these specific acts, Edward promoted and encouraged an expansion of the breadth and depth of the movement to reform the church in his kingdom, in part by promoting, encouraging, and supporting those theological thinkers, both English and those who came to England from abroad, who shared his desire for additional reform. The net effect of all of these developments is summarized by Skidmore:

> The religious Reformation that took place in Edward's reign went far beyond anything Henry could have imagined. The Bible in English, free for all to read, the abolition of the chantries and masses for the dead, the widespread destruction of images and saints' shrines, new services in English read by ministers forbidden from wearing traditional vestments, the abolition of the mass and the introduction of communion in both kinds revolutionized a society where society was paramount to an understanding of human nature.[97]

Edward, the Influenced and Influencer

We have already noted some of those who played an important role in shaping the theological thought of the young king. Most historians have emphasized the influence of Somerset and Northumberland. Both were dedicated to the Protestant cause, Somerset perhaps in a more informed way that Northumberland. Somerset was also held in higher affection by the young king than was Northumberland, though this did not inhibit Edward from later permitting his execution. While both of these men played important roles in the royal administration and the establishment of policy, neither had a major role in influencing the development of Edward's thought. There were, however, other important and influential figures who helped to shape Edward's thinking on matters of religion.

We have already observed that Queen Catherine Parr was both openly Protestant and held in close affection by both Edward and Elizabeth.[98] Unfortunately, while we know of the affection

---

Oxford University Press, 2002). Accessed at http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O110-EdwardVI.html on November 19, 2014.

[97] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 4.

[98] In a discussion of Catherine's influence upon Elizabeth, MacCulloch notes the character of Catherine's

(continued next page)

in which Edward held her, the lack of any detailed information about the extent and nature of her interaction with Edward makes it impossible to gauge the extent of her influence upon him. The influence of Richard Cox and John Cheke, who supervised his education, and Jean Belmain, his French tutor, is clearer. These men were directly responsible for Edward's education, including his religious education.[99] They spent more time teaching him and discussing these matters with him than anyone else. We can especially see the influence of Belmain on Edward's treatise on papal authority and his successive drafts of the revised statutes for the Order of the Garter.[100]

In Book II, Chapter 1 of *De Regno Christi*, his work dedicated to the king and presented to him at New Year's of 1551, Martin Bucer encourages Edward to follow the example of the godly kings of the Bible in his efforts to reform religion in his kingdom. The first step in this, Bucer observes, is to gather and listen to godly advisors in matters of religion:

> For this holy and difficult purpose, they gathered around them as advisers and assistants some priests, prophets, and other devout men, who, they thought, gave promise in their knowledge of God and in their zeal of accomplishing very much indeed.[101]

---

religious thought, as expressed in her *Lamentations of a Sinner*, "Reading it, there is no doubt that we are hearing the testimony of one who has pushed aside the old devotional world and left it for a new. We hear the familiar great evangelical themes: justification by faith alone, sneers at the cult of the saints and attacks on unwritten verities, besides the inevitable abuse of the Bishop of Rome. This is very different from the religious mix prescribed for Henry's Church in the 1543 King's Book, where the 'new learning' is held at arm's length," (MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 187).

[99] At the beginning of his Chronicle, Edward notes that Cox and Cheke were responsible for bringing him up in the knowledge of the Scripture (Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 3).

[100] MacCulloch (*Tudor Church Militant*, 25–26) notes that, "Some of the most striking evidence [of the fervor of the king's evangelical commitment] comes from his French schoolwork, which may indicate that among his tutors he was given particular encouragement in evangelical enthusiasm by his French master, Jean Belmain; however, Belmain was nephew by marriage to the principal tutor Sir John Cheke, so we need not consider that this represented any special division of policy among Edward's schoolmasters."

[101] Martin Bucer, *De Reno Christi*, Book II, Chapter 1, in Wilhelm Pauck, ed., *Melanchthon and Bucer,* The Library of Christian Classics, Icthus Ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), 266. Once he has gathered such advisors, Bucer says, the kings should follow these steps (266–267): "They then took care before all else that the law of God was very energetically declared and explained to the people. The next step was to persuade all, after they had professed obedience to the law, once more wholeheartedly to accept and truly to reverence the Lord's covenant. Then, finally, they reorganized and renewed the estate and ministry of priests and Levites and the entire administration of religion, according to the law of God; and they watched most vigilantly that no one should destroy what they had done." In analyzing the actions of Edward's administration during his short reign, it appears that it

(continued next page)

Whether by conscious design or natural inclination, Edward certainly followed Bucer's advice. In addition to his teachers mentioned above, Edward surrounded himself with advisors and consultants who were both knowledgeable in matters of theology and passionate to extend the reform of the church. One important source of influence on Edward's theological thinking were the preachers invited to address Edward and the court.

> In April 1550 the ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire, a good Catholic who had no reason to add to the myth-making about an evangelical paragon, noted the king's enthusiasm for taking notes on sermons, and added that Edward was particularly insistent on inviting the most extreme preachers to court.[102]

The truthfulness of this insight is probably reflected in the fact in the very month that this was reported, April of 1550, Edward ordered that regular preaching at the court should be increased to weekly occurrence.[103]

Unfortunately, no complete list of those who preached at the court before Edward exists, and Edward's own notes on these sermons have been lost.[104] Latimer is known to have preached a series of sermons before the king in Lent of 1549. Cambridge don Thomas Lever preached a series of sermons in 1550, including one at which he castigated the court for having taken property from the church (specifically the monasteries and chantries) for its own purposes. That most assertive of Calvinists, John Knox, served as a royal chaplain in 1551 and preached before the king on several occasions over the next two years. John Hooper also preached a series of Lenten sermons before the king, and was rewarded by being made bishop of Gloucester.

Moreover, the King was clearly influenced by these sermons. Those parts of Edward's unfinished "Discourse on the Reform and Abuses in Church and State" (1551) that touch upon

---

was attempting to do all of the things that Bucer advises.

[102] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 23.

[103] Ibid., 24.

[104] Ibid., 23.

the need for reform in social issues reflect, both in their ideas and their language, Latimer's series of Lenten sermons preached before the King in 1549.[105] Another example of the influence of a preacher on Edward's thought and action is mentioned by MacCulloch:

> We have the Protestant publisher and chronicler Richard Grafton's story of one occasion in 1552, at which the king was moved by a sermon from Bishop Ridley to add a dramatic bonus to a major initiative of social policy. For more than a decade, the city authorities in London (Grafton prominent among them) had been lobbying the Crown in an effort to systematize London poor relief in a series of new hospitals and institutions; now the king gave away the royal palace at Bridewell to be converted into a central workhouse and detention centre for those labeled social undesirables.[106]

In addition, it was a sermon by Knox before the king in 1551 that triggered the debate over whether one should receive communion standing or kneeling, ultimately resulting in Edward's support for the inclusion of the 'Black Rubric' in *the Prayer Book of 1552* (see below).

In addition to preachers at the court, Edward interacted with, and was influenced by, a number of carefully selected leaders within the church. Foremost among these was clearly Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. As a close advisor and associate of his father, Cranmer had a natural position of influence with the young king, especially in matters of liturgical reform. In addition to Cranmer, Edward was influenced by Hugh Latimer (Bishop of Worchester and chaplain to Edward VI in 1549–50), Nicholas Ridley (Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, Chaplain to Thomas Cromwell, Bishop of Rochester and, later, of London), and John Hooper (Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester and chaplain to both Somerset and Northumberland). All of these were to be martyred under Mary. Ridley was a major influence on Cranmer's understanding of the Eucharist. Hooper was one of England's most aggressive promoters of the theology of Zwingli.

---

[105] Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, xxv.

[106] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 23.

These English divines were supplemented by a variety of Continental evangelicals who were welcomed to England during Edward's reign and supported in various ways by Edward and his government.

> During the years 1547–1553 upwards of forty foreign Protestant divines settled in England, most of whom held ecclesiastical or university appointments within the gift of the state or church. Of these; three—Bucer, Martyr, and Ochino, famous at once for their preaching and their learning—may be described as Continental reformers of the second rank when compared with Calvin, Melanchthon, or Bullinger. Another group of perhaps twelve were scholars, humanists, or preachers of the third rank, but nonetheless of considerable reputation. The remainder were steadfast Protestants, experienced preachers, and men of learning who supplied a notable addition to the ranks of the Protestant clergy and certainly a fruitful variety of spiritual conviction at a time when the national faith was in the process of definition.[107]

Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire Vermigli) was perhaps the greatest of the Italian Protestant teachers. Originally an Augustinian monk, he became a persuaded Protestant as early as 1531. In trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities in Italy, he fled Italy and eventually joined Bucer in Strasbourg. He was invited to England in 1547 by Cranmer. He was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford where he became a strong proponent of Protestant teaching, especially on the Eucharist. Jordan describes his influence on the English Reformation as very great, especially through his influence on Cranmer.[108]

Less well-known both in his own time and today, Bernadino Ochino was a close friend and associate of Peter Martyr, and was regarded as a great preacher. Being condemned by the Inquisition in 1542, he fled Italy to go to first to Geneva and subsequently to Augsburg. He came to England with Martyr in 1547. He was subsequently made a prebendary of Canterbury and received a pension from the King. He spent most of his time in England working on his own

---

[107] Jordan, *Young King*, 190–191.

[108] Ibid., 191–192.

writings. One of these, his work rejecting the authority of the Pope,[109] was dedicated to Edward, and was used by him as a source for some of his own ideas, expressed in his treatise on the same subject. Forced to flee England during the reign of Mary, Ochino eventually fell out of favor with the Calvinists and died in Moravia.

Martin Bucer was the most famous of the Continental scholars to find refuge in Edward's England. Bucer had been a Dominican monk when he met and was influenced by Luther. He was excommunicated by Rome and fled to Strasbourg in 1523, where he became the leading preacher and teacher of the Reformed faith. He was particularly concerned to find a way to unify the various Protestant positions and sought unsuccessfully to reconcile Luther and Zwingli. Unwilling to abide by the terms of the Augsburg Interim, Bucer was forced to leave Strasbourg in 1549, accepting the long-standing invitation of Cranmer to come to England.[110] Greschat summarizes his reasons for the move:

> Bucer remained one of the most prominent and highly esteemed figures of the Protestant camp. This was evident not least from the countless invitations that he started receiving from 1547 on, among others from Melanchthon in Wittenberg and Calvin in Geneva, offering him sanctuary. He ended up choosing England, however, essentially because he was convinced that it was in this country in which the Reformation was apparently advancing so successfully that his special gifts and unique experiences could be put to use in the most meaningful and fruitful way and had the greatest chance of making a lasting impact.[111]

A few days after his arrival in London on 25 April 1549, Bucer was introduced to King Edward. He subsequently wrote of the encounter to an associate:

> In glowing terms he praised the scholarship and piety holding sway at the court, referring not only to the duke of Somerset but particularly to the king himself. He also retold … how he, Bucer, had explained to the twelve-year-old king that the

---

[109] This work was translated by John Ponet in 1549 and published under the title of the *Tragoedie or Dialoge of the unjuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome.*

[110] Cranmer had originally invited Bucer to come to England in 1547, and again in 1548. Jordan, *Young King*, 194.

[111] Greschat, *Bucer*, 227.

> negligence of church discipline lay at the root of the German Protestants' downfall, and how the king responded, with tears in his eyes, that God may have punished his people for their ungratefulness and disobedience, but that God would certainly receive it mercifully once again if it repented and did penance.[112]

Shortly after his arrival Bucer was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.[113]

During his short time in England, Bucer made every attempt to avoid the various controversies over doctrinal matters. Asked by Peter Martyr to enter into a debate over the Eucharist at Oxford, Bucer declined for fear that the differences between himself and the Zwinglian position promoted by Martyr would only provide ammunition for the traditionalists.[114] Bucer's own view was that Christ was really, but spiritually, present in the Eucharist, but only for those received the sacrament in true faith.[115] Rather than become embroiled in these theological debates, Bucer preferred to work for reconciliation and unity among the Protestants, declaring his aims to Martyr: "We must aspire with the utmost zeal to edify as many people as we possibly can in faith and in the love of Christ—and to offend no one."[116]

During his short time in England, Bucer was regularly consulted by various of the leaders of the English church for his views on theological questions ranging from the relation of faith and good works to whether it was permissible for clergy to wear vestments or Christians to loan money at interest. As we will discuss further in our examination of the development of the *Prayer Book of 1552*, Bucer's critique of the 1549 edition encouraged Cranmer to work to eliminate the remnants of 'superstition' in the 1552 edition of the *Prayer Book*.

---

[112] Greschat, *Bucer*, 228.

[113] Bucer had previously received a royal appointment as a Divinity Reader at Cambridge in December 1548. Jordan, *Young King*, 194, n. 7. According to Jordan, the previous holder of the chair, by the name of Madew, resigned so that Bucer could be appointed to the post. Bucer's close friend Paul Fagius, who had accompanied him to England, also received an appointment as an instructor in Hebrew at Cambridge.

[114] Geschat, *Bucer*, 234.

[115] Jordan, *Young King*, 195.

[116] Geschat, *Bucer*, 235.

Edward played an important role in promoting Martin Bucer during his short time in England, Jordan notes that Bucer received special gifts from Edward, who encouraged him to guard his health and to not overtax himself with lecturing.[117] Among the gifts that Bucer received from Edward was a monetary gift to enable him to obtain two Alsatian tiled stoves to increase his comfort in the cold and wet English weather that Bucer so despised.[118]

In addition, Edward was significantly influenced by him. In particular Bucer's *De Regno Christi*, written for and presented to the King in manuscript as a New Year's gift at the beginning of 1551, confirmed Edward's inclination toward the need of further reform in the church. It was also used by Edward as a source of some of the ideas his own "Discourse on the Reform and Abuses in Church and State," probably written in April of the same year.[119] Edward's appreciation of Bucer is reflected in his entry in the Chronicle noting Bucer's death on 28 February 1551. It is one of the few places in the Chronicle where Edward expresses genuine personal feeling about the death of someone.[120]

Finally, in addition to all of those who had personal contact with the king, Edward was influenced by correspondence with important leaders of the reform movement from across Europe. Chief among these were Calvin, Bullinger, and Melanchthon. Not only did Edward himself receive correspondence from these three, including both encouragement and advice, but they frequently wrote to others mentioned above, and their guidance was passed onto the king through these intermediaries.

One prominent European reformer from whom much guidance was sought, though less in the end received, was Philip Melanchthon. Cranmer believed that Melanchthon would be able to

---

[117] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 308.

[118] Greschat, *Bucer*, 247.

[119] Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, xxiv–xxv.

help resolve the conflicts emerging within the various Protestant perspectives in England, especially in the matter of the Eucharist. Cranmer, especially, sought Melanchthon's advice, and pleaded with him for several years to come to England. Melanchthon himself wrote to Edward at least once with advice and encouragement.[121] With Edward's support, after the death of Bucer, a further attempt was made to bring Melanchthon to England. It appears that this effort was near to success when Edward himself died.

> One of the great might-have-beens of Reformation history was the invitation by Edward VI's government to Philipp Melanchthon to fill the gap left by the death of Martin Bucer as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge University. … Astonishingly, it looks as if in 1553 Melanchthon was ready to accept the Cambridge invitation, overcoming his lifelong superstition about seafaring, in order to travel to England. Only Edward's death stopped him coming, although there is a curious silence about what happened to the very handsome travel expenses which he was granted by the beleaguered Edwardian government.[122]

Despite never coming to England, Melanchthon nevertheless kept in close touch with developments there, recommending a number of other younger scholars and encouraging both Cranmer and King Edward to pursue moderation in their religious policy.

John Calvin appears to have taken a particular interest in developments in England. Yet his letters to Somerset and to the King were of a different tone than the advice received from Bucer and Melanchthon, Where they argued for moderation and understanding, Calvin's emphasis is summarized by Jordan, employing as an example Calvin's first letter to Somerset from October 1548:

> … the government must move with much greater vigour to the weeding out of remaining popish superstitions, for the policy of moderation thus far pursued was self-defeating. The completion of the Reformation in doctrine must be speedily

---

[120] Ibid., 53–54.

[121] This letter was dated 13 January 1549. Jordan, *Young King*, 200, n 6.

[122] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 170.

