

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-7-1930

The Old Religion in England During the Early Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth

Carl S. Meyer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_meyerc@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Meyer, Carl S., "The Old Religion in England During the Early Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth" (1930). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 665.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/665>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Read & approved 5/12/30
W. H. Blank.

Read and approved.
12 May, 30
R. W. Glantz

App. by, For, 5/12/30

THE OLD RELIGION IN ENGLAND
DURING THE EARLY YEARS OF THE
REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH
(1558-1570)

A
thesis
presented to the faculty
of
Concordia Seminary
St. Louis, Mo.
by

Carl S. Meyer

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree
of
Bachelor of Divinity.

Table of Contents.

THE OLD RELIGION AS THE OFFICIAL RELIGION OF ENGLAND

Nov. 17, 1558 - Jan. 15, 1559	
Elizabeth succeeds Mary	1
The Proclamation of Nov. 18	4
The New Privy Council	6
The Incident of Christmas Morning	7
The Proclamation of Dec. 27	8
The Coronation of the Queen	9
Jan. 15, 1559 - June 24, 1559	
The majority of the nation is Catholic	12
The Easter Proclamation of the Queen	13
The attitude of the people	14

ATTEMPTS OF THE CLERGY TO RETAIN THE OLD RELIGION

The Convocation of 1559	
The five Articles	15
The Conference of Westminster	
The propositions	16
The discussion on March 31	18
The debate is broken up, April 3.	19

THE ABOLITION OF THE OLD RELIGION BY ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

The personnel of Parliament	
The Bishops	20
The Peers	22
The Commons	23
The Restoration of the Tenth	26
The Supremacy Act	
Its passage through Parliament	27
Revived some acts made under Henry	30
Vested the governing rights of the Church in the Crown	31
The Oath of Supremacy	32
The Penalties of the Act	33
The Act of Uniformity	
Its progress through the two Houses	35
Its purport	36
The Bearing of these Acts on the Old Religion	38
The Old Religion defined as heresy	39
Minor Ecclesiastical Legislation	40
The Alteration of the Liturgy	41

THE EXECUTION OF THE ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

The Deprivation of the Marian Bishops	45
The Treatment of the Deprived Bishops	47
The Minor Clergy and the Acts	
The Northern Visitation	48
The Southern Visitation	50
The total extent of the conformity	51
The reasons for the conformity	52
The Commission of 1559	55
The Elizabethan Injunctions of 1559	56

THE OLD RELIGION IN ENGLAND IN ITS INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS	
Catholics who left England	
The Carthusians	58
The Bridgettines of Syon	59
The Monks of St. Benedicts	59
The Franciscans	60
The Convent of St. Monica, Louvain	60
The Dominicans	60
The Seminary at Douay	61
Foundational Efforts which failed	63
Englishmen as Jesuits	63
The Louvain School of Apologetics	64
English Lay Exiles	65
The Relations between England and Spain	67
England and the Papal See	
Paul IV	70
Cum ex apostolatus officio	71
Pius IV	73
Mission of Parpaglia	74
Mission of Martinengo	76
Ippolito d'Este	78
The Proposed Excommunication at the Council of Trent	79
Denham's account of the Papal plans	82
 THE LAITY OF ENGLAND AND THE ABOLITION OF THE OLD RELIGION	
The laymen adopt the new religion	83
An estimate of the number of Catholics in 1570	84
Could Conformity be taken as Apostasy?	86
Some reasons for the laxity and Capitulations	89
The Government and those who refused to conform	92
The Act of Assurance	94
The Uprising of the North (1569)	96
How the Catholics were served by their priests	98
The Devices of the Catholics to conform and remain true to their religion	100
Summary of the Situation	101
 PIUS V AND THE EXCOMMUNICATION OF ELIZABETH	
The indictment	103
Regnans in excelsis	104
The proclamation of Elizabeth	105
 DOCTRINAL CHANGES FROM THE OLD RELIGION	
The Homilies	106
The Heresies of the Homilies	108
The Articles of Religion	
Their history	113
Doctrinal agreement	114
Doctrinal Disagreement	115
 CONCLUSION	
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	

INTRODUCTION

To comprehend the topic we must, first of all, understand the scope of the term "Old Religion." Nothing else can be meant by that designation than that system of religion which had ^{pre}prevaded the countries of Europe and had been the marrow of its religious life during the period preceeding the memorial ^{able}sixteenth century. Under this term we would include both its national and its international aspects. We will ^{shall}investigate this ecclesiastical system in England during the process of its overthrow -- after it had temporarily regained what was thought to be its dominant position. This overthrow we would follow in its "due process of law," by legislative decrees, and the introductions of a ritual and creed foreign to it. We will ^{shall}see this religion loose its high eminence and sink almost to insignificance. It is a dark picture which we must present. The more brilliant pages; its fight for life; the persecutions which were inaugurated against its adherents; the work of the persons, outside the sanction of the law, to keep alive and inflame the spark of loyalty to the See of Rome, which fairly teems with noteworthy incidents; and incidents of a depressing character; take place only in the two decades following the one which we are considering. The incidents which we ^{shall}will portray will often be dry. The fault is not with the topic, however. It is only with an apology that we begin.

THE OLD RELIGION IN ENGLAND AS THE OFFICIAL RELIGION

November 17, 1558 - January 15, 1559.

Mary Tudor, the first queen regnant of England, the ardent adherent of the Catholic religion, died on the seventeenth of November, 1559. Her successor had been appointed by a law of her father, Henry VIII, and no scruples could alter this law. A previous attempt by Edward VI to set aside this order of succession had proved unsuccessful.¹ Nor could Mary hope to deprive Elizabeth of her undoubted rights,² even if she had thought of doing so. She had, however, taken pains to assure herself that her sister would remain true to that Church to which she had subscribed her allegiance and for which Mary had sacrificed her

1 Edward had issued a "devise" for the succession, barring both Mary and Elizabeth in favor of Lady Jane Grey. Done at the instigation of Northumberland, whom the people hated, it did not meet with the approval of the populace. Lady Jane Grey "reigned" only nine days. Mary was received by the uproarious approval of a Protestant population of London. The people set great store on the hereditary right of their rulers. Cf. Froude, *Hist. of Engl.*, VI.; Pollard, *Hist. of Engl.*; Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, II.; Stone, *The History of Mary I.*; et alii: *passim*.

2 35 H. VIII. c.1 had provided that Henry could dispose of the crown of England. He provided that Edward should reign, after him Mary, and then Elizabeth -- in case either Edward or Mary failed to have issue.

Archbishop Heath, in announcing the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth, said to the assembled Parliament on that same day: "...He (God) hath left unto us a true lawful and right inheritress of the crown of this realm, which is the Lady Elizabeth, second daughter of our late Sovereign Lord of noble memory King Henry the Eighth and sister of our late said queen; of whose most lawful right and title in the succession to the Crown, thanks be to God! we need not to doubt." Froude, *op. cit.*, VII., p.1.

Elizabeth wrote in the same vein to Philip II of Spain: "Exponet Vestrae Serenitati hic noster nuntius quam singulari Dei benignitate, et quam consentiente omnium ordinum voluntate et applausu, tranquillo etiam et omni laeto omnium subditorum nostrorum haec regna et dominia nostra ad nos tamquam ad praecharissimi patris nostri felicitis memoriae Henrici Octavi indubitatisimam et maxime legitimam unicum haeredem jure optimo devoluta sunt." Quoted by Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement*, p. 3n, from *Collection de Chroniques Belges inedites*, Doc. CCXXXI, i, p. 299.

own happiness and the happiness of her realm.¹

¹ Mary, early in her reign, made efforts to persuade Elizabeth to join the Catholic Church. On Sept. 8, 1553, Elizabeth capitulated and went to mass with her sister. Soon after she opened a chapel in her own house. Cf. Stone, op. cit., p. 246. We find various references to the fact that Elizabeth was willing to reconcile herself to her sister by declaring her adherence to the Roman Catholic religion. Cf. ib., passim, especially p. 403.

The efforts to assure herself which Mary made that the Old Religion would be the religion of the new queen are worth noting. We quote at length. "Queen Mary in her last sickness sent Commissioners to examine her (Elizabeth) about religion; to whom she answered, 'Is it not possible that the queen will be persuaded I am a Catholic, having so often protested it?' and thereupon did swear and vow that she was a Catholic. This is answerable to what Mr. Camden saith, and is likewise confirmed by the Duke of Feria's letter to the king, who in this sickness of the queen, visited the Lady Elizabeth. She certified him that she did profess the Catholic religion, and believed the Real Presence, and was not like to make any alteration for the principal points of religion." Quoted by Miss Stone, p. 464, from *The Life of Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria*, p. 90.

Besides the visit of the Spanish ambassador mentioned, Mary sent two members of the Privy Council to Elizabeth, through whom she left her her crown conditionally. The conditions were: a) the maintenance of the Old Religion; b) the settlement of the Queen's debts. Cf. Stone, p. 466.

Another detail is given us: "If we may credit the countess de Feria, (Elizabeth) added, 'that she prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her alive if she were not a true Catholic.'" Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, III., p. 98f, with reference to MS. *Life of the Countess de Feria*, Lingard.

Continuing, this same author quotes Edwin Sandys as follows: "Mary, not long before her death, sent two members of her council to her sister Elizabeth, and commanded them to let her know 'that it was her intention to bequeath to her the royal crown, together with the dignity that she was then in possession of by right of inheritance.' In return, however, for this great favour conferred upon her, she required of her three things: first, 'that she would make no change in her privy council;' secondly, 'that she would make no alteration in religion;' thirdly, that she would discharge her debts, and satisfy her creditors.' Elizabeth replied in these terms: 'I am sorry to hear of the queen's illness, but there is no reason why I should thank her for her intention of giving me the crown of this realm, for she has neither the power of bestowing it upon me, nor can I lawfully be deprived of it, since it is my peculiar and hereditary right. With respect to the council, I think myself at liberty to choose my councillors as she was to choose hers. As to religion, I promise this much; that I will not change it, provided only that it can be proved by the word of God, which shall be the foundation and rule of my religion. Lastly, in requiring the payments of her debts, she seems to me to require nothing more than what is just; and I will take care that they shall be paid as far as may lie in my power.'" Ibid., III., p. 99, reference to *Zurich Letters*: published by the Parker Society.

It was not unnatural that the people of England should wonder what course the new regnant, the daughter of "Nan Bullen", would follow in the matter of religion. The Catholics stood by, hoping that Elizabeth would retain her allegiance to the Church of Rome, fearing that she would not.¹ Various questions may have suggested themselves, but all united in celebrating the advent of a new reign.²

Miss Strickland judges that the Countess of Feria had the better opportunity to know what actually took place. She says: "Her (Elizabeth's) answer was probably comprised in language sufficiently mystified to conceal her real meaning to Mary and her councillors." Ibid., III., p. 99.

Mary was to make another, a final plea to Elizabeth. When she sent her crown-jewels to the Princess through the Countess de Feria she again added the request that Elizabeth would not change her religion. Cf. Ibid., p. 100, reference to the MS Life of Countess de Feria, Lingard.

Finally it is to be noted that Mary's marriage with a foreign prince, Philip of Spain, the persecution of the Protestants, the loss of Calais, among other things, made Mary as unpopular at her death as she had been popular five years before when she entered London triumphantly to assume the crown of England. For references cf. p.1, note 1.

1 The Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip several days before the death of Mary: "I fear that in religion she will not go right, as she seems inclined to favour men who are supposed to be heretics, and they tell me that the ladies about her are all so." Quoted by Agnes Strickland, III., p.100 from Gonzales, pp. 254.255.

Since the Spanish ambassadors were more intimate with the Catholic sentiment of the country than probably any one else, we find in this assertion an indication that others had the same fear that "she will not go right."

2 Elizabeth's immediate popularity was quite manifest. "All the churches in London did ring, and at night (men) did make bonfires and set tables in the street, and did eat and drink, and made merry for the new queen." Quoted by Pollard, op. cit., p.175 from Machyn, p.178.

Froude, with his rhetoric, adorns this celebration in the following manner: "The bells which six years before had rung in triumph for Mary's accession, now pealed as merrily for her death. The voices which had shouted themselves hoarse in execrations on Northumberland were now as loud in ecstasy that the miserable reign was at an end. Through the November day steeple answered steeple; the streets were spread with tables, and as twilight closed, blazed as before with bonfires. The black dominion of priests and priestcraft had rolled away, like night before the coming of the dawn. Elizabeth, the people's idol, dear to them for her sister's hatred, the morning star of England's hope, was Queen." Froude, VII., p.2.

Elizabeth's first official proclamation did not deal with the religious situation directly. It merely forbade the alteration of any of the customs of the country,¹ but those who were wary might have found reason to express some doubt about the retention of the Old Religion.²

During the remainder of the month of November and during December there was no alteration in religion in accordance with the Queen's proclamation. The late Queen,³ Cardinal Reginald Pole,⁴ and

1 This proclamation was issued on November 18th, according to Pollard, *op. cit.*, p.194. Blunt, *The Reformation of the Church of Engl.*, II., p. 336 says that it was "issued on the day of her accession." The same date is given by Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth*, p. 15n. Pollen, *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, p.18, says it was issued two days later (Nov.19). Maitland, in the *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II., p. 564, says it was issued "at once." Froude does not mention the proclamation. Neither does Lingard, *History of Engl.*, VI. The date is not essential.

The proclamation contains the following clause: "...not to attempt uppon anny pretence the breache, alteration, or chaunge of any ordre or usage presently establyshed within this our Realme." Meyer, p.15n.

2 This proclamation contained an "&c." which has called for some comment. It was added to the title of the Queen and took the place of the phrase "Supreme Head of the Church" found in the titles of Henry VIII and Edward VI as well as that of Mary during part of her reign.

Maitland, *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II., p.564, calls it "a new and happy *et caetera*." He says that it "seemed to hint, without naming, a Headship of the Church."

We learn that, "It was deliberately adopted after consultation between Elizabeth and Cecil on the day before, and was not a trifling matter;..." Pollard, *op. cit.*, p.194.

3 The funeral of Mary Tudor began Dec. 10th and occupied the four following days. Cf. Blunt, *op. cit.*, II., p.335. The Salisbury ritual was used. *Ibid.*, l.c. The expenses of this funeral were between 70,000 and 80,000 pounds sterling. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p.193.

The funeral sermon in Westminster Abbey was preached by Bishop White of Winchester on Eccl. iv, 2.3. "It contained a bold warning against religious change." Cf. Pollard, p. 193n and p.193. It also contained the following sentence: "That as St. Paul forbade women to speak in the church, it was not fitting for the church to have a dumb head." Cf. Strickland, *op. cit.*, III., p.107. Other remarks made in the course of the sermon caused his arrest and detention.

4 Reginald Pole, the Archbishop of Canterbury, a member of the royal family, a descendant of the house of York and the Beauchamps, the two houses united by Henry VII, was buried befitting his station. Cf. Blunt, *op. cit.*, II., p.335n, Pollard, *et al.*, *passim*.

two divines¹ were buried according to the rites of the Catholic Church. Obsequies were held for the demise of Emperor Charles V.²

The rabid Protestants of London were not satisfied with this cautious procedure. In time they showed their displeasure by various acts of violence³ and buffoonery.⁴ As yet the Queen had not been crowned.

1 Their funeral is mentioned only by Agnes Strickland, *op. cit.*, III., p. 107. She does not say who they were.

Four Bishops died in November and December, 1558. They were the Bishops of Rochester, Bristol, Chichester, and Norwich. Cf. Birt, p.44n.

2 "The xxiii. day of December was the obsequie at Westmynster, with the same herse that was for quen Mare, was for Charles V., Emporowre of Rome, was durge, and the morrow masse with ... mornars, and ... was the cheyff morner." Blunt, II., p. 335n, quotation from Machyn's Diary, p.184.

"At the obsequies celebrated in memory of Charles V. the celebrant, an heretical minister, omitted the name of the Pope in the Canon, said the Pater Noster in English, and ... a Litany was recited without the invocation of any saint, as in the reign of Edward VI." Birt, p.19f with reference to Chron. Belg., No. CCLXXI, 1, pp. 365-6; 29th December, 1558. Cf. Gasquet, *A Short Hist. of the Cath. Church in Engl.*, p. 106.

3 "Notwithstanding some efforts to check their zeal, the London mob tore down the new crucifixes. Priests if they showed themselves in the streets were kicked into the kennels, and the Protestant clergy coming forth out of their hiding-places, began unpermitted to read English services again." Froude, VII., p.18. He refers us to De Feria's letter to Philip, Ms. Simancas, in Nov.

Violence was not altogether the rule. "...on January 2 it was reported from Paris that the majority had entirely renounced the mass, although the queen 'did not prevent any of the few who attended it from continuing to do so in safety and without being outraged in any way.'" Pollard, *op. cit.*, p.198, cited from the Venetian Cal., vii., 6; cf. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, 324-30 (reference by Pollard, p.198n.).

4 "Il Schifanoya, writing on 23rd January, 1558-9, mentions 'the mumery performed after supper on the same day (Twelfth Night) of crows in the habits of cardinals, of asses, habited as bishops, and of wolves representing abbots'; as also 'the masquerade of friars in the streets of London.'" Birt, p. 23f, from the Venetian Papers, No. 10.

London was more Protestant than the rest of the country. We should not therefore suppose that all were inclined as were some of the more rabid Londoners. Then too these are merely incidents. That they transpired does not say that they were approved by the majority of the people. Nor does there seem to have been active disapproval. A more detailed discussion of the religious sentiment at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign will be given in the following pages.

The New Privy Council

Before her coronation, however, Elizabeth was to choose her council. These men, who together with her were to guide the affairs of the nation, could have retained the Old Religion, had they so desired.¹ But the Queen was careful to choose men who were favorably inclined towards Protestantism. William Cecil headed the list of her advisers. Whereas fifteen members of Mary's council were excluded, eleven of the old members were retained. Those who were ardent Catholics (Montague, Englefield, Cornwallis, Boxall, Peckham) were not retained. Archbishop Heath withdrew and relinquished the seals as Chancellor in favor of Sir Nicholas Bacon who was made Lord Keeper. Paget likewise withdrew from the council. Sadler, Parry, Richard Sackville, Ambrose Cave, and Edward Rogers were called to become members of the council. Other administrative posts were filled with men who had leaning against Catholicism.² And while the English nation

1 We are told: "If the Catholic party had been well organized, if Elizabeth had had one good Catholic friend and adviser, the resultant policy of the Queen would probably have been different." Pollen, p.11.

I am not convinced that merely one "good Catholic friend and adviser" would have stayed the change in religion. A hostile council no doubt would have.

2 Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p. 182f.; Froude, VII, 18.

In this council those who were principally concerned about a change in religion were: Cecil and Bacon; perhaps, Northampton, Pembroke, Bedford, and Lord John Gray. Cf. Froude, VII., p. 27 and Blunt, II., p.336.

Cecil, it seems, made efforts to find out what course of policy would be best to adopt. Wade submitted "Distresses of the Commonwealth;" Goodrich wrote "Diverse Points of Religion;" and "The Device for the Alteration of Religion" was brought to Cecil's attention. Cf. Pollen, p. 21f.; Froude, VII, pp. 20-26.

Efforts were already being made to revise the Prayer-Book of Edward VI. Cf. Froude, VII, p. 27.

We cannot enter into the details of these "devices" and proposals for alteration.

was wondering whether or not the Queen would retain the Old Religion, these men were discussing ways and means of changing it.¹

Parliament, too, was to have its voice in these matters. Elizabeth, therefore, summoned them for their first meeting of the new reign.²

The Queen's position during these early months was a very peculiar and trying one. She did not know exactly in what direction to turn, or, if she did, she did not care to have the nation at large know how she was inclined. It seems to me that, politician and demagogue and diplomat that she was, she wanted to find out first what really was the actual state of feeling concerning the religious policy to be adopted. We might say that she was like the preacher's wife who wanted a new coat but did not dare to buy one for fear that the people would denounce her for extravagance; nor did she dare to go about in her old one for fear that the people would notice its shabbiness. Elizabeth chose Christmas morning for making an experiment. She forbade her chaplain, Ogelthorpe the Bishop of Carlisle, to elevate the host during the mass. He, however, refused and Elizabeth left the royal chapel after the reading of the Gospel of the day.³ It seems certain that Elizabeth adopted this course of action so

1 Vide ante p. 6, note 2.

2 I have been unable to find out whether or not in the proclamations, writs, or summons (whatever they may have been) for the next session of Parliament the matter of changing the religion was mentioned. It seems strange to me that historians should pass over this point. It would be of the greatest value to know whether or not the country was appraised of an alteration by these means. More will be said later concerning the the personnel of the Parliament, its religious inclinations, etc.

3 "And for newes you shall ondyrstand that yestyrdaye beyng Chrystemas day, the Quene's majestie reparyrd to her great closet, with hyr nobles and ladyes, as hath been acustomyd yn such high feasts. And she perseving a bysshope preparing himselfe to make all in the olde fowrme, she taryyd there onetill the gossPELL was done, and when all the people lokyd ffor hyr to have offryde according to the olde facion, she with hyr nobles returnyed agayn from the closet and the masse, onto her priveye chamber,

that she could gauge the sentiment of the country.¹ At last the Protestants had something tangible which indicated the coming events.²

The Queen's Proclamation of December 27, 1558

Shortly after this incident a more direct indication was given that changes in the religion of the country were about to take place. The Queen issued a proclamation two days afterwards forbidding all manner of preaching. She also restored by this proclamation the English language in some parts of the liturgy of the service; the Gospel and the Epistle were to be read in the vernacular; the Pater Noster and the Credo were to be said in English. All other innovations were

which was strange unto dyvers, &c." Letter of Sir William Fitzwilliams to Mr. More, written on St. Stephan's Day, Dec. 26, 1558. Reprinted from the Losely MSS in Thomas Wright's Queen Elizabeth and her Times, Vol. I., p. 4f. It is also given in Ellis, Original Letters, Second Series, Vol. II, p. 262. Cf. also Blunt, II., p. 337f, n.

Practically all the historians mention this incident, sometimes with comments.

1 Miss Agnes Strickland seeks to divine the feminine mind of Elizabeth: "This retreat was to signify her disapproval of the mass; yet she proceeded softly and gradually till she ascertained the tone of the new parliament, which had not yet met. Had her conduct on Christmas morning excited general reprobation instead of approbation, she could have attributed it to sudden indisposition ..." Strickland, III, p. 109.

We must give such prominence to Elizabeth's actions, because of the fact that as sovereign the people looked to her to establish the religion of the country. They had followed Henry away from Rome, the Protestantism of Edward, and the restoration of the Old Religion under Mary.

2 Those who wished could have seen the restoration in the release of the prisoners which Mary had caused to be arrested on account of their heretical views. "...Commissions were issued to sheriffs and magistrates, some dated within three weeks of the Queen's accession, directing that inquiry should be made respecting persons who had been sent to prison 'under suspicion of religion,' and if no good causes were found for their detention, to set them at liberty on their own recognizances to appear when called." Many were released in London, Maidstone and Colchester. Perhaps all who were in prison for their religious opinions were set free within a few weeks after Mary's death. Cf. Blunt, II, p. 338f. He refers us to Strype's Annals, i. 54.

to await the sanction of Parliament.¹

The Coronation of the Queen, January 15, 1559.

The time had come for the coronation, and it was only with difficulty that Elizabeth found an orthodox Catholic Bishop to crown her.²

Her procession before the coronation was replete with incidents which showed that the people of London desired a change in the religion of the

1 Pollard assigns the date of December 30th to this proclamation. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p. 194. December 27th is the correct date according to the proclamation itself as I have it.

The proclamation reads in part: "The Queen's Majesty, understanding that there be certain persons, having in times past the office of the ministry in the church, which do purpose to use their former office in preaching and ministry and partly have attempted the same, ... hath therefore, according to the authority committed to her Highness, for the quiet goverance of all manner of her subjects, thought it necessary to charge and command ... all manner of her subjects, as well those that be called to ministry in the church as all others, that they do forbear to preach or teach or to give audience to any manner of doctrine of preaching other than to the Gospel and Epistles, commonly called the Gospel and Epistle of the day, and to the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue, without exposition or addition of any manner, sense or meaning to be applied or added, or to use any other manner of public prayer, rite or ceremony in the church, but that which is already used and by law received, as the Common Litany used at this present in her Majesty's own chapel, and the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed in English; until consultation may be had by parliament, by her Majesty and her three estates of this realm, for the better conciliation and accord of such causes as at this present are moved in matters and ceremonies of religion. The true advancement whereof, to the due honour of Almighty God, the increase of virtue and godliness, with universal charity and concord amongst her people, her Majesty most desireth and meaneth effectually, by all manner of means possible, to procure and to restore to this her realm ... Given at her Highness' palace at Westminster, the 27th day of December, ..." Printed in Prothero, Select Statutes, pp. 183-184 from Strype's Annals, II. p. 391.

2 Heath, Archbishop of York, should have been the man to perform this function, since Reginald Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, had died on the same day which saw the death of Mary. Elizabeth's actions, as they have been described, had made him with most of the rest of the bishops dubious about accepting this dignity. Dr. Ogelthorpe, who crowned her, had to borrow his vestments from the Bishop of London, Bonner. He was the only bishop to meet the coronation procession. Strickland, III., p. 113.

It might be mentioned that the Bishop of Carlisle was one of the junior members of the bench. He had been consecrated on Aug. 15, 1577. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., 198n.

country and that they looked to her to bring about this change.¹

The Queen was crowned on the 15th of January, 1559 by the Bishop of Carlisle.² We do not know what actually happened at the coronation,³ but the ceremony was performed quite in accord with the usual Roman Catholic rites.⁴ Elizabeth swore the prescribed oath, promising to main-

1 Agnes Strickland describes these incidents somewhat in detail (III., pp. 112-113. The manner in which Elizabeth received the Bible presented by the city seemed to please the populace immensely. As she was leaving the city the song of farewell "gave a hint of the expected establishment of the Reformation:-

'Farewell, O worthy queen! and as our hope is sure,
That into Error's place thou wilt now Truth restore;
So trust we that thou wilt our sovereign queen endure,
And loving lady stand from henceforth evermore.'

In this connection an incident on the morning after the coronation might be mentioned. It was the custom to release some prisoners of state on such occasions. Miss Strickland relates the following incident: "In her great chamber one of the courtiers presented her with a petition, and before the whole court, in a loud voice implored 'that four or five more prisoners might be released.' On inquiry, he declared them to be 'the four evangelists and the apostle St. Paul, who had been long shut up in an unknown tongue, as it were in prison, so that they could not converse with the common people.' Elizabeth answered very gravely, 'It is best first to inquire of them, whether they approve of being released or not?'" Ibid., III., p. 116 with reference to Bacon's Apothegms.

2 The date of the coronation is given as Jan. 20th, by Blunt, II., p. 335. For the correct date cf. Camb. Mod. Hist., II., p. 565; et alii.

3 "The three extant accounts of the coronation are printed and discussed in the English Hist. Rev., xxii., 650-73, xxiii., 87-91, 533-34, xxiv., 322-23, xxv., 125-6. They are conflicting and often obscure, and doubt has been increased by omissions and mistranslations in the Venetian and Spanish Calendars." Pollard, op. cit., p. 199n.

"What happened at the coronation is obscure. The Bishops, it seems, swore fealty in the accustomed manner; the Epistle and Gospel were read in English; it is said that the celebrant was one of the Queen's chaplains and that he did not elevate the Host; it is said that she did not communicate; she was anointed by the Bishop of Carlisle, whose rank would not have entitled him to this office, had not others refused it." Maitland in the Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 565.

"As at the mass on Christmas, Elizabeth withdrew before the elevation of the host took place in order to avoid being present at the outward sign of transubstantiation, which was then regarded in England almost as the symbol of the Roman Church, she also refrained from receiving the Holy Communion, which was given under the ancient rite under one kind." Meyer, p. 19. Ibid., p. 19n: "The proof of both facts, almost amounting to certainty, is given by C.G. Bayne, The Coronation of Qu. Eliz., in the Engl. Hist. Review, XXII, pp. 650-73. Cf. H.A. Wilson, The English Coronation Orders, Journal of Theol. Studies, II. (1901), p. 497."

4 Cf. above note 3.

tain the Old Religion.¹ How she kept this oath will be seen by the action of the Parliament which met eight days later.

1 The following is the coronation oath as given by Pollen, p.24f:
Bishop: "Will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm ... the Laws, Customs and Franchises, granted to the clergy by the glorious King St. Edward, your predecessor?"

Queen. "I will grant and promise to observe them.

B. "Will you keep peace and godly agreement entirely according to your power, both to God, to the Holy Church, to the Clergy, and to the people?"

Q. "I will keep it.

B. "We beseech you grant us your (general) pardon, to preserve unto us and to the Churches committed to our charge all Canonical Privileges and due Law and Justice; to protect and defend us, as every good King in his Kingdom ought to be Protector and Defender of the Bishops and Churches under their Government.

Q. "With a willing and devout heart, I promise and grant you my pardon, and that I will preserve and maintain to you and to the Churches committed to your charge all Canonical Privileges and due Law and Justice, and that I will be your Protector and Defender to my power, by the assistance of God, as every good King in his Kingdom ought in right to protect and defend the Bishops and Churches under their Government.

"This done, the King (or Queen) doth confirm that he will observe the premisses by his Oath, taken immediately upon the altar before all."

Pollen tells us that "The Liber Regalis is reprinted by L.G.W. Legge, English Coronation Records. ... That the Liber Regalis was exactly followed is agreed by all historians." Ibid., p. 25n.

It seems certain that Elizabeth, strictly speaking, perjured herself. Protestant historians are prone to pass this point over quietly, e.g., Meyer, p. 19, discusses the incidents of the coronation but he doesn't say much about the oath.

January 15, 1559 - June 24, 1559.

When Parliament met its session was opened by a solemn mass.¹ There was, as yet, no move to distinguish the English Church from that of Rome. Whatever changes in religion were to be made, were to be made by Parliament. Changes were made. These will be discussed subsequently; here we merely wish to ascertain the movements of the people and their attitude.

The nation was Catholic as were all the nations of Europe before Martin Luther ^{afterward} awoke them with the blows of his hammer on the eve of All Saints' Day, 1517. Henry VIII had brought it about that the English refused to acknowledge the Pope's authority in favor of his own "caesaro-papalism." The country had been invaded with Reformed and Lutheran tendencies and divines during the days of Edward VI. But the accession of Mary had altered this and the nation was once more Catholic. Nor can we believe that they were unwilling Catholics despite the fact that about three hundred Protestants lost their lives for the sake of their religion during the reign of this granddaughter of Isabella the Catholic. Not all of those, by any means, who had become adherents of Protestantism were weeded out by the persecution of their fellow-believers. Rather, in this case too the blood of the martyrs had become the seed of the church. Some of conformed to the Old Religion during the reign of Mary, as did the Princess Elizabeth and William Cecil; others had fled from the country. These now returned, -- they were especially the clergy -- and were eagerly promulgating their religion and begging for the overthrow of the Pope.²

1 Cf. Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 565.

2 Jewel, writing to Peter Martyr (March 20, 1558-9) said: "I found ...

Elizabeth was not to be rushed. During this period both religions were tolerated in England. Mass was still being celebrated and the Reformed preachers could teach what they believed to be the truth.¹

The events in Parliament at this time were alarming to the Catholics. But before any bills had been passed changing the established order of things Elizabeth issued a proclamation which called for the administration of the Easter communion in both kinds.² If we remember that the adherents of the Catholic celebrate, and no doubt at that time also did celebrate,³ the Easter communion as a special communion, and that this communion has a peculiar, inexpressible significance to them, ~~we can in a certain degree grasp~~ the full force of such a proclamation. It is another question how far this proclamation was carried out, and that question we cannot answer.⁴

on my return home, ... the Roman Pontiff was not yet cast out; no part of religion was yet restored; the country was still everywhere desecrated with the Mass; the pomp and insolence of the bishops was unabated. All these things, however, are at length beginning to shake and almost to fall. ..." Birt, p.99 from I Zur., I, p.10, no. 44.

Richard Cox wrote to Wolfgang Weidner, two months later (May 20): "Meanwhile, we ... are thundering forth in our pulpits, and especially before our Queen, Elizabeth, that the Roman Pontiff is truly Antichrist, and that traditions are for the most part blasphemies. At length many of the nobility, and vast number of the people, begin by degrees to return to their senses; but of the clergy none at all...." Birt, p. 101, from I Zur., p.27, No.11.

1 Cf. above, p.12, note 2.

2 Pollard, op. cit., p.203f, with reference to Maitland in the Engl. Hist. Rev., xviii., 527.

That is the only mention of this proclamation which I have found. Maitland in the Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.567, says: "On Easter day the Queen received the Communion in both kinds; the news ran over Europe; ..."

3 This was established at the Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, Can. IX, so we may well suppose that it was a custom that was already firmly rooted

4 From the following pages it will be seen that the mass was not entirely abolished during the first year or more of Elizabeth's reign. The question is therefore justified.

As a whole the people were content during this unsettled period. The early excitement of the accession of Queen Elizabeth had died down; events on the Continent, notably the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis, occupied the minds of the statesmen together with the problem of the religious settlement. Those who had seen the religion of the country change several times during the preceding decade and who had acquiesced in those changes did not seem to dread the coming change.

We will not at this point take up the discussion of the numerical strength of the Catholic party in England at the time of the meeting of Parliament. That question has no bearing on the alteration of the religion.¹

1 "The question of religious majorities in England is premature for the period under consideration. ... Things were still in the making, and the masses were as yet in a state of flux and could be led in any direction." Meyer, p.10.

ATTEMPTS ON THE PART OF THE CLERGY TO RETAIN THE OLD RELIGION

The Convocation of 1559

The Bishops and the higher clergy were the ones who were chiefly concerned about the change of religion which the coming session of Parliament seemed to forebode. While they themselves were a part of this political body, they also maintained a separate organization in purely ecclesiastical matters which met as a synod, called Convocation. When Parliament opened Convocation likewise met.

Their main object was to forestall any change. For this purpose they drew up five articles in which they set up a purely and thoroughly papistical position. Transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the real presence, the supremacy of the Pope, and the authority of the clergy over the laity were affirmed.¹

1 "Reverend Fathers, public report affirms that many doctrines of the Christian religion hitherto believed by Christians, and handed down to us from Apostolic times, are now called to question, more especially such as are contained in the subjoined Articles. Thinking it our duty to provide not only for our own eternal salvation, but for that of those who are committed to our charge and stirred to action by the examples of our forefathers who have lived in like times with ourselves, we deem it right to affirm our faith as contained in the following Articles:—

"I. That in the Sacrament of the Altar, by virtue of the words of Christ, duly spoken by the priest, is present realiter, under the kinds of Bread and Wine, the natural Body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also His natural blood.

"II. That after the consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance, but the substance of God and Man.

"III. That in the Mass is offered the true Body of Christ and His true Blood, a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

"IV. That to Peter the Apostle, and his lawful successors in the Apostolic See, as Christ's vicars, is given the supreme power of feeding and ruling the Church of Christ militant, and confirming their brethren.

"V. That the authority of handling and defining concerning the things belonging to Faith, Sacraments, and Discipline Ecclesiastical hath hitherto ever belonged, and ought to belong, only to the pastors of the Church, who the Holy Ghost for this purpose hath set in the Church, and not to laymen. Blunt, II, pp. 374-5, reprinted from Wilkins' Concil. iv. 179; Strype's Annals, i. 79. Cf. Froude, VII, p. 57 and 57n.

These Articles had no effect on the course of events. They are important merely because they show that the clergy would not be subservient in the religious change about to take place. Furthermore, they provided an opportunity for the Bishops to unite in a solid front against the coming innovations.

The Conference of Westminster Abbey.

During the session of Parliament, where the Bishops strenuously opposed the Bill of Supremacy, an opportunity was given them to defend their position in a public debate against the Protestant divines. It was mainly on account of the opposition they had voiced in Parliament,¹ perhaps also on account of the publication of the five Articles mentioned above,² and the demands of the Protestant clergy that they should be refuted, that the Bishops should be answered,³ that the Government decided to give them an opportunity to air their opinions in public.

1 "The clergy, with remarkable unanimity, had pronounced against all change; and decency required that for a religious reformation there should be some semblance or shadow of spiritual sanction." Froude, VII, p. 74f.

2 "It was in consequence probably of the publication of these five Articles by Convocation that the Queen and her advisers determined to invite some of the leaders of the Ultramontane party to hold a conference in Westminster Abbey with some of the leaders of the opposite side; ..." Blunt, II, p. 376.

3 "On the other hand, the protestant clergy complained loudly that there was no one to answer in parliament the sophistries of their opponents." Pollard, op. cit., p. 205.

Birt, p. 101-2, makes the following statement: "Dr. Cardwell says (History of Conferences, p. 24), that Elizabeth, or her Council, warned by the strong tokens of hostility exhibited in Convocation and Parliament to the projects of reform which were before them, and by 'the great influence of the Romanists in the country at large,' ... resolved upon withdrawing the Bill Uniformity for the present, and adopting some method of turning the stream of public opinion more strongly in favour of the reformers. She decided upon a conference between the most eminent divines of the two rival parties ... being convinced that whatever in other respects might be the issue of it, much advantage would be obtained for the direction of her future measures."

The disputation was so arranged that the Protestant cause could triumph, and was on the whole unfair for the Catholics.¹ It seems to me as if the Government wanted to have the possibility of saying to the people of England: "Although these measures (the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity) were passed without the consent of the clergy of this realm, they have shown by their position at the Westminster Debate that their theological opinions are untenable and that they can be disproved." It might be debated, however, whether the Government first voiced its demand for such a colloquy.²

At any rate the debate was arranged between eight Catholics and eight Protestants.³ The propositions to be debated were: concerning the

1 The propositions for the debate were such as could not be so readily refuted. Only one of them dealt with a doctrine, the sacrifice of the mass, and in no wise answered the objections raised by the clergy.

Then too the Catholics were given the disadvantage of having the "privilege" of opening the debate on every proposition. There was some misunderstanding as to whether the debate was to be read from MS or whether it was to be spoken freely. There seems to have been some confusion as to the language to be used. Cf. Birt, pp.100-106; Pollen, p.32; Pollard, 205.

The unfairness becomes evident in the events of the second day.

2 Maitland says: "Its outcome might make us suspect a trap was laid by the Protestants. But it is by no means certain that the challenge came from their side, and the Spanish ambassador took some credit for arranging the combat." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.568.

The general consensus of opinions among the authorities I have consulted seems to be that the Government wished it. It is certain that the Government arranged it.

I have followed Froude, who certainly cannot be accused of any bias against the Elizabethan Government, in my assertion that the Government acted thus to have an answer for the people. Froude says: "They (the Catholic prelates) did not and would not understand that they were but actors in a play, of which the finale was already arranged, that they were spoiling its symmetry by altering the plan." VII, p.77.

3 The Catholics were: White, Bishop of Winchester; Watson, Bishop of Lincoln; Bayne, Bishop of Litchfield; Scott, Bishop of Chester; Cole, Dean of St. Paul's; Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury; Chedsey, Archdeacon of Middlesex; Langdale, Archdeacon of Lewes. Blunt, II., p.376; Froude, VII, p.75.

The Protestants were: Scory, Jewell, Horne, Aylmer, Guest, Cox, Grindall and Whitefield. Cf. *ibid.*, l.c.

According to some accounts Abbot Feckenham is added to the Catholics and Sandys to the Protestants. Cf. Birt, p. 101n.

use of the vernacular on divine services, the right of changing ceremonies in the church, and the sacrifice of the mass.¹

The first discussion began on March 31, 1559. Unfortunately the first proposition did not occupy the immediate attention of the debaters but the rules of debate, concerning which there was evidently some misunderstanding, either because they were not given clearly -- which seems the more likely -- or because the Catholics wished to create a misunderstanding -- which is unlikely. The Catholics had come without having written out their speeches to be read from manuscript. After some quibbling Dr. Cole, Dean of St. Paul's, spoke. Dr. Horne, later the Bishop of Winchester, read his speech for the Protestant side. "Certainly able, but full of sophistries."² This was all the debating that was done on this day. Arrangements were made for the next debate, to be held three days later. This time the Catholics tried to understand the ^{instructions} instructions, but it seems as if they did not succeed.

1 "I. It is against the Word of God, and the custom of the ancient Church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in common prayers and the administration of the Sacraments.

"II. Every church hath authority to appoint, take away, and change ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same be to edification.

"III. It cannot be proved by the Word of God that there is, in the Mass, offered up a sacrifice propitiatory for the quick and the dead." Blunt, II., p.377. Cf. Froude, VII, p.75; Pollard, op. cit., p. 205; Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 568. Birt, pp. 98-119, passim.

Pollard, l.c., says concerning these propositions: "Confident in the justice and strength of their cause, they had been manoeuvred into the least popular, if not the least tenable of their positions. Even the Emperor Ferdinand had abandoned the first two, to which national feeling in England was also hostile; to the third all the thirty-four sects, of which Bishop Scot had spoken, were opposed; and the bishops were prohibited by the conditions of the debate from carrying war into the enemies' country and sowing dissension among them."

Maitland stresses the same thought: "Their first two theses would bring them into conflict with national feeling; and the third point they would be exposed to the united force of the Lutherans and Helvetians, for the sacrifice, and not the presence, was to be debated." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.568.

We see from this that the propositions in themselves were unfair.

2 Birt, p.107.

There were fresh arguments about the rules of the debate on the third of April. Had the Catholics obtained permission to present the first proposition again? Sir Nicholas Bacon ruled otherwise. Watson and Bayne made remarks which were deemed sufficiently out of order to send them to prison. Abbot Feckenham alone was willing to proceed with the debate. And after many words the conference was broken up; the ^{propo-}propositions were still unsettled. The Catholics had had their chance, but to no avail.¹

1 Cf. Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.569. Pollard, op. cit., p.205. Birt, pp. 98-119. Froude, VII, pp. 75-78. Pollen, p.32.

The chief sources used by these men are: Venetian Calendar, vii., 64-66; Jewel, Zurich Letters, i., 13-16; State Papers, Dom. Eliz., iii, 52 (Birt has "54"); Foxe, Acts and Mon., ed. 1839, viii, p. 692; Spanish Cal., i., 52; Kervyn, i., 497-98; Chron. Belg., No. CCCXXXIII, p.489; Cath. Rec. Soc., i, pp. 28-9. Not all of them use all these references. I have massed them together merely for the sake of reference.

It must be noted yet that there seems to be no impartial account of the proceedings on Monday, April 3. Even the official account must be regarded as colored. Jewel's, Feria's, Il Schifanoja's, reflect the various viewpoints of the writers -- according to the authorities I have used.

THE ABOLITION OF THE OLD RELIGION BY ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

January 25, 1559 - May 8, 1559.

The Personnel of the Parliament

Elizabeth had ordered the existing religious rites to be retained, with a few minor changes, "until consoltation may be had by Parliament, by her Majesty and her three estates of this realm, for the better conciliation and accord in such causes as at this present are moved in matters and ceremonies of religion."¹ The "three estates," it is evident, could with the royal sanction effect an alteration in religion, if they so desired; again, they could retain the Old Religion, if they so desired.² Hence it seems proper to ascertain who these men were and how they were inclined towards a religious change.

The House of Lords contained two of these "three estates," the peers and the clerics. The clerics, we might naturally suppose, would not be in favor of any departure from the Old Religion. Their numbers had been thinned, their power broken, their leaders were not of the eminently aggressive type. Twenty-six churchmen would have been the greatest number of clerics who possibly could have attended Parliament.³

1 Proclamation of Queen Elizabeth, Dec. 27, 1558. Vide ante, p.8f.

2 From what has been said and what will be said concerning the religious sentiment of England at this time, keeping in mind that the Queen's power was almost absolute, this assertion can be taken for its face value. The mere fact that an alteration was effected shows that it could be done. It is, of course, conjectural, whether or not they could have refused to alter the religion. Conjectures, better known as guesses, however, are always dangerous and usually uncertain at best, since it is hard to say "what might have happened."

3 Birt, p.44

Six sees were vacant at the death of Mary,¹ and four more bishops (and Cardinal Pole) died before the opening of Parliament.² Of the fifteen remaining Bishops, five did not take their places.³ Thus we see that there were only ten present. After the 17th of April, 1559, Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, was present. The ten men who were there were: Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York; Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London; John White, Bishop of Winchester; Richard Pate, Bishop of Worcester; Anthony Kitchin or Dinston of Llandaff; Ralph Bayne, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield; James Tuberville, Bishop of Exeter; Cuthbert Scott, Bishop of Chester; Owen Ogelthorpe, Bishop of Carlisle; and Dr. Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster.⁴ After the third of April Ralph Bayne was no longer among those present, since he had been sent to prison for contempt at the Westminster Debate.

Whether from shame or conviction these clerics retained their loyalty to the faith of their fathers. They were a solem phalanx in the opposition of those measures which were to abolish the Old Religion. The Elizabethan religious settlement was established without the vote of a single one of the spiritual peers of the realm. They made their opposition felt; they would not return to the status quo of the Edwardian Reformation, although none of them seem to have in office during his reign.⁵

1 Pollard, op. cit., p. 200

2 Birt, p. 44n, gives a list of those who had died and whose places had not yet been filled.

3 Pollard, l.c.

4 Birt, p. 46

5 I have not investigated this point to any extent, but it seems possible that one or two may have served also in the Edwardian Church.