> accomplished, which can only be imposed by the laying on of a godly discipline which will secure a moral Reformation in England.[123]

Calvin went on to encourage the firm repression of the risings which had so weakened the realm and the weeding out of all remaining popish survivals.[124]

In addition to writing to Somerset, Calvin wrote to Bucer, Cranmer, and Cheke, urging all of them to press for more and speedy reforms in the church and in the national administration. Calvin also wrote directly to Edward:

> Much the same advice was given by the Genevan in a letter sent directly to the King, reminding him in cool and forthright terms that though it was true that certain indifferent matters might be borne with, this must not lead to confusion of purpose in the work of Reformation. In England, he was persuaded, the over-riding problem was the weakness of the clergy, which still reflected the ignorance and barbarism which popery had fostered. He accordingly advised Edward to make certain that all popery be extirpated from the universities, so that godly clergy might be bred, while urging that the refugee clergy who had come to England be accorded full Christian liberty.[125]

Edward appreciated Calvin's zeal for the reform of the church. He clearly shared many of Calvin's goals. As the French Protestant Francis Bourgoyne wrote to Calvin after an audience with Edward:

> … our Josiah, the King of England, made most courteous inquiry of me concerning your health and ministry. To which when I had made such reply as in my judgment I considered worthy of you, he sufficiently declared, both by his countenance and his words, that he takes a great interest in you and in everything belonging to you. Mention was incidentally made of the letter which you once sent to be delivered to his uncle, the then protector of the kingdom, and which he declared to have been exceeding gratifying to him. … The King supports and encourages pure religion and godly and learned men to the utmost of his power, and would effect much more if his age allowed him.[126]

---

[123] Jordan, *Young King*, 201.

[124] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 324.

[125] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 324.

[126] A letter of Francis Bourgoyne to Jean Calvin, dated 4 December 1550. John Gough Nichols, ed., *Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth*, 2 vols. (London: Roxburghe Club, 1857), I:cxlix.

Edward's appreciation for Calvin may have been enhanced by the fact that both Cranmer and Bucer were closer to Calvin in their approach than they were to Zwingli. Dickens suggests, however, that another aspect of Calvinism may offered a further important attraction to the young king:

> Calvin had a system set up in Geneva involving theological instruction, living a moral life and not criticizing the government, that would allow for unequalled advantage in public order, social justice and educational opportunity. This was a system that would fill the void when the Catholic Church was abandoned and "assuaged the dread of chaos ever besetting our sixteenth-century ancestors".[127]

Yet, however much Calvin encouraged the Reformation of the church in England, MacCulloch notes that Calvin's interest in England was not always accompanied by a clear sense of what was transpiring in the country.

> The most spectacular symptom of this was that right up to the summer of 1551, he still regarded Somerset as the most important figure in English politics. In fact, after Somerset's execution, Calvin had to be told fairly firmly by his exile friends in England that it would not be helpful to write English politicians lamenting the Duke's death. The reality is that in the time of Edward VI, Calvin was not the towering international figure which he later became.[128]

Nevertheless, Calvin held King Edward in high regard. To Cheke, Calvin expressed his special hope in Edward.

> But his great hope, so he wrote to Cheke, lay in the young King. There was, for Calvin, rare courtesy as there was deep conviction, when he declared it had been due to Cheke's tuition that 'England possesses a king, not only of the noblest disposition, but moulded by your labours to mature excellence beyond his age, who may stretch forth his hand to the distressed or rather afflicted Church in these miserable times.'[129]

When he heard of the death of the king in 1553, Calvin wrote:

> At first, uncertain rumors flew about concerning the death of the King.... Afterwards more certain messengers that I could wish confirmed this intelligence... [that England had] been deprived of an incomparable treasure of which it was unworthy.

---

[127] Dickens, *English Reformation*, 224.

[128] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 173.

[129] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 325.

> Indeed, I consider that, by the death of one youth, the whole nation has been bereaved of the best of fathers.[130]

Jordan argues, however, that even more important than John Calvin was the fellow Swiss Reformer Heinrich Bullinger, "who without doubt was to follow more closely and to influence more directly the course of the English Reformation than any other foreign divine."[131] Influenced by the writings of both Luther and Melanchthon, Bullinger initially adopted a Lutheran position before eventually moving in the direction of Zwingli, whom he succeeded as the leading pastor in Zurich in 1531. Several of the leading English Protestant divines spent time with him, and he was especially close to John Hooper, upon whose view of the Eucharist he exerted a significant influence. His voluminous correspondence kept him in regular contact with most of the leaders in the Protestant camp.[132] Moreover, ten of his writings were translated and published in England during this period.[133]

> This huge corpus of his works constituted a kind of quarry of sober and sensitive teachings quickly and easily absorbed into the stream of English intellectual and institutional life. There was nothing novel about his writings, which tended to be conventional, but his arguments and his presentation were characterized by a most persuasive practicality and sensibility which gave them, and deservedly, very great appeal.[134]

In no area was Bullinger more influential on the more aggressive reformers such as Hooper than in his views on the Eucharist. The ability of Calvin and Bullinger to come to agreement on a

---

[130] Ibid., 534.

[131] Jordan, *Young King*, 202. Bullinger's influence on the English Reformation extended well into the reign of Queen Elizabeth. However, these matters fall outside the scope of this study.

[132] More than 12,000 of his letters have survived. Of these Jordan observes, "It is accordingly not surprising that this correspondence is a principal source for the English Reformation, hundreds of letters having been addressed to him by refugee clergy, sympathetic English merchants, and high ranking officers of church and state such as Cranmer, Haddon, and Cheke," (Jordan, *Young King*, 202).

[133] Jordan, *Young King*, 202.

[134] Ibid., 202–203.

formula for talking about the Eucharist in the *Consensus Tigurinus*[135] was especially important for developments in England, as it provided a basis for reconciling the growing gap between the Zwinglian-leaning and Calvinist-leaning reformers. Of the importance of this development for the English Reformation, MacCulloch writes:

> If Zürich and Geneva had failed to agree at this moment, it would permanently have damaged relations between Zürich and Canterbury. It was thus of major importance for England when, in one of the few statesmanlike moments in the sixteenth-century Reformation, Bullinger and Calvin brokered the *Consensus Tigurinus,* creating a formula comprehensive enough to avoid the appearance of victory for either side....
>
> The consolidation of this Reformed identity came just at the time when ... Thomas Cranmer and the English evangelical leadership had also consciously moved out of step with Lutheranism in their Eucharistic thought....
>
> Without the achievement of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, therefore, it would not have been nearly so easy for the Swiss Reformation to develop its future creative relationship with the English Church.[136]

Much of this development lay in the future. For Edward, the importance of this development was that it removed a source of division between his religious advisors, and allowed them to move forward with revisions to the *Prayer Book* that could take the first small step toward the wholesale reform of English church life that Edward would increasingly seek.

Assessing Edward's Contribution

In this section we have primarily attempted to show why Edward was increasingly willing, as his reign progressed, to move away from the moderate and balanced religious settlement that had characterized his father's policy. We have emphasized the persons who influenced Edward, observing that almost all of those to whom the young king listened for guidance in matters of religion belonged to that segment of the church that was most aggressive in promoting reform.

---

[135] The *Consensus Tigurinus* (sometimes called the Zurich Agreement) was a formula worked out in the spring of 1549 between Calvin and Bullinger that resolved many of the differences between the Calvinists and the Zwinglians over the nature of the Eucahrist, at least to the point that it allowed the Swiss Reformed to present a united front against the Catholic position. It also served to widen the gap between the Calvinists and Zwinglians, on one hand, and the Lutherans on the other.

[136] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 168–170.

This gave Edward a very different perspective than Henry. For Henry, reform had been a practical matter, focused on the issue of the royal prerogative. A limited reform of the constitution and administration of the church balance both satisfied Henry's needs and reflected his disposition. In exercising his royal prerogative, maintaining a balance (albeit one slightly tilted in the Protestant direction) was necessary in order to maintain good order in his kingdom. For Edward, the answer to the question of what was necessary was almost always to be found in an understanding of what was *right and godly*, rather than what was practical. This disposition led Edward to support and encourage a broadening of the scope of the Reformation that went far beyond what Henry envisioned, or would have been willing to tolerate.

In this section we have emphasized those who most influenced Edward, but there is another element that must be noted with regard to these individuals. With the notable exception of Thomas Cranmer, Edward either elevated or translated almost all of the important leaders of the reforming branch of the church during his reign. At the same time he removed from office, or approved the removal from office, of almost every key leader of the conservative faction. In addition he welcomed key foreign reformers to England, and found them places of influence in the universities and the church. Moreover, Edward's patronage protected them when they were invariably accused of false teaching by the more conservative elements in church and academia. Thus, under Edward's administration there was an almost total transformation of the theological and ecclesiastical leadership of the nation that placed in positions of power and influence those who could advance the vision of a reformed church that they and the young king shared.

Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer

As Procter and Frere have observed, "The definite history of the compilation of the First Prayer Book is wrapped in considerable obscurity. … [W]hen the attempt is made to ascertain accurately the names of those who complied it and the history of their work, little evidence is

forthcoming."[137] Despite the uncertainty that remains over the exact process by which the *Prayer Book* came into being, there is a general consensus that the person who most directly shaped the form that it eventually took was the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer.[138]

> The Book of Common Prayer owes it character above all to one man: Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1533 to 1556. While the liturgy of the Prayer Book is sometimes describes as 'timeless' it is in fact rooted firmly in the time of the Reformation and in Cranmer's personal views and character.[139]

This being admitted, it remains our task to demonstrate that King Edward played a significant role in the history of the *Prayer Book*.

The Reform of Worship before Edward

The predominant theological conservatism that marked the Reformation during the reign of Henry provided little opportunity for the wholesale revision of the worship life of the church in England. Nevertheless, liturgical reform was in the air of both the Church of Rome and the churches of the Reformation. Among Lutherans, Luther's own efforts at liturgical revision began as early as 1523. Among Catholics, the revisions to the Roman Breviary produced by the Spanish Franciscan Cardinal Francis de Quiñones in 1535 aimed at simplifying the Canonical Hours by emphasizing singing the Psalms and reading the Bible.[140] Cranmer used this work to revise the Sarum Breviary, which was the basis of the *Prayer Book*'s Order of Morning and Evening Prayer.[141] The influence of Quiñones is also reflected in the Preface to the *Prayer Book*

---

[137] Francis Procter and Walter Howard Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, Rev. Ed. (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1958), 44.

[138] For a brief biographical sketch of Thomas Cranmer, see Appendix A.

[139] Charles Heffling and Cynthia Shattuck, eds., *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 21.

[140] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 27.

[141] E. C. S. Gibson, "Introduction," in Ernest Rhys, ed., *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, Everyman's Library (London: J. M. Dent, 1910), viii.

of 1549 (now known as the Second Preface), which is described by Dearmer as a restatement by Cranmer of Quiñones's arguments for the reform of the Breviary.[142]

In Germany in 1543 Hermann von Wied, the Archbishop of Cologne, produced a doctrinal discourse with revised liturgical examples that was heavily influenced by Lutheran and Reformed ideas, commonly known as Hermann's Consultation.[143] While this work was ultimately rejected by Rome after several decades of use, it influenced liturgical thinking in England, and the services of Baptism and Holy Communion in the later *Prayer Book* exhibit its influence.[144]

Despite the conservatism of the Henrician reform, from the mid-1530s there were a variety of suggestions about how the worship life of the church should change. The anti-papal emphasis of Henry's Reformation was reflected in a revision of the Sarum Breviary in 1536 (and again in 1542), which omitted any reference to the Pope and eliminated several other minor Roman elements.[145] At this stage the greatest emphasis was on the need to have the public readings of the service be from the Bible in English so that the people might be instructed in godliness.[146] By

---

[142] Dearmer, *Prayer Book*, 48. Gibson (*First and Second Prayer Books*, viii) goes further, describing it as "a literal translation from the preface of the first edition of Quignon's work...." The relationship between Quiñon's revision to the Breviary and Cranmer's later work is examined in detail in chapter 2 of Francis Aidan Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (London: John Hodges, 1890), 19–29.

[143] The short version of the Latin title of this work is *Simplex ac Pia Deliberatio* (*A Simple and Pious Consultation*). There is debate over the extent to which Bucer and Melanchthon contributed to this work. There is a consensus that they influenced the work to a significant degree, but Gibson (*First and Second Prayer Books*, viii) and Daniel (*Prayer-Book*, 23) describe them as the actual authors of the work. The German edition of this work in 1543 was followed by a Latin edition in 1545 and a subsequent English edition in 1547.

[144] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 29. Cf. also Gibson in *First and Second Prayer Books*, viii, Daniel, Prayer-Book, 23, and Francis Procter, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1898), 23.

[145] Dearmer, *Prayer Book*, 49.

[146] Heffling, *Book of Common Prayer*, 22–23. William Tyndale's translation of the New Testament into English, opposed by Henry VIII, first appeared in 1525. The Convocation of 1534 petitioned Henry to authorize a complete English translation of the Bible, and the translation by Miles Coverdale, drawing heavily on Tyndale's work, appeared in 1535. In 1536 Henry issued a proclamation granting permission for the private reading of the Bible in English. The most important translation published during this period, however, was the 'Great Bible' of 1539. This work, prepared largely by Coverdale and drawing heavily on Tyndale, was authorized by the king for public reading. Beginning with the 1540 edition it included an introduction by Cranmer. Daniel, *Prayer-Book*, 21–22.

1538 Cromwell, acting on Henry's behalf, issued an injunction requiring the placing of an English Bible in every church and the requiring that the people be taught the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer in English.[147]

Henry's desire to maintain a balance between the reformers and the traditionalists for the sake of unity prevented significant theological reform, and as a result yielded limited liturgical development. Both Cranmer's early tendency to favor the Lutheran position and Henry's early interest in exploring the possibility of an alliance with the Germans against the Pope had implications for the theology of the church. The Ten Articles (1536) and the Bishops' Book (1537) showed clear signs of Lutheran influence. However, the failure of the theological negotiations of 1538 led to a withdrawal of the king's support for Lutheran theology and a conservative resurgence led by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. This led to the production of the Six Articles (1539), reaffirming the traditional Roman Catholic teachings on transubstantiation, communion in one kind, private auricular confession, clerical celibacy, and monastic vows.[148] Henry's disastrous marriage to Anne of Cleves in 1540 closed the door on any possibility of a rapprochement with the Germans and led directly to the subsequent arrest and execution of Thomas Cromwell. It also left Cranmer politically and theologically isolated and under attack from Gardiner and the theological conservatives who increasingly dominated the influence upon the king. The King's Book (1543, a revision of the earlier Bishop's Book) and the parliamentary Act for the Advancement of True Religion of the same year took further steps away from Reformation doctrine.

---

[147] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 30.

[148] Heffling, *Book of Common Prayer*, 22. Daniel (*Prayer-Book*, 23) describes it as "the whip with six strings," and notes that it made the denial of transubstantiation a capital offense. He also notes that the reading of the Bible in English was restricted at this time to the nobility and the gentry, the punishment for others who read the Bible in English being a month's imprisonment per each offense.

Despite these developments, Cranmer was able to initiate some limited liturgical reforms during the last years of Henry's reign. In 1542 he made a formal proposal to amend the service books of the church.[149] In May of 1544 he published the first officially authorized worship service in the English language, the processional service known as the Exhortation and Litany. He also drafted a communion liturgy to replace the traditional Mass. This service was never formally adopted or used, however, before the king's death. Nevertheless, it likely formed the basis of the communion liturgy eventually incorporated into the *Prayer Book*.

Apart from the introduction of the reading of the Bible in English, the changes in the liturgy of the church in England during the Henrician Reformation were minor. As Gasquet summarizes the developments:

> Glancing at the state of affairs at the moment of Henry's death it may be said that the system of public worship, which existed throughout the middle ages in England, remained intact and in full force. The rites of Sarum, York, and Hereford were in practical use as they had been an hundred years before, the same books, the same ceremonies.[150]

The *Prayer Book of 1549*

It was not until the succession of Edward in 1547 that the work of reforming the worship of the church in England could begin in earnest. With the new king's blessing, several minor changes appeared in short order. In July of that year Cranmer published the *First Book of Homilies*, promoting the theology of the Reformation through religious instruction and setting a standard for preaching.[151] More significant were the two sets Royal Injunctions and the Articles of Enquiry for the Royal Visitation issued in the fall of 1547. These prohibited the worship of images and called for their destruction, banned processions, ordered that the epistle and gospel

---

[149] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 30. Daniel (*Prayer-Book*, 24–25) indicates that at this time Cranmer assembled a 'Committee of Convocation' consisting of two other bishops and six clergy to work on the project, but that their progress was restricted until after Edward's accession to the throne.

[150] Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 4.

lessons should be read in English, and instructed clergy to preach at least one sermon each quarter of the year. They also required that both the Bible and Erasmus's paraphrase of the Gospels in English be publicly displayed in every church, and that clergy should be examined for their knowledge of them by the bishops, among other things.[152]

The opening of the first Parliament of Edward's reign on 4 November 1547 marked an important change. As a part of the opening service the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Creed and the *Agnus Dei* were all sung in English, marking the first time that the "mass was sung before the lords in the English tongue."[153] As Gasquet observes, all the arrangements for the service were "ordered and transposed by the King's authority," and so, "it must be presumed that all that was done there had his Majesty's countenance and approval" just as had been the case earlier in the year on Easter Monday when Compline was sung before the King in English.[154] The nature of Edward's interest in these matters is reflected in the observation by Jeremy Collier that, "In the latter end of this winter, 1547, a committee of divines were commanded by the king to draw up an order for administering the Holy Eucharist in English under both kinds."[155]

In January of 1548 another royal order banned many of the traditional ceremonies associated with Candlemas and Holy Week. Plans for a more extensive revision of the orders of worship were underway. Edward issued a royal proclamation in 8 March 1548 establishing The Order of the Communion, a form of the communion service to be used in administering the sacrament in both kinds.[156] Edward spells out his role by declaring in the proclamation that he

---

[151] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 35.