The peers, however, did not show the same staunchness in the face of what might be called this "religious warfare." There were those among them who were loyal Romanists; there were still others who trimmed their sails to the wind; there were also some who were staunch Protestants; but the greater number of them were Nationalists. The opposition forces were not sufficiently strong to retard the change of religion. Of the sixty some peers, about one-third seem to have been adherents of the Old Religion.¹ The leaders of the Protestant forces, consequently the antagonists of the Old Religion, were; Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal; the Duke of Norfolk; the Earls of Rutland, Huntingdon, Bedford, and Sussex; and Lord Clynton.² It is said that Elizabeth created several new

1 "Of the 63 temporal peers, 20 were as ostensibly as certainly ^{Catholic} Catholic to the core as were the bishops." Birt, p.46.

Froude has a slightly different set of figures. "...the lay peerage of England consisted but of sixty-one persons, of whom it was observed that eighteen were either unable or unwilling to appear at Elizabeth's first Parliament, while twelve who were present at the opening very soon discontinued their attendance. ... But the personal absence of half the peers implied but a cold welcome to the new sovereign." Froude, VII, p.41 (also quoted by Birt, p.48n.). Note the difference between "63" and "61".

The adherents of the Old Religion were: the Marquesses of Winchester and Northampton; the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, Northumberland, ^{Westmore-}land, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Cumberland, and Hertford; Viscount Montague; and the Lords Morley, Dacre of Gilsland, Lumley, Latimer, Vaux of Harrowden, Windsor, Wharton, Rich, and Hastings of Loughborough. Given thus by Birt, p. 46 without any supporting references.

I am inclined to challenge this list, because only nine of these men voted against the Act of Uniformity and only one of them, Montague, ^{against} against the Act of Supremacy. Vide post. E.g., Froude says concerning the Marquis of Winchester: "His principle was loyalty to the family of Henry VIII.; his creed, faith in God and English freedom, and hate of all fanatics, Catholics and Protestants." Froude, VII, p.44. Of him we also read: "The marquis of Winchester acted according to the characteristic description of his own mean policy, by playing the part of the willow rather than the oak, and from one of Elizabeth's persecutors, became at once the ^{sup-}plest of her instruments." Strickland, III., p.108 with reference to Nauton's Fragmenta Regalia. In justice to the Marquis it must be ^{said} said that he voted against the Act of Uniformity.

2 Birt, p.47 with reference to Chron. Belg., No. CCXCV, i, p.413; No. ~~CCCXXII~~ CCCXXII, i, p.475. ^{No.}

peers to bolster the Protestant cause.¹ The known Protestant strength numbered about twenty members.² Of the remaining not much can be said.³ The balance of power in the House of Lords seems to have been held by these.⁴

These same divisions between Catholics, Protestants, unknown, and Nationalists, as far as we can judge, also existed in the House of Commons.⁵ They were, however, more inclined to Protestantism than the peers of the realm.

The composition of their membership presents quite a problem. The first question to be considered is: to what extent did the Government influence the election of the members of this branch of Parliament?[?] The answer to this question, as given by the various authorities, seems to depend on the religious views of the individual who is being asked.

1 It has been interesting to me to note the different figures given by various writers of this period concerning the number of peers Elizabeth I is said to have created, perhaps to strengthen the Protestant forces. Birt, p.47, says "five"; Lingard, VI, p.10, has the same figure; so too Miss Strickland, III, p.116; Pollard, op. cit., p.200, says "three"; Froude, VII, p.41, picks the number between these two, "four". I have not noted what Meyer or Pollen have said concerning this, or if they have said anything. Maitland, Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.567, says: "A few creations and restorations." We can agree with his statement. The point is not very essential.

2 "To this solid phalanx of twelve should be joined nine others of whose Protestantism there can be no reasonable doubt, though they do not stand prominently forth as leaders, at least at the time in question." Birt, p.47. The number depends on what figure we take for the new peers created.

3 "...A residue still remains concerning whom nothing can be affirmed one way or the other at the date indicated. That most, if not all of them, conformed in process of time need not necessarily oblige us to infer that in 1559 all or any of them were other than Catholic." Ibid., l.c.

4 "To sum up the opposing forces: there were 37 solidly Catholic peers" --- he includes the bishops --- "as against 21 as decidedly Protestant." The 7 'trimmers' and 16 who form the 'unknown quantity' --- 23 in all --- complete the entire 81 who then constituted the Upper House." Ibid., p.48.

5 It must be born in mind that Parliament did not have the same political organizations which it later developed. To speak of an organized "opposition" would be anachronism.

We cannot decide this question.¹

¹ Pollard perhaps gives the fairest answer: "The official records of this election, which lasted from December 28 to January 23, are more imperfect than usual; but the returns which exist show that about one-third of the members who had sat in Mary's last Parliament were re-elected, and that the change in personnel was less than it had been in January, 1558. Such documentary evidence as survives to indicate crown interference on previous occasions is entirely lacking for the first of Elizabeth's parliaments; and the vague statements made in later years by theological controversialists and repeated by modern historians, that this house of commons was an assembly of crown nominees, break down in every case in which it has been possible to test them by reference to documentary sources." Pollard, *op. cit.*, p.199, reference to *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xxiii., 455-76, 643-82.

Maitland says: "The Bishops were staunch; the English Church by its constitutional organs refused to reform itself; the Reformation would be an unprecedented state-stroke. Probably the assembled Commons were willing to strike. The influence of the Crown had been used on the Protestant side; but Cecil had hardly gathered the reins in his hands and the government's control over the electoral machinery must have been weak. Our statistics are imperfect, but the number of knights and burgesses who, having served in 1558, were again returned in 1559 was not abnormally small, and with the House of 1558 Mary had been well content. Also we may see at Westminster not a few men who soon afterwards are 'hinderers of true religion' or at best only 'faint professors'; but probably the nation at large was not unwilling that Elizabeth should make her experiment." *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II, 566f.

Birt quotes this statement by Maitland and says, "Our dissent from this writer's conclusion is apparent." Birt, p.55.

Previously Birt had said: "...some fifty only of the members who sat in Mary's Parliament in 1558 found seats in Elizabeth's in 1559." *Ib.*, l.c.

Later Birt says: "In other words, the Parliament was a packed one; and the historian Hume supplies the explanation. 'It appears,' he says, 'that some violence ... was used in these elections; five candidates were nominated by the Court to each borough, and three to each county; and by the sheriff's authority the members were chosen from among the candidates.' Hume's statement is based on a document of the reign of Charles I among Secretary Windebank's papers." *Ibid.*, l.c., with Hume's ed. 1854, iv, p. 7 as reference. He says that this statement in the last sentence of the quotation refers to State Papers collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon, p. 92. Cf. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, III, p.218n, Revised ed.

Birt likewise quotes Froude, whom one would suspect of being a Catholic, if he were to read only this statement. Froude says: "For the Commons, the Catholics were loud in their complaints of the unfairness of the elections; and it may be assumed as certain that a government which had contemplated the removal of every Catholic magistrate in the kingdom, exerted itself to the utmost in securing the return of its friends. It is equally certain -- inasmuch as five years later when two justices of the peace out of three were then reported to be unfavourable to the Reformation -- that when parties approached an equality the Crown was in no condition to use violence. Constitutional opposition however was yet imperfectly understood; and the disaffected on either side looked rather to rebellion when the government was against them than to the tedious process

The next question to be considered is: how "Protestant" was the House of Commons? This does not become evident on the vote of the various ecclesiastical measures. Unfortunately there are no records of their votes, with the exception of one bill. In general, however, we may say that the House of Commons was of a somewhat decidedly anti-Catholic tone.¹

of Parliament. The universal horror of the late reign forced the defenders of its principles into the shade, and the moving party though numerically the weakest were the young, the eager, and the energetic. The Catholics left the field to their adversaries; and town and country chose their representatives among those who were most notorious for their hatred of pope and priesthods." Froude, VII, p.42. He gives as reference a line and a half of Spanish from the MS. Simancas.

Birt says concerning Froude's quotation: "That picturesque writer relies for proof of his last phrase on a passage in a letter from Feria to Philip, in which he refers to: '...the wickedness which is being planned in this Parliament, which consists of persons chosen throughout the country as being the most perverse and heretical.'" Birt, p.53f. He refers to Chron. Belg., No. CCCI, i, p.442, 20th February, 1558-9 as the source of this statement by the Spanish ambassador. Ibid, p.53n.

Lingard says: "...in the lower, a majority had been secured by the expedient of sending to the sheriffs a list of court candidates, out of whom the members were to be chosen;..." Lingard, VI, p.10. He refers to Strype, i. 32. He also says in this same footnote: "The court named five candidates for the shires, three for the boroughs. -- Clarendon Papers, 92." Ibid. VI, p.10n.

It will be noticed that he gives the same reference that Hume does. Birt, who quotes both Hume and Lingard, does not note this fact, at least, he has not stated it.

Meyer says: "The majority in Elizabeth's first House of Commons (about eighty per cent.) was made up of independent members whose election had been quite regular." Meyer, p.22f.

I have here given the statements and testimony of the leading historians and I dare not be so presumptuous as to decide which of them is right. I have, however, given the preference to Pollard's statement, but on no absolute grounds. Anyone reading his facts will see that he has taken great pains to come to some conclusion on the matter. A discussion of the method of election in the XVIth century would be necessary before we could decide absolutely. Furthermore, Lingard's and Hume's authority is from the XVIIth century. Pollard is an authority who cannot easily be gainsaid.

1 Vide post under the discussion of the various bills which passed through the Parliament.

The Act for the Restoration of the Tenth to the Crown

Parliament having met took up the religious problem as the principal business of the House. The Act which bore the official title "An Act for the restitution of the First Fruits and Tenth and rents reserved nomine decimae and of parsonages impropriate to the imperial crown of this realm"¹ was passed by Parliament with comparatively little opposition.² The spiritual peers were the only ones in the House of Lords who voted against the measure.³

The Act provided that certain moneys instead of going to Rome would henceforth go to the imperial crown.⁴ It was the first step in the movement which led the English Church away again from Rome. The ease with which this measure was passed shows us that the English nation was none too eager to contribute to the cause of the See of Rome.

1 1 Eliz. Cap. iv. Reprinted in Prothero, *Select Statutes*, etc. p.22f.

2 "There was little difficulty about a resumption of those tenths and first fruits which Mary had abandoned." *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II, p.567.

3 Birt traces this bill through its various stages in the two houses. In the House of Lords, where it was read for the third time on Feb. 4th, it "was carried by a majority of thirty-eight, the only dissentients to the measure being the Spiritual Lords." Birt, p.60. The House of Commons amended it and returned it to the Upper House. Here it was again voted on, after a third reading, on March 15th, "on which occasion it passed with eight dissentients, according to D'Ewes -- seven bishops and the Abbot of Westminster." The House of Commons passed the bill in its amended form on March 22nd. It received the royal sanction on the eighth of May. Birt, p.60.

3 This Act repealed Statute 2 & 3 P. & M. c.4 and provided "that the said first-fruits and all payments thereof, from and after the said first day of this parliament, shall be revived, ... and be ... united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." Exemptions were granted to the Universities, schools and colleges, and all vicarages below the value of ten pounds sterling. The tenths and pensions of rectories "and other profits and emoluments ecclesiastical and spiritual aforesaid and the reversions and reversions thereof and all rents, emoluments and profits incident to the same, as were in the hands and possessions of the late Queen Mary at and before the Feast of St Michael the Archangel last past be ... in the seisin and possession of our said Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors" Cf. note 1 above.

The Act of Supremacy

Although Parliament was ready to appropriate the money which was to go to the Pope to the imperial crown, they were not so willing to transfer his authority to this same personage. Decidedly more opposition was voiced against "An Act restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same."¹ It was finally passed after many repeated changes.²

The bill originated in the House of Commons on the ninth of February. After several sporadic debates it was referred to a committee of two, Sir Francis Knollys and Sir Anthony Coke ("two ardent champions, be it noted, of the new order").³ What they did to the bill we do not know, but a similar bill was reintroduced and recorded as "nova" on February 21st.⁴ It was read for the third time on the twenty-fifth.⁵ From there it went to the House of Lords. It was read for the first time on Feb. 28th. Two weeks later, on March 13th, it was read for the second time.⁶ After a debate in which Heath spoke against the "supremum caput" it was referred to a committee,⁷ of whom the majority are said to have been of Catholic sympathies.⁸ They provided for

1 1 Eliz. Cap. 1. Reprinted in Prothero, op. cit., pp. 1-13.

2 "The battle rages so fiercely over it, passions were so aroused by it, that it has become impossible to follow the measure through all the stages and changes necessitated by violent and strenuous opposition in both Houses. Nevertheless, the main features of the discussion come out with sufficient clearness for all partical purposes in the Journals of the Houses and in Sir Simon D'Ewes's account of the parliamentary transactions of that period." Birt, p.72. Following him, for the most part, we are trying to trace the bill through its various stages in this manner.

3 Birt, p.73. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p.201.

4 Birt, p.74.

5 Ibid., p.74f. Pollard, p.202.

6 Birt, p.75; cf. Pollard, p.202.

7 Birt, p. 76; Pollard, l.c.

8 Cf. over, p.28 under note 1.

amendments and provisions which mitigated the harshness of the bill as it had been first presented.² The bill was read for the third time on the 18th of March, in a milder form. The two temporal lords who opposed this new version of the bill were the Earl of Shrewsbury and the Viscount of Montague. The ten spiritual peers voted against the measure.³

1 The committee referred to was composed of two Bishops, Tuberville of Exeter, Ogelthorpe of Carlisle; the Marquis of Winchester, the Lords Morley, Rich, North, and Willoughby (to these Birt adds Lord Clyton); the Earls of Rutland, Sussex, Pembroke, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, and the Duke of Norfolk; and the Viscount Montague. Cf. Birt, p.76 and Pollard, op. cit., p.202.

Those said to be of Catholic sympathies were: the two Bishops, the Marquis of Winchester; the Lords Morley, Rich, and North, The Earls of Shrewsbury and Rutland; and the Viscount Montague. Cf. Birt, l.c.

2 "Its proceedings, testifies Bishop Scot, gave great comfort to his party; the penalties for recusants were mitigated; the clauses reviving Edward VI.'s second act of uniformity and Book of Common Prayer and legalising the marriage of priests were deleted; and the assumption of the title 'supreme head' was left at Elizabeth's option." Pollard, p.202. (Corpus Christi Coll., Cambridge MS. in Strype's Annals, I., ii., 399-407, 408-23; Kervyn, i., 470; Spanish Cal., i., 38; Venetian Cal., vii., 52), ibid., p.202n.

Maitland gives a complete view of the whole proceedings: "Seemingly the Queen's ministers carried through the Lower House a bill which went the full Henrican length in its Caesaro-papalism and its severity. Upon pain of a traitor's death, everyone was to swear that Elizabeth was the Supreme Head of the Church of England. In the Upper House, to which the bill came on the 27th of February, the Bishops had to oppose a measure, which would leave the lives of all Romanists at the mercy of the government. Few though they were, the dozen prelates could still do much in a House where there were rarely more than thirty temporal lords, and probably Cecil had asked for more than he wanted. On the 18th of March the project had taken a milder form; forfeiture of office and benefice was to be the punishment of those who would not swear. Against this more lenient measure only two temporal lords protested; but a Catholic says that other 'good Christians' were feigning to be ill." Camb. Mod. Hist., II., p.567

3 Birt, pp.78-79.

"It was carried apparently by thirty-two votes to twelve, and was sent down for the commons to agree to the lords' amendments and additions." Pollard, op. cit., p.203.

Birt gives a somewhat different record of this vote. He says: "...if D'Ewes be correct as to the names of those who alone stood by the past against innovation ... the votes must have been, Content, 52; Non-Content, 20; or a majority of thirty-two against the bishops." Birt, p.80.

Comparing what Maitland (q.v. note 2 above) and Pollard say with what Birt says, we can refuse to accept his testimony.

The bill is back in the House of Commons again. They had already pushed through a bill on March 17th and 18th "that no one should be punished for using the Prayer Book of 1552."¹ The bill which had come to them from the Lords was amended in this manner: "It revived the act of uniformity prohibiting any other service; and probably deprived the queen of any option in the matter of her title."² On March 22nd it had been read for the third time and on that same day it was read three times in the House of Lords.³ The ten prelates voted against the bill.⁴

One would think that after such a procedure the bill would be ready for the royal sanction at the end of the session. The Westminster Abbey Conference took place,⁵ and an Easter recess followed. We can imagine with what joy it was hailed. After this short breathing spell they were ready for hard work again.

Queen Elizabeth did not wish to be the "Supreme Head" of the Church. On April 10th another bill or the same bill modified was again submitted to the House of Commons "and they passed the new bill creating her merely 'supreme governor' in four days (April 10-13) without once dividing the question."⁶

In the House of Lords the bill, after two readings, was again submitted to a committee, consisting of fifteen members of whom eight were of Catholic sympathies. "They modified some of the penalties,

1 Pollard, op. cit., p.203.

2 Ibid., l.c.

3 Ibid., l.c. Birt, p.81.

4 "...the ten spiritual peers repeated their vote against it, but they stood alone." Pollard, l.c. This

5 Vide ante, pp.16-19.

6 Pollard, p.207; cf. ibid., pp.204-6; Birt, pp. 82-84.

introduced some guarantees for the protection of those who might be accused under the act, and met Heath's earlier criticism about the repudiation of the first four general councils, by acknowledging their authority in matters of faith."¹ On April 26th it was read for the third time in the House of Lords, "ten spiritual peers, as in March, together with Montague, voting in the minority."² The commons duly accepted the amendments made in the House of Lords, "but added a new proviso of their own on the 27th; and in this form it finally passed the lords two days later."³

Thus this act, severing England from Rome, was ready for the royal sanction on April 29th, nine days before the close of the session.⁴

The act, in the form in which it was eventually passed, repealed that act which had once more brought England under the jurisdiction of the Pope during the reign of Mary,⁵ revived numerous laws made during the reign of Henry VIII.,⁶ all of them of an ecclesiastical nature, and one

1 The new members of this committee were: the Earls of Worcester, Arundel, Bedford; the Lords, Howard of Effingham and Hastings of Loughborough; and St. John Beltsho. Pollard gives sixteen, adding Thirlby. Here he also gives Clinton, whom he had omitted on the list of those who served in March. Over half of this committee was the same as that which served on the previous occasion. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p. 207; Birt, p. 84.

For the quotation, cf. Pollard, l.c. with reference to Maitland in the Engl. Hist. Rev., xviii., 519-23.

2 Pollard, op. cit., p. 207

3 Pollard, l.c.

4 Cf. Maitland in the Camb. Mod. Hist., II., pp. 568-569. Birt, p. 85f.

5 1 & 2 P. & M. 8. "An Act repealing all statutes, articles and provisions made against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of King Henry the Eighth." 1 Eliz. 1, Section, I. Prothero, op. cit., p. 1f.

6 23 H. VIII. 9. "An Act that no person shall be cited out of the diocese where he or she dwelleth, except in certain cases."

24 H. VIII. 12. "An Act that appeals in such cases as hath been used to be pursued to the See of Rome shall not henceforth be had or used but within this realm."

made during the reign of Edward VI.¹ It abolished all foreign ecclesiastical power in the realm,² and vested the governing rights of the church in the queen.³ She was authorized to appoint commissions to help her in the execution of these duties.⁴ All ministers and

23 H. VIII. 20. "Concerning restraint of payment of annates and first fruits of archbishoprics and bishoprics to the See of Rome."

25 H. VIII. 19. "An Act concerning the submission of the clergy to the King's Majesty."

25 H. VIII. 21. "An Act concerning the exoneration of the King's subjects from exactions and impositions heretofore paid to the See of Rome, and for having licenses and dispensations within this realm without suing further for the same."

26 H. VIII. 14. "An Act for nomination and consecration of suffragans within this realm."

28 H. VIII. 16. "An Act for the release of such as have obtained pretended licenses and dispensations from the See of Rome."

Cf. 1 Eliz. 1. Prothero, op. cit., pp. 1ff.

For these acts which were repealed cf. Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 178-256.

1 1 E. VI. 1. "An Act against such persons as shall unreverently speak against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, commonly called the Sacrament of the Altar, and for receiving thereof under both kinds." Cf. 1 Eliz. 1.

2 "And to the intent that all usurped and foreign power and authority, spiritual and temporal, may for ever be clearly extinguished, and never be used or obeyed within this realm or any your Majesty's dominions or countries; may it please your Highness that it may be further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall at any time after the last day of this session of Parliament, use, enjoy, or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm or within any other of your Majesty's dominions or countries that now be or hereafter shall be, but from henceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm and all your Highness' dominions for ever; any statute, ordinance, custom, constitutions or any other matter or cause whatsoever to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding." 1 Eliz. 1.

3 "and that also it may likewise please your Highness that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, That such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order and correction of the same and all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, shall for ever, by authority of this present Parliament, be united in the imperial crown of this realm." 1 Eliz. 1.

4 "Your Highness ... shall have full power and authority by virtue of

clerics were required to take the following oath:¹

I, A.B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, That the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm and of all her Highness' dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal, and that no foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges and authorities granted or belonging to the imperial crown of this realm: so help me God, and by the contents of this Book.

Various officials of the state were also obliged to take the same oath.² Penalties were provided for such as refused to take this corporal

of this Act, by Letters Patents under the Great Seal of England, to assign, name and authorize ... such person or persons, being natural-born subjects, when and as often as your Highness shall think meet and convenient ... to exercise, use, occupy and execute under your Highness .. all manner of jurisdictions, privileges and pre-eminences, in any wise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within these your realms of England and Ireland or any other your Highness' dominions or countries; and to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such heresies, errors, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities whatsoever, which by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction can or may lawfully be reformed, etc. to the pleasure of Almighty God, ...; ..." 1 Eliz. 1. Sect. VIII

1 "And for the better observation and maintenance of this Act, ... That all and every archbishop, bishop, and all and every other ecclesiastical person or other ecclesiastical officer and minister, of what estate, dignity, pre-eminence or degree soever he or they be or shall be ... shall make, take and receive a corporal oath upon the Evangelist, ..." Ibid., Section IX.

The oath itself is so important that it is reprinted in many of the books treating the religious change of 1559.

2 "... every temporal judge, justicer, mayor and other lay or temporal officer and minister, and every other person having your Highness' fee or wages within this realm or any your Highness' dominions ..."

"... all and every person and persons temporal, suing livery or oustre le maine out of the hands of your Highness, your heirs and successors, before his or their livery or oustre le maine sued forth and allowed, and every temporal person and persons doing any homage to your Highness, ..., or that be received into service with your Highness ... shall, make, take and receive the said corporal oath ..."

Even the graduates of the Universities were required to take this oath: "...all and every other person or persons which shall be promoted or preferred to any degree of learning in any University within this your realm or dominions ..."

oath.¹ Those not required to take the oath were forbidden in any manner to maintain the primacy of the Pope, the ultimate penalty for doing so being death for high treason.²

1 "... any such archbishop, bishop or other ecclesiastical officer or minister or any of the said temporal judges, justiciaries or other lay officer or minister shall peremptorily or obstinately refuse to take and receive the said oath, that then he so refusing shall forfeit and lose during his life all and every ecclesiastical and spiritual promotion, benefice and office, and every temporal and lay promotion and office, which he hath solely at the time of such refusal made; ... and that also all and every such person and persons so refusing to take the said oath shall immediately after such refusal be from thenceforth during his life disables to retain or exercise any office or other promotion which he at the time of such refusal hath jointly or in common with any other person or persons; ..."