[152] Ibid.

[153] Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 64.

[154] Ibid., 64–65.

[155] Jeremy Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1708–1714), as cited by Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 140.

[156] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 38. Heffling, *Book of Common Prayer*, 23. A convocation of the Bishops

(continued next page)

had "caused sundry of his most grave and well learned prelates to assemble themselves for this matter, who after long conference together, with deliberate advice finally agreed upon" the Order of Communion issued.[157]

In September of 1548 a gathering of reform-minded senior clergy gathered at Chertsy Abbey to review the work and to plan for the presentation of the revisions to Parliament. These divines also met at Windsor Castle, perhaps on 22–23 September when Edward was in residence there, either to begin their work with a formal session before the king or to review the progress with the King. The question of how much of the work was done at Windsor remains unsettled. In his journal Edward writes of the work done by "a number of bishops and learned men gathered together at Windsor." Cranmer, writing to Queen Mary in September of 1555 likewise speaks of those who were "gathered together at Windsor for the Reformation of the service of the church."[158] It would seem, on the strength of these comments, that some considerable amount of the work must have been undertaken at Windsor, though the details of the arrangements and the King's role in them remain unknown to us. It is likely that they worked at Windsor for an extended period of time.[159]

There exist several further indications that Edward was both informed and supportive of the work on the revision of the liturgy being undertaken at this time. A letter of 4 September 1548 to the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University orders the chapels at the colleges to follow the example of the royal chapel "until such time as an order be taken and prescribed by his

---

had previously approved this change in Dec. 1547 (Procter and Frere, *New History*, 37). This Order was not an entire communion service, but rather consisted of only two parts, the requirement of announcement indicating the date on which the minister intended to administer the sacrament——this assumes that the Eucharist would not be celebrated as a part of every Mass——and a ritual for administering the sacrament with the laity receiving both elements. The latter takes up the service after the communion of the priest and continues through the prayers. Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 91–92.

[157] Ibid., 94. They note that, according to Foxe, this gathering took place at Windsor Castle.

[158] Ibid.,136–137.

Highness to be universally kept throughout the whole realm."[160] In addition, a royal proclamation of 23 September, issued while the king was meeting with the committee of divines he had assembled for this task at Windsor, further speaks of Edward's wish "to see very shortly one uniform order throughout his realm" and of "certain bishops and notable learned men" gathered together at this time for that very purpose by his Highness commandment.

That there was not at this time a consensus among the leading figures of the church in England over the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is apparent from the three or four days of debate over the *Prayer Book* that took place in the House of Lords beginning on 15 December. Over the course of this debate several of the bishops expressed their disagreement with teaching regarding the sacrament promoted by the *Prayer Book*.[161] When the bill finally came to a vote, ten of the bishops eventually voted for the bill and eight against it.[162] Writing to Bucer, Peter Martyr describes the situation:

> [T]here is so much contention among our people about the Eucharist that every corner is full of it and even in the supreme council of the state, in which matters relating to religion are daily brought forward, there is so much disputing of the bishops among themselves and with others, as I think was never heard before.[163]

Despite the fact that the divisions among the churchmen over the doctrine of the Lord's Supper promoted by the *Prayer Book* were serious enough that they would have kept the unity-minded Henry VIII from promoting the issue, Edward was clearly in favor of the measure.

---

[159] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 45. See also note 3 on page 46.

[160] Ibid.,46.

[161] For a summary of the debate and the details of its passage, see Procter and Frere, *New History*, 47–52 and Chapter XI in Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 157–181.

[162] Gasquet and Bishop (Ibid.,171–172) analyze the known views of the bishops not present and conclude that a complete tally would have yielded a vote of 13 for and 10 against, with the remaining four uncertain but leaning against.

[163] As quoted by Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 174.

Edward's knowledge of events and his attitude are reflected in a letter from an Englishman, John Burcher, to the Swiss Reformed theologian Heinrich Bullinger, informing him of the events then transpiring in England. After speaking briefly of the debate itself, Burcher adds:

> I will not however omit this truly discreet reply which our king made to the Protector. When the disputation was ended, the Protector accosted the king with an expression of his surprise, saying, 'How very much the bishop of Westminster has deceived my expectation.' 'Your expectation,' the king replied, 'he might deceive, but not mine'. When the Protector further enquired the reason, 'I expected,' said the king, 'nothing else but that he, who has been so long time with the emperor as ambassador, should smell of the Interim'; a reply truly becoming the young king, and which I did not think right to omit.[164]

The first Act of Uniformity was passed on 21 January 1549. Among the provisions of the Act was the requirement that the new *Prayer Book* be employed in all the churches by Whitsunday of that year (9 June).[165]

That Edward approved and supported all these measures is also reflected in several of his own letters from this period. He expresses his own support and his view that that the Act had the support of the Parliament and church in general in his letters to Bishop Bonner of London of 23 July 1549 and to his sister Mary (undated but from the same general time), both of whom strongly opposed the *Prayer Book*.[166] In his letter to Mary, Edward clearly states his own role:

> We have, by the advice of our dearest uncle Edward Duke of Somerset &c. and the rest of our Privy Council, with one full and whole consent, both of our clergy in their several synods and convocations, and also of the noblemen and commons in the late

---

[164] As quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 177.

[165] Heffling, *Book of Common Prayer*, 25. Of the passage of this Act and the debate over the Lord's Supper, Edward wrote in his chronicle, "A Parliament was called, where a uniform order of prayer was instituted, before made by a number of bishops and learned men gathered together in Windsor. There was granted a subsidy, and there was a notable disputation of the sacrament in the Parliament House" (Jordan, *Chronicle*, 10). This terse style is characteristic of Edward's chronicle, which typically records the bare facts about events with little comment or reflection of the king's feelings on the matters reported.

[166] During the debate in the House of Lords, Bishop Bonner had stated his position bluntly: "The faults in the book are these: there is heresy there because it is called bread" (Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 166.). Bishop Bonner's continuing resistance to the reforms led to his eventual arrest, trial, conviction, and removal from office on 1 October 1549. In his place the King appointed the enthusiastic reformer Nicholas Ridley.

> session of our parliament, established by authority of our said parliament one godly and uniform order of common prayer.[167]

With these words Edward asserts that the Parliament's action in passing the Act of Uniformity that established the *Prayer Book* was his action.

Edward's support for, and intent to promote, the liturgical reform was further acknowledged in a royal letter of 6 February 1551 to the Viceroy of Ireland, which stated that the King had "caused the Liturgy and prayers of the Church to be translated into our mother tongue of this realm of England" and expressed his desire that the church in Ireland should employ the same *Prayer Book*, as required by the Act of Uniformity.[168] The church in Ireland, however, generally resisted the adoption of the *Prayer Book* and rejected its reforming theology.

We cannot here describe in detail the changes introduced by the *Prayer Book of 1549*.[169] In general, it may be described as closer to the Lutheran liturgies of the day than to the Reformed[170] and that it represented an initial step away from those elements seen by the reformers as problematic. In addition to everything now being done in English,[171] the services were simplified and a strong emphasis was placed on the singing of the psalms and the reading of the Scripture. Elements of the Mass that were thought to promote the doctrine of transubstantiation were removed.[172] Other elements later deemed irreligious superstitions by the reformers were

---

[167]Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 153, citing the source as R. O. State Papers. Domestic Ed. VI Vol. IX. No. 51.

[168] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 63.

[169] Many summaries and analyses are available, including the Chapter XII and Chapter XIII of Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 182–235.

[170] Ibid.,217 ff.

[171] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 49 note 2, observes that individuals who knew Greek, Hebrew, or Latin were to be allowed to continue to use those languages in their private devotions, and that the universities at Cambridge and Oxford could use them in their chapels "for the further encouraging of learning in the tongues." See also Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 236 and 272.

[172] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 54, argue that a number of the elements removed did not actually promote the doctrine of transubstantiation or other teachings offensive to the reformers, but were misunderstood to have done so.

nevertheless retained. Invocations of Mary and the saints were reduced but not eliminated entirely. The making of the sign of the cross and the prayers for the dead were both retained.

The *Prayer Book of 1552*

Opposition to the anticipated changes had begun as early as March of 1548 when The Order of the Communion was established. Widespread preaching against the changes led to the restriction of preaching to those who were licensed by King, the Lord Protector, or the Archbishop beginning on 24 April. When that failed to silence the opposition, a complete ban on preaching was instituted on 23 September.

The formal approval of the *Prayer Book* by Parliament and the church in January of 1549 did not settle matters. The traditionalists thought that it went too far;[173] the reformers did not think that it went far enough.[174] The people in general were opposed to the changes that they neither wanted nor understood.[175]

The opposition of the traditionalists led some to open and armed insurrection against the government, especially in the west where it took two months to suppress an open rebellion against the theological and liturgical innovations introduced by the *Prayer Book*.[176] Even those who were not inclined to oppose the introduction of the *Prayer Book* by force of arms engaged in a form of passive resistance by interpreting the often ambiguous language of the liturgy and its rubrics in such a way as to allow for the maximum degree of conformity to the old practices and

---

[173] Bishop Hooper, for example, described it as "very defective and of doubtful construction, and, in some respects, indeed manifestly impious" (Rhys, *First and Second Prayer Books*, xii–xiii).

[174] John Calvin, speaking for many of his more dedicated followers in England, wrote of the *Prayer Book of 1549* that it contained "many tolerable absurdities," and called for further revisions (Dearmer, *Prayer Book*, 64).

[175] As Gasquet and Bishop (*Edward VI*, 254) observe, "At the present day, for those who are accustomed to the Book of Common Prayer, it may be difficult to realize how deeply the English people resented the abolition of their ancient sacred rites."

[176] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 56, note that the demands of the insurgents focused on the revival of the conservative Six Articles of Henry VIII, the restoration of the Latin Mass and communion in one kind, the removal of the English Bibles, prayers for souls in purgatory and the restoration of a variety of ceremonies involving candles,
(continued next page)

doctrines.[177] Of these Peter Martyr lamented to Bullinger, "The perverseness of the bishops is incredible. They oppose us with all their might; yet some of that order, although a very few, are favourable to the undertaking."[178]

The reform-minded group had the strong support of King Edward, however, and they continued to press for additional changes. Edward was amenable to these suggestions. As Skidmore notes, "Though Edward may have not have put his hand to the 1552 *Prayer Book*, he continued to maintain a strong interest in the reformed faith and its application."[179] In recognizing the influence upon Edward of the Continental Reformers then living in England, Daniel observes, "Unfortunately the young King gave too ready an ear to their suggestions, and determined on having the new Prayer Book revised."[180] Whether or not Daniel is correct about the influence of Bucer, Peter Martyr and others among the Continental Reformers is, for our purposes, immaterial. His observation about Edward's support and encouragement for further liturgical reform is unquestionable. In discussing the make-up of the committee that was subsequently appointed to further revise the recently-issued *Prayer Book*, Proctor notes that the committee "was appointed for that purpose by the King, *who had determined on many changes*" (emphasis added).[181]

---

holy water, images, etc. See also Dearmer, *Prayer Book*, 55–56.

[177] Gasquet and Bishop (*Edward VI*, 269–270) give examples of a variety of these practices, as mentioned in the writings of contemporaries.

[178] As quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 256.

[179] Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 256.

[180] Daniel, *Prayer-Book*, 40. Of the influence of these Continental Reformers, Gasquet and Bishop, write, "Henry's hand was heavy on the innovators, at least in the later years of his reign, and so far as was possible he kept their books and their teaching from being disseminated among his people. With Edward's accession, however, the will to restrain the circulation of these works of foreign reformers ceased to exist" (Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 124–125). This understates the matter. Edward did not merely allow these foreign reformers to publish their views, he promoted some of them to influential positions (for example, Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr to the positions of Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and Oxford respectively) and actively encouraged and sought out their views.

[181] Proctor, *History*, 34.

The Royal Visitation Articles issued in the fall of 1549 exceeded, and even contradicted, the *Prayer Book* in forbidding elements such as the use of holy oil, chrism, multiple altars, and the practice of having celebrating communion more than one time on any day.[182] In addition, when some took the imprisonment of the Duke of Sommerset in the fall of 1549 as a sign that the old practices and services would be restored, the king issued a letter on Christmas day ordering the destruction of all the old church books and reaffirming the exclusive use of the *Prayer Book*.[183]

The first formal step toward a further revision of the *Prayer Book* was the issuance of an Ordinal containing additional services not contained in the original *Prayer Book*, particularly those related to ordination and/or installation to various church offices. An act of Parliament passed in January of 1550—the bishops in the House of Lords voted 9-5 in favor of it[184]—empowered the king to appoint a committee to prepare the new Ordinal, which was completed in March of the same year. This work, which shows some signs of the influence of Martin Bucer,[185] was eventually incorporated into the *Prayer Book of 1552*.

In November of 1550 the Council issued an order requiring the removal of all altars from the churches and providing for the administration of communion from a table.[186] Both Martin Bucer in Cambridge and Peter Martyr Vermigli in Oxford wrote critiques of the *Prayer Book*

---

[182] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 59–60.

[183] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 60.

[184] Bishop Heath of Worcester opposed the book so fervently that he was eventually imprisoned for eighteen months before being deprived of his see on October of 1551. Ibid., 61.

[185] Ibid., 71–72. E. C. Whitaker provides an English translation of the last part of Bucer's *De Ordinatione Legitima*. E. C. Whitaker, *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer* (London: Mayhew-McCrimmon Ltd. 1974), 176–183. He further notes (pp. 5–6) that a comparison of it and the Ordinal of 1550, "reveals clearly that there is some relationship between them, and probably that one is directly indebted to the other." His assessment continues, "[T]he compilers of the ordinal of 1550 made use of Bucer's treatise. But whether the treatise was specially written for their use, and at their request, and whether it was written before Bucer came to England or afterwards, are matters which the evidence does not allow us to determine."

[186] Heffling, *Book of Common Prayer*, 25.

calling for a stronger assertion of reformed theology.[187] Only Bucer's critique, known as the *Censura*, has survived.[188] It is an extensive and detailed analysis that has been described as:

> … sometime shrewd, sometimes merely perverse, always moderate and scholarly, and generally representing a middle position between the doctrine of the Church and the extravagances of the extreme reformers.[189]

The extent of the influence of the critiques by Bucer and Peter Martyr is debated.[190] What is not debated is that Edward openly supported those who pushed for further reform. Jordan speaks of "… the increasingly fervent sympathy of the young king for the aims and aspirations of the evangelical party within the Church" in this period.[191] The king's genuine personal interest in the subject of the church, and his attention to the views of Bucer in particular, are illustrated by an unfinished essay that Edward wrote, probably in April of 1551, on the need for reform in the church and state.[192] As Jordan suggests, the essay was probably inspired by Bucer's *De Regno Christi*, which had been presented to the King at New Years' Day of 1551.[193]

---

[187] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 77–78. Peter Martyr's critique of the first edition of the *Prayer Book* appears to have been less extensive than Bucer's. In the letter to Bucer cited below, Peter Martyr expressed his approval of Bucer's more extensive comments, noting only that he was surprised that Bucer did not oppose the reservation of the elements of the Eucharist to be taken to those who were sick.

[188] Two manuscript copies of the Latin text of Bucer's critique exist, one in Cambridge the other in Oxford. The Cambridge manuscript in Bucer's own hand appears to have been an early draft containing many revisions. The Oxford manuscript was copied by someone else, presumably an amanuensis, and contains several generally minor corrections in Bucer's hand. It is also signed by Bucer. E. C. Whitaker regards the Oxford manuscript to be the normative edition, and it is that edition, and not the early printed edition that he characterizes as full of errors, that he provides with an English translation. Whitaker, *Martin Bucer*, 2–3.

[189] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 73. They summarize the substance of Bucer's critique in some detail on pages 73–76. Bucer's critique was submitted on 5 January 1551 to the Bishop of Ely, who had commissioned it, (cf. Whitaker, *Martin Bucer*, 2–3 for a discussion of this point). Bucer died the following month.

[190] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 80–81, characterize Bucer's influence in these terms: "… many of the suggestions of [Bucer] had been adopted, but his conservative views had clearly not found so much favor as his proposals for alteration, and while some of his worst suggestions were set aside, in other respects the changes made were more radical."

[191] Jordan, *Threshold*, 364.

[192] The unfinished essay, titled "Discourse on the Reform of Abuses in Church and State," is printed in Jordan, *Chronicle*, 159–167. The section on the reform of the church is brief, and emphasizes the need of the preaching and hearing of the Word of God for the sake of the morals of the people, and the need for moral, orthodox, and learned men to be appointed as bishops in order to carry out the discipline of the church.

[193] Jordan, *Threshold*, 364.

In a letter to Bucer on 10 January 1551, Peter Martyr reports on Edward's support for the additional changes sought by the pro-reform group:

> But what Sir John Cheke (the king's tutor) told me rejoices me not a little. If the bishops will not change the things that ought to be changed, the king will do it himself, and when the matter comes to the Parliament he himself will interpose his royal authority.[194]

In the absence of any clear statement from Edward himself to this effect, this assertion can only be regarded as hearsay. However, it is consistent with other actions taken around this time. The assertion of the use of royal authority to enforce the changes was no hollow threat. Five of the leading bishops who resisted certain aspects of the first *Prayer Book* were imprisoned during this period.[195]

On 14 April 1552 Parliament approved a second Act of Uniformity, and with it the further revision of the *Prayer Book*. This time there were only two bishops left to oppose it. The Act stipulated that the revised *Prayer Book* must be used beginning on 1 November of that year.

The *Prayer Book of 1552* went further than its predecessor of 1549 in promoting the Reformed theological position.[196] Many of the changes involved the removal of practices that the reformers regarded as promoting superstition. Another emphasis was the determination to remove or modify everything in the *Prayer Book* that Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester until he was deposed and imprisoned for his opposition to the *Prayer Book*, had used in his debate with Cranmer to argue that the new *Prayer Book* still allowed for the old faith.[197]

---

[194] As quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 285.

[195] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 79.

[196] A summary of the changes is given by Procter and Frere, *New History*, 81–83 and by Daniel, *Prayer-Book*, 41–42. Daniel (*Prayer-Book*, 25) further states that the Introductory Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution of the 1552 *Prayer Book* are drawn from Calvin's Directory (a liturgy originally written in French for the use of the Reformed Church at Strasburg, but published in at Latin translation in England in 1551).

[197] See Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 289–290.

The one major area of theological change introduced by the *Prayer Book of 1552* involved the Eucharist:

> The chief doctrinal alteration was in reference to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. In the book of 1549 the Communion Service had been so constructed as to be consistent with the Catholic belief in the real presence. But the alterations in 1552 were designed to facilitate and foster the view that the prayer of consecration had reference rather to the persons than to the elements, and that the presence of Christ was not in the sacrament but only in the heart of the believer.[198]

In all of these, but especially the position on the Eucharist, the words of Gasquet and Bishop ring true, "... in 1552 in the revision of the Communion office the Lutheran principles of liturgical change were abandoned in favour of the radical methods prevalent in the Reformed churches."[199]

Even so, the revised *Prayer Book* was deemed not to have gone far enough in the minds of some of the Reformed-minded camp. This became immediately apparent in a controversy, apparently spurred on by John Knox who was acting as the King's Chaplain at the time, over whether communicants should receive the Lord's Supper kneeling or standing.

The 1552 *Prayer Book* indicated that communicants should kneel to receive the sacrament. After the 1552 revision had already gone to press, Knox and his supporters pressed for a change in this rubric. Even though Cranmer opposed the change, its proponents secured a statement from King Edward supporting their view. As a result the Council ordered on 27 October 1552, three days before the revised *Prayer Book* was to go into general use, the insertion of a statement to clarify how the kneeling was to be understood.

This so-called Black Rubric[200] strongly asserted the Reformed view of the Lord's Supper, declaring that the natural body and blood of Christ were in heaven and not present in the

---

[198] Procter and Frere, *New History*, 82–83.

[199] Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI*, 290.

[200] The name Black Rubric arose over time as a description of this passage. It was customary at the time for rubrics to be printed in red. However, since this passage was not a true rubric, but an explanation of how the rubric regarding the kneeling of communicants was to be understood, it was specified that it should be printed in black *(continued next page)*

Eucharist, "For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body, to be in more places than in one at one time." Thus the kneeling position was intended as "a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder … which might else ensue." The adoration of the bread and wine as the true body and blood of Christ was declared to be "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."[201]

Assessing Edward's Contribution

From the preceding survey it is clear that while many of the details of the development of the first two editions of the *Prayer Book* are uncertain, Edward did not play a direct role in its formation. He was neither the author of its words nor its prime mover. The liturgical reform reflected in the *Prayer Book* was already underway, if to a limited degree, when Edward became king. Even so, while Cranmer and others prepared the words and the ideas that took form in the *Prayer Book,* it must be said that the *Prayer Book* would not have come into being in the form and at the time that it did without the support of Edward.

Like his father Henry before him and his sisters Mary and Elizabeth after him, Edward was no theologian. Nevertheless, he exhibited an interest in religion and a sincere commitment to the Reformed faith that grew over the course of his short reign. As a result, Edward promoted theological and liturgical reform in a way that Henry had never done. In this his policy was the opposite of that of his father, whose primary concern had been to preserve unity.

Edward encouraged, and in some cases elevated to their posts, divines like Ridley and Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli, who contributed significantly to the development of the

---

rather than in red. Since the *Prayer Book* had already gone to press, this paragraph had to be printed on a separate page and inserted into the copies that had already been printed. It was subsequently incorporated into the main text of the *Prayer Book.*

[201] Heffling, *Book of Common Prayer*, 25.

Prayer Book. He aligned himself with the most aggressively reforming elements in the church, sought their guidance, and gave his blessing to most of their recommendations. He accepted and encouraged the promotion of the teachings of the *Prayer Book*, especially in the removal of images and altars, and in the advancement of the Reformed view of the Lord's Supper. He was willing to use his royal authority to punish those who resisted or opposed its changes. And perhaps most importantly, he was willing to promote the adoption of changes that were bound to be highly divisive in a way that his father would never have done. His personal intervention in ordering the inclusion of the Black Rubric against the wishes of Cranmer demonstrates that in these matters Edward did not merely rubber-stamp the Archbishop's views.

The extent of the impact of Edward's influence has been judged by E. C. S. Gibson, if voiced in a somewhat negative way. Speaking of the revised *Prayer Book of 1552*, he writes:

> It marks the extreme limit to which the liturgical changes proceeded in England, though, had Edward's reign lasted much longer, it is probable that it would have witnessed a still wider departure from ancient usage in matters connected with public worship.[202]

By acknowledging that Edward's death limited the scope of liturgical reform in England at that time, Gibson tacitly testifies to the significance of the young king's role in the development of the *Prayer Book* during his reign.

Thus, Edward's role in the development of the *Prayer Book* was crucial, if indirect. He used the moral, political, and legal authority of his office both to enable its publication and to enforce its adoption and use. As royal enabler and proponent, he ensured the creation and adoption of the single most visible and enduring expression of the Reformation in England in the form of a *Book of Common Prayer* that has created, sustained, and normed the theology of the

---

[202] Gibson, "Introduction," xv. He is likely correct, as Gasquet and Bishop, (*Edward VI*, 304) note that additional 'innovations' were introduced in the brief period between the second *Prayer Book* and the king's death. That these changes have garnered little attention is likely due to their not having come into common use before Edward's death.

church in England from his day onward. It was Edward's *Prayer Book of 1552* that was revived, with limited changes, under Elizabeth in 1559. And so, allowing for the minor emendations of the 20th century, Gasquet and Bishop would seem to be justified in the conclusion that they drew in 1890: "But as regards the English Book, what it was in 1552 it practically remains to the present day."

The Order of the Garter

The origins of the foundation of the Order of the Garter remain obscure. It was founded by King Edward III, somewhere between 1344 and 1351, with the most commonly accepted date being 1348. For our purposes, neither the exact date nor the truthfulness of any of the various legends told to account for the name and its peculiar motto, *Honi soit qui mal y pense* ("Shamed be he who thinks evil of it"), are particularly important. What is important is the close relationship between the order and the sovereign. Membership in the order is limited to the monarch, the Prince of Wales, and a maximum of 24 'companions' appointed by the monarch alone.[203] Until modern times, when it has become customary to grant honors such as membership in the order for service to the nation, there was an especially close relationship between the monarch and the order.

Edward VI expressed a strong personal interest in reforming the statutes of the order. To modern observers, the redrafting of the statutes governing an honorary royal society would seem to have little relevance to a discussion of the great theological questions of the English Reformation. However, as MacCulloch observes, the strong interest that Edward showed in reforming the order was an expression of a genuine religious concern:

---

[203] This does not take into account various supernumary members, usually members of the royal family or foreign monarchs. The admission of such additional persons was not introduced until 1786.

> The Knights of the Garter were of prime concern to any English monarch, but in a kingdom where the royal supremacy was the central principle of the reformed Church, one could regard a reformed chivalric Order as the highest expression of what this Reformation was all about. The Order had always been a sacred organization; a variety of super-guild. In it the monarch met his companions on arms in ceremonies which were both formal and an intimate religious expression of their comradeship....[204]

Moreover, from the perspective of Edward's reign, the amendment to the statutes that governed the order was a matter of religious necessity.

> In 1548 the government had destroyed thousands of guilds throughout the land, and thereafter, without radical change, the Order looked especially anomalous in the Edwardian Church. Worse still, it was intimately linked to the cult of St. George, a saint of decidedly legendary character whom most reformers treated with frank contempt, and whom Edward himself had ridiculed at the Garter ceremony of 1550. It was vital to make the Order send out the right message about the character of England's Reformation at home and abroad.[205]

However, the traditional view of the attempt to amend the statutes of the order has tended to discount Edward's involvement in the process. This traditional view is primarily based on the history of the Order of the Garter compiled by Elias Ashmole (1617–1692). Ashmole's account downplays Edward's role in the effort to reform the statutes of the order:

> § 3. THERE have been several Endeavours since the Reign of King *Henry* VIII. for reforming the Statutes. As first, King *Edward* VI, who as Sovereign, by the Orders themselves, had an undoubted Prerogative set him to alter and reform many Things which seem'd inconsistent with the Religion he establish'd. To which Purpose, at a Chapter at *Greenwich,* held *April* 23. in the Third Year of his Reign, the Lord *St. John,* the Earl of *Arundel,* and Sir *William Paget,* were to peruse and make them agreeable to the King's other Proceedings, by the Assistance and Advice of the Protector, the Duke of *Somerset,* and other Companions. This was follow'd by a subsequent Order pass'd in the Cha[p]ter at *Greenwich* the Year after, that the Statutes should be reform'd and corrected as they thought expedient: And for the better Accomplishment of their Design, at the next Feast, *April* 24. 5 *Edw.* VI. another Order commenc'd, impowering the Duke of *Somerset,* the Marquess of *Northampton,* the Earls of *Warwick, Arundel, Bedford* and *Wi[l]ts,* to peruse and amend the Statures and other Books of the Order, which were brought to some

[204] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant,* 31.

[205] Ibid., 32.

> tolerable Degree of Perfection; for thereupon a new Body was collected (in general very much altering the Laws of the Order) and publish'd *March* 17. *Anno* 7 *Edw.* VI.[206]

According to this view, Edward's role is reduced to instructing others among his counselors to amend the statutes and "make them agreeable to the King's other Proceedings." While even this view tacitly acknowledges that Edward was the force behind the amendments, recent research demonstrates that the king played a more direct role in the process.

After some tentative reforms in the first years of Edward's reign aimed at removing what appeared to have been the worst features of the practice of the order,[207] in 1550 Edward began to pursue a more aggressive reform effort. There exist three versions of the revised ordinances drafted in the king's own hand. The evidence of these manuscripts is that the counselors of the king did not push him in the direction of reform, but rather had to work to restrain his reforming zeal:

> Edward's successive autograph redrafts, like his treatise on papal supremacy, are shot through with teenage evangelical fervor tempered by adult second thoughts, no doubt largely those of his collaborator, the government servant and future Elizabethan minister, William Cecil. Each in the king's sequence of three surviving drafts, datable between late 1550 and mid 1551, is more moderate than the previous one, and the final statutes more moderate again. Nevertheless, after all this toning down, the Order still severed all connection with St. George.[208]

---

[206] Elias Ashmole, *The History of the Most Noble Order of the Garter: Wherein is Set Forth an Account of the Town, Castle, Chappel, and College of Windsor; . . . To Which is Prefix'd, a Discourse of Knighthood in General, . . . Collected by Elias Ashmole, . . . The Whole Illustrated with Proper Sculptures* (London: Printed for A. Bell, W. Taylor, and J. Baker, and A. Collins, 1715), 145. Cited from The Eighteenth Century Collections Online of the Text Creations Partnership at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ecco/004894364.0001.000/1:10?rgn=div1;view=fulltext on July 7, 2014. Note: the two letters enclosed in square brackets in the quotation are this author's reconstruction of the text. In the on-line text these characters are represented by an elevated dot of the color red. No explanation of this use is found on the web site, and it is uncertain whether this represents a flaw in the printed edition from which the citation was taken, or a mistake in the transcription of the text.

[207] Roy C. Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (Berkley: University of California Press,1977), 166, describes these initial reforms as the replacement of the requiem for the departed knights with an ordinary Mass, the use of the English Litany in place of the old Latin processional, the ceasing of the practice of reverencing the altar, and the requirement that the knights take communion during the main annual ceremonies.

[208] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 32.

Edward's vision for the revised order was to create a band of allies to support the king in his works, but most especially to support him in his efforts to reform the religious life of the kingdom. As Alford observes:

> Since the origin of the Order's foundation, Edward explained, the pleasure of God 'to have unite and concorde in his defence that all Christians might be bounde together wath the bounde of charitee' had been subverted by Eden's serpent, who had 'darkened with doutfulnes and contrarienes perverted with supersticiousnes and Idolatrie, and finally almost destroied it with bringing in of poperi and naughtines'. For Edward, the sovereign was the focus of the Order, operating at the heart of its chapter meetings, and the first part of the Edward's draft Garter oath committed knights to the protection of the king and his commonwealth. The second and third parts complemented the first: knights promised to 'refuse the bishopes of Romes auctorite' and to fight in their country's cause 'against him and his erroneous and pestilent heresies'. Equally, they committed themselves to extinguishing 'al mens traditions against the scripture'. Facing biblical texts that condemned idolatry, St George lost his place. And to distance the Order from the saint and his feast day of 23 April, Edward timetabled the major assembly of the Garter for 30 November and 1 December, with knights bound by a commitment to the Book of Common Prayer and the reception of the 'supper of our Lord'.[209]

Alford's observation about the role of the role of the reception of the Lord's Supper is particularly noteworthy. For Edward, the fact that the members of the order would be joined to one another in the reception of the Eucharist was particularly important, for he desired that Communion would act for the order as a "token that in the defense of Christian doctrine, wholly contained in God's word, they are united that they will defend it even unto death."[210]

Assessing Edward's Contribution

The revision of the ordinances that governed an honorary royal society would not normally be counted as a significant contribution to the Reformation of the church. However, in this case it becomes significant insofar as it reveals the personal attitude of Edward in matters of religion,

---

[209] Stephen Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 56.

[210] MacCullough, *Tudor Church Militant*, 35. The author further notes that Edward disparaged the idea of Martin Luther and had no truck with Luther's obstinate defense of the idea that the body and blood of Christ were *(continued next page)*

and his understanding of the way that religion should shape every element of society. Moreover, Edward's actions in this regard illustrate his willingness and ability to intervene personally in such matters.

We have observed that Edward's personal commitment to, and passion for, the cause of the Reformation led him to undertake personally the task of drafting revised statutes for the order to bring it into line with the standards of evangelical doctrine that he had advocated in other aspects of his court and in his kingdom. His appointment of others to examine the statutes, as noted by Ashmole, must be seen in the light of that personal commitment, not as evidence of the insignificance of his role in the matter, but as evidence of his determination to see the task completed in as thorough a manner as possible. It hardly requires saying that this is something that Henry VIII not only did not consider, but something that he would never have considered. This difference reflects in microcosm the radically different outlook on the question of the nature and scope of the Reformation that guided Edward from that which had guided his father, and which distinguished the Edwardian phase of the English Reformation from the Henrician.

Princess Mary and the Mass

Princess Mary (born 18 February 1516), the older sister of Edward by 21 years, was the fifth of the sixth children born to Katherine of Aragon and Henry VIII, but the only one to survive infancy.[211] Henry's frustration at the lack of a male heir was not reflected in his attitude toward his daughter. Throughout her early life, Mary remained a favorite of her father, who saw to it that she was both well-educated and experienced in matters of court and government. In 1525 he sent her to Wales and established a court for her at Ludlow Castle. From there for three

---

present in the consecrated bread and wine.

[211] For details of Katherine's children, see Appendix A.

years she functioned as an unofficial princess of Wales by overseeing, nominally at least, the administration of the Wales and the Marcher lands.