2 "And for the more sure observation of this Act, and the utter extinguishment of all foreign and usurped power and authority, may it please your Highness that it may be further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if any person or persons dwelling or inhabiting within this your realm, or in any other your Highness' realms or dominions, of what estate, dignity, or degree soever he or they be after the end of thirty days next after the determination of this session of this present Parliament, shall by writing, printing, teaching, preaching, express words, deed or act, advisedly, maliciously, and directly affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain and defend the authority, pre-eminence, power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, state or potentate whatsoever, heretofore claimed, used or usurped within this realm or any dominion or country being within or under the power, dominion or obeisance of your Highness, or shall advisedly, maliciously and directly put in ure or execute any thing for the extolling, advancement, setting forth, maintenance or defence of any such pretended or usurped jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence or authority or any part thereof, that then every such person and persons so doing and offending, their abettors, aiders, procurers and counsellors, being thereof lawfully convicted and attainted according to the due order and course of the Common Laws of this realm, for his or their first offence shall forfeit and lose unto your Highness, your heirs and successors, all his and their goods and chattels, as well real as personal; and if any such person so convicted or attainted shall not have or be worth of his proper goods and chattels to the value of twenty pounds at the time of such conviction or attainer, that then every such person so convicted and attainted over and besides the forfeiture of all his said goods and chattels shall have and suffer imprisonment by the space of one whole year without bail or mainprise; and that also all and every the benefices, prebends and other ecclesiastical promotions and dignities whatsoever of every spiritual person so offending and being attainted shall immediately after such attainer be utterly void to all intents and purposes as though the incumbent thereof were dead, ...; and if any such offender

† This law was directed solely against the Old Religion. There can be no question that when it speaks of "the authority, pre-eminence, power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, state or potentate whatsoever, heretofore claimed, used or usurped within this realm" that it means the authority of the Pope. Nor can there be any question that it wished to stamp out this authority as much as possible. That this law was not enforced in its full rigor, nor perhaps meant to be so enforced, does not militate against the thought and the wish of the law-makers that "for ever" this authority be no longer recognized within the kingdom.

or offenders after such conviction or attainder do eftsoons commit or do the said offences or any of them in manner and form aforesaid, and be thereof duly convicted and attainted as is aforesaid, that then every such offender and offenders shall for the same second offence incur into the dangers, penalties and forfeitures ordained and provided by the Statute of Provision and Premunire, made in the sixteenth year of the reign of King Richard the Second; and if any such offender or offenders, at any time after the said second conviction and attainder, do the third time commit and do the said offences or any of them in manner and form as is aforesaid, and be thereof duly convicted and attainted as is aforesaid, that then every such offence or offences shall be deemed and adjudged high treason, and and that the offender and offenders therein, being thereof lawfully convicted and attainted according to the laws of this realm, shall suffer pains of death and other penalties, forfeitures and losses, as in cases of high treason by the laws of this realm."

Note: All the quotations from this Act are made as they appear in Prothero, Select Statutes, pp. 1-13. This law is also given in Gee and Hardy, Documents, etc., pp. 442-458.

The Act of Uniformity

During less time but nevertheless with heated opposition and acrimonious debate "An Act for the uniformity of Common Prayer and Divine Service in the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments"¹ was passed by Parliament. Exactly when this bill was first introduced into the House of Commons seems to be conjectural.² It was read three times in the House of Commons in three days, and in a like number of days it passed through the House of Lords.³ Despite the rapidity with which this bill was handled it was less favorably received than the Act of Supremacy. Feckenham and Thirlby, the Bishop of Ely, were among the more vehement opponents of the bill in the House of Lords.⁴ When the measure came to a vote in the Upper House, it was found that the clerics alone were not the only ones who opposed it. Nine lay peers

1 I Eliz. Cap. II. Reprinted in Prothero, *Select Statutes*, pp. 13-20. Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, etc., pp. 458-467.

2 "The embryonic history of this measure is obscure." *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II., p. 569.

Birt assigns a definite date for its beginning: "As early as 16th February, 1558-9, a 'Bill for Common Prayer and administering the Sacraments' passed its first reading in the House of Commons, where it was introduced; but nothing further seems to have come of it -- at least for the time being." Birt, p. 87.

3 "On the 26th the lords took the first reading of the new bill of uniformity, which had passed quickly in three days (April 18-20) through the house of commons, the catholics being too weak to challenge a division at any stage. Its course was equally rapid (April 26-28) in the lords, who dispensed with a committee." Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

Birt: "It may be presumed that the third reading was passed on the 29th, though this is not mentioned." Birt, p. 89.

Maitland, *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II., p. 569, assigns the dates April 18-28 for its passage through both Houses.

4 "Jewel, writing to Peter Martyr, said: 'The cause of the Pope is now agitated with much vehemence on both sides. For the bishops are labouring that they may not seem to have been in error, and this delays and hinders the progress of religion; but it is indeed no easy matter to accelerate its course, as the poet says, with such slow-paced horses. Feckenham, the Abbot of Westminster, in order, I suppose, to exalt the authority of his own profession, in a speech that he made in the House of Lords, placed the Nazarites, the prophets, nay, even Christ Himself in the monastic orders! No one more keenly opposes our cause than the Bishop of Ely (Thirlby), who still retains his seat in Parliament, and his disposition along with it.' (I Zur., p.20, No. 7, 28th April 1559)." Birt, p. 89n.

are said to have voted against the bill. It is also said that the measure was carried by only three votes.¹ And so it was ready for the Queen's sanction, which was given at the close of the session, somewhat more than a week later, on the eighth of May.

This Act restored Edward's Second Book of Common Prayer with modifications. A few alterations in the ritual and the omission of phrases directed against the Pope in the Litany and Rubric were made.²

1 "But to return to Elizabeth's Parliament, we have it on fairly good authority that nine temporal lords, including the Treasurer (the Marquis of Winchester), and nine prelates (two Bishops were in goal) voted against the bill, and that it was carried by three votes. Unfortunately at an exciting moment there is a gap, perhaps a significant gap, in the official record, and we cease to know what lords were present in the house. But about thirty temporal peers had lately been in attendance, and so we may infer that some of them were inclined neither to alter the religion of England nor yet to oppose the Queen." Maitland in the Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 570.

"Eighteen peers, nine spiritual and nine temporal, including Elizabeth's lord high treasurer, her president of the council of the north (Shrewsbury), and her warden of the marches (Wharton), voted against the bill; twenty-one, all temporal, voted in its favour: four spiritual peers, Watson, White, Goldwell, and Abbot Feckenham, who would certainly have turned the scale, were prevented by accident or by design from taking part in the division. By so dubious and slender a majority, it seems, did the Elizabethan settlement escape shipwreck. But the proxies, if exercised, would have increased the majority; and, if they had failed, a conference between the two houses would probably have met the difficulty, as it did in a similar deadlock in 1529." Pollard, p. 208. Cf. Birt, pp. 89-90.

Concerning the complicated voting by proxies we have nothing to say. Cf. Birt, 49-52.

The authority for the majority of three votes seems to be the Spanish ambassador alone. He wrote on the tenth of May: "The saying of the Office in English and the giving up of the Mass passed by three votes only in the Upper Chamber, and with much opposition from the bishops and certain peers." Quoted by Birt, p. 90 from Chron. Belg. No. EOCXLVI, i, p. 519.

2 This act revived 5 & 6 E. VI. 1 which had provided for the uniform order of service, and repealed 1 Mary (2) 2. which had repealed this Act of Edward's Parliament.

Instead of quoting from the Act itself I will give Maitland's excellent summary of these changes: "The changes sanctioned by Parliament were few. An offensive phrase about the Bishop of Rome's 'detestable enormities' was expunged, apparently by the House of Lords. An addition from older sources was made to the words that accompany the delivery of bread and wine to the communicant, whereby a charge of purest Zwinglianism might be obviated. ... A certain 'black rubric' which had never formed part of the statutory book fell away." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 569f.

Penalties were incurred by those using any other order of service.

Those clerics who used any other service were, for the first offence,
deprived of their office; ^{for one year*} for the second offence, imprisonment for
one year was added; for the third offence, imprisonment for life.¹

1 "... and that if any manner of person, vicar or other whatsoever minister, that ought or should sing or say Common Prayer mentioned in the said book or minister the Sacraments from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St John Baptist next coming, refuse to use the said Common Prayers or to minister the Sacraments in such cathedral or parish church or other places as he should use to minister the same, or shall wilfully or obstinately (standing in the same) use any other rite, ceremony, order, form or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, openly or privily, or Matins, Evensong, administration of the Sacraments or other open prayers than is mentioned and set forth in the said book, ... or shall preach, declare or speak any thing in the derogation or depraving of the said book or anything therein contained or of any part thereof, and shall be thereof lawfully convicted according to the laws of this realm by verdict of twelve men or his own confession or by the notorious evidence of the fact, shall lose and forfeit to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, for the first offence, the profit of all his spiritual benefices or promotions coming or arising in one whole year next after his conviction; and also that the person so convicted shall for the same offence suffer imprisonment by the space of six months without bail or mainprise; ... the same person shall for his second offence suffer imprisonment by the space of one whole year and also shall therefore be deprived, ipso facto, of his spiritual promotions, ...; ... the person so offending and convicted the third time shall be deprived, ipso facto, of all his spiritual promotions and also shall suffer imprisonment during his life; and if the person that shall offend and be convicted in the form aforesaid, concerning any of the premises, shall not be beneficed nor have any spiritual promotion, that then the same person so offending and convicted shall for the first offence suffer imprisonment during one whole year next after his said conviction without bail or mainprise; and if any such person not having spiritual promotions after his first conviction, shall afterwards offend in any thing concerning the premises and form aforesaid thereof lawfully convicted, that then the same person shall for his second offence suffer imprisonment during his life." 1 Eliz. c.2.

* This deprivation consisted in losing the profits, their "living," for one year, not the deprivation from the functions of their office. Imprisonment for six months was also added.

The Bearing of these Acts on the Old Religion

In justifying myself for devoting so much space to these dry legislative acts I will quote the words of a constitutional historian:
"These two statutes, commonly denominated the acts of supremacy and uniformity, form the basis of that restrictive code of laws, deemed by some one of the fundamental bulwarks, by others the reproach of our Constitution, which pressed so heavily for more than two centuries upon the adherents of the Romish Church. By the former all beneficed ecclesiastics, and all laymen holding office under the crown, were obliged to swear to the oath of supremacy, renouncing the spiritual as well as temporal jurisdiction of every foreign prince or prelate, on pains of forfeiting their office or benefice; and it was rendered highly penal, and for the third offense treasonable, to maintain such supremacy by writing or advised speaking. The later statute trenched more on natural rights of conscience, prohibiting, under pain of forfeiting goods and chattels for the first offense, of a year's imprisonment for the second, and of imprisonment during life for the third, the use by a minister, whether beneficed or not, of any but the established liturgy; and imposed a fine of one shilling on all who would absent themselves from church on Sundays and holydays.

This act operated as an absolute interdiction of the Catholic rites, however privately celebrated."¹

1 Hallam, The Constitutional History of England, etc., (New York, 1859 from the 5th London ed.), p. 73-4.

These words are quoted in part by not a few of the Catholic ^{historians} who write on this period, E.g., they found their way in part in the Catholic Encyclopedia.

The Old Religion Defined as Heresy by Statute

The definition of heresy by statute properly belongs under the discussion of the Act of Supremacy, but I have elected to make this a special division on account of the viewpoint of our topic.

The words defining heresy were vague enough so that Catholicism would not necessarily come under its scope. It was rather by the exclusion of certain tenets of this religion that it would have to be classed under the "heresies."

The abolition of the primacy of the Pope has already been noted.¹ Only the first four General Councils were acknowledged and the authority of Scriptures alone allowed.² This definition must be classed as moderate and quite tolerant. A State even in the XVth century cannot go into a thoroughly dogmatic presentation. Further discussion of the doctrinal deviations from the Old Religion will follow when we discuss the XXXIX Articles.

1 Vide ante, p.31

2 "Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That such person or persons to whom your Highness, your heirs or successors, shall hereafter by Letters Patents under the Great Seal of England give authority to have or execute any jurisdiction, power or authority spiritual, or to visit, reform, order or correct any errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, or enormities by virtue of this Act, shall not in any wise have authority or power to order, determine or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been determined, ordered or adjudged to be heresy by the authority of Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils or any of them, or by any other General Council wherein the same was declared by express and plain words of said Canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation; anything in this Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding."

Section XX of 1 Eliz. c. 1. Cf. Prothero, p.12

Cf. Blunt, op. cit., II., pp. 378-380.

Minor Ecclesiastical Legislation

Other bills of an ecclesiastical nature besides those mentioned also received the royal sanction on the eighth of May, the close of this session of Parliament. It would be futile to speak of those bills which were lost in committees, disappeared from view, or were incorporated in those already mentioned.¹

Among those passed was a "Bill touching Colleges and Chantries surrendered to Henry VIII,"² which empowered the Queen to make laws regulating the government of these institutions.³ Another bill provided for the vacancies on the bench of the Bishops.⁴ The third of minor ecclesiastical legislative acts was one which completed the abolition of all religious houses.⁵

1 Such were: a bill "to restore spiritual persons that were deprived for marriages or heresies, to be restored to their benefices" (Birt, p.64); another "to make lawful the deprivation of Bishops and Spiritual persons" (ib., 66); still another "for making of ecclesiastical laws by 32 persons" (ib., p.66); also a bill "for leases to be made by Spiritual Persons" (ib., p. 67); and "An Act for the admitting and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops" (ib., p. 67f.).

2 1 Eliz. c. 22

3 Birt, p. 68

4 1 Eliz. c. 19 was to the effect "that the Queen shall collate or appoint bishops in bishoprics being vacant."

It is of interest in this place to note the vote of the House of Commons on this measure. Birt says that this is a "solitary instance" of which we have the recorded vote of this body. The House of Commons consisted of 224 members, of whom there were ninety in the minority against this measure. Birt, p.69f.

Cf. Birt, pp. 68-70 for this measure.

5 1 Eliz. c. 24. "An Act to annex to the Crown certain religious houses and monasteries and to reform certain abuses in chantries." Reprinted in Prothero, Select Statutes, pp. 37-38.

Cf. Birt, pp. 71-72.

The Alteration of the Old Religion in its Liturgy

According to the Act of Uniformity the Edwardian Prayer-Book of 1552 was to be used again in divine services by the twenty-fourth of June, 1559, the Feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, and that commonly used by the Catholic Church was banned by this same Act.¹ The externals of worship, the liturgical part of a church service, interested the people and meant more to the majority of them than the Articles of Religion or the heresies of the Homilies. We have seen, for instance, the course adopted by the Queen on Christmas morning in order to ascertain the feelings of the people in religious matters.² The "men of Cornwall" in 1549 asked for the restoration of candles, ashes, palms, and holy water, and repudiated the new service because it was "but like a Christmas game."³ And since the people were so inclined it is entirely appropriate for us to incorporate a section on the liturgical alterations. While it is manifestly beyond the scope of the paper to discuss these changes in any detail, which we are not prepared to do, we must point out several of the major alterations effected in the liturgy of the Old Religion.

Chief among these was the abolition of the celebration of the mass. The mass which forms the center of the Roman Catholic cultus found no place in the Elizabethan Prayer-Book. "It was the Mass that mattered" became an epigrammatic saying of the adherents of the Old

1 1 Eliz. c. 4. Vide ante, pp. 35-37

2- Vide ante, p.7 et seq.

3 Pollard, Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, p.249f.

Religion and its abolition was their great sorrow.¹ While it may not mean so much to an outsider, we can well understand that such a move should have portrayed to these followers of Rome and inherent fundamental difference between the two religions. With the mass processions were also done away with, as well as veneration of images and of saints.²

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was distributed under two kinds with words which hardly admitted of a Catholic interpretation.³ And as the seven sacraments of the Roman Church were not held to be such, their sacramental character was disallowed, but they were retained as ceremonies in the Anglican Church.⁴

1 "As has been said epigrammatically: 'It is the Mass that matters' --- no substitution can be found for that."

I have found such statements recurring time after time in Catholic writers, who with almost one accord take this as one of the most grievous "sins" of the Elizabethan Government.

2 Cf. The Elizabethan Injunctions. Vide post.

3 After giving the words of institution the communion liturgy continues:

"Then shall the minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and next deliver it to other ministers, if any be there present (that they may help the chief minister,) and after to the people in their hands kneeling. And when he delivereth the bread, he shall say,

"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life: and take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thine heart by faith, with thanksgiving,

"And the minister that delivereth the cup, shall say,

"The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life: and drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, Edited for the Parker Society, by the Rev. William Keatinge Clay. pp. 194-195.

4- 5 Conformation, *ibid.*, pp. 210-216.

Solemnization of Matrimony, *ibid.*, pp. 217-224

Visitation of the Sick, pp. 225-230. The Communion of the Sick, pp. 231-232.

The Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, pp. 274-298.

Penance is nowhere mentioned, although the general confession and absolution is retained. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 191; 55.

The order of the church year was retained together with a number of the Saints' days.¹ The old pericopes were not discarded.² The Matins and Vespers were kept.³ The use of the English language provided a not unwelcome change in the liturgy of the service.⁴

Of peculiar interest are certain prayers, incidental in character, against the head of the Old Religion. One of these dates from the year 1586. It was a thanksgiving for the deliverance of Elizabeth and the realm "from the traitorous and bloody practises of the Pope, and his adherents."⁵ Another prayer was for the preservation of all those realms "which do profess the Gospel."⁶ Almost entirely, however, there are no prayers or anything of that sort which might be thought would be offensive to the followers of the Catholic religion.

1 Ibid., pp. 78-171, collects and pericopes.
The saints' days retained were: St. Andrew's day; St. Thomas the Apostle; the Conversion of St. Paul; the Purification of Mary; St. Matthew's day; the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary; St. Mark's day; St. Philip and James; St. Barnabas, the Apostle; S. John Baptist; St. Peter's day; St. James the Apostle; St. Bartholomew; St. Mathew (sic); St. Michael and all Angels; St. Luke the Evangelist; Simon and Jude, Apostles; and All Saints. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 162-179 for collects, Scripture lessons, etc. of these days.

2 Ibid., pp. 78-171.

3 Ibid., pp. 53-58. They were called Morning and Evening Prayer.

4 "As in Germany, so in England, the reformation had aroused a vehement desire to have the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular. On this point there was no difference between those of the ancient faith and the reformed. ... Along with the desire for an English Bible went the demand for divine service in English. In vain catholics sought to obtain from the authorities of their church permission to use the vernacular, if not in the whole, at least for parts, of the service -- what the Roman church denied the anglican granted." Meyer, pp. 70-72, *passim*. Reference to Strype, *Annals of the Reform*. II., ii., (Oxford, 1842) p. 348.

5 Liturgical Services, etc., pp. 595-603. One sentence in the special prayer is: "... by her (being therein established) to deliver this thy people that were as captives to Babylon, out of the thralldom of the enemies of thy true Church, to restore us again to the free fruition of the Gospel of thy Son our Saviour Christ." (p. 597)

The next year another thanksgiving service was held to the same effect. Ibid., ~~pp. 604-607~~ pp. 604-607.

6 This prayer dates from the year 1585. Ibid., p. 580f. It mentions the Pope only by implication.

It will be noticed that for the most part in liturgical matters the English Government, in a manner somewhat similar to that of Luther, tried not alienate its people by introducing customs and usages ^{contrary} to those to which they were accustomed. The onslaughts of the Puritans, later, shows that there was an element in England which did not agree with the conservative line of policy which the Elizabethan authorities followed.

They differed from Luther (among other things) in this that the substitutions of tables for altars was generally introduced.¹ We can well imagine that this gave offence to some of the Catholics.

A word remains to be said about the vestments of the clerics. The full regalia of the Catholic clergy was set aside in favor of that used in the second year of Edward VI.² Those vestments that remained were for the most part identical with those used in ancient time.

1 Procter, History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 61.

2 Blunt, op. cit., II., p. 349. Cf. Procter, op. cit., p. 58.

THE EXECUTION OF THE ACTS ABOLISHING THE OLD RELIGION

The Deprivation of the Marian Bishops

The Bishops, being the leaders of the hierarchy, were the first to be affected by the enactment of the Acts previously passed in Parliament.¹ The Queen had issued a separate commission to eighteen peers, all laymen, to tender the oath of the administration to the clergy and to deprive those who refused to take this oath.² Bonner, Bishop of London, sometimes called "Bloody Bonner," was the first man called ^{before} this commission.³ He refused to subscribe to the demands of the commissioners, refused to take the oath of Supremacy, and according he was deprived from his bishopric of London.⁴

The Abbot of Westminster monastery, Feckenham, was the next man who was required to take this oath and who likewise refused. About the same time Henry Cole, the Dean of St. Paul's Church in London, was recipient of the same treatment.⁵

1 1 Eliz. c. 1 and 1 Eliz. c. 4. Vide ante, pp. 27-37

2 "On 23rd May the Queen issued a commission to eighteen lay peers, noblemen and knights, conferring plenary power upon them to administer the oath of Supremacy to all bishops and ecclesiastical persons, and all lay persons holding offices, under pain, on refusing to take it, of deprivation of office." Birt, p.208 with reference to Rymer, ^{foedera}, xv, p. 518.

3 "Lately they tried to induce the bishops to take the oath of ^{Supremacy} Supremacy. Finally, meeting with no success, they have begun to put the Act in force. The first whom they summoned was the Bishop of London, in order to give an example to the rest of the kingdom. Asking if he was willing to take the oath, he replied that he abided by his decision (que tenia), and departed laughing at them, and took refuge in the monastery of Westminster, which is a sanctuary, because, besides having deprived him, they endeavoured to ^{commit} commit him to prison on the score of certain pecuniary fines in which they had mulcted him, at the same time despoiling him of his house and all he ^{possessed} possessed." Aquila to Philip, June 6, 1559, Chron. Belg., No. CCCLIV, i, p. 536 as quoted by Birt, p. 212.

4 Cf. note 3 above.

5 Aquila continues the letter (quoted in note 3): "The next day they summoned the Abbot of Westminster, and the next the Dean of St. Paul's, with whom they held lengthy conferences, using severe threats, and in the end deprived them." Birt, p.212.

THE EXECUTION OF THE ACTS ABOLISHING THE OLD RELIGION

The Deprivation of the Marian Bishops

The Bishops, being the leaders of the hierarchy, were the first to be affected by the enactment of the Acts previously passed in Parliament.¹ The Queen had issued a separate commission to eighteen peers, all laymen, to tender the oath of the administration to the clergy and to deprive those who refused to take this oath.² Bonner, Bishop of London, sometimes called "Bloody Bonner," was the first man called ^{before} this commission.³ He refused to subscribe to the demands of the commissioners, refused to take the oath of Supremacy, and according he was deprived from his bishopric of London.⁴

The Abbot of Westminster monastery, Feckenham, was the next man who was required to take this oath and who likewise refused. About the same time Henry Cole, the Dean of St. Paul's Church in London, was recipient of the same treatment.⁵

1 1 Eliz. c. 1 and 1 Eliz. c. 4. Vide ante, pp. 27-37

2 "On 23rd May the Queen issued a commission to eighteen lay peers, noblemen and knights, conferring plenary power upon them to administer the oath of Supremacy to all bishops and ecclesiastical persons, and all lay persons holding offices, under pain, on refusing to take it, of deprivation of office." Birt, p.208 with reference to Rymer, ^{Feckena} Foedera, xv, p. 518.

3 "Lately they tried to induce the bishops to take the oath of ^{Supremacy} Supremacy. Finally, meeting with no success, they have begun to put the Act in force. The first whom they summoned was the Bishop of London, in order to give ^{an} an example to the rest of the kingdom. Asking if he was willing to take ^{the} the oath, he replied that he abided by his decision (que tenia), and departed laughing at them, and took refuge in the monastery of Westminster, which is a sanctuary, because, besides having deprived him, they endeavoured to ^{com-} commit him to prison on the score of certain pecuniary fines in which they had mulcted him, at the same time despoiling him of his house and all he ^{possession} possessed." Aquila to Philip, June 6, 1559, Chron. Belg., No. CCCLIV, i, p. 535 as quoted by Birt, p. 212.

4 Cf. note 3 above.

5 Aquila continues the letter (quoted in note 3): "The next day they ^{sum-} summoned the Abbot of Westminster, and the next the Dean of St. Paul's, with whom they held lengthy conferences, using severe threats, and in the end deprived them." Birt, p.212.

Towards the end of June, the Bishops of Carlisle, Chester, Lichfield, Lincoln, and Worcester were deprived. All had refused to take the oath of Supremacy -- "they could not afford to be less constant than the humble folks that had perished at the stake in Mary's reign, or admit that that blood had been spilled without a cause"¹ -- and thus they preserved their self-respect.² The other Bishops, with the exception of Kitchin of Llandaff, were deprived during the summer.³

Their successors were chosen from among the stauncher Protestants. These, however, have no interest for us at the present time.⁴

1 Pollard, Hist. of Eng., p.215.

2 "... on the 26th of June, at Westminster, no less than seven Bishops, those of Carlisle, Chester, Chichester, Lichfield, Lincoln, Llandaff, and Worcester, were deprived together." Pollen, p. 36.

We may note several discrepancies in this quotation. The date may be questioned (although it is probably right). It is given by Machyn, according to Birt, p.215, as the 21st; by Quadra, according to the same authority, l.c., as the 26th. Machyn it seems is more erroneous than the Bishop, so Birt accepts the 26th. "Machyn's record... is so faulty, that Quadra's must perforce be preferred." Birt, p.215.

Pollen says that the Bishop of Chichester was deprived at this time. But he was dead, having died in Dec. 1558 and no successor had been appointed as yet in June. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p.200 and Birt, p. 40n. for the mention of Chichester's death.

Pollen gives the Bishop of Llandaff as having been deprived. This is almost certainly a mistake. Pollard, op. cit., p. 215 says: "... none was found to submit except Kitchin of Llandaff who himself had burned no heretics." Birt says, p. 219f.: "He (Kitchin) was the only one of the Marian bishops who proved untrue to his trust." The same fact is told us by Lingard, VI, 16; Froude, VII, p. 93; Stebbings, The Church in Engl., p. 400; Gasquet, A Short Hist. of the Cath. Church in Engl., p. 110. Pollen is the only one whom I have found who asserts that he was deprived.

3 Cf. Camb. Mod. Hist., II., p. 571.

Concerning the Bishop of Llandaff Maitland says: "It is not certain that the one weak brother, Kitchin of Llandaff, actually swore the oath, though he promised to exact it from others."

4 This question has no bearing on our subject. Cf. Blunt, II., pp. 385-390 for the settlement of the episcopate.

The troubles which Elizabeth had in finding Bishops to consecrate the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Parker; the Nag's Head fable; and kindred material would lead us too far afield.

The Treatment of the Deprived Bishops.

Five of the deprived bishops died a natural death before the end of the year, 1559.¹ Three of them escaped and found a habita^t on the Continent.² The remaining were kept in confinement in England, of more or less severity.³ Archbishop Heath, for example, was virtually at liberty^{liberty} during the remainder of his life.⁴ None of the Bishops were to suffer the^{the} fate that Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley or John Rogers suffered under Mary.⁵

1 Cf. Birt, p. 223. They were: Bayne of Coventry and Lichfield; ^{Morgan} Morgan of St. David's; Ogilthorpe of Carlisle; White of Winchester; and ~~Tunstall~~ ^{Tunstall} of Durham.

2 Cuthbert Scott of Chester, Pate of Worcester, and Goldwell of St. Asaph. Cf. Gasquet, Short History, etc., p. 110.

3 Gasquet, op. cit., l.c., says that the rest were placed "in, what Camden euphemistically calls, 'free custody.'"

Meyer says: "Each case was decided on its own merits." Cf. Meyer, pp. 26ff. Bonner perhaps was treated most harshly. The rest were ^{and} fined, after being imprisoned for a while, and released "when it was no longer feared that they would prove troublesome."

4 Meyer, l.c., relates that Heath was treated mildly, that he was "not treated like a political offender, but rather like a deserving state official forced into retirement." Elizabeth visited him occasionally.

5 Meyer, l.c., says of Bonner, "The authorities were careful that he died without the crown of martyrdom..."

Froude, VII, p. 91: "Even the murderous Bonner had no worse fate to ^{fear} fear than some 'room befitting his condition' in the Tower or the Marshalsea, ^{with} with the garden walls the limit of his exercise -- such a fate merely as for 1200 years the religious orders throughout Christendom had voluntarily chosen for themselves, in retiring from the world with which intercourse ^{perilled} imperilled their souls."

Stebbing, op. cit., p. 401: "It is true that none of these bishops had to confess their Faith on the scaffold like Bishop John Fisher, but the Elizabethan government could claim little credit for leniency, since the harsh treatment meted out to these learned and venerable men was harsh enough to win for them the title of Confessors, if not Martyrs, for their religion."

Birt, p. 120: "They paid the penalty for their consistency by ^{undergoing} undergoing imprisonment of varying degrees of severity; but, whether the restraint put upon their movements and their freedom was suffered in prison or in a bishop's house, it was equally a restriction ^{endured} endured for conscience's sake."

Aikin, I., p. 281: "Elizabeth, unlike the genuine bigotry of her sister contented herself with a kind of negative intolerance; and as long as the degraded bishops abstained from all manifestations, by words or deeds, of hostility against her government and ecclesiastical establishment, and all celebrations of the peculiar rights of their religion, they were ^{free} free from molestation; and never to them, as to their unfortunate protestant predecessors, were articles of religion offered for signature under the fearful alteration of compliance or martyrdom."

I have given these quotations in order to show how the various viewpoints differ.

The Minor Clergy and the Acts of Parliament

We accept as the number of minor clergy, that is, priests, in England during the year 1559 about eight thousand.¹ These we will consider in relation to their various dioceses,^s since no sweeping generalization should be made.

We pass over those in religious houses, for as we will see in the following section, these refused to accept the Oath of Supremacy, were deprived of their monasteries, and in most instances were forced to leave^{leave} the country.

The Northern Visitation.

Using the information we have with care the following facts are the more important.² The diocese of York, the seat of the Archbishop, was one of the first visited by the royal commissioners (a separate commission for this province). Of those in the York Cathedral it appears that less than half conformed, while many of the diocese did not swear to the oath, although they were not deprived.³ The See of

¹ Meyer, p.29, has this number. He prefers Birt's calculation in this instance. The number usually given is 9400. Birt, p.124, says: "Nine thousand four hundred is certainly a maximum limit to assign for the number of parishes in England and Wales at Queen Elizabeth's accession, but it is altogether too high for the total of the clergy actually serving them, for the evidence goes to show that many of the clergy were, owing to the paucity of their numbers, pluralists." ... "Hence it may be assumed with a certain degree of safety and confidence that 7,500 would more probably represent the actual number of clergy holding livings in 1559." *Ib.*, p.162.

² In this and the following I am using Birt. He, as will be shown later, may not be altogether trustworthy. None of the other historians have treated this part in any detail, merely giving the composite results of the visitations.

³ "The general result of the visitation of York Cathedral in its members^{members} was that nine prebendaries conformed, either straightway or after a short^{short} deliberation, while ten suffered sequestration or were shortly after deprived. The remainder of the visitation of the diocese of York is not of prime importance for this investigation; but it may be mentioned that only a few clergy put in an appearance, although duly summoned. Of those few, some^{only a few} may have submitted, though there is no evidence that such was the case;.. Birt, p. 152f. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 151-3.

Durham was next visited, where not a few refused to conform.¹ In the Cathedral Chapter a staunch loyalty to the Old Religion prevailed.² The Carlisle diocese on the surface presents an entirely opposite picture; here the visitors encountered but little resistance.³ The clergy of the diocese of Chester were almost as subservient.⁴ But we are not so sure that this lack of opposition came from compliance or whether it merely appears as if there was no opposition, because the visitation was rather hasty and not very thorough.⁵

1 "The commissioners then proceeded to this most northern of the ^{English} Sees, where they were destined to encounter stubborn opposition." Birt, p. 153.

2 "...The visitation of the Cathedral Chapter itself: the result affords evidence of the uncompromising attitude of that body as a whole." ^{affords} ^{ib.} p. 155. "Of ten prebendaries who were dealt with, two, ..., conformed. ... ^{the} remainder, ..., all suffered immediate sequestration, which ended in due time in deprivation of most of them." Ibid., p. 156.

Cf. Birt., pp. 153-156.

3 "They met with no opposition; ..." Birt, p. 156. He mentions only one name in exception to this procedure. Cf., ib., p. 156f.

4 In Chester it was necessary to delegate their powers to others. ^{these} "These surrogates, ..., held a session at Tarvyn ..., going thence to Chester Cathedral ..., where 'all' the clergy willingly subscribed. Of course this statement applies only to those who were present; for by known facts it cannot be doubted that, as the diocese shows a considerable number of recalcitrants, a certain number must evidently have abstained from presenting themselves to the Visitors." Birt, pp. 157-158.

5 "From the Valor Ecclesiasticus it may be gathered that about this period the diocese of York contained 600 livings." Birt, p. 163 with reference to Harl. Ms. 594, no. 9, f. 85; No. 10, f. 89; no. 16, f. 188 continues: "From returns made early in Elizabeth's reign, it appears that Carlisle diocese contained 111 parsonages and chapels-at-ease, that ^{show a} Chester held 383, and Durham 213. In all, therefore, the Northern Province ^{shows a} total of some 1,300 livings. ... The detailed proceedings of the visitation (as recorded in P.R.O. Dom. Eliz. vol. x) show only 90 priests as ^{formally} summoned, of whom 21 appeared and took the oaths required of them, 36 ^{upon} appeared and refused to take them, while 33 absented themselves, 16 of whom were, however, represented by proxies, and 17 were wholly unrepresented. Thus it may be inferred that of these 90, 37 only conformed, while 53 desired to maintain the Papal Supremacy. The register, however, in a less detailed fashion, gives an abstract of the number of beneficed and unbene-^{less} ficed clergy who refused to attend the visitation, although duly preconised. These abstracts furnish a total of 314, thus distributed: York, 158; Chester 85; Durham, 36; Carlisle, 35. Unfortunately the register does not offer an information as to the number who attended and refused to accept the oaths; nevertheless, it proves one point conclusively, namely, that in the Northern

The Southern Visitation

For the Southern Visitation we have no such record of the ^{detailed} doings of the commissioners (another separate body) as is given us for the Northern Visitation. The information we look for is given us by ^{must be drawn from} isolated details.¹ London was Protestant, there is no doubt about that. Half of the clergy, at least, were ready to fall in line with the ^{religion} adopted by the Government.² Elsewhere the clergy seem not to have been so ready to acquiesce.³ The diocese of Winchester appears to have been more ^{not} contumacious than some of the rest.⁴ But to speak with exact information ^{-ation} about this visitation is impossible.⁵

Province 360 priests for absolute certainty, probably double that ^{number} ^{found} ¹⁵⁵⁹ either refused to take the oaths or would have refused had it been possible or politic to bring pressure to bear on them." Cf. also ^{ib.}, 187.

I give this quotation for what it is worth. Despite the positive and authoritative way in which he speaks it is necessary to question these figures. Vide post, p. 51f.

1 Cf. Birt, p. 166-7

2 "As there were about wight hundred clergy at that time in the ^{London dio-} ^{to place} London diocese, and only four hundred signed their subscription to the Acts, it is plain that the remainder, whatever they may have done later, at that period at least either refused outright to conform, or like so many of the northern clergy, simply put in no appearance. It is well to place on record here, ^{that} at least twelve of those who signed at the period of visitation, were at a subsequent date deprived, showing that when they had leisure to think ^{out} for themselves what their subscription really meant, they repented of their hasty compliance, and would have nothing to do with the new-fangled religion, when once all that it implied was fully brought home to them. On the other hand, it may not be doubted that of the four hundred who abstained from signing in August, 1559, many must have finally acquiesced, either tacitly ^{and} or explicitly." Birt, p. 174.

3 "Outside London, opposition to the Act of Uniformity was stronger and more open." Ibid., l.c.

4 The Spanish ambassador wrote on July 1st: "In the bishopric of Winchester, I know for certain they have not accepted it (the new prayer-book), nor will they take the oath, and at the present moment all is confusion there, and that here they have not dared to press them." Quoted from Birt, p. 175 from Chron. Belg., No. CCCLXII, i, p. 548.

5 "What happened 'outside London' it is impossible to record with ^{pre-} ^{vis-} ^{any} precision, owing to the fact that the official report of the Southern visitation was either never drawn up, or if drawn up, has been lost -- at any rate it is not at present known to be in existence, nor is any direct reference to it to be met with." Birt, p. 177

The Total Extent of the Conformity of the Clergy

Despite the idea we have been given of hostility among the clergy almost everywhere to the change in religion, we must modify our picture. What we have noted ~~was~~ not always the rule. The bad are noticed before the good come into prominence. In this case also, those who refused to conform are more prominent, like the proverbial sore thumb, than those who bowed to the wishes of the government, even if they stifled the voice of their conscience. Of the total number of eight thousand clergymen in England, we can say with enough authority to support us, that at least more than ninety percent. of them (if not at least ninety-five percent.) were not deprived of their office. This means, that there were at the very most eight hundred clergymen who refused to take the Oath of Supremacy and were punished for refusing to do so. This is stating it very conservatively. The majority of authorities give a ~~lower~~ ^{higher} percentage for those who were not deprived for refusing to swear the oath; many as low as three per cent. Whether twenty-five per cent. of them refused to conform or ~~whether~~ only about three or four per cent. refused we have no way of deciding.¹

1 "I have the names of over 700 holders of benefices who underwent deprivation before the end of 1565." Birt, p. 197.

He also notes "1,175 who abandoned their livings for conscience' sake -- 1,1875 in all ..." Ibid., p. 203.

After quoting the first sentence given in this note Meyer ^{continues} continues: "I am unable to control this number; the conjectures upon which Dom Norbert Birt relies (pp. 200-03, in order still further to increase the percentage of those who were deprived, are in many cases open to criticism and have not brought conviction to me. A.F. Pollard, Hist. of Engl., 1547-1603 (London, 1910), in Hunt-Poole's Political Hist. of Engl., VI., p. 217, and J.P. Whitney, The Elizabethan Reformation, in the Quarterly Review, No. 430, also decline to accept Dom Birt's calculations." Meyer, ^{note} p. 29, note ¹ The quotation he refers to in Pollard (p.217) reads as follows: "Camden puts the total number of recusant clergy at 177; this errs perhaps nearly as far on one side as a modern estimate of 2,000 does on the other." He gives as reference to the "modern estimate of 200" Birt, p. 203.

The Reasons for the Conformity of the Clergy

The spectacle of (let us say) even seventy-five percent. of the clergy conforming to a religion which was not compatible to the old religion to which they had heretofore adhered calls for explanation. It is not enough to say that they were forced to do so by law. They had seen enough people of the laity -- during their own lifetime -- who had refused to conform to the religion prescribed by the law of the land. But the legal requirement was a salve for their consciences.¹ No doubt, there were those who conformed because they were convinced that the new religion was the true religion.² We may perhaps doubt that there were very many such, but no one will deny that the conjecture is plausible. Others perhaps conformed because the vows of

Maitland says: "A large number of deans and canons followed the example set by the Bishops. Of their inferiors hardly more than two hundred, so it seems, were deprived for refusing the oath." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 572.

Father Pollen (S.J.) says: "Father Birt, p. 203, following Simpson, thinks (and apparently with good reason) that the clergy who sooner or later refused to conform amounted to some 2000, that is, about a quarter of the whole." Pollen, p. 41n.

I am not quoting other Protestant or Catholic historians than I have quoted for most of them have made no efforts to arrive at any independent conclusions. Nor can I.

Birt has an ax to grind with Gee and Mandell Creighton. Meyer is a Protestant historian whose work has been indorsed with an "Imprimatur" and a "Nihil Obstat." The Cambridge Modern History is a work of undoubted authority. Pollen is unquestionably thoroughly acquainted with the history of Catholicism in England during the reign of Elizabeth. Birt's work shows painstaking and thorough research.

Perhaps the difficulty arises in how the different men define the terms designating the various classes of clergy.

1 "The crown takes away all defects" may have served the clergy as well as it did the laity. Cf. Strickland, III., p. 108 where it is applied to the laity. The growing spirit of nationalism which was centered in the crown could not have left the clergy untouched.

2 I have not found this reason attested by an historian, at least not as far as I can recollect. Considering the fact that Protestantism was agitating England for a decade and more, I find no reason why my deduction cannot stand.

celibacy would no longer bind them, but these were in all probability but a very small minority.¹ Others conformed, as they thought, only temporarily; they expected another change in a few short years.² The "Vicar of Bray" conformed because he lacked moral fibre.³ Many conformed because they were ignorant of what conformity meant;⁴ and as

1 The number of married clergy during the early years of Elizabeth's reign, to my knowledge, is nowhere stated. The Edwardian clergy had been permitted to marry. Although Elizabeth herself did not favor the marriage of clergymen, Archbishop Parker had a wife. It would be an interesting study to ascertain how many of the Marian clergy took unto themselves wives after the restriction of celibacy had been lifted.

2 "Many of these parish clergy, who thus subscribed, were known to their Elizabethan bishops as being merely outward conformists; and, as episcopal Injunctions record, were quietly 'waiting for a day', expecting the next turn in the wheel of fortune, when Catholicism would again be uppermost. How they came to reconcile such an attitude with their conscience it is not for us to enquire. It is enough for present purposes merely to record the fact." Birt, p.139.

3 Concerning the "Vicar of Bray" Pollen remarks (p.2n): "As the changes of side made by the Vicar of Bray are stated in a well-known song to have been occasioned by the political revolutions of the late seventeenth century, it may be worth recalling that the original vicar is said by Fuller (Worthies, p.18), to have held the livings of St. Michael's, Bray, Berkshire, during the religious revolutions of Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. Want of documents prevents our testing this in all particulars; but it cannot be exactly correct, for one vicar Simon Symonds (possibly the person intended), is known to have died in 1551. But Thomas John, Vicar of Blisland, Cornwall, instituted in 1529, continued there for fifty-two years. There are similar cases at Brighton, Pontefract, etc. The popular song, however, has also some foundation in fact. See Notes and Queries, Indexes to series v. and vi."

"The much-sung 'Vicar of Bray' stands for a type; his is not an isolated case." Birt, p.167.

"They .. bowed before the storm, smothering their convictions, if they had any left...." Ib., l.c.

4 "The acrimonious disputes of Calvinists and Zwinglians about Transubstantiation, or the mode of Christ's presence in the Sacrifice of the Mass, or of the Last Supper, were above the comprehension of ordinary men; they might argue that it would be time enough to consider such abstruse questions when the various Schools of innovators had settled amongst themselves some platform of mutual agreement. Both discipline, and doctrine, were therefore, to some extent at least, in a state of fluxion; and men might be pardoned if, in the perplexity engendered by such constant theological wrangling, they held their judgment in suspense, or leaned this way or that, as here or there they seemed to perceive some respite from the war of controversy, some breathing-space from the buffets of doubt and debate, nay, even of coercion." Ibid., p.138-9.

Cf. also, p.54, n2.

for disallowing the authority of the Pope, they were satisfied to do that.¹ Perhaps some had no opportunity to learn the difference between the two religions.² Then too there were such as saw their "Amtsbrueder" taking the oath, and the force of example caused them to reason, "If he can do it, so can I." Crowd psychology to a certain degree.³ What more can we say? The final reasons and motives for such acts are known only to Him who searches the hearts of men. We may censure them; we may condone them; we may weep for them. But judge them, we dare not.⁴ We cannot plead in extenuation, if we wished, that they had no leaders, for in such matters every man is responsible for himself. Besides that, their leaders, the Bishops, had given them an example of loyalty to the Old Religion. We do not wish to taunt them or deride them in any way for the course they followed, but the fact of their apostacy, if we may call it that, seems so contrary to our ideal of those who themselves should be leaders of men conscious of the principles for which they stood, that this digression need not ask for pardon.

1 The reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI gives enough evidence of this fact. I am not convinced that the Pope had very many friends in England even among the clergy.

2 "Many of the clergy, too, who were buried in their country cures, and had little converse with the outer world (and this applies still more to their parishioners), were unlikely to be well acquainted with the latest phases of the many controversies which were then disturbing men's minds in the busier haunts of cities; hence they could rarely have had the chance of understanding the true purport of the oaths they were suddenly called upon to take, and may thus have set their names to any form of subscription presented to them with no very accurate perception of the gravity or consequences of their act." Birt, p.139.

3 This is another conjecture on my part, but I think that the events justify the supposition.

4 "There is little consolation to be found in the short, sad story of the fall of the clergy and laity. Protestants, no less than Catholics, must feel ashamed of their immediate surrender." ("Saddest of all, the great mass of the clergy had allowed themselves to be impressed into the enemy's army." Pollen, p.39.

"In the first place, some allowance must be made for human nature. Few of us are moulded of the stuff from which martyrs are made. Less robust natures seek comfort in a middle term and salve their consciences with compromise." Birt, p.138.

The Commission of 1559.

In order that the Act of Uniformity and the Act of Supremacy might not remain dead letters on the statute books of England, like some of the laws passed by the Congress of the United States, or be confined in their execution merely to the two commissions appointed for the Northern Visitation and the Southern Visitation, a commission was appointed by the Queen on July 19, 1559, as she was authorized by statute, to enforce these laws. The commissioners, nineteen in number, of whom any six constituted a quorum, could summons juries and witnesses in all parts of England to try those who had offended against these statutes.¹ Those who were absent from divine services, and this meant especially the Catholics who for conscience's sake absented themselves from the heretical worship, also came under their jurisdiction;² and so too the extirpation of heresy was within their cognisance.³ Thus this permanent commission was to exercise the power which had been vested in the Queen. We, however, know nothing of the workings of this commission.