The eventual annulment of Henry's marriage to Katherine changed matters for Mary. She was separated from her mother when the latter was banished from the court in 1530. After the annulment of the marriage between Henry and Katherine and the marriage of Henry to Anne Boleyn in 1533, Mary was declared illegitimate. Eventually demoted from princess to the Lady Mary, she was removed from the line of succession in favor of Elizabeth after the latter's birth in September of 1533. Demonstrating the strong will that was a personal characteristic throughout her life, Mary refused to acknowledge the status of Anne or Elizabeth. This led to a further breech between Mary and her father. It is said that they did not speak for the three years before Katherine's death in 1536.[212]

After the death of Anne and Henry's marriage to Jane Seymour, the new queen encouraged Henry to be reconciled to his daughter.[213] After some difficult negotiations Mary was persuaded by the ambassador from Spain to write to her father on 22 June 1536 acknowledging the annulment of her parents' marriage, her own illegitimacy, and her father's position as head of the English church.[214] By this means, a sufficient rapprochement was achieved that allowed Mary to be reinstated in the court and have a household of her own established and supported by the king. She was named godmother to Edward upon his birth in 1537. Mary retained the favor of her father for the rest of her life, though without accepting the religious changes that he had instituted. A number of those associated with her were involved in, or accused of being involved in, plots against the king and other acts of religious resistance. However, Mary herself was never

---

[212] Linda Porter, *Mary Tudor: The First Queen* (London: Little, Brown Book Group, 2007), 100.

[213] Ibid., 121.

[214] Letter of Mary to Henry VIII of 22 June 1536. The text of the letter is available on-line at http://englishhistory.net/tudor/primary1.html, accessed 12 October 2014.

proven to be directly associated with any of these activities. In 1544, Henry had both Mary and Elizabeth restored to the line of succession after their younger brother Edward. After Henry's death and Edward's accession to the throne in 1547, Mary accepted the legitimacy of her younger brother's rule.

Prior to the death of Henry, Mary had practiced her religious beliefs without regulation. There were no laws making either being a Roman Catholic or practicing Catholicism a legal offense. This situation changed with the introduction of the *Prayer Book of 1549*. The Act of Uniformity of 1549 mandated that the rites of the *Prayer Book* be used for all worship services. This amounted to a ban on Roman Catholic practice. Mary challenged the new law, beginning on the very day that it took effect. On Whitsunday, 9 June 1549, in defiance of the introduction of the *Prayer Book*, Mary celebrated Mass in her chapel at Kenninghall according to the traditional Roman rite, including the use of incense, candles, and the chiming of bells. She also increased the frequency of the worship services conducted at her home from two to three masses each day, and increased attendance by inviting townspeople to participate.[215] A week later the Council wrote to her, ordering that she desist employing the Mass and use the new *Prayer Book* instead. The Council also summoned two of her household administrators, her comptroller and her chaplain, to give them additional instructions. Mary wrote back on 22 June:

> My Lorde, I perceive by the letters which I have received from you, and all of the king's Majesty's council that you be all sorry to find so little conformity in me touching the observation of his Majesty's laws; who am well assured that I have offended no law, unless it be a late law of your own making, for the altering of matter in religion which in my conscience, is not worthy to have the name of a law, both for the King's honour's sake, the wealth of the realm … and (as my conscience is very well persuaded) the offending of God, which passes all the rest.[216]

---

[215] Weir, *Children*, 81.

[216] Mary's letter of 16 June 1549 to Edward and his council, as quoted by Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen* (New York: Random House, 2009), 143.

Mary was determined to resist the attempt by the Council that ruled England in Edward's name to force her to give up the practice of her faith. She made it her personal practice to hear Mass as many as four times a day in her chapel at Kenninghall.[217] Going further still, she made her position public by requiring her entire household to take part in these religious services.

> Mary's household would become a bastion of Catholic loyalty. Ordinances were drawn up at Kenninghall providing for religious services. Particular importance was attached to the observance—by all her servants—of Matins, Mass, and Evensong. 'Every gentleman, yeoman and groom not having a reasonable impediment' was to be at services every day. To be in Mary's service was to live as a Catholic. Service and sanctity were inextricably bound together.[218]

While the initial impetus for restricting Mary's religious practice seems to have been initiated by the Council, Edward became personally involved in the matter at an early stage.[219] In August of 1549 he wrote to her on the matter. At this stage Edward clearly believed that Mary's refusal to obey the law was due either to a grudge or by lack of information. He asserts that what Mary believes is incorrect, and suggests that if she only would subject herself to counsel she would see the error of her ways and change her mind:

> We have somewhat marveled, and cannot but still marvel very much, what grounds or reasons have or do move you to mislike or refuse to follow and embrace that which, by all learned men of our realm, hath been so set forth, and of all out loving subjects obediently received; and knowing your good nature and affection towards us, we cannot think any other matter in this your refusal than only a certain grudge of conscience, for want of good information and conference with some goodly and well learned men for remedy.[220]

---

[217] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 140.

[218] Ibid., 138.

[219] This is not the first time that Edward had exhibited an interest in the spiritual welfare of his older sister. He had written to Queen Catherine Parr on 12 May 1546, "Preserve, therefore, I pray you, my dear sister Mary from all the wiles and enchantments of the evil one and beseech her to attend no longer to foreign dances and merriments which do not become a most Christian princess." Prince Edward to Queen Catherine, as reprinted in North, *England's Boy King*, 183.

[220] Letter of Edward to Mary. Quoted by Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 146–147.

In this belief, Edward was certainly wrong. For her part, Mary was irrevocably determined that she and her household should be free to continue to worship God in accordance with the precepts of the old religion. For his part, Edward became increasingly determined that she should submit and conform to the practices of the reformed faith. This led to an increasingly strident conflict that persisted throughout the remainder of Edward's reign. As MacCullouch observes:

> This was potentially the most important issue to face his government, involving as it did a coincidence of dynastic, diplomatic and religious policy. Mary's closeness to her cousin the Holy Roman Emperor, the pious Catholic Charles V, meant that the issue could never simply be a domestic one; the English government's refusal to let Mary's religion alone became inextricably and contrarily entangled with their efforts to persuade the Emperor to give English diplomats free exercise of evangelical religion on embassies to the imperial court. In all of this, the king was the most aggressive advocate of trying to pressure Mary into obedience.[221]

As the discussions between the king and his representatives and Mary proceeded throughout the rest of 1549 and the early part of 1550, it became clear that neither side was willing to give way. As early as September of 1549, Mary had begun to think of leaving England.[222] By the spring of 1550 the pressure on Mary had increased to the point that she had come to a decision to depart England for the continent in order to be allowed to exercise her faith:

> … disheartened, she wrote the imperial ambassador in March 1550 asking if he would help her flee from England. A fortnight later the emperor instructed the ambassador to get an assurance from the council—or, even from the king himself—that Mary 'should be permitted to continue in her observances of the ancient religion, and in the enjoyment of the same liberty that was hers at her fathers' death.' The council's response was to say that Mary alone (with two or three of her women) could hear mass in her chamber, whilst her household must conform to the statutes.[223]

If the Council was willing to compromise, Mary was not. She had established in her household an enclave of Catholic worship, which her father in his time had permitted to remain.

---

[221] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 36.

[222] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 153.

She was determined to maintain her right, as she saw it, to have her household practice her religion in accord with her own conscience. If she could not maintain such a household in England, the only alternative was to go abroad.

By the end of April, Mary had reached the end of her rope. She felt that she could not stand any more persecution or questions about her religious beliefs. She wanted peace and not conflict. So she summoned the imperial ambassador van der Delft and informed him that she could not go on in England. She repeated her earlier request that Charles V would arrange for her to leave the country.[224] Van der Delft conveyed her message to the Emperor, and this time he agreed. The emperor gave the order for Mary to be taken from England.

An initial plan by which she would have left the country in the retinue of the imperial ambassador, who was due to leave England in mid-May, was abandoned when it became apparent that she would not be able to sneak away to join his ship unnoticed.[225] After several months of planning, the escape was scheduled for the end of June. On the evening of Monday June 30, 1550, three imperial warships arrived off the English coast, ostensibly for the purpose of trade. The plan called for Mary to escape under the cover of darkness, be rowed out to the waiting ships, taken from there to the Low Countries and thence to the court of Charles's sister, the regent Mary of Hungary.[226] But Mary was apparently of two minds over whether to leave or to remain and continue to resist. Whitelock summarizes her dilemma:

> To have fled would have been to gamble. If Edward died when Mary was abroad, she would have no hope of succeeding. If she stayed, she might be deprived of her household and be left to face dangers alone. There was both 'peril in going and peril in staying.' Having set the plan in motion, Mary procrastinated, then changed her

---

[223] Loach, *Edward VI*, 130.

[224] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 153.

[225] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 153.

[226] Ibid., 155.

> mind. She accepted that to win her rightful throne and restore Catholicism, she needed to be in England.[227]

It is not as clear as Whitelock suggests that Mary herself was the cause of the failure of the attempt to get Mary out of the country at the beginning of July. Whitelock herself notes the pivotal role of Robert Rochester, one of the managers of Mary's household, in attempting to postpone the departure until the fall. Several meetings between Rochester and those sent to effect Mary's departure led to confusion and the ultimate collapse of the plans. Loach summarizes the events:

> [The rescue party] failed to take Mary away. The account of what happened contains farcical elements—a meeting with the Princess's comptroller, Rochester, in a church yard, complicated negotiations over the corn that that the ships had imported as a decoy, Mary's refusal (which exasperated her would-be rescuers) to leave without most of her personal possessions, adverse winds and the rest.[228]

But there is another factor as well. Edward's own diary makes it clear that some knowledge of an escape plan had become known to the English authorities, though some of these entries may refer to a third attempt that was more rumored than actual. Edward writes:

> Sir John Gates sent into Essex to stop the going away of the Lady Mary, because it was credibly informed that Scepperus should steal her away to Antwerp, divers of her gentlemen were there, and Scepperus a little before came to see the landing places.[229]

Two weeks later he added, "Because the rumor came so much of Scepperus's coming, it was appointed that they of the Admiralty should set my ships in readiness."[230] In any case, whether through Mary's indecision, Rochester's intervention, or the preparations of the English authorities, the plan to rescue Mary collapsed.

---

[227] Ibid., 156.

[228] Loach, *Edward VI*, 131.

[229] Diary entry by Edward VI for July 13, 1550. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 40. The Scepperus to which Edward refers was Dutch admiral Cornelius Scepperus, the commander of the imperial fleet, who was sent by Charles V to effect Mary's escape.

[230] Diary entry by Edward VI for July 27, 1550. Ibid., 41.

Edward later received word from the court of Queen Mary of Hungary that offered yet another interpretation of the events:

> There came down divers advertisements from [Sir Thomas] Chamberlin, ambassador with Queen Mary of Hungary, that their very intent was to take the Lady Mary and so to begin an outward war and an inward conspiracy, insomuch that the Queen said Scepperus was but a coward and, for fear of one gentleman that came down, durst not go forth with his enterprise to my Lady Mary.[231]

In the end, Mary did not leave. Her situation continued to deteriorate as Edward and the Council attempted to wear down her resistance in the hope that she would comply with the law.

As the summer and fall progressed, Mary's continuing resistance led Edward and his Council to feel that, despite the previous agreement, additional steps had to be taken to force her compliance. Edward recorded the order to have one of her chaplains arrested: "There were (was *in MS.*) letters sent for the taking of certain chaplains of the Lady Mary for saying mass, which she denied."[232]

Shortly thereafter, Mary attended the court celebration of Christmas, where she met both Edward and Elizabeth. At this meeting there was an emotional argument between Mary and Edward over the subject. He insisted that she must comply with the commands to worship employing the *Prayer Book*. She maintained that he was not old enough to make up his mind about such matters. In the aftermath of this encounter, a series of letters between the two continued the debate. In a letter from Edward to Mary on 24 January 1551, the king states his view of the matter frankly and personally.

> After giving all due consideration to the matter, it appears to us to stand as follows: that you, our nearest sister, in whom by nature we should place reliance and our

[231] Diary entry by Edward VI for August 14, 1550. Ibid., 44. Jordan (note 106) interprets this as an attempt by the Queen of Hungary and the Emperor to deny that any attempt to remove Mary had occurred or been planned.

[232] Diary entry by Edward VI for December 15, 1550. Ibid., 50. Edward refers to the arrest of Francis Mallet, a chaplain of Mary's household, who conducted a Mass for the household at a time when Mary herself was not present, which was deemed to be a violation of the agreement to allow her to hear Mass (Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 157–158).

> highest esteem, wish to break our laws and set them aside deliberately and of your own free will; and moreover sustain and encourage others to commit a like offence.... My sister, you must learn that your courses were tolerated when our laws were first promulgated, not indeed as a permission to break the same, but so that your might be inclined to obey them, seeing the love and indulgence we displayed towards you. We made a difference between you and our subjects, not that all should follow our ordinances, and you alone disregard them, but in order that you should do out of love for us what the rest do out of duty. The error in which you persist is twofold, and each part of it so great that for the love we bear to God we cannot suffer it, but you must strive to remedy it; nor can we do otherwise than desire you to amend your ways, for the affection we bear you....[233]

Rather than resolving the situation, the Christmas encounter and exchange of letters that followed led to increasingly hardened positions on both sides. Mary again appealed to Charles V to intervene, and Charles again wrote to the king and his council to insist that Mary be allowed to worship as before. In March, Edward summoned Mary to appear before him, determined to settle the matter once and for all.

When Mary entered London on 15 March 1551 with a retinue of over 400, the people of London streamed out of the city to meet her in an impressive show of affection and loyalty.[234] Edward was not intimidated by this show of support, however, and when Mary came before the king and his council the next day—two weeks after the death of the reformer Martin Bucer that Edward had admired—he was determined to accomplish her compliance to the law. As Edward recounted the events in his diary on March 18:

> The Lady Mary, my sister, came to me to Westminster, where after salutations she was called with my Council into a chamber where was declared how long I had suffered her mass (against my will *crossed out*) in hope of her reconciliation and how now, being no hope, which I perceived by her letters, except I saw some short amendment, I could not bear it. She answered that her soul was God['s] and her faith she would not change, nor dissemble her opinion with contrary doings. It was said I

[233] Edward to Mary, as cited by Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 159–160. See also Loach, *Edward VI*, 133–134.

[234] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 162.

> constrained not her faith but willed her (not as king to rule *inserted*) but as a subject to obey. And that her example might breed too much inconvenience.[235]

This brief summary by Edward hardly tells the whole story. The meeting apparently turned acrimonious, with Edward lecturing his older sister on the dangers of clinging to the old faith and she asserting, as she had in their meeting at Christmas, that he was too young to be able to judge such matters. This time Edward responded that, "You also may have somewhat to learn. None are too old for that." She retorted by accusing him of not having enough respect for her and asking whether he wished to "take away her life rather than the old religion, in which she desired to live and die?" He denied having any such intention. At this point the councilors apparently intervened to calm matters down, and the meeting was ended without a resolution.[236]

The tension was increased on 19 March when the imperial ambassador, Scheyfve, came before the council with a message from Charles V:

> The Emperor's ambassador came with [a] short message from his master of [threatened] war, [to know] if I would not suffer his cousin the princess to use her mass. To this was no answer given at this time (but at the next *crossed out*).[237]

Whether Charles was serious in this threat or not, Edward, and especially his council, took the threat seriously. The next four entries in Edward's diary (for 20–25 March) all deal with this matter. For Edward this was the combination of a fundamental religious issue combined with the question of whether any subject could be allowed to flout the King's law. For the counselors the threat to England's economy from the potential closure of the wool markets in Flanders was a critical concern. Edward was advised by the bishops of Canterbury, London, and Rochester that it would be a sin to tolerate Mary's false worship, but that it could be tolerated for a short time

---

[235] Diary entry by Edward VI for 18 March 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 55.

[236] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 162–163. Loach, *Edward VI*, 131–132.

[237] Diary entry by Edward VI for 19 March 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 56.

while trying to resolve the matter. Edward pressed for a more hard-line response. Allison Weir recounts the scene:

> [W]hen some councilors suggested that his sister's disobedience be tolerated in order to pacify the Emperor, he retorted, 'Is it lawful by Scripture to sanction idolatry?'
>
> A bishop replied, 'There were good kings, Your Majesty, who allowed the hill altars, and yet were called good.'
>
> 'We must follow the example of good men when they have done well,' the boy declared loftily. 'We do not follow them in evil. David was good but David seduced Bathsheba and murdered Uriah. We are not to imitate David in such deeds as these. Is there no better Scripture?'
>
> The bishops looked blank.
>
> 'I am sorry for the realm, then, and sorry for the danger that will come of it,' concluded the King. 'I shall hope and pray for something better, but the evil thing I will not allow.'[238]

Edward's councilors managed to persuade him, though not without some difficulty,[239] that, given the economic threat, the best course would be to stall for time by sending an ambassador to Emperor Charles. In the meantime they could continue to pressure Mary by punishing others who attended the Mass with her.[240]

In the months that followed, events continued along the same lines. Between March and June, Edward had several of Mary's closest associates either jailed or threatened with imprisonment.[241] At the same time, Edward was dealing with the problem of whether his ambassador to the court of the Emperor, as well as the Emperor's ambassador to England, would be allowed to worship according to their own religious preference, or whether they would have

---

[238] Weir, *Children*, 117.

[239] Loach, *Edward VI*, 132, cites Richard Morrison, the English ambassador to the Emperor, as bearing witness to the fact that Edward, "remained resolute, not only standing his ground, but insisting in an eloquent and emotional speech that whatever the circumstances God's commands must be obeyed." However, she further notes that Morrison was not himself present at this meeting, and so could not have more than a general sense gained at second hand of what Edward said.

[240] See Edward's diary entries for 20, 22, 23 and 25 March 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 56–57.

[241] See Edward's diary entries for 22 March, and 27 April 1551. Ibid, 56 and 60. For a discussion of this and the events leading up to it see also Loach, *Edward VI*, 132–133 and Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 163–165.

to comply with the law of their host country. Edward's proposal to the Emperor on settling this matter made a distinction between this question and the problem of Mary:

> Mr. Wotten had his instructions to go withal to the Emperor to be as ambassador ledger in Mr. Morrison's place and to declare this resolution: that if the Emperor would suffer my ambassador with him to use his service, then I would suffer his; if he would not suffer mine, I would not suffer his. Likewise that my sister was my subject and should use my service appointed by act of Parliament.[242]

In June Mary protested again at the arrest of her servants:

> The Lady Mary sent letters to the Council, marveling at the imprisonment of Doctor Mallett, her chaplain, for saying of the mass before her household, seeing it was promised the Emperor's ambassador she should not be molested in religion, but that she and her household should have mass said before them continually.[243]

Edward records the reply to this assertion by Mary:

> They [the Council] answered that because of their duties to their king, country, and friends, they were compelled to give her answer that they would see not only him but also all other mass-sayers and breakers of order straitly punished, and that as for promise they had nor would give none to make her free from the punishment of the law in that behalf.[244]

During these months, Edward's government had been negotiating a treaty with France with a view to strengthening their economic and political position, both in relation to the threat from Scotland and in relation to the threat of war by the Emperor over the restrictions placed on Mary. When these negotiations were concluded on 19 July (they included the investiture of the King of France in the Order of the Garter and of Edward in France's Company of St. Michael, as well as the betrothal of Edward to the daughter of the French King Henry II and various financial arrangements[245]) the way was open for another attempt to resolve the problem of Mary's use of the Mass.

---

[242] Diary entry by Edward VI for 10 April 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 58.

[243] Diary entry by Edward VI for 22 June 1551. Ibid., 67.

[244] Diary entry by Edward VI for 24 June 1551. Ibid.

[245] Edward mentions the finalization of the treaty in a diary entry for the 19th of July. He records many of the *(continued next page)*

On 9 August, Edward gathered twenty-four Lords of the Council to discuss with him the situation regarding Mary: "who at length agreed that it was not meet to be suffered any longer, making thereof an instrument signed with their hands and sealed to be part of the record."[246] In the aftermath of this meeting, the three chief administrators of Mary's household were summoned before the Council and given instructions in the form of a letter signed by the King to convey to Mary and her chaplains. Upon their return to her household on the 15th, Mary refused to allow them to convey their message to her chaplains or the rest of her household. She drafted a letter for them to take back to the king.

> I have by my servants received your honourable letter, the contents whereof do not a little trouble me.... Having for my part utterly refused heretofore to talk with them in such matters, trusted that your Majesty would have suffered me, your humble sister ... to have used the accustomed Mass, which the King your father and mine, with all his predecessors did evermore use; wherein also I have been brought up from my youth, and thereunto my conscience doth not only bind me, which by no means will suffer me to think one thing and do another, but also the promise made to the Emperor, by your Majesty's Council, was an assurance to me that in so doing I should not offend the laws, although they seem now to qualify and deny the thing.[247]

Mary continued by repeating her regular assertion that Edward was not old enough to have an opinion on such matters and by appealing to his forbearance. She concluded by asserting, "[R]ather than to offend God and my conscience, I offer my body at your will, and death shall be more welcome than life with a troubled conscience."[248]

Edward notes the return of Mary's three servants on 23 August, as well as their refusal to carry out the mission with which they had been charged.[249] On the 26th Edward sent the Lord

---

matters associated with the treaty in numerous entries over the period from April to July.

[246] Diary entry by Edward VI for 9 August 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 76.

[247] Letter from Mary to Edward, cited by Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 166–167.

[248] Ibid.

[249] See Edward's diary entries for 23 August 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 78.

Chancellor, the Comptroller of his own household, and the Secretary of the Privy Council to Mary with yet another demand for her compliance:

> His majesty did resolutely determine it just, necessary and expedient that her Grace should not any ways use or maintain the private mass or any other manner of service than such as by the law of the realm is authorized or allowed.[250]

Mary again refused in the same terms as before. Edward's representatives then summoned Mary's chaplains and informed them of the prohibition, to which they agreed, according to the report given by the messengers to the king and his council.[251] Edward then had the three messengers from Mary's household who had refused to deliver his message imprisoned in the Fleet Prison then subsequently transferred to the Tower.[252] Finally, Edward saw to it that additional steps were taken to ensure that Mary did not leave England and that she complied with his orders:

> Certain pinnaces were prepared to see that there should be no conveyance overseas of the Lady Mary secretly done. Also appointed that the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chamberlain, the Vice-Chamberlain and the Secretary Petre see by all means they could whether she used the mass, and if she did that the laws should be executed on her chaplains. Also, that when I came from this progress to Hampton Court or Westminster, both of my sisters should be with me until further order were taken for this purpose.[253]

The king seemed to be more determined than ever to force Mary to comply. However, the political winds were changing direction. On September 3, Edward was informed by the French ambassador, Edward's new ally, that tensions between France and Emperor Charles V had reached the point that war seemed likely. France sought England's assistance in assuring the safe passage by sea of the Dowager Queen of Scotland, which Edward granted the following day. The next day an ambassador from Charles V appeared with a new message regarding Mary:

---

[250] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 166–167.

[251] Ibid.

[252] See Edward's diary entries for 26, 28, and 31 August 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 78.

> The Emperor's ambassador came to require that my sister [?] Mary's [?] officers should be restored to their liberty and [that] she should have [?] her [?] mass till the Emperor was certified thereof. It was answered, first, that I needed not to answer except I list, because he spoke without commission, which was seen by the shortness of the time since the committing of her officers, of which the Emperor could not be advertised. He was willed no more to move these piques, in which he had been often answered, without commission. He was answered that the Emperor was by this time advertised, although the matter pertained not to him. Also, that I had done nothing but according to a king's office herein, in observing the laws that were so godly and in punishing the offenders. The promise to the Emperor was not so made as he pretended, [as is] affirmed by Sir Philip Hoby, being at that [time] there [the] ambassador.[254]

In light, however, of the imminent outbreak of a war for which England was unprepared, and into which it did not want to be drawn, it would seem increasingly prudent to avoid steps that would give the Emperor cause to declare war against England and perhaps even to attempt to put Mary on the throne.[255]

Concerns arising from the international situation and the accusations surrounding the proposed coup by the Duke of Somerset, which led to his eventual trial, condemnation, and execution, did not bring an end to the struggle over Mary's religious practices entirely, but it did lower their priority. Edward reports sending a group of officials to examine his sister's imprisoned men.[256] Nothing appears to have resulted from this interview, and no further action was taken against Mary's men, though they remained in prison. Mary subsequently pleaded illness when she was invited to the court to help entertain the visiting Dowager Queen of Scotland, presumably to avoid any further confrontation.[257] Nothing more is said about Mary in

---

[253] Diary entry by Edward VI for 29 August 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 78.

[254] Diary entry by Edward VI for 5 September 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 80. Jordan notes that the uncertainties indicated in the citation of this passage arise from damage to the original manuscript.

[255] Edward notes in his diary that he was informed of the outbreak of war on 11 September 1551. Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 168–169, notes that the Emperor's sister, Mary of Hungary, to whose household Mary had been set to flee the previous summer, proposed that Charles V should invade England and place Mary on the throne.

[256] See Edward's diary entry for 20 September 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 82.

[257] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 169. Mary regularly used the excuse of illness to avoid joining Edward's court

(continued next page)

Edward's diary until early January of 1552. At that time Edward writes: "The Emperor's ambassador moved me severally that my sister Mary might have mass, which, with no little reasoning with him, was denied him."[258]

In March of 1552 Edward refused the request of the King of France that England should join in the war, which nevertheless disrupted the trade, and hence the economy, of the country. Also that month, Mary's three men were released from the tower and returned to her service, though this is not mentioned in Edward's diary.[259] In April Edward was sick, reportedly with the measles and smallpox.[260] Throughout the spring and summer, Edward's diary reflects his preoccupation with the progress of the war between France and the Emperor, his continuing determination to avoid becoming involved in it, as well as other economic and political matters. This does not mean that Edward was uninterested in religious matters. Over the summer he wrote to the commander of the Isle of Guernsey to instruct him, "that divine service may there be used as in England."[261] However, no further mention is made of the problem of Mary.[262]

As Edward became ill and his health deteriorated to the point that he knew that death approached,[263] he became increasingly concerned about the matter of his successor. Edward saw Mary briefly for the last time when she visited the court in February. By the will of his father and

---

throughout this period.

[258] Diary entry by Edward VI for 3 January 1552. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 104.

[259] Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 169.

[260] See Edward's diary entries for 2 April 1552. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 117, notes that while Edward was reported recovered by the end of the month, other evidence suggests that he never fully recovered from this illness.

[261] See Edward's diary entries for 12 July 1552. Ibid., 136.

[262] That Edward continued to be concerned with religious matters during this period leading up to his final illness is reflected in the memorandum that he prepared for the Privy Council meeting in October of 1552, which lists 10 items to be undertaken under the general heading of 'For Religion.' Ibid., 179.

[263] Edward became ill in January or (according to other sources) February of 1553. His condition fluctuated throughout the spring, but he was clearly becoming weaker rather than stronger. By April the rumors of his fading health were widespread in official circles. By the middle of May his impending death was generally assumed by those with knowledge of his condition. He died on 6 July 1553.

the Parliamentary act of 1544, Mary was his designated successor. Knowing that Mary would reverse the course of the Reformation and restore Catholicism, Edward was determined to protect his church by prohibiting Mary's succession to the throne. As Edward himself reportedly said, "[F]or if our sister were to possess the kingdom (which Almighty God prevent) it would be all over for the religion whose fair foundation we have laid."[264]

As a result, Edward first sought to disinherit Mary in favor of Elizabeth, but he was informed that this was not legally possible. Under English law, either both were legitimate or both were illegitimate. As a result, Edward's only option to prevent Mary's succession was to disinherit both. Probably in early April, he drafted a Devise for the Succession, in which he named Lady Jane Grey, his 16 year-old cousin, as his successor.[265] While Edward made every possible attempt to ensure that his wishes would be followed after his death, which occurred on 6 July 1553, and despite Northumberland's efforts on behalf of his daughter-in-law, Mary was declared queen by the Privy Council on 19 July 1553.

Assessing Edward's Contribution

Edward's interactions with Mary in their conflict over her continuing use of the Mass are important in that they illustrate both the depth of Edward's personal convictions in the direction of Protestantism and that he did take a personal hand in the direction of religious matters during the course of his reign, especially after 1549. Throughout this period, it was Edward, and not the members of his Privy Council, who took the lead in pushing for the need to force Mary to comply with the King's law. Given the pressure from Emperor Charles V, the Council was

---

[264] This was reported by Robert Wingfield, one of the judges summoned by Edward on 15 June 1553 to help him draw up his will. It is cited by Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, 172. See also Loach, *Edward VI*, 164.

[265] Jane Grey was the granddaughter of Henry VIII's sister Mary. Initially Edward wanted to restrict the succession to the male heirs of this line. Given, however, his declining health and expected imminent death, and the fact that there no males in the proposed line of succession at that time, he was persuaded to include Jane herself in the line of succession. For the date of the 'devise', see Loach, *Edward VI*, 163.

largely content to allow Mary to quietly practice her faith within the confines of her own household. Edward was not. He pressed the matter as strongly as he could until other matters intervened. Dealing with the charges arising from Somerset's proposed coup distracted the King at the end of 1551. The threatened, and later actual, war between his ally France and the Emperor dominated the court throughout 1552. Edward and his officials were aware that Charles's perception of their mistreatment of Mary could lead the Emperor to declare war against England and thereby draw them into a war for which the nation was unprepared. These concerns forced them to delay any final action against Mary until after the threat of war was removed, by which time Edward's declining health made further action by him impossible.

This picture contrasts with the view of Edward suggested by Jennifer Loach, who downplays Edward's religious convictions, regarding them as little more than "an adolescent's attachment to what he grew up with," and emphasizes instead his interest in such normal adolescent pursuits as hunting, riding, and military matters.[266] That Edward was interested in such things is undoubtedly true, but those interests do not conflict with his religious concerns, which are more than amply demonstrated by his personal involvement in, and aggressive pursuit of, the effort to end Mary's use of the Mass.

---

[266] Loach, *Edward VI*, 181. Loach, following Jordan, cites the lack of specifically religious material, especially comments on sermons that he had heard, as evidence of Edward's lack of a deep interest in religious matters. However, as Diarmaid MacCulloch notes, it was widely known and commented upon that Edward kept a separate notebook of the sermons that he had heard, and which he almost certainly recorded his religious reflections. This notebook was lost sometime after 1616. Thus the absence of extensive comments upon religious matters in his diary should not be seen as lack of interest in religious matters. MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 22–23.

CHAPTER THREE

ASSESSING EDWARD'S REIGN

The central mistakes that most people make in assessing Edward's contribution to the English Reformation are the failure to recognize the substantial change in the course of the Reformation during the short period of Edward's reign, as well as the failure to recognize his contribution to it. Casual observers tend to see the *Prayer Book* as the main contribution of the period and conclude that, since Edward was not a major factor in its development, he cannot have been very important. This facile argument neglects the extent to which, as king, Edward not only allowed, but also strongly encouraged and promoted the both the expansion of the scope of the Reformation in England and its shift in an increasingly radical direction.

We noted in chapter one that there are three reasons commonly given for dismissing Edward's significance in the development of the English Reformation: the context of his reign (being surrounded by more dramatic events in the reigns of his father and sisters), his negligible role in the development of the *Prayer Book*, and the combination of his age and the brevity of his reign. The British historian Diarmaid MacCulloch has suggested another reason that the legacy of Edward's efforts is often ignored, especially among English churchmen. He notes the tendency of the great Anglo-Catholic leaders of the Church of England from the 18th century to the mid 20th century to downplay, or even to ignore entirely, the significance of the reign of Edward for the history of the English church.

> In this we hear one solution to the problem of the Edwardian Reformation: simply to deny it any part in the Church of England story. In listing his sequence of Anglican heroes from the 1580s to the 1700s and beyond, Fr. Whistler was completely silent on the first half-century of the English Reformation.... Evidently to be Edwardian, or even mainstream Elizabethan, was not to be true to the Church of England. What was

> particularly offensive to such commentators about the Edwardian adventure was that it was a religious revolution, demolishing the traditional church in order to rebuild another. The revolution involved rewriting history and eliminating objects which evoked that history—the very history and objects which Frere and Whistler treasured.[267]

He further observes that such a neglect of this period does a disservice not only to an understanding of the history of the church, but to the fuller sweep of British history as well.

> Often it has been treated as a rather confused entr'acte for the two set-piece spectaculars of Henrician and Elizabethan England. To view it thus is a mistake. These six years reshaped the culture, which the union of the English, Scots and Irish crowns later exported to the rest of the world. They saw the first officially backed moves to turn English maritime strength to the ventures of world exploration, as expeditions set off for Africa and Muscovy. They also began with a first attempt by the first Edwardian government to unite the entire British Archipelago under one crown: different initiatives were undertaken in Scotland, Ireland and Wales, which bore contrasting fruit. Somerset's regime invaded and devastated Scotland in order to secure the marriage of the boy Edward and the even younger Mary Queen of Scots, but it also sought to charm the people of Scotland into a union, using newly coined rhetoric of British identity. The effort was inept and in the short term a spectacular failure, but it had a lasting effect....[268]

It is, however, the impact of Edward's rule upon the church concerns us here. MacCulloch pictures that impact in starkly visual terms:

> The extent of the change would have been obvious to anyone walking into a fully reformed English church building in 1553. The greatest visual impact came from words: words in painted plaster, boards or on printer posters stared down from whitewashed walls, turning the church interior into the pages of a giant scrapbook of scripture. Three new pieces of church furniture stood out amid the hastily adapted and purged remains of the old. A wooden table, moveable into the body of the church for communion services, symbolized the overthrow of the old mass, with all its associated theology of a sacrificing, celibate priesthood; to emphasize this rejection, the table was placed at right angles to the alignment of the old altars. A poor box to collect alms, which the Edwardian government ordered to be placed in every church, was an official reminder that people's charity was to be directed not to masses or graven images, but to needy people made in God's image. A pulpit reinforced the

---

[267] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 158–159.