1 Printed in Prothero, pp. 227-232.

"...from time to time hereafter, during our pleasure, to enquire, as well by the oaths of twelve good and lawful men, as also by witnesses and all other ways and means ye can devise for all offences, misdōers (sic) and misdemeanours done and committed hereafter and hereafter to be committed or done contrary to the tenor and effect of the said several acts and statutes and either of them and also of all and singular heretical opinions, seditious books, contempts, conspiracies, false rumours, tales, seditious, misbehaviours, slanderous words or shewings, published, invented or set forth by any person or persons against us or contrary or against any the laws or statutes of this our realm, or against the goverance and rule of our people."

2 "...and also to enquire of, search out and to order, correct and reform all such persons as hereafter shall or will obstinately absent themselves from church and such divine service as by the laws and statutes of this realm is appointed to be had and used."

3 "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend in all places within our realm of England all such errors, heresies, crimes, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities spiritual and ecclesiastical where-soever(sic) which by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power, ... can be reformed, etc. ..."

The Elizabethan Injunctions of 1559

To make the work of the commission easier the "Supreme Governor" of the Church in accord with the authority invested in her by Parliament issued various Injunctions, fifty-three in number and an appendix. They may be summed up as follows:¹

"They enjoined on all ecclesiastical persons to accept the royal Supremacy and to preach against all usurped and foreign power, also against images, relics, miracles and such like superstitions; upholders of papal Supremacy were to be denounced; regulations were laid down about Bible reading, proper licensing of preachers, keeping of registers, support of the poor, and of students at the Universities, the upkeep of chancels and clergy-houses, the payment of tithes, the parochial duties of incumbents, the substitutions of Litanies for processions (except 'beating the bounds'); the treatment of notorious sinners; the removal of shrines and suchlike 'monuments of feigned miracles, idolatry, and superstition'; the imposition of humiliating rules to be observed by clergy proposing to marry; methods of teaching and catechising, and so forth."

1 Quotation from Birt, p.142.

These Injunctions are given in part by Prothero, pp. 184-189. Those dealing especially with Catholicism are the following:

I. "... And furthermore, all ecclesiastical persons having cures of souls shall ... declare .. four times in the year at least, in their sermons and other collations, that all usurped and foreign power, having no establishment by the law of God, is for most just causes taken away and abolished ... and that the Queen's power within her realms and dominions is the highest power under God, to whom all men within the same realms and dominions by God's law owe most loyalty and obedience."

II. "Besides this, to the intent that all superstition and hypocrisy crept into divers men's hearts may vanish away, they shall not set forth or extol the dignity of any images, relics or miracles ..."

III. "Item, That they, the persons above rehearsed, shall preach in their churches and every other cure they have one sermon every month of the year at least, wherein they shall purely and sincerely declare the word of God, ... and that the works devised by men's fantasies, besides Scriptures, as wanderings of pilgrimages, setting up of candles, praying upon beads, or such like superstition, have not only no promise of reward in Scripture, but contrariwise great threatenings and maledictions of God..."

IX. "Also, if they know any man within their parish or elsewhere that is a letter of the word of God to be read in English ... or a fautor of any usurped or foreign power ... they shall detect and present the same to the Queen's Majesty, or to her Council, or to the ordinary, or to the justice of the peace next adjoining."

XXIII. "Also, That they (parson &c.) shall take away ... and destroy all shrines, ... paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses."

The appendix contains "An admonition to simple men, deceived by malicious" in which she again affirms the royal supremacy.

THE OLD RELIGION OF ENGLAND IN ITS INTERNATIONAL ASPECT

1558-1565

Catholics of England who Left Their Native Country for the Sake of Religion.

The Parliamentary enactments of 1559, especially that which ^{suppressed} suppressed the religious houses, ¹ found those who had given the three vows in a dilemma. They could not remain in their houses, they would not ^{conform} conform to the laws of their country and forsake their religion. The Spanish ambassador, Count de Feria, on leaving the country, secured the Queen's ^{assent} permission to take with him some of these religious. ² Among them were the Carthusians and the Bridgettines of Syon. ³ The Government was ^{content} content to see these persons (and also other persons) leave the realm -- a ^{welcome} welcome gesture of tolerance. ⁴

1 1 Eliz. c. xxiv. Vide ante, p.40, note 5.

2 Cf. Guilday, English Catholic Refugees, I., 3-5.

"The Count de Feria departed a fortnight ago, and it has not yet been heard what present the Queen made him at his departure, saving that he asked of her as a special favour, instead of gifts, a passport for passage to Flanders of all monks, friars, and nuns now here, who were required to renounce their profession, swear against the Pope, and observe the articles lately enacted against the Christian and Catholic Church, besides being expelled and driven out of their monasteries and convents, had they been men to consent to this; but they determined to die rather than change their purpose." Quoted by Guilday, op. cit., p. 5n and Birt, p. 151 from Venetian Calendar, 1558-1560, no. 77. Il Schifanoja to the Castellan of Mantua, London, May 30, 1559.

3 Cf. Guilday., pp. 4f.; 43; 57.

4 "Still, on the whole, the government was content at first to get rid of catholics. Clergy and religious, too, were free to leave England, and many availed themselves of this unusual permission." Meyer, p. 31. He gives Span. Cal., 155-67, p. 77 as reference.

"Meyer is wrong in saying that during the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign all that was required in order to obtain the necessary authorization to leave the country was the promise to keep away from Rome (England und die Katholische Kirche unter Elizabeth und den Stuarts, vol. I, p. 25): 'Die Regierung war zunächst schon zufrieden, wenn sie die Katholiken nur los wurde.' In some cases this was true, as the Calendars of the period show -- but it was always difficult to obtain a passport. The majority of the exiles left the country on their own accord without permission. In May, 1558, a priest of Canterbury was arrested at Dover in trying to leave

The Carthusians

After leaving England the Carthusians went back to the monastery on the continent which they had occupied after they had been expelled from England by Henry the Eighth, the monastery of Val-de-Grace, in Burges.¹ Their Superior was Dom Maurice Chauncy. In Burges they were supported by a pension from Philip II and also by donations from other sources, chiefly from the richer English exiles of the Old Faith in Belgian.² Difficulties arose from the poverty which they endured -- Philip was not always so prompt in paying the pension. The house was overcrowded. The English monks wanted a separate noviate. Some of the Flemish inmates were dissatisfied. In the year 1568 a separation was thought desirable and in the following year it took place. The new foundation was established in the rue Sainte-Claire.³ It became known as Sheen Anglorum. Students of the Douay Seminary began to enter this order at the end of this decade.⁴

the country (Cf. For. Cal. Eliz. 1559-60, p. 627); another priest, ^{the} the chaplain of Edward Walgrave, was arrested at Gravesend. (cf. Kervyn de Lettenhove, Relations, etc. Vol. II, p. 555). Even the permission granted to the Duke de Feria was afterwards limited lest it should appear that the Government was willing to see all the Catholics go." Guilday, op. cit., I., p. 3-4, note.

"The Count de Feria had obtained permission to take to Flanders ^{all} all the religious. Since his departure this concession has been limited to those who were in being at the time of the other schism, and who are very few in number." Il Schifanoia, June 6, 1559. Venetian Papers, No. 78, quoted by Birt, p. 213.

"From the beginning of her reign, Elizabeth's government set itself in stern opposition to the exodus of Catholics from the realm." ^{self} Guilday, op. cit., I., p. 3. ^{Guilday}

1 Cf. Guilday, op. cit., pp. 41-42.

2 Cf. ibid., I., p. 43. Birt, p. 135 reports that Cotton MS at the ^{British} British Museum, Vesp. C. xiii, No. 108 says that Philip donated them 1,120 florins yearly and that there twenty-four persons there.

3 Cf. Guilday, op. cit., I., p. 43

4 Cf. ibid., I., p. 44

The Bridgettines of Syon

This order of nuns, the Bridgettines of Syon, like the Carthusians, ^{-and} returned to their former home which they occupied before their ^{restoration} restoration to England during the reign of Mary. They established themselves in Termonde with Catherine Palmer as their Superior in the Bridgettine monastery of the same place, maintaining their independence. During the years 1559-1563 they continued to reside there. They, too, were supported by a pension from Philip, alms from the exiles in Flanders, and also by gifts from some of the Catholics in England. They removed to a monastery, called Bethany, at Zurich in Zeeland, having obtained this place through the aid of Marguerite de Parme. Nicholas Sander bought them a home at Mishagen, near Antwerp. There they remained ^{from} from 1568-1571. Here we leave them, though they moved in the following year. They numbered twenty-six, two more than the Carthusians.¹

The Monks of St. Benedict

This order also, like the Carthusians, was again expelled from ^{England} England at the accession of Elizabeth. There were only twenty-eight of these ^{at} at that time, and they went into voluntary exile. They did not move as a community; but individuals of this order went to Ireland, Scotland, and the Continent. Dom Sigibert Buckley, a member of the restored colony at Westminster during Mary's days, lived until 1607, being imprisoned for forty-four years. He saved this English order from extinction.²

1 Cf. Guilday, op. cit., I. pp. 57-8 and Birt, p. 135 (Vide ante, ⁵⁸ p. 58, note 2). They received the same sum from the Spanish crown as the ^{monks} monks. Hamilton's Chronicle of St. Monica, p. ix says that they were ^{the} the only English community which hath preserved its continuity with pre-reformation days.

2 Guilday, op. cit., I., pp. 215-216; Birt, pp. 127-129, 135-6.

The Franciscans

The order on which Henry VIII had turned with cruelty and executions,^{-time,} the Franciscans, likewise restored for a short period under Mary, were perhaps the only order which continued during the reign of Elizabeth to remain in England. Several members of this order under the leadership of Stephan Fox went to the Low Countries, but an unorganized group of their number remained in England.¹ Interesting as it might be, we do not have access to a record of their activities in England during this period.²

The Convent of St. Monica, Louvain.

The chief organization of English nuns on the Continent did not ^{have} its rise during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign; however, the prioress of the institution, later known as the Convent of St. Monica's in Louvain, had entered Saint Ursula's convent already in 1548. Sister Elizabeth Woodford was joined a few years later by Margaret Clement who for thirty-eight years was Mother Superior of this convent. It became the home of some twenty-five English women.³

The Dominicans

The Dominicans of England has been allowed to go to the Continent under the terms of the "gift" which was given to the Count de Feria. The English Province of this Order ceased to exist after 1566.⁴

1 Guilday, op. cit., I., pp. 285-286. Birt, p. 126.

2 Guilday, p. 285n, gives Miss Stone's "Faithful unto Death; ^{Account of} the Sufferings of the English Franciscans during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, from contemporary records (London, 1892)" as his authority.

3 Guilday, op. cit., I., pp. 377-378 and Hamilton's "The ^{of the} Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular of the Lateran, at St. Monica's in Louvain," passim.

4 Guilday, op. cit., I., pp. 400-1; Birt, p. 127.

The Seminary at Douay

The most important foundation of English in the Low Countries was the establishment at Douay, an establishment which no account of the treatment of the Old Religion in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth can neglect to mention. However, as our topic is restricted to the first decade of the reign of this Queen we find that it is of little importance to us, for it was not until the year 1574 that the first priests of this institution came to England. William Allen, later created a cardinal, one of the most influential of the English exiles on the Continent, founded this college on Michaelmas Day, 1568. The house in which the college was begun was rented. The project had been decided upon while Allen was journeying to Rome with Dr. Vendeville in the Fall of the year 1567. It was established first for the purpose of collegiate training, an orthodox establishment for young men who wanted an education. It was only after the founding that its character as a training-school for missionaries became dominant.¹ The college opened with four English and two Belgian scholars. The two Belgians soon left, and the college grew slowly.² The students lived in hard-

1 For these details cf. Meyer, pp. 92-121; Pollen, pp. 244-248, and Guilday, op. cit., I., pp. 63-66.

Guilday, p. 65, quotes Allen's letter to Vendeville, written in 1578 or 1580 from Knox's Douay Diaries, pp. xxvi-xxvii, about the purpose of the founding of this institution: "First, to enable English students abroad to have the benefit of collegiate training; secondly, to form a body of learned priests capable of restoring the Catholic religion in England whenever circumstances would permit; and thirdly, to instruct in their religion English youths who might come for their education to the College. The missionary work in England was an after-thought. It seemed hopeless to train priests for the English mission while the power was in the hands of heretics."

It must be remembered that Allen in common with the other exiles was waiting for the day when the Catholic religion would be restored in England either through Mary Stuart or by the marriage of Elizabeth with a Catholic.

2 Pollen, p. 246.

ships, and no doubt the teachers also, for they had very little money and were forced to beg for alms from the Pope and Spain.¹ Catholics from Oxford and Cambridge were among the first of those who were attracted to this new seat of learning. Among the more outstanding men who attended this institution during its first years were: Richard Bristow, John Marshall, Edward Risen, John White, John Wright, Richard Storey, Thomas Darrell, and Morgan Philipps.²

The priests of the following decade were trained for their work as missionaries and "Seelsorger." The practical phases of the ministerial office were stressed.³ It is worthy of note -- also to be commended in them -- that up to the year 1600 there was no need of written rules and regulations for the governance of this College.⁴

1 Pollen, p. 246.

2 Guilday, op. cit., I., p.65

3 "More importance was attached to the practical side of the ecclesiastical calling than to purely scientific equipment. The seminarists were exercised in preaching and dialectic, and were made familiar with the chief doctrines of protestantism. Pastoral theology formed a prominent feature in the course of instruction, while devotional exercises aimed at deepening the religious feelings. Instruction in church history, especially English church history, supplemented the theological course." Reference to Knox's Diaries, Meyer p.96.

4 "Up to April 16, 1575, when it was made a Pontifical College subject directly to the Holy See and supported by papal aims, Allen governed his community with no written laws and rules, such as are customary today. This condition still existed up to the year 1600, when Rome insisted upon a written constitution for the government of the students. One notable fact in the history of the College is that the twenty years during which Allen governed it by the force of his own loving and lovable disposition, are among the most productive and the most intellectual of the whole two centuries and a half of its existence." Guilday, op. cit., I., p.66.

I regret it very much that I have been forced to curtail my paper and extend my report only to the year 1570. The history of the missionaries from this institution is one of the most interesting of the whole investigation which I have made.

Educational and other Foundational Efforts among the English Catholic Exiles which Failed.

During the first decade of Elizabeth's reign, especially during the earliest years, attempts had been made to establish colleges and seats of learning on the Continent for the English Catholics. In Louvain we find the "College of Preachers" which did not survive.¹ The "Oxford House" and the "Cambridge House" were begun at Louvain; and they likewise did not survive. We are told: "Almost within a year after her accession (Elizabeth's), over a hundred Oxford and Cambridge men had left England for the Continent, and Louvain attracted the greater number of these. Two houses were begun in the town, the one called Oxford, the other Cambridge, where the students lived until the foundation of the College at Douay."²

Besides this there were various settlements of nunneries, small in their numbers, and of no importance, which came to naught.³

Englishmen who Entered the Society of Jesus During the First Decade of Elizabeth's Reign.

During this first period the Jesuits also attracted a few ^{English-}Englishmen into their society. A certain Thomas King and one Roger Bolbert entered the Society of Jesus about 1561. These seem to be the only ones until after 1568. It was not until the following decade, more especially the one beginning with 1580 that the Jesuits come into prominence in English affairs. Here we have men like Campion, of whom one man says, "Campion only needs to be known to be loved."⁴

1 Cf. Pollen, p. 247

3 Cf. Pollen, p. 248

2 Guilday, op. cit., I., p.4

4 Guilday, op. cit., I., pp. 121-122^{121-125.}

The Louvain School of Apologists

In this group we place an organized body of men who perhaps influenced the adherents of the Old Religion in England more during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign than any other group of people. It developed from a statement made by the Bishop of London, Jewel, regarding the claims of the Catholic Church and the Pope. He was answered by Harding in "An Answer to Maister Juelle's challenge."¹ A controversy began which is not very interesting in itself. Sander, Allen, Harding and Marshall contributed for the Louvain School. Their works are said to "consitute the strongest breakwater Catholic scholars have ever made against Anglicanism."²

The importance of these books, among which John Marshall's (Martial) "Treatise of the Cross"¹ must be mentioned, is due to the fact that they seem to have reawakened a Catholic-consciousness among the adherents of that religion in England. We are told: "These books awakened in the Catholics, perhaps for the first time, a widespread enthusiasm, a resolve to run risks; and over forty issues of fresh volumes or editions was made in two or three years. Though these editions were probably not large, the grand total must have been quite considerable, and proves that there must, already at this time, have been more mutual understanding and correspondence between Catholics all over the country than we should otherwise have thought."³

1 Pollen, p. 108.

2 Guilday, op. cit., I., p.10

3 Pollen, p. 109.

Cf. Pollen, pp. 106-111 and Guilday, I., 9-11. I am not prepared to give a very full, accurate or detailed discussion of this movement. I underestimated its importance while gathering my material.

English Lay Exiles on the Continent

Although more important than the convents, for instance, from a national point of view, we have at present no record of the colonies of English Catholic laity who resided on the continent during this period.¹ There seem to have been groups in Rome, Paris, Madrid, Louvain and Brussels.² Any attempt to gauge their number must remain guess-work.³

The Elizabethan Government did not bother about these people during these first years.⁴ Nor did they begin their treasonable practises at that time.⁵ We will see, however, how the English

1 I have not been able to find any material dealing with these in particular. There may be some, but what it is and where to find it, I do not know.

2 Guilday, op. cit., I, p. xvii, says: "Between Elizabeth's ^{accession} and the failure of the Northern Rising (1558-1569), the exiles consisted mainly of the fragments of the Religious Orders, such as the Carthusians and the Bridgettines ...; students and professors from Cambridge and Oxford, the latter University being fairly deserted at the end of this first period; and individual priests and laymen, such as Sir Francis Englefield, Dr. John Clement, and others."

3 Pollen says concerning the English refugees in Flanders: "In a petition dated March 8, 1566, their numbers are given as: "Priests 68, religious men 40, nuns 25, students 37, seven families totalling 30 persons, and 13 others, in all 213 persons."

Guilday says, I., p. 7: "The extent of this first period of the ^{English} Exile-movement can be judged from the fact that, when Allen founded the English College at Douay (1568) ... the register of the college soon numbered over one hundred names."

His "soon" represents a period of about five years. This statement ^{movement} gives us one clue, but it is insufficient. It must be remembered that these exiles were the more zealous Catholics and more apt to take up such an activity as Allen's establishment.

4 "During these first ten years of the English Catholic Exile-movement ^{movement} on the Continent (1558-1568), the English Government does not seem to have occupied itself very much with the exiles. Even the foundations of Douay were looked upon at the beginning with contempt." Guilday, I., p. 11

5 "There is no sign that English Catholics were treasonably mixed up with Spanish politics in the first years of Elizabeth. It does not alter this fact that even then several Englishmen had entered the services of Philip II." Meyer, p. 35.

refugees in Louvain petitioned the Council of Trent for the excommunication of Elizabeth.¹ They were more rabid than those remaining in England. They, and chiefly they, were interested in putting Mary Stuart on Elizabeth's throne.²

Outside of Louvain, perhaps, the other important settlement of English Catholic exiles on the Continent is Rome (with the exception of possibly Douay). An English hospice was in Rome for the convenience of priests and others who were living in exile.^{2b} This hospice is important because it developed into the Venerable English College at Rome, an institution prominent in the annals of the Counter-Reformation in England.³ Among those exiles in Rome we will see twelve men who testify against their Queen when Pius is about to excommunicate her.⁴

The lay Catholics of England living as exiles seem to have been so scattered that it is hard to trace them. We must desist from any further efforts to tell of their activities.

1 Pollen, p. 76. Camb. Mod. Hist., II., p. 586.

2 Sanders wrote to Cardinal Morone (not dated) "that much might be effected 'if these three easy (!) measures be taken,' viz. if the ^{title} English are absolved from their allegiance to Elizabeth; if Mary's title is confirmed; if some English exiles are sent to Scotland to proffer Mary the English crown. The memorial closes with the words: 'Totum amittitur quidquid in illa deficienda omittitur.'" Pollen, p. 76 with reference to Bayne, p. 274.

From the internal evidence of this letter we can approximate the date. Elizabeth had not yet been excommunicated and Mary was still in Scotland. Mary escaped to England in 1568. The letter may be as much as five ^{half} years earlier.

^{53-61.}
^{and}
^{years}
2b Gasquet, The History of the Venerable English College, Rome, pp. 58-61.

3 Ibid., passim; Pollen, Meyer, et al., passim.

4 Pollen, p. 148

Elizabeth refused the offer of Philip, but he was still friendly to her.^{her.}

The events of the first Parliament, which really should have ^{called} for a procedure of excommunication on the part of the Pope, cause Philip ^{William} to forestall this move. Elizabeth's refusal to be called "supremum caput" ^{caput} was represented to the Pope as an indication that excommunication ^{would be} too harsh a measure to apply to this heretic.¹ Philip was still ^{afraid} of France and of the possibility that Mary Stuart, the Dauphiness of France, would be placed on the throne of England and thus bring about a union of England and France against Spain and her dependents.²

1 "Distracted between his creed and his policy the King of Spain, notwithstanding De Feria's urgency, durst not interfere. He was persuaded firmly that without his help Elizabeth's throne could not stand; and he felt himself the responsible cause of the success of what he most detested. To avoid if possible the dilemma with which his ambassador had threatened him, he wrote to the Pope, making the most of Elizabeth's solitary act of virtue in refusing to be called Head of the Church, and requesting him to suspend his censures till other means had been tried." Froude, VII, p.85f with reference to MS Simancas, Philip to De Feria, May.

2 "They (Cecil and his friends) were confident that so long as the only possible rival to Elizabeth was the Dauphiness of France, they might feel sure of Philip, let them do what they would." Froude, VII, p.87.

Pollen, p. 85, says concerning Philip: "Through all the momentous changes of Elizabeth's accession, the revolution in religion and suppression of the old Faith, during the remarkable tragedy of Mary Stuart, his policy remained -- I do not say unaffected -- but substantially unaltered. He long hoped against hope that England would yet come back of its own accord to the old position, and when this hope faded, he did not think of any innovation to make in his policy."

Again Pollen, p.87: "Philip certainly knew what would be the result of a complete victory by Elizabeth, yet, spell-bound by fear of France, he looked on with but few protests while the heretical Queen crushed the old order in England. He hardly raised a finger when Ireland was similarly dealt with, and he almost encouraged her to do the like in Scotland."