[268] Ibid.,11.

> message of the walls that God was to be approached most directly through his biblical word....[269]

Given the ultimate breech between what would become the Puritan tradition and the established Anglican tradition, and given the Puritan-leaning direction of the reforms that Edward favored, the tendency of later Anglo-Catholic churchmen to deny the Edwardian reforms (especially those between 1550 and 1553) a prominent place in the history of the Church of England is not so surprising.

Given the transformation of religion, worship, and church life that MacCulloch describes, the question that remains for us is the extent to which Edward himself may be seen to be responsible for this transformation. We have already seen that there is a common tendency to dismiss the significance of Edward's reign because of its brevity. However, given the breadth of the transformation that MacCulloch describes, the length of the reign *per se* becomes a negligible factor, for it is not how long one lives but what one accomplishes that ultimately matters. As Skidmore notes:

> Edward may have only been fifteen years old when he died, tantalizingly close to adulthood, and though his reign was just six years long, as Richard Hook later remarked, "He died young, but lived long, for life is action."[270]

Still others have asserted that Edward could not have played a significant role in the development of religious events during his reign because of his age. While there seems no doubt that Edward's guardians dominated the civil administration during his reign, the whole question of the degree of the influence of the king in religious matters has required further examination. The preceding sections of this study have illustrated examples of very specific ways in which Edward did exert an influence of events around him, particularly in the last three years of his reign when the pace of the Reformation accelerated.

---

[269] Ibid., 159–160.

Most writers appear to take it for granted, offering little supporting evidence, that a young man in Edward's position would have unformed opinions and be dominated by those who acted as his guardians. Yet, MacCullouch observes that Edward's role increased over time.

> At the beginning of his reign, such a child could only expect to be a symbol of policies determined by the adults around him, yet, as we shall see, his views and his personality were already becoming significant factors in official religious changes as he entered his teens, and that significance accelerated as year succeeded year.[271]

In addition, our survey of Edward's own diary, of contemporary comments about Edward and his piety, and of his recorded actions in the sphere of religion, suggest that Edward, even as a youth, was a pious and enthusiastic promoter of the reform efforts. Moreover, as MacCulloch recounts, the youthful king was not above taking shockingly direct action:

> In a remarkable scene at the official confirmation of the aggressively advanced reformer John Hooper as Bishop of Gloucester, the king personally noted that the oath of supremacy that Hooper was about to swear was still in the form devised for his father, including mention of the saints, placed in association with God in offensively traditional fashion. This was just a few months before Edward would eject St. George from the Order of the Garter and, in similar spirit, he now struck out with his pen from the oath the offending words about the saints, much to Hooper's delight. The adults let him get away with it; there was to be no waiting for Parliament to confirm this unilateral ejection of the holy company of heaven. By this single act on impulse, he had altered the theology of the English Church and had shown more emphatically than Henry VIII or Elizabeth ever did what Tudor royal supremacy was all about.[272]

In his study of Edward VI, Christ Skidmore has observed that, "Two different strands make up Edward's reign: the personality of this Tudor king who was the most gifted of all his siblings; and the political world that sought to cope with a child as ruler."[273] This observation raises an

---

[270] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 4.

[271] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 18.

[272] Ibid.,35–36.

[273] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 9.

important but as yet unexplored issue: the question of Edward's character, and especially his disposition toward religion.

The traditional view, emerging already in Edward's time and growing thereafter, particularly as a result of the depiction of Edward by John Foxe, is that Edward was a devoted and pious Protestant who embraced and promoted the Protestant faith with enthusiasm. Thus, as Loach notes:

> Edward was portrayed by his ministers and propagandists as the young Solomon, son of Henry VIII as David, whose task was to complete the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem, or the spiritual temple of Christianity in England. Edward was, in the words of Thomas Becon, "the true Josias, that earnest destroyer of false religion, that fervent setter-up of God's true honour…"[274]

This traditional depiction of Edward has been challenged in the 20th century, particularly by W. K. Jordan and, following him, Jennifer Loach. These biographers of Edward have tended to downplay his interest in religion. For example, we have previously noted Jennifer Loach's statement that Edward's religious convictions were little more than "an adolescent's attachment to what he grew up with."[275] In this she has followed the view advanced by W. K. Jordan that "Edward was never deeply concerned with matters of religious doctrine, his interest in ecclesiastical affairs being almost wholly administrative."[276] Indeed, Jordan concludes,

> [H]is mind and concerns lie much nearer to those of his great and wholy Erastian sister Elizabeth, than to the obsessive personal religious policy which brought ruin to his sister Mary.[277]

In this assessment of Edward's character Jordan and Loach depend almost exclusively on the entries on Edwards diary, commonly referred to as his *Chronicle*. Jordan writes:

---

[274] Loach, *Edward VI*, 180.

[275] Ibid.,181.

[276] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 19.

[277] Ibid.,26.

> As one reads the *Chronicle*, which in a true sense is a record of what interested the young king, a decided revision of the traditional assessment of his character and personality emerges. His driving concern, clearly, was with the dull but essential tasks of administration and more particularly with the whole process of conciliar and fiscal administration.[278]

He continues by discussing the evidence that the *Chronicle* gives of Edward's interest in political, administrative, economic, and military matters. He then observes:

> An examination of the *Chronicle* and the various state papers written by the King enforces a still more important revision of our estimate of him, his interests, and his aspirations for his realm. One finds in these intensely personal documents little evidence of religious warmth, much less of zeal or of concern with religious matters, save as his supremacy and ultimate sovereignty were involved. There can be no doubt that he was an advanced Protestant in his religious convictions and that he was personally a pious youth. But these personal convictions seem to have left his policy almost untouched. … There is in fact in the *Chronicle* almost no interest exhibited in purely religious matters, not more than five percent of the whole text being so concerned and well over half that meagre proportion having to do with essentially administrative matters.[279]

In this general assessment of Edward's personality and interests Loach concurs:

> His *Chronicle* records nothing of his religious zeal. No sermon—not even that preached by Latimer and immortalized in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*—is mentioned in it. It is much harder than the conventional view has it to document his Protestantism.[280]

Since Jordan and Loach have depended so heavily upon this document for the understanding of Edward's character and interests, a further word about it is in order. In discussing this work, W. K. Jordan describes it in the following terms:

---

[278] Ibid., 25.

[279] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 26. Jordan's characterization of the *Chronicle* as an "intensely personal" document seems to conflict with his own assessment of it as "Political Diary" that was a "cold, harsh, and emotionless document," (see the citations below for these assessments).

[280] Loach, *Edward VI*, 181. While we will grant her general point about the paucity of religious content in the *Chronicle*, her statement about the lack of mention of sermons in inaccurate. For example, regarding the death of Bucer Edward writes, "…[T]here was an oration of Mr. Haddon made very eloquently at his death and a sermon of [Dr. Matthew Parker]. After that Mr. Redman made a third sermon. Which three sermons made the people wonderfully to lament his death," Edward's diary entry for 28 February 1551. Jordan, *Chronicle and Political Papers*, 53–54.

> Perhaps the most accurate title which could be provided for this formally title-less work would be 'Political Diary', but 'Diary' was a word unknown in the author's generation and conveys as well a sense of personal and intimate writing not to be found in this sternly sober recital of events.[281]

He continues by describing it as "... in the very nature of the case terse, telegraphic, and reminiscent rather than expository. Entries are brief and were evidently designed to recall the whole of events only noted here."[282] And after reviewing its content in some detail, he concludes:

> The *Chronicle* must be described as a cold, harsh, and emotionless document. There are in it only momentary flashes of boyish enthusiasm, there is nothing of the brooding uncertainty of adolescence, little of affection for any human being.[283]

Given this assessment of the document by Jordan, it is difficult to see why he would expect to find in it, "religious warmth, much less of zeal or of concern with religious matters." Thus, Jordan's own assessment of the document would seem to undermine his use of it as a major source for understanding Edward's religious character and personality.

An alternative view of the significance of Edward's *Chronicle* for understanding his character is given by David Loades:

> Not too much should be read into its rather detached tone, because Edward had been taught a stoical attitude towards his own feelings and emotions. Events which touched him personally, like the death of his grandmother in October 1550, go unnoticed, and his brief dismissal of the executions of both his Seymour uncles has often been commented upon. ... [T]he whole document is a disciplined statement of events and deliberations. It is much more useful as a source for the history of the reign than for any analysis of Edward's personality....
>
> Edward's chronicle is therefore more a reflection of his training than of his character. ... In one respect at least there is a clear answer. The uncompromising nature of Edward's Protestant faith can be clearly seen throughout. At first it could be represented as no more than a reflection of ideas being regularly instilled by his

---

[281] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 23.

[282] Ibid.

[283] Ibid., 26. It is something of an irony, given Jordan's overall conclusions of Edward's lack of interest in religious matters that one of the few places in the *Chronicle* where a glimpse of humanity and emotion do shine through is in his comments on the death and funeral of Martin Bucer.

> tutors, but by the summer of 1550 a personal note was beginning to creep into his exchanges with Mary which the latter persistently failed to recognize.[284]

And of the observation by Jordan and Loach of the lack of references to sermons in the Chronicle, Loades observes:

> The lack of references to these sermons in the journal might be thought suspicious, but we have it on Nicholas Ridley's testimony that it was after one of these efforts that Edward was so moved by his description of the plight of the London poor that he summoned the lord mayor, and ordered that the old royal palace of Bridewell should be converted into a workhouse and correction centre.[285]

Diarmaid MacCulloch takes the response to the position of Jordan and Loach further. MacCulloch acknowledges that "The balance of entries in Edward's personal Chronicle makes it fatally easy to argue for his possessing a 'cool and secular spirit', as did the Chronicle's modern editor W.K. Jordan." However he rightly adds that Jordan's treatment of the question of royal sovereignty mistakes the attitude of the 16th century: "To imply that the royal supremacy might be a secular notion is in any case a strange judgement, for in the England of the 1550s the supremacy was a profoundly religious concern."[286] He further observes the role of an historical accident on our modern reading of Edward's character.

> So when John Foxe and others enthusiastically stressed the king's evangelical piety, were they merely indulging in wishful thinking? Were his real loves the tournament field and the hunt? Before we rush to assume that we know better than those who knew Edward personally, we must realize how easy it is to be misled by an archival accident. The essential parallel to the Chronicle has been lost: Edward's notebook of the sermons he heard, carefully noting the preacher's name, time and place. Some time before 1616 Bishop James Montague saw this book, which was in the King's Library under the care of the librarian Patrick Young, but since then it has disappeared. This book would have complemented what the young king wrote in the

---

[284] David Loades, *Intrigue and Treason: The Tudor Court 1547–1558* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004), 75.

[285] Loades, *Intrigue and Treason*, 76.

[286] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 22.

> Chronicle, so the loss accounts for the Chronicle's apparent lack of interest in evangelical preaching: Edward was too tidy-minded a boy to duplicate effort.[287]

Moreover, even Jordan acknowledges that Edward's theological disposition was decidedly Reformed and Evangelical. As he observes, "There was never from the outset any doubt of his stalwart Protestantism...."[288] He further notes that among the surviving school exercises of Edward, in addition to the Latin and Greek exercises, "There are, as well, three exercises in French, set by Belmain on religious topics, which are Calvinist in temper and straitly, sometimes rather awkwardly, anti-papal in sentiment."[289] Perhaps this ought not to be surprising given that, as Jordan notes, "... every later addition to the staff of men charged with the teaching of the sensitive an precocious boy ranged from moderately to radically Protestant in their doctrinal views."[290]

In addition, there is sufficient contemporary evidence, not all of it cast in a positive light, that confirms both Edward's enthusiasm for, and increasing personal promotion of, the Protestant agenda. As Allison Weir observes:

> By now [1551] a fanatical Protestant, he was fond of lecturing those around him in the articles of faith, a role which sat oddly with his youth. His councilors and courtiers were already in awe of him. 'He will be the wonder and terror of the world if he lives,' declared Bishop Hooper that year.[291]

If Edward's earliest biographers can be accused of a kind of Protestant hagiography, his modern interpreters are often equally guilt of casting Edward in their own image, of creating a 20th century liberal Edward in place of the 16th century Protestant one.

---

[287] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 22–23.

[288] Jordan, *Threshold of Power*, 18.

[289] Ibid.,22.

[290] Jordan, *Young King*, 41.

[291] Weir, *Children*, 123.

Contrary to the assertions of Jordan and Loach, the Chronicle is not the best instrument for judging Edward's either Edward's religious views or the degree of his personal devotion to those views. As noted above, the Chronicle is primarily a political diary. A much better measure of Edward's religious views is to be found in those things that he personally wrote, and in which he himself specifically and consciously articulated his religious views. The two examples that we have are his writing on the papacy and his draft of the revised statutes for the Order of the Garter. We have previously, if briefly, discussed the latter. Some comments on the former are in order here.

Edward's own "Treatise Against the Supremacy of the Pope" was written in French between December 1548 and March 1549, with a dedication to the Duke of Somerset added at the end of August 1549.[292] The work is clearly the King's own, though he draws from existing sources:

> Edward's work was based in part on John Ponet's English translation of a work by the Italian refugee Bernardino Ochino, which had been dedicated to Edward in early 1549. However, Edward did not slavishly copy Ochino; instead he reused his ideas and historical detail to tailor his own argument. But it is clear that the treatise was an original composition. A contemporary note attached confirms that it was the king's own work....[293]

---

[292] Edward's work is preserved in two manuscripts. The King's own autograph copy is in the British Museum (MS Addit. 5464), bearing the title "Alencontreles abus du monde." It bears a starting date of 13 Dec. 1548 and an ending date of 14 March 1549. This manuscript does not contain the King's dedication to the Duke of Somerset, which was added in August of 1549. It also contains corrections throughout in another hand, thought to be that of the Edward's French tutor, Jean Belmaine. The second manuscript is a clean copy preserved in the Cambridge University Library (MS Bibl. Univ. Cantab. Dd. 12, 59) under the title "L'encontre de la Primauté du Pape." The French text of the Cambridge manuscript is published in Nichols, *Literary Remains*, I: 173–205. At least three English translations of the work have been published, the first in 1682. An accessible English translation (including the dedication) is found in Religious Tract Society, *Writings*, 25–48.

[293] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 149. The contemporary note to which Skidmore refers is a handwritten note at the end of the British Museum manuscript, in the same hand as the corrections to the French, that attests to the Edward's authorship (translation from Religious Tract Society, *Writings*, 48):

> Just as a good painter can represent the visage, look, countenance, and bulk of a prince; so by the writings, words, and actions of a prince, one may easily understand what spirit is in him, and to what he is addicted. As one may see by the writings of this young king, who composed and wrote this book, being not yet full twelve years old, and without the help of any person living; except as to the subject, which he had heard of many, and the remembrance which he had of books that he had read. For, from

(continued next page)

The treatise consists of a short introduction, four parts, and a conclusion. It rejects the theological and historical basis of the claims of the papacy to ecclesiastical authority. The opening paragraph establishes the tone and summarizes the direction of Edward's thought:

> For what nation is there in the earth in which there is not some vice, and many disorders? And principally in this age, because now there is such an exaltation of the great empire of antichrist; which is the source of all evil, the fountain of all abomination, and true son of the devil. For when God had sent his only Son to heal our infirmities and, and to reconcile the world unto himself by his death; the devil instantly changed the institutions of Christ into human traditions, and perverted the holy scriptures to his purposes and designs by his minister the pope. And therefore, if the astrologers, who maintain that all things shall return to their own elements, say a truth, the pope shall descend into hell; for he cannot belong unto God, or be his servant, whilst, under the pretense of religion, and the command of God, he usurps unto himself the authority of Christ, as appears in all his works. Therefore it seemed best to me, in this little book, first to condemn the papacy, and afterwards the doctrine of the pope.[294]

The work continues in this tone throughout, illustrating both Edward's theological disposition and his personal passion for the Protestant position, at least on the question of papal supremacy.

On other matters, his views are more elusive. His attitude toward the Mass, his support for the removal of images from the churches, and especially for eliminating all references to the adoration of the saints is consistent with the views of the most radical branch of European reformers. His views on the Eucharist move in the same direction, even if they are a bit less well-formed.

> More tantalizing are Edward's brief reflections upon the communion which he considered was 'wholly contained in God's word'. On several occasions, Edward began to consider its very nature, changing its name to 'the supper of our Lord' and striking out the title given by the 1549 Prayer Book, 'the holy communion commonly called the mass'.... Another statement that communion was 'the faithful remembrance of Christ's death once offered up for all, and dwelleth not in man's

---

the time that he began to write the said book and until he had finished it, the said book was always in my keeping, even to the present time.