Philip counseled patience and submission to the Catholics in England. His ambassador writes: "I have advised the Catholics to avoid all occasion for this accusation (i.e. of speaking against the Queen), as it is not prudent to offend her. Rather let them treat matters which are not against their conscience with moderation and reserve, since they owe to God a respect for superiors. Even if they had the strength to resist them with arms in their hands, it would not be wise to do so, and much less now that they are in such evident peril." Quoted by Pollen, p.92, from the Spanish Calendar, 1558-1567, p. 389. The date of the letter is not given.

Another ambassador had been sent to England from Madrid, Alvarez de Quadra, Bishop of Aquila. Philip was to frustrate the mission of Parpaglia, and the churchman Quadra was in England not as such, officially, but as the diplomat from the Court of Spain. Later the Catholic King would not sever diplomatic relations with the heretical Queen of England, relying perhaps on the fact that she had not been excommunicated -- which he had prevented.

The turn of Scottish affairs,¹ as well as the proposed Dudley marriage affected the policy of Philip in slightly different ways, but behind as his dealings with England, like the sinister shadow, lurked the fear of France.

The English Catholics received but little encouragement from Philip, nor were there any treasonable arrangements made between the Catholics in England and the Catholic King of Spain.² This remark, however, must be restricted to the first decade of Elizabeth's reign.

Various attempts were made to unite Elizabeth with a Catholic husband and thus bring the land back again to the Old Religion. Among them, for instance, was the proposal of the Archduke Charles, son of Emperor Ferdinand. Since all these attempts failed (they served only for diplomatic purposes as far as the Queen was concerned), we must perforce pass them over.

1 In 1559 with John Knox again in Scotland, the land in insurrection against the regent, the Earl of Arran was seeking the hand of the English Queen to unite Protestantism in England and Scotland under one crown. An English fleet was sent to the Firth of Forth, an English contingent under the command of Lord Grey was before Leith. Philip did not interfere. The Treaty of Edinburgh followed. Cf. Camb. Mod. Hist., pp. 572-578.

2 Cf. Meyer, p. 35.

England and the Papal See

During the reign of Mary the country had been in intimate relation with the Papal See. Reginald Pole, one of the chief figures in the Catholic Church, had come to England as legatus a latere and remained there to become Archbishop of Canterbury. It was he that spoke the papal absolution on the thirtieth of November, 1554, St. Andrew's Day, for the sin of schism to the prostrate Parliament. His death, a few hours after after Mary's, removed this ultramontane, and so Elizabeth did not have to cope with his legitimate scruples. His death also removed the only other person in the realm who had official connections with the See of Rome. The English representative remained in Rome, but not as an official agent of the Government.

Pope Paul IV and the Old Religion in England

Elizabeth at her accession did not choose to notify the then Pope¹,

1 "A story which came from a good quarter bade us see Elizabeth announcing to the Pope her accession to the throne, and not rejection Catholicism until Paul IV declared that England was a papal fief and she a usurping bastard. Now, Caraffa was capable of any impudence and just at this moment seemed bent on reviving the claims of medieval Pontiffs, in order that he might drive a long-suffering Emperor into the arms of the Lutherans. But it is now certain that in the matter of courtesy Elizabeth, not Paul, was the offender. She ignored his existence. Edward Crane was living at Rome as Mary's ambassador. He received no letters of credence from the new Queen, and on the 1st of February, 1559, she told him to come home as she had nothing for him to do." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.564.

I have quoted this because it gives the two versions, the one now discarded, concerning the early dealings of Elizabeth with the Roman Bishop. Cf. also Pollen, p.59 and Meyer, p.20. Those who would like to represent the breach of England with Rome as the fault of Rome have been more prone to believe that Paul IV went beyond his rights in asking that Elizabeth submit her right of succession to his arbitration. This, according to the most competent scholars, is not in accord with the facts. The Reformation of England according to the honest facts would then be the "fault" of the Pope.

Paul IV, of this fact. This may be considered a breach of courtesy or it may be regarded as wilful neglect. At any rate Edward Crane was left without an official commission.

Paul IV, on his part, was not so ready to break off all relations with that country whose king had once been styled "defensor fidei" by his predecessor. He refused to follow the lead of the French ambassador who wanted him to declare Elizabeth illegitimate in favor of the Dauphiness of France, Mary Queen of Scots, a great-granddaughter of the first Tudor, Henry VII. The French dealings with the Pope were balked chiefly by Philip II, the brother-in-law of Elizabeth.¹

Paul thought that Elizabeth ought to be excommunicated, but he seems to have waited for a "convenient season."² In the meantime, before excommunicating Elizabeth directly, he issued the bull Cum ex Apostolatus officio, in February, 1559,³ in which he sent up the premise that heresy itself would bar a ruler from his office.⁴ The

1 Camb. Mod. Hist. II., p.564; Pollen, p.56

"Nevertheless, Paul, abrupt and careless of consequences as he was, has not taken the step. He has asked King Philip if he shall take it, and when the King will execute the sentence. Philip refused. On the 24th of April, as soon as he had received the ambassador's letter, he wrote urging the Pope to continue his previous passive attitude. ... His Holiness declared himself satisfied with King Philip's plan, and that he would await the issue of the Spanish negotiations before going any further." Pollen, l.c.

2 "Paul IV, we see, thought that the excommunication and deposition of Elizabeth would be a necessity, and the sooner it could be done with justice the better." Pollen, p.55.

3 Mirbst, Quellengeschichte, p. 288, gives Feb. 15, 1559 as the date. Pollen, p.51n, has Feb. 16.

4 "Considerantes dignum esse ut qui virtutis amore a malis non abstinere, metu poenarum ab illis deterreantur, et quod ... comites, barones, marchiones, duces, reges et imperatores, qui alios docere et illis bono exemplo, ut in fide catholica contineantur, esse debent, ... de apostolica potestatis plenitudine sancimus quod ... omnes et singuli ... comites, barones, marchiones, duces, reges, et imperatores, qui hactenus, ut praeferatur, deviasse aut in haeresim incidisse seu schisma incurrisse excitasse

bull maintains the power of the Pope over kings and peoples, the right to depose heretical princes and those who favor heretical princes. The immediate relation of this bull to Elizabeth is not quite clear, but it seems certain that, coming at the time it did, that it was meant to warn also her.¹

Paul IV died on Aug. 18, 1559. His death brought another man to the Roman See and cut short his own efforts to win England over to the fold of the Old Religion. We have no reason to suppose that he would have been successful. His successor would do as much as we might suppose ought to be done to win the attention of the Queen, but his efforts were to no avail. Hence it is logical to conclude that Paul IV would have had no success.

vel commississe deprehensi aut confessi, vel convicti fuerint et in posterum deviabunt aut in haeresim incident seu schisma incurrent vel exciabunt aut committent, et deviasse seu commississe deprehendentur aut confitebuntur seu convicentur ... cum in hoc inexcisabiliores ceteris reddantur, .. sint eo ipso, absque aliquo iuris comitatibus quoque, baroniis, marchionatibus, ducatibus, regnis et imperio penitus et in totum perpetuo privati, et ad illa de caetero inhabile et incapaces comitatus, baronias, marchionatus, baronias, marchionatus, sucatibus, regna et imperium restituti, reponi reintegrari aut reabilitari possint, ..."

Mörbst, Quellengeschichte, pp. 288-9

1 "This Bull ... declared that all heretical sovereigns fell from their right by the mere fact of their heresy. This was, however, general legislation, intended for all Catholic countries. The fact of heresy had to be proved in each case, before the law could be applied to any particular prince. The Bull was not a sentence against any individual, as, for instance, Elizabeth. But coming, as it did, so near her accession, it may have been represented as aimed at her." Pollen, p. 51n.

"This edict, though it had been aimed mainly at Ferdinand's three Protestant Electors, was a salutary warning for Elizabeth and Antony and Maximilian; but no names were mentioned." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 584.

Elizabeth, being a heretic and having "usurped the Pope's authority" would naturally be more apt to come under the bull than the Catholic princes.

Pius IV and the English Situation

The successor of Giovanni Piero Caraffa, Paul IV, was Giovanni Angelo de' Medici -- but he was not as his name might lead us to believe of the distinguished Florentine house. The new Pope, Pius IV, was more interested in keeping a cordial international relationship between the various nations of Europe than in excommunicating Elizabeth. The Council of Trent also called for more immediate concern on his part.

At this time the Council of Trent was summoned to meet on April 6, 1561. The first session of this meeting (the seventeenth), however, was not opened until Jan. 18, 1562. This was the third meeting of this famous Council. It considered problems of the Catholics north of the Alps, chiefly, among others, the giving of the cup to the laity. Friction, threatening to disrupt the Council, developed.¹

Pius IV is described to us as conciliatory in his nature. He is said to have been "learned and kindly and of exemplary life." "He wished to live at peace with all men, and to win the support of the Catholic monarch for the Holy See."²

Various attempts, directly and indirectly were made during his pontificate to reconcile England with Rome. Several of these will occupy our attention in turn.

1 Cf. Camb. Mod. Hist., II, pp. 674-680.

2 Ibid., p. 674.

The Mission of Parpaglia

The first attempt, and the most important because it was the first, was made during May, 1560. Vincent Parpaglia, formerly a secretary of Cardinal Pole, was chosen for the mission.¹ He was to bear a letter from the Pope to Elizabeth as an official nuncio. Pius promised to receive Elizabeth into the haven of the Catholic Church with as much joy, or, if possible, with more joy than was evidenced at the return of the prodigal son.² The messenger also carried some oral, secret instructions. What they were must remain

1 He seem to have been chosen by a committee appointed at the Council of Trent and his choice was approved by the Pope as his own nuncio.

"Special congregations of Cardinals were appointed to deal with the affairs of different nations, and the five names of the committee to deal with England are reported (28th of March) to be the Cardinals Moroni (Protector), de Carpi, of Tournon, of Trent (Madruzzi), of San Clemente, and they had selected, before April 27, 1560, as messenger, Vincenzo Parpaglia, Abbot in commendam of San Salvatore in Turin (commonly, but less correctly, called San Saluto or San Salvatore), to treat with Queen Elizabeth." Pollen, p.67. Vat. Arch. C.T., 79, f. 196. Cf. Foreign Calendar, 1560-1561, n.74. References given by Pollen, p. 67n.

"The conciliatory Pius IV had not been on the throne long before he sent to Elizabeth a courteous letter (May 5, 1560). Vincent Parpaglia, the Abbot of San Salvatore at Turin, once the secretary of Cardinal Pole, was to carry it to her as Nuncio. She was to lend him her ear, and a strong hint was given to her that she could be legitimated." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.578.

2 Blunt, II, p.429f, gives a copy of the letter as it appeared in Fuller Ch. Hist., ii. 463. The letter reads in part:

"Dear daughter in Christ, health and apostolic benediction. ... And if so be as we desire and hope, you shall return into the bosom of the Church, we shall be ready to receive you with the same love, honour, and rejoicing that the father in the Gospel did his son returning to him: although our joy is likely to be greater in that he was joyful for the salvation of one son, but you, drawing along with you all the people of England, shall hear us and the whole company of our brethren, who are shortly, God willing, to be assembled in a General Council for the taking away of heresies, and so for the salvation of yourself and your whole nation, fill the universal Church with rejoicing and gladness. ... But concerning this matter the same Vincentius shall deal with you more largely, and ~~we~~ shall declare our fatherly affection toward you; and we entreat your Majesty to receive him lovingly, to hear him diligently, and to give the same credit to his speeches which you would to ourself."

-self."

conjectural.¹ He was, however, not allowed to come into England. But -- ^{but-}
it was Philip of Spain and not Elizabeth of England who kept him from the ^{the}
British Isles.² Yet the Queen and her Council were by no means anxious to ^{to}
have the nuncio enter the realm.³ And when the mission was frustrated,
the Bishops of the Old Religion were thrown into prison.⁴

1 Blunt, II, p.430, says that "it was understood by those who wrote of ^{of}
these events" that Pius IV promised to revoke the sentence which had been ^{been}
pronounced on the union of Henry and Anne Bolleyn, to permit the Lord's
Supper to be distributed sub utraque, and to sanction the Prayer Book.
Blunt says, "It seems highly probable that this was the case."

Other writers doubt that the Pope had promised to sanction the Prayer ^{Prayer}
Book. Maitland says concerning the recall of the nuncio: "And the ^{it is to}
be feared that she, or someone on her behalf, told how the Pope had offered
to confirm her Book of Common Prayer, if only she would fall down and wor-
ship him." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.579. Pollen, p.83, calls it a ^{curious}
legend."

2 "Parpaglia was considered to be a pronounced partisan of France. ^{the} The
policy of France was to have Elizabeth excommunicated. This was sufficient
to make it the policy of Spain to prevent the fulfillment of his mission.
Pius IV. had commended his nuncio to the protection of the two Hapsburgs,
but the Emperor Ferdinand, who scarcely knew Parpaglia, alone furnished him
with the desired letter of introduction to Queen Elizabeth. The courts of
Spain and Brussels, on the contrary, were scarcely better pleased with Par-
paglia's journey than the English court itself, and begged the pope to
nominate another nuncio. Orders from Rome reached Parpaglia in Brussels
instructing him not to proceed to England until he should receive further
instructions. Painful as it was for the Spanish ambassador in London to
undertake the task of once more dashing the hopes of English Catholics to
the ground and of keeping the unbidden guest at a distance from the queen,
there was nothing to do except to write to the nuncio strongly dissuading
him from continuing his journey to England." Meyer, p.40.

Meyer gives the following references (p.40n): K. de Lettenhove, II., p. ^{p.p.}
441; Baronius et Raynaldus, Annal. Eccles., ad ann. 1560, Paragraphs 43, 55;
Arch. Vat., Arm. LXIV., t. 28, fol. 64; Venetian Cal., VII., p. 229; Foreign
Cal., 1560-1, No. 507; Span. Cal., pp. 170 et seq.

Maitland describes the proceedings as follows: "Philip when he ^{heard}
the news, was seriously offended. He saw a French intrigue, and the dip-
lomatic machinery of the Spanish monarchy was set in motion to procure
the recall of the Nuncio. All manner of reasons could be given to the
Pope to induce a cancellation of his rash act. Pius was convinced or
overawed. Margaret of Parma stopped Parpaglia at Brussels." Camb. Mod.
Hist., II, p. 579.

3 Blunt, II, p. 431, tells us that Parpaglia was required by the Privy ^{Privy}
Council to send his credentials from Calais by messenger before he could
enter the country.

England was now more stable; it was free from foreign control, so
"she brusquely refused to look at the olive branch." Cf. Pollard, p.236.

4 Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 579; Pollard, p. 236. ^{p.236.}

The Mission of Martinengo

Pius IV was not yet willing to give up all attempts to reconcile Elizabeth and England to the Catholic Church. This time he made sure that the nuncio would be suitable to Philip. So in December of the same year, 1560, Girolamo Martinengo was appointed as the papal messenger. Although Elizabeth herself appears to have been more than half-willing to receive this representative of a power which she had refused to acknowledge,¹ the Privy Council was persuaded by the more Protestant of their number, under the idea that to do otherwise would be treason,² to refuse to sanction such a move and the invitation to send official delegates to the Council of Trent was definitely spurned.³

1 There was a plot at this time between Elizabeth, Lord Robert Dudley, and the Spanish ambassador, without the connivance of Cecil, to bring about the marriage of Elizabeth and Dudley and the return of England to the Catholic fold. Cecil concocted a papal "plot" -- as Maitland says in a parenthetical statement, "there was always one to be discovered" -- to alarm Elizabeth. But Elizabeth was at this time also negotiating with the German Protestants and Cecil with the Scottish Reformers. Elizabeth even tried to have the French refuse to send legates to the Council. It is hard to tell where she or anyone else was acting honestly. This affair is one of the most complex of all diplomatic dealings. Cf. Froude, VII, pp. 338-352. Camb. Mod. Hist. II, pp. 582-583. Pollard, p. 246. 426. Pollen, pp. 68-72. Meyer, pp. 41-44.

2 The meeting of the Privy Council was held on May 1, 1561. "By this one word 'treason' Cecil brought it about, though many wished that the nuncio should be heard, that he was, in fact, refused by the common vote of all." Quoted from *De Nuncio Apostolico*, in Dr. Sander's hand in Arch. Vat., Arm., XLIV., v. 28, f. 335, by Pollen, p. 70.

Cecil and Sir Nicholas Bacon were the one chiefly responsible for this move. Meyer, quoting from the same source as Pollen, -- which he designates as an anonymous account of this meeting -- gives us the following proof, p. 44n: "*Custos sigilli publici, qui cum Cecilio moderatur et regit omnia, ita rem posuit, ut diceret, se no videre quemquam posse absque manifesto crimine laesae majestatis huic nuntio admittendo suffragium prebere.*"

3 Cf. reference given above in note one.

Froude's words are of special interest here, VII, p. 350: "Politely and peremptorily the visit of the nuncio was declined. Neither directly nor indirectly could England recognize the authority of the Pope; and for sending bishops or ambassadors to the Council, as soon as any free and truly general council could be assembled by consent of all Christian princes, with guarantees of liberty for discussion, England would willingly be represented there; but for the Council to which they were

As a result of this refusal by Elizabeth the Pope thought she ought to be excommunicated, but Philip thought differently, and the Pope did not act in this matter at that time.¹

now invited -- called by the Pope as a continuation of the Council lately held at Trent -- 'where no manner of person might have voice or decision but such as were already sworn to the maintenance of the Pope's authority,' 'her Majesty could hope no good from it, as tending to confirm those errors and those claims which had occasioned the disorders of Christendom.'" Reference to Spanish MSSs, Rolls House, De Quadra to Philip, May 5: Ms Simancas.

¹ Meyer, p. 45

Froude, VII pp. 355-6, gives the following letter of Philip to Cardinal Pacheco, his ambassador in Rome, written on July 11 (quoted by Froude from Mignet's Life of Mary Stuart, Appendix):

"His Holiness, after the refusal to admit his nuncio, may desire naturally to pronounce the Queen of England schismatic and deprive her of her crown. If he has any such intention, I must request him to forbear from pronouncing a sentence which cannot be executed.

"The duty of carrying it into effect will devolve on myself, as the most faithful son of the Church. I am at present in no condition to attempt any such enterprise; and should I do so the French and Germans will no doubt take arms against me. The peace of Europe will be broken, and the Council, the only remedy for the disease of the world, will be again postponed.

"Occasion will not be wanting by-and-by when I am better prepared; and my own person and the arms of Spain will be then at his Holiness's disposal. He knows well my zeal in the matter. For this I married my Queen who is in glory, when her age and constitution gave small promise of children; and the risk to which I exposed my life in going to that realm is notorious to the world. When the present Queen destroyed all that we had done, the late Pope ~~proposed~~ to depose her and give England to me. Sensible as I was of his Holiness's kindness, I persuaded him to forbear. You will entreat the present Pope in my name to exercise the same moderation, assuring him at the same time that I aim at nothing but the glory of God.

"You will observe in his reply whether he repeat the offer made to me by Paul the Fourth. I would know his views on that point as soon as possible."

Meyer, App. II., pp. 467-469 gives the letter written by Martinengo to Morone asking for instructions and the Cardinal's answer. I have not been able to read this letter, to my sorrow, because it is written in Italian. Its contents I glean from the notes appended by Meyer.

Meyer, App. III., pp. 470-471, gives the instructions for Martinengo as nuncio in England, written from Rome on March 9, 1561, in which Elizabeth is exhorted to send representatives to the Council of Trent. This letter I have also been unable to read and gather its contents in the same manner as the above letter.

Pollen, p. 71n, refers us for the episode of Martinengo to Bayne, pp. 73-116 and also to Susta, i, 172.222.

Ippolito d'Este

Pius was willing to make a third attempt to interest the Queen. Like a super-salesman he wouldn't take "No" for an answer. He commissioned the papal legate at the French court to negotiate with Elizabeth.¹ The Cardinal of Ferrara tried it.² His efforts also came to naught. Soon after that, on Sept. 20, 1562, Elizabeth concluded the Treaty of Hampton Court with the leader of the Huguenot faction of France, the Prince of Conde.³

Towards Elizabeth the Catholic princes were not inclined with very great animosity. When her excommunication was proposed at the Council of Trent the Emperor Ferdinand refused to listen to the ^{thought} thought. The Pope, therefore, and for present purposes this is what we are interested in, asked him to communicate with Elizabeth. He did so, but the Queen replied to his plea for toleration that she could not break the laws of her land.⁴ We classify this attempt of the Pope to communicate with Elizabeth as an informal one, and it too failed to alter the situation.

Another informal attempt was made through Thomas Sackville. Although he was an Englishman, he did not even attempt to see the Queen about this matter.⁵

1 "...The Pope in an autograph letter commissioned him to treat with the queen of England and to accede to her wishes, 'provided only that she and her kingdom return to the true religion and to our catholic faith.'" Meyer, p.45f with reference to Joseph Susta, Die röm. Kurie u. d. Konzil von Trient, I., p.198. The document is date June 29, 1561

2 The papal Legate at the French Court, the Cardinal of Ferrara, had some hope of succeeding where others had failed; 'not as Legate of Rome or the Cardinal of Ferrara, but as Hippolito d'Este,' an Italian gentleman devoted to her Grace's service. There were pleasant letters; cross and

3 Cf. over.

4 Cf. over.

5 Cf. over

The Proposed Excommunication of Elizabeth at the Council of Trent

We have so far passed over the efforts which were made to have Elizabeth excommunicated. Proposals for this action came from the English exiles in Louvain,¹ and the Cardinal Secretary in Rome.² The Pope was willing to issue the bull,³ but he had not yet been appraised of the attitude of the Catholic princes on the matter.

candles were commended; she was asked to retain them 'even as it were for the Cardinal of Ferrara's pleasure'; but hardly had the Council been re-opened at Trent (January 18, 1562) than Elizabeth was allying herself with the Huguenots and endeavouring to form a Protestant league in Germany." Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.584.

3(p.78) Ibid., l.c.

4(p.78) Pollen, p.79. Reference by Pollen to British Museum, Vesp. V. iii. f. 64, Sept. 24, 1563, for Ferdinand's letter. To Bayne, pp. 202 and 306 for Elizabeth's reply. Pollen, p.79n.

5(p.78). Meyer, p. 55f. Pollen, pp. 80-81.

Pollen says that Pius gave Sackville "definite and ample promises of the favours he would show the Queen in case she would rejoin the Church." His references are to C.R.S., ii. 1-11, and vii. 53; Bayne, pp. 205-7.

Sackville on his return to England conformed to the Anglican Church, or, as Pollen puts it, he "passed again under the Cecil yoke." p.81.

Sackville's father was one of the Commissioners appointed on July 19, 1559. He himself was a Protestant before going to Europe.

1 Pollen, p. 76; Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p.586.

2 Pollen, p. 75.

Meyer, App. IV, p.471, gives a letter of Cardinal Borromeo to the papal legates in Trent, written on June 2, 1563, in which he refers to the question of Elizabeth's excommunication.*

3 Meyer, App. VII, p. 472, gives the letter of Card. Borromeo to the papal legates in Trent, written from Rome on June 30, 1563, in which the pope expresses himself in favour of Elizabeth's excommunication.*

* These letters, as the following ones on p.80, reprinted by A.O. Meyer in the appendix of his work are in the original language, Italian. The contents of the letters are indicated by notes in connection with them in which Meyer gives a brief summary. I have almost verbally followed these notes, since there was no use of my trying to read the letters themselves.