[294] Religious Tract Society, *Writings*, 27

> temples,' suggests just that; Edwards beliefs were forming into a coherent whole, anticipating future religious reform.[295]

Moreover, to the limited extent that we have the ability to judge, Edward appears to have leaned more in the Zwinglian direction than the Calvinist, not to mention the Lutheran:

> In the question the real or spiritual presence in the bread and wine, his defaced jottings reveal Edward was less sure about what he exactly believed. For him, the Lord's Supper was 'the faithful remembrance of Christ's death, yet he drew back from adding the phrase 'and his body and his blood spiritually by some mystery' probably in fear of being mistaken of favouring the real presence.[296]

Edward's own view may be most clearly expressed in a poem written by the king for Sir Anthony St. Leger, a knight of his chamber.[297] In this poem the king asserts an understanding of the Eucharist that allows a spiritual presence of Christ to those who believe, a position reminiscent of that of Bucer. After exploring and rejecting Augustine's view of the Eucharist, Edward writes:

> None other Transubstantiation I
> Beleeve of the Eucharist,
> But that there is both bread and wine,
> Which we see with our eye:
> Yet Christ is there by power divine,
> To those that spiritually
> Do eate that bread and drinke that cup,
> ...
> For I believe Christ corporally
> In heaven doth keepe his place:
> And yet Christ sacramentally
> Is here with us by grace.
> So that, in this high mysterie,
> We must eat spiritual meate,
> To keepe his death in memory,

[295] Skidmore, *Edward VI*, 166–167.

[296] Ibid.

[297] There remains some uncertainty about the authorship of this poem, as it is attributed by some to St. Leger himself. Nichols (*Literary Remains*, I:viii–x) examines the arguments and concludes that Edward is most probably the author, which appears to be the majority view.

Least we should it forget.[298]

Taking all of this into account, there seems little grounds to accept the assessment of Jordan, Loach, and others that Edward was little concerned with matters of religion. Rather, the balance of the evidence would seem to support the contemporary assessment of the king's character given by those who knew and interacted with him:

> … we derive no little comfort from having a King who is truly holy, and who is inflamed with so much zeal for godliness. He is endued with so much erudition for his age, and already expresses himself with so much prudence and gravity, as to fill all his hearers with admiration and astonishment: wherefore we must entreat God with most fervent prayers very long to preserve him to the kingdom and to the church.[299]

Given Edward's words and actions, and the contemporary assessment of others who knew him well, it would seem that Jordan's claim that Edward was in temperament much closer to Elizabeth (and by implication to Henry) than he was to Mary is incorrect. Both Edward and Mary were strongly, personally, and passionately committed to their respective faiths, Mary to the old religion and Edward to the Reformed faith, especially as advocated by its more radical proponents. This Mary herself did not understand, for she repeatedly stated her view that Edward's advocacy of the Reformed faith was a childish misunderstanding that would pass away when he reached intellectual, and presumably spiritual, maturity. All the evidence suggests the opposite.

The Reformation in England was very different in at the end of Edward's reign than it was at the beginning of his reign. And Edward's personal disposition and theological preferences had a great deal to do with bringing about this change. It is quite likely that, had Edward lived, his theological inclinations would have moved English church increasingly in a Reformed direction.

---

[298] Nichols, *Literary Remains*, I:206–208.

[299] Letter from Peter Martyr to Heinrich Bullinger on 1 June 1550, as cited by Nichols, *Literary Remains*, I:cxliv.

As Diarmaid MacCulloch points out,[300] Elizabeth's settlement of the theology of the English church in 1559, while retaining many of the hallmarks of Edward's reign such as the 1552 *Prayer Book*, bears more of the spirit of the position of the church at the end of Henry's reign than of the end of Edward's reign. Such would not have been the case if Edward had survived and continued to rule. Certainly those whose theological dispositions were formed during Edward's reign continued to attempt to press for reforms during the Elizabethan period that went far beyond what Elizabeth herself was willing to endure.[301] There is every reason to believe that Edward would have supported their views to an extent that Elizabeth did not.

In assessing the impact of Edward VI on the course of the English Reformation during his reign, the first and chief question must be what criteria should be employed in assessing the contributions of a ruler to religious developments during his reign. Rulers do not generally contribute to the religious developments within their reigns by their theological writings or scholarly disputations. Rather, their main contribution comes through their actions, and most especially the indirect influence that they exert over the course of events by what they support or encourage, by what they oppose, and by the people that they put into positions of leadership to carry out their will. It is by this standard that we must assess the contributions of Edward to the religious developments during his reign.

Edward was not the trigger for the Reformation in England during his reign. He was not its cause or one of the leading theological thinkers who gave shape to it. Nevertheless, it was his will that established the direction of the church. And, in asserting his will, he did what kings are most capable of doing. He permitted, encouraged, and promoted a Reformation of the church in England that went well beyond what his father had envisioned. The results of his permission,

---

[300] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 185–187.

[301] MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 192–194.

encouragement, and promotion were a church in the process of a radical transformation at the time of his death. As Edward's reign progressed, and the King felt increasingly comfortable and assertive in both articulating and arguing for his own religious views. Those elements within the church that most desired reform felt empowered by Edward's support to press their position forward. There can be little doubt that he would have established the Forty-Two Articles and the catechism of 1553 as the standard for his church if he had survived. Moreover, his increasing assertion of his views beginning in 1550 encouraged and empowered those elements that were pushing for the Reformation of the church farther and farther beyond the Henrician settlement in the direction of the Continental, and especially the Swiss, reformers. Had he lived, the Church of England would have looked much different than what eventually emerged under Elizabeth. This recognition, one of the great 'what ifs' of Western church history, is in itself a sufficient attestation to the role that Edward played in the reform of the church during his short but eventful reign.

APPENDIX A: BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUNDS

Katherine of Aragon

Katherine had been born to King Ferdinand II of Aragon and Queen Isabella I of Castile on 16 December 1485, making her more than 5 years older than her future husband Henry VIII (born 28 June 1491). By the terms of the Treaty of del Campo (1489), her parents betrothed her to Arthur Tudor, who, as oldest son of Henry VII of England and his wife Elizabeth of York, was the Prince of Wales and heir apparent to the throne of England. The betrothal was one of several provisions of the treaty that was intended to seal an alliance between England and Spain against France. The marriage was delayed until both parties reached the age of 15. After the young couple was married on 14 November 1501 at St. Paul's Cathedral in London, they settled at Ludlow, near the border with Wales, from which it was expected that Arthur would exercise his government of the Welsh. However, in March of 1502, both Katherine and Arthur became ill. Katherine recovered but Arthur died on 2 April. Shortly after Arthur's death the royal houses of England and Spain agreed that Katherine should marry the new heir, Henry. Henry himself initially opposed the match. Katherine, who maintained until the end of her life that the marriage to Arthur had never been consummated, remained in England while the negotiations over her marriage to Henry dragged on. In 1507 she was appointed Spanish ambassador to England. According to English historian Allison Weir,[302] she was the first female ambassador in Europe. After his coronation on 22 April 1509, Henry announced that he had changed his mind, and agreed to the marriage. He and Katherine were wed in a private ceremony at Greenwich Church

[302] Allison Weir, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (New York: Grove Press, 1991), 59.

on 11 June 1509. During the years of her marriage to Henry, Katherine gave birth to six children, an unnamed daughter prematurely stillborn (31 January 1510), a son Henry who lived less than two months (1 January 1511–23 February 1510), an unnamed son who was either stillborn or died shortly after birth (October 1513), another son named Henry who died within a few hours of birth (December 1514), Mary (18 February 1516) who would later become Queen of England, and an unnamed daughter who lived for six days (10–16 November 1518).

John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland

John Dudley was the oldest of the three sons of Edmund Dudley. Formerly a Member of Parliament from Lewes, Edmund Dudley had been made a privy counselor under Henry VII and Speaker of the House of Commons in 1504. Henry appointed him to a special position as a collector of debts owed to the king, especially by the nobility. This latter position both allowed him to collect a sizable personal fortune and made him rather unpopular with the nobility in general. After the death of Henry VII and the accession of his son Henry VIII in 1509, Edmund Dudley became something of a scapegoat for the unpopular acts of the previous regime. He was beheaded at the order of the king in 1510. After Edmund's death his son John, then aged 7, became the ward of Sir Edward Guildford, whose daughter Jane he subsequently married.

Dudley's family connections secured him a place in the royal administration, and his competence led to a variety of gradually more important appointments. Dudley succeeded his father-in-law, Sir Edward Guildford, as Master of the Royal Armour. He served as Guildford's lieutenant in a campaign in France in 1523, during which he was knighted for bravery and the leadership he displayed in battle. In 1534 he succeeded his father-in-law as a Member of Parliament. In 1537 he was sent on a mission to Spain, and also in that year he began his association with the Admiralty, to whose leadership he would eventually rise.

In addition to his important contributions to developing the navy during Henry's reign, Dudley led several campaigns in Scotland and was made Lord Warden of the Marches in 1542. As head of the Admiralty, Dudley oversaw the expansion and reorganization of the navy during Henry's reign. He also headed several diplomatic missions for the king, including serving for a term as governor of Boulogne. He served as a member of the Privy Council from 1542 onward. In 1546 he was appointed Lieutenant General of all the king's armies.

Appointed Chamberlain of the Household upon Edward's accession, he had to give up his position at the Admiralty. His military career continued with a successful campaign against the Scots as Lord Lieutenant of the Army under Somerset, whose Protectorate he appears to have supported during the first years of Edward's reign. In the summer of 1549 he was appointed the military leader of the government forces assembled to suppress a rebellion in Norfolk led by Robert Ket(t) which had been sparked by increases in food prices and rents. As one of the sixteen executors of the will of Henry VIII, he had been elevated to the position of Earl of Warwick at the accession of Edward, at the same time that Seymour was made Duke of Somerset.[303]

Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury

Thomas Cranmer was born in 1489. After his graduation from Jesus College, Cambridge, (c. 1515) he as appointed as a fellow of the college. He resigned from this position to marry, but returned to the position after the death of his wife. He was ordained in 1520 and became a Doctor of Divinity in 1526. In his early years, Cranmer does not appear to have been engaged in the early pro-reform activities at Cambridge. Beginning in 1527 he undertook a series of

[303] For a more detailed summary of Dudley's life with an emphasis on his political career, see the biographical entry in S. T. Bindoff, ed., "DUDLEY, Sir John (1504/6–53), of Halden, Kent; Dudley Castle, Staffs.; Durham Place, London; Chelsea and Syon, Mdx," *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509–1558*, 3 Vols. (London: Secker and Warburg, 1982). Accessed on-line at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/dudley-sir-john-15046-53 on 15 October 2014.

diplomatic missions for Henry VIII, including being a part of the negotiations attempting to arrange Henry's divorce from Katherine of Aragon.

In 1532, while in Europe on a mission to the court of Emperor Charles V, Cranmer met the Lutheran reformer Alexander Osiander and married Osiander's niece, Margaret. The marriage was conducted in secret since it was illegal for English priests to marry at this time, and is the first clear indication of sympathy on Cranmer's part for the theological changes introduced by the Lutheran Reformation. Shortly thereafter Cranmer was nominated by Henry to the position of Archbishop of Canterbury, to which office he was consecrated on 20 March 1533.

In his position as archbishop, Cranmer was one of the most powerful voices for reform during the reigns of Henry and Edward. After Edward's death and Mary's accession, Cranmer was arrested. He was convicted of treason, his promotion of reformed theology deemed an act of sedition against Mary's rule, and was sentenced to death. In the months after his condemnation Cranmer recanted his reformed theological views on numerous occasions, including at a public worship service in which he received the Lord's Supper according to the Roman Catholic rite on the day before his scheduled execution. Despite his public repentance and return to Catholicism, Mary was determined that he should be executed as an example. On the day of his execution (21 March 1556) Cranmer renounced his previous recantations, and condemned the Pope as the antichrist as he was burned at the stake.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avis, Paul. *Anglicanism and the Christian Church.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989.

Alford, Stephen. *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Ashmole, Elias. *The History of the Most Noble Order of the Garter: Wherein is Set Forth an Account of the Town, Castle, Chappel, and College of Windsor; . . . To Which is Prefix'd, a Discourse of Knighthood in General, . . . Collected by Elias Ashmole, . . . The Whole Illustrated with Proper Sculptures.* London: Printed for A. Bell, W. Taylor, and J. Baker, and A. Collins, 1715. Cited from The Eighteenth Century Collections Online of the Text Creations Partnership at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ecco/004894364.0001.000/1:10?rgn=div1;view=toc on July 7, 2014.

Bernard, G. W. *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Bindoff, S. T., Ed. "DUDLEY, Sir John (1504/6–53), of Halden, Kent; Dudley Castle, Staffs.; Durham Place, London; Chelsea and Syon, Mdx." *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509–1558.* 3 Vols. London: Secker and Warburg, 1982. Available on-line at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/dudley-sir-john-15046-53. Accessed on 15 October 2014.

Bossy, John. *Christianity in the West 1400–1700.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Bush, M. L. *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset.* London: Hodder & Stoughton Educational, 1975.

Cannon, J. A. "Edward VI." *The Oxford Companion to British History*, ed. by John Cannon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Collier, Jeremy. *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.* London: William Straker, 1708–1714.

Cross, F. L. and Elizabeth A. Livingstone. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Daniel, Evan. *The Prayer-Book: Its History, Language, and Contents.* 20th ed., Revised and Enlarged. London: Wells Gardner Darton & Co., 1901.

Dasent , J. R., et al., eds. *Acts of the Privy Council of England.* 36 vols. New Series, Vol. II (1547–1549). London: Her Majesty's Stationer's Office, 1890–1964.

Dearmer, Percy. *The Story of the Prayer Book*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation.* 2nd ed. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1989.

Duffy, Eamon. *Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition: Religion and Conflict in the Tudor Reformations.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2012.

———. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Edwards, David L. *Christian England.* Vol. 2, *From the Reformation to the 18th Century.* Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984.

The First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI, 1549. The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden & Welsh, N.D. (1888?).

Gibson , E. C. S. "Introduction." In Ernest Rhys, ed. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI.* Everyman's Library. London: J. M. Dent, 1910, viii.

Greschat, Martin. *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*. Translated by Stephen E. Buckwalter. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan and Edmund Bishop. *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer.* London: John Hodges, 1890.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Heal, Felicity. *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Heffling, Charles and Cynthia Shattuck, eds. *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Hoak, D. E. *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

The Holy Bible: English Standard Version. Wheaton: Standard Bible Society, 2001.

Jordan, W. K., ed. *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI.* London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1966.

———. *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power. The Dominance of the Duke of Northumberland.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

———. *Edward VI: The Young King. The Protectorate of the Duke of Somerset.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Loach, Jennifer. *Edward VI.* Yale English Monarchs, edited by George Bernard and Penry Williams. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Loades, David. *Intrigue and Treason: The Tudor Court 1547–1558.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004.

———. *The Tudors: History of a Dynasty.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2012.

Lyte, H. C. Maxwell and R. H. Brodie, eds. *The Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward VI, 1547–1553.* 6 vols. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1924–9.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation.* New York: Palgrave, 2001.

———. *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation.* London: Allen Lane, 2000.

Matusiak, John. "A Lamb in Lion's Garb: Evolving Perspectives on Edward VI." *History Review* 48 (March, 2004): 4–7.

Nichols, John Gough, ed. *Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth.* 2 vols. London: Roxburghe Club, 1857.

North, Jonathan, ed. *England's Boy King: The Diary of Edward VI 1547–1553.* Welwyn Garden City: Ravenhall Books, 2005.

Parry, G. T. R. "Inventing 'The Good Duke' of Somerset." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* xl (1989): 370–380.

Pauck, Wilhelm, ed. *Melanchthon and Bucer.* The Library of Christian Classics. Icthus Ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.

Procter, Francis. *A History of the Book of Common Prayer.* London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1898.

Procter, Francis and Walter Howard Frere. *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer.* Revised Edition. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1958.

Porter , Linda. *Mary Tudor: The First Queen.* London: Little, Brown Book Group, 2007.

Religious Tract Society. *Writings of Edward VI, William Hugh, Queen Katherine Parr, Anne Askew, Lady Jane Grey, Hamilton, and Balnaves.* London: The Religious Tract Society, 1836.

Rhys, Ernest, ed. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI.* Everyman's Library. Introduction by E. C. S. Gibson. London: J. M. Dent, 1910.

Richards, Judith. "Edward VI and Mary Tudor: Protestant King and Catholic Sister." *History Review* 59 (September 2007): 18–22.

Skidmore, Chris. *Edward VI: The Lost King of England.* New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2007.

Smyth, C. H. *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926.

Strong, Roy C. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1977.

"Timeline of the English Reformation." http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_the_English_Reformation. Accessed on June 5, 2013.

Tytler, P. F., *England under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary.* London: Richard Bentley, 1839.

Weir, Allison. *The Children of Henry VIII.* New York: Ballantine Books, 1996.

———. *The Six Wives of Henry VIII.* New York: Grove Press. 1991.

Whitelock, Anna. *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen.* New York: Random House, 2009.

Whitaker, E. C. *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer.* London: Mayhew-McCrimmon Ltd. 1974.