When the committee investigated the case, stating the views of Ferdinand, who was not willing that the proposed bull of excommunication should be issued,¹ the Pope hesitated and retracted his former declaration.² When Philip's protest was added,³ the matter was settled, and the Pope declined to proceed any further.⁴ Thus since these two powers were not willing, nor in a position, to carry out the proposed excommunication it came to nothing.⁵

1 Meyer, App. VI, p. 472, gives the letter of Card. Morone to Card. Borromeo written on June 28, 1563 from Trent, stating that the imperial legates dissuade from the excommunication.*

2 Meyer, App. VIII, p. 473, the letter of Card. Borromeo to the legates in Trent, written from Rome on July 6, 1563, in which the Pope recalls his previous declaration and adopts the Emperor's reasons against excommunication.*

3 Meyer, App. IX, p. 473, letter of Card. Morone to Card. Borromeo written from Trent on July 7, 1563, in which is stated that Granvelle in the name of the King of Spain as well as that of the emperor, was against the excommunication.*

4 Meyer, p. 474, App. X, Card. Borromeo to the legates in Trent, on July 10, 1563, Rome. Out of regard for the emperor, the pope abandons the idea of the excommunication of Elizabeth.*

Meyer, p. 474, App. XI, Card. Borromeo to the legates in Trent, on July 17, 1563, Rome. The pope abandons the idea of excommunicating Elizabeth out of regard for the king of Spain.*

* * Cf. over, p. 79 (*).

5 Pollen, p. 77, gives a good account of the procedure. He says that the Cardinals "summoned the ecclesiastical representatives of the chief Catholic powers, of the Emperor, Spain, France, Poland, and Savoy, June 11, 1563, read them the English proposal, and inquired what their respective Governments would say to it. They also informed the Pope what they had done."

"An interesting exchange of letters now followed. The Emperor and Spain condemned the proposal very strongly; from Francis I find no answer, which is, perhaps, to be explained because of the war with England, which was still in progress. But whether they would have liked it or not, the objections raised by the Emperor Ferdinand were so urgent that the whole project was immediately dropped. ..."

We are interested in noting the reasons for the refusal of Ferdinand. We have seen how Philip presented his case, vide ante, p. 77. Ferdinand had similar reasons. Meyer, p. 52f (with reference to Sickel, pp. 551 et seq.) tells us: "The emperor's weightiest reason against the excommunication was couched in the form of a question -- where in all Christendom is the prince who will undertake to carry the excommunication into effect? How absurd and unworthy of a general council it would be to frame a decree that could not be executed, needs no proofs."

That Pope Pius IV refused to proceed with the steps leading to final excommunication shows weakness and instability in the Roman Church.¹ Such a procedure could not help but have the effect of disheartening the adherents of the Old Religion in England and of putting them at the mercy of the Government, for ^{it} knew that the Catholic powers outside the realm were not inclined to meddle in its affairs of an ecclesiastical nature.²

1 "The refusal of pope and council to employ spiritual weapons was a symptom of profound significance. The catholic church no longer ventured to employ against the queen of a small country weapons which it once had not shrunk from using against the Roman emperor. Deference to the policy of the Hapsburg regarding treaties and marriages cannot alone explain this refusal, and even if it did, would itself be a confession of weakness. Both advisers, especially the emperor, touched a more fundamental reason -- the inability of the church to carry her own verdict into effect. The earlier excommunication of Henry VIII. had been a paper protest of the middle ages against the advent of a new era. Before repeating this exhibition of impotent wrath, it was thought more prudent to make every attempt to avoid a breach and gain the object in view by friendly means. So little was Rome the aggressor in the conflict that she did not even attempt to defend her own rights. The pope was more afraid of his own bull than Elizabeth was." Meyer, ⁵⁴p. 54f.

"The whole incident, and especially the immediate withdrawal, both by the Cardinal Legates and by the Pope, of the proposed excommunication of Elizabeth, at the complaint of the Emperor, shows clearly that great diversity of opinion existed on the subject of excommunication of princes, ..." Pollen, p. 78.

It all depends on how one looks at it.

"'Rome,' says the official historian of the council, 'decided not to cut off the diseased limb since its amputation would not be for the healing but for the injury of the whole body.'" Meyer, p. 54, quoted from Pallavicino, lib. xxi., c., vii., Par. 6.

And that is another way of looking at it.

2 At this time we have the negotiations between the Emperor and Elizabeth regarding the marriage of the Queen and the Archduke Charles.

Maitland observes: "She (Elizabeth) was protected from the anathema by considerations of the wordliest sort." Camb. Mod. Hist. II, p. 587.

Denham's Account of the Papal Plans

An interesting account of the plans of Pope Pius IV is given us,^{us, 1, 1}
how true it is we do not know,² in which we are told that this Pope,
at the instigation of a meeting of higher clerics, had promised to
give England to that prince who would conquer it,³ granting indul-
gence and pardon to any one who would kill the Queen of England,⁴
and calling for the promotion of Mary Stuart's cause.⁵ The document
is dated 1564.⁶ These plans, however, were altered; some of them
found more complete expression in the underhanded dealings of
Gregory XIII.

1 Blunt, op. cit., II., pp. 434-437. "A list of several Consultations amongst the Cardinals, Bishops, and other of the several Orders of Rome now a contriving and conspiring against Her gracious Majesty and the Established Church of England."

"This paper is copied from a manuscript in the British Museum (Add. MS., 4784, fol. 39-42), to which is prefixed the following memorandum: 'Severall Memorialls of ye Lord Cecill's transcribed out of a Booke of his being lent vnto mee by John King, Minister & Deane of Tuam, Anno 1656.'"

2 This account is mentioned by no other historian (except Strype), as far as I know. It is the copy of a copy made almost a century later. We know nothing of Denham; his testimony is perhaps gossip, since he writes from Venice. I hesitate to impeach it without more grounds, but I cannot help but express some misgivings concerning it. I am not attacking the integrity of Blunt in this case, but I would like to have further proofs that these events actually took place and that such plans were made.

3 "And to encourage the same, the Council hath voted that Pius should bestow her Grace's realm on that prince who shall attempt to conquer it."

4 "It was granted, not only indulgence and pardon to the party that should assault her Grace either private or in public, or to any cook, brewer, baker, physician, vintner, grocer, chirurgeon, or any other calling whatsoever, that should or did make her away out of this world, a pardon, but an absolute remission of sins to the heirs of that party's family sprung from him, and a perpetual annuity to them for ever, and the said heirs to be never beholden to any of them fathers for pardon, be they of what order soever, unless it pleased himself, and to be one of those Privy Council whosoever reigned successively."

5 "It is ordered, upon pain of excommunication, and of a perpetual curse to light on the families and pesterities of all those of the Mother Church of Rome who will not promote or assist by means of money or otherwise Mary Queen of Scotland's pretence to the crown of England."

6 That is, the letter attached to the document as copied.

THE LAITY OF ENGLAND AND THE ABOLITION OF THE
OLD RELIGION

The Laymen Adopt the New Religion

It is only by knowing the background of the events on the Continent, as we have described them, that we can understand the situation of the Catholics in England. Again, remembering how the clergy conformed and the reason for their conformity, all of which reasons do not apply to the laity, we must consider, first of all, the attitude of the common people towards the change in religion.

It is not a question of how many retained their loyalty to the See of Rome. Since we cannot be certain of how many there were among the leaders in the pulpits, we can be still less certain how many there were among those who sat in the pews. We note, however, that there was no rebellion, no uprising, hardly a demonstration which has as a pretext in any way the revolution in religion, until a decade after the religious change had been made. When we recall "The Pilgrimage ^{age} of Grace" of 1536 -- only two years after the definite breach with the Papacy under Henry VIII -- , the "Rising of the Men of Cornwall" of 1549 -- in the third year of the Protestant Protectorate of Somerset --, Wyatt's rebellion in 1554 -- the year of the Spanish marriage --, even if ^{if} these uprising had other motives than religious, and though the religious ^{is} motive was not always very predominant, we can see that the religious change under Elizabeth must have met, if not with hilarious and exuberant ^{and} approval, yet with some sort of willing resignation.¹

1 Cf. Pollard's various works, passim; et alii. Mod.
"Among the laity there was much despondent indifference." Camb. Mod.
Hist., II, p. 572.

We wonder how Catholic England really was at the time of the accession of Elizabeth. We are told that of the then population two-thirds were Catholics at heart. We are also warned that if we believe that only a majority were Catholic we will not be so apt to be far wrong.¹

An Estimate of the Number of Catholic in England in 1570

For us the question of how many Catholic there were at the time of the accession has little significance. We are interested in how many adherents the Old Religion retained after the state had completed the religious settlement. Those that did not become adherents of the religion of the State, but retained their adherence to the See of Rome, were, by the laws of the land, traitors. That they dwindled to a minority is certain.² How small this minority was during the period under discussion we have no way of knowing. Unfortunately (or should we say fortunately?) we have no attempt ^{at} a Literary Digest during this time to ascertain their number, nor would any such attempt have been possible. We must therefore be satisfied with vague conjectures.

1 "Since we cannot be certain of the numerical strength of the two parties even among the clergy, and must rest satisfied with a vaguely approximate result, any attempt to claim the majority of the nation as a whole for the adherents or enemies of Rome must be regarded as merely conjectural and devoid of solid proofs." Meyer, p.10.

Cf. Froude, VII, p.11. He places the number at two-thirds.

2 "In the years between the close of the council of Trent and Elizabeth's excommunication (1563-70), the catholic church had plainly lost the greater number of her adherents." Meyer, p. 65.

"After 1570 the Spaniards themselves realized that now only the majority 'of respectable people' were catholics." Meyer, p. 65n with reference to Span. Cal., 1568-79, p. 309.

Meyer likewise here discounts the assertion of the Spanish ambassadors that the Old Religion was "increasing" in England. His reasons are convincing.

We are told that there were perhaps 3,750,000 people in England in 1570.¹ This figure is approximately as close as we can hope to make it, so we accept it. We are also told: "In the figure for 1585 (120,000 circ.) we have in all probability the earliest indication of the number of English Catholics."² Let us take these two figures as a basis in an attempt to estimate the English Catholic in 1570. But our attempt must remain a guess. These 120,000 Catholics in 1585 represent the number who were in good standing. The missionaries of Douay had labored in England since 1574. The Jesuits had begun their mission in 1580. There had been a few martyrs (Campion, et al.), and martyrs help to make converts. On the other hand we must remember that the older people were more apt to be adherents to the church of their youth, so there were more of those in 1570 than in 1585; it was but a generation after Henry "broke the bonds of Rome." Then too, the Northern Uprising had failed. The excommunication of Elizabeth was very unpopular in England. The year 1570 represents perhaps the lowest ebb in the Catholic movement in England. The country had had ten years in which to become accustomed to Protestantism.^{-then} Our guess is that there were perhaps only about 115,000 Catholics in England in 1570. This figure represents about three percent, of the population. We might place the percentage at five percent, but I cannot persuade myself that we can put it any higher.³

1 Meyer, p. 64. He supports this figure by a somewhat lengthy *argumentation*

2 Ibid., p.63.

3 My figure cannot be supported by any quotations. Meyer's estimate given above is the only numerical estimate I have found for the whole period. I know that any Catholic historian would deride such a low estimate, and perhaps justly. I am, for my part, convinced that at present I must accept that estimate as correct, but with a question mark. With the boldness of youth I have ventured to make this independent, dependent conclusion.
independent,

Could Conformity be taken for Apostasy?

Leaving the field of conjectures, we return once more to more or less solid ground.

Elizabeth, it is said, boasted that she would make no windows into men's souls, meaning thereby, that they could believe what they wished, provided only that they maintained an outward conformity to the state religion.¹ This question, whether to go to the Anglican services or not, was the question which seems to have bothered the minds of the Catholics to the greatest extent. The law of the country demanded it. A fine of twelve pence had been fixed as the punishment for disobeying this law.²

This question was submitted to a congregation at the Council of Trent in 1562. A letter had been sent to Mascareynas, the Portuguese ambassador at this place. A congregation was arranged to discuss the question. Cardinal Hosius, Don Bartholomew, and Diego Lainez, S.J., were members of this committee. "They eventually issued a longish exhortation," we are told, "to courage in resisting the new services, which they declared could in no way be tolerated."³

1 "In the early years of Elizabeth's rule there was some justification for her boast that she made no windows into men's souls. There was no liberty of worship, but there was no inquisition." Pollard, *Hist. of Eng.*, p. 218.

"Elizabeth and her ministers stated (when it served their purpose) that they did not care about interior assent; what they wanted was obedience to the law." Pollen, p. 96.

"The Queen and her officials plainly declared, and their actions backed up their declaration, that the consciences of men should not be violated by interference with their purely religious beliefs so long as conscience was not made the shield and excuse for opinions so depraved as to involve the Queen's subjects in acts of open violence against the State." Klein, *Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 185.

2 1 Eliz. c. ii.

3 Pollen, p. 100. Cf. *ib.*, p. 75.

57

The Pope, likewise, when asked for a "Gutachtung" on this question by the Spanish ambassador in England, during this same year, declared that the Catholics should desist from carrying out this practise. He declared that Catholics could not attend them without peril of damnation to their immortal souls.¹

Two years later, however, another man, the future Pope Pius V, was willing to modify this sentence slightly. Two priests were given faculties by him which allowed them to dispense those who had attended the Anglican services, declaring "proper dissentientes multorum sentetias" the practise could be excuse from grave sin.²

Again two years later, in 1566, Pius V, now Pope, delegated a certain Laurence Vaux to inform two of the more prominent of the English exiles in the Low Countries, Sander and Harding, that such a practise should not be tolerated. Vaux was delegated by these two men to take this message into England. In 1567 Cardinal Morone procured a pagella of which official copies were sent into England, declaring that Vaux' information was authentic.³

Inspite of these opinions we dare not suppose that all the Catholics desisted from attending Anglican worship. Had they done so more of them might have retained their allegiance to the Holy See. As it was, they were gradually weaned away from the Old Religion in increasing numbers. It is true, as a Catholic remarks: "Enforced church-going was not a proof of Anglicanism, but it was the most powerful means of uprooting the ancient Faith."⁴

1 Pollen, p. 101; Froude, VII, p. 484; Klein, p.28.

2 Pollen, p. 104.

3 Pollen, p. 104f.

4 Pollen, p. 96.

We may in a way excuse those Catholic who attended the Anglican service in the words of the same writer: "...Many people, when Gallicanism was common, thought the oath was merely a royal flourish, which, like other royal pretensions, should not be scanned too closely. They would not take its schismatical character seriously. Under pressure, Catholics sometimes relapsed into this frame of mind even in Elizabeth's reign .."¹ To our mind, however, the fact that Catholics attended the Anglican services under the circumstances in which they did shows a spirit of indifference. But we will grant that the times must have been trying to the souls of the honest Catholics.

Methods were provided for those who had lapsed into this error and wished to regain their standing in the Roman Church. It will be recalled that one of the Spanish ambassadors was a Bishop. De Quadra received a brief from the Pope, in October, 1563, which allowed him to sub-delegate his powers, that those who had lapsed might be reconciled and absolved from their sin. He, however, did not get an opportunity to use these powers for a very long time. He died on Aug. 24, 1563. It is not known what use he made of these powers, or whether he used them very extensively while he had the opportunity.²

1 Pollen, p. 96n.

2 Ibid., p. 102 with reference to Arch. Vat., xliv., xl., n. 419.

religion was merely a matter of politics.¹ This may be true more especially with those of the upper classes. The change of the clergy, also, may have made the people indifferent. If a majority of them changed so readily, as if it mattered little, the laity cannot be expected to have adopted another point of view.

The papal authority was also resented in England. A nation that as early as 1351 had passed the Statute of Provisors and in 1353 the First Statute of Praemunire,² and had repeated these same statutes in 1390 and 1393 respectively;³ the same nation which saw the light of the "Morning Star of the Reformation", and a century and a half later (1534) had passed the Supremacy Act⁴—omitting the clause which the clergy had appended to the Supreme Head "per legem Christi licet"—only twenty years later to prostrate itself before the papal legate when, nota bene, he had brought with him a dispensation allowing them to keep the lands of the monasteries which had been suppressed;⁵ that nation to my mind can not have been a nation very desirous of retaining the authority of the See of Rome.

Added to this there was a certain bull of Alexander VI's issued in 1493, entitled "Inter caetera divinae",⁶ that did not suit the maritime nation of England any too well. That bull

1 Pollard, p. 214 with reference to Span. Cal. i., 69; Brit. MS. Add. MS. 26056.

2 Gee and Hardy, Documents, etc., p. 102 and 103f. 27 ed. III. c. 1.

3 Ibid., pp. 112-121 13 R. II. c. 2. pp. 122-125, 16 R. II. c. 5.

4 Ibid., pp. 243-244. Cf. Pollard, Henry VIII., passim.

5 Pollard, Hist. of Eng., p. 130. Et alii.

6 Mirbst, Quellengeschichte, pp. 246-248.

which caused the newly discovered lands to be divided between Spain and Portugal left ^{England} outside in the cold looking in, wishing that it had some of the spoils. It was easy to confuse patriotism and religion in a case of that kind.¹

Nor can we overlook the fact that the modification of Elizabeth's title had some influence in reconciling Catholics. She did not, as did Henry, claim to be virtually the pope of the English Church. She called herself the Supreme Governor.²

It is also claimed that Parker, the Archbishop of Canterbury, maintained that the English Church was the true Apostolic Church, and that ^{some of} the English Catholics were ready to receive this claim.³

1 "But perhaps the most potent of all causes which estranged Englishmen from the papacy and Spain was the bar they placed in England's path across the sea. A good Roman catholic could not flout the papal award which divided the New World between Portugal and Spain; and if the 'sea divinity,' as Fuller terms it, of Hawkins and Drake was hardly orthodox protestantism, it was at least anti-papal. It was no accident that those parts of England which heard the call of new-found lands forsook their ancient faith for one which rendered attacks upon the papists not only a profitable pleasure, but also a religious duty." Pollard, op. cit., p. 189.

Pollard is the only one who mentions this. This reason which he sets up seems to me can hardly be overstressed.

2 "This modification in the title of the royal supremacy explains, at least to a considerable extent, the remarkable fact that Elizabeth's ecclesiastical reform met with so little opposition." Meyer, p. 25.

Cf. Froude, VII, p. 78. He calls the modification of the title, "a variation of phrase."

Meyer referring to this statement in a footnote says in the text, p. 25: "The general opinion that there is no difference between the supremacy of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth's overlooks the point that the former was unlimited (in theory at least) and the later limited."

3 I do not know who said this or where it was said, I have merely remembered the effect of the statement and set it down in in this manner.

The Government and Those who Refused to Conform

The treatment of the Catholics during these early years is intimately bound up with international events.¹ If we would sum up the activities of the Government against the Catholics during this decade, we would say that the Government as a rule did not molest them as long as the country was not under the some sort of a foreign threat, but as soon as events began to transpire which might be dangerous to the peace of England and its well-being, the Catholics felt the heavy hand of the laws, which the Parliament had passed, in a degree that was more or less in proportion to the danger that threatened.²

The year 1559 which saw the abrogation of the papal power in England saw also the fall of the papal church. The church of Rome "collapsed almost like a house of cards."³ During this year we have seen the visitors going about, establishing the new religion, but refraining from asking too many questions. Yet the task confronting the new Bishops was not so easy. Even if the Catholics were but a minority (how small we do not say) they provided enough anxiety for the hierarchy that now was.⁴

Those priests which had been deprived and continued to work in secret among the people must have caused the new prelates some anxiety.

1 Stebbings, p. 404f.

2 "Between 1560 and 1570 it treated them harshly and suppressed their freedom of worship only when the political horizon was overcast." Meyer, p. 127.

3 Pollen, p. 39

4 On March 23, 1564 Jewel wrote to Simler: "We have only to do with some of the popish satellites, who are making as much disturbances as they can in their corners and hiding-places." Quoted by Birt, p. 441, from 4/ Jewel, p. 1261, Letter XXXVII.

To say how many of these priests there were, where they labored and to what extent, is impossible. We are told that in 1596, more than thirty-five years after the religious settlement, there were between forty and fifty of the old Marian clergy still active in England.¹ Of course, there must have been more in the earlier years. We may, however, suppose that this figure is a slight exaggeration.

These priests were forced to do their work in secret. And it seems as if the Government did not try to enforce the law very strictly, but allowed them to go about unmolested for the most part. "The majority of the priests so labouring in England were doubtless never caught."² They were not caught, because the Government didn't care to catch them.

The first year of the reign of Elizabeth does not seem to have resulted in very many arrests of Catholics. In 1560, however, at the time when the nuncio Parpaglia was sent to confer with Elizabeth, there was some effort made to curb Catholicism. The Spanish ambassador ^{writes:} "The Catholics have been persecuted worse than ever, and all those that are known are cast into prison."³

Again in the following year when Martinengo was on his way to London efforts were made to coerce the Catholics. Cecil, we are told by a good authority, managed to piece together the details of several events, such as the Work of Father Wolfe, S.J., in Ireland which was simultaneous with an uprising in that island (although there probably was no connection between the two) and the capture of a certain priest

1 Birt, p. 301 from William Holt, S.J., who wrote this in 1596.

2 Birt, p. 303

3 De Quadra to the Count de Feria on May 23m 1560. Quoted by Pollen, p. 65, from the Spanish Calendar, p. 156.

by the name of Cox,¹ to use that as a pretext for imprisoning the Catholics.²

The year 1563 saw the release of quite a number of these Catholic prisoners, due perhaps to the fortuitous concurrence of the threat of an epidemic and a letter from the Emperor Ferdinand.³ In this year, when the second Parliament of Elizabeth met, it was thought advisable to strengthen the laws which had been passed against the adherents of the Old Religion. Another Act⁴ was therefore passed, increasing the penalty of a first offender to Praemunire,⁵ and extending the oath to

2 Pollen, pp. 69-70.

2 Pollen, p. 71, quotes a letter which Cecil wrote to Throckmorton on May 8, 1561: "When I saw the Romish influence toward, about a month past, I thought necessary to dull the Papists' expectation by discovering certain Mass-mongers and punishing them, as I do not doubt you have heard. I take God to my record that I mean no evil to any of them, but only for the rebating of the Papists' humours, which by the Queen's lenity grow too rank. I find that it hath done much good." (Reference to R.O., Foreign Elizabeth, xviii. 103).

3 Pollen, p. 79.

4 5 Eliz. Cap. 1. Prothero, pp. 39-41. "An Act for the Assurance of the Queen's Majesty's royal power over all estates and subjects within her Highness' dominions."

5 "Be it therefore enacted ... That if any person dwelling within this realm ... after the first day of April, which shall be in the year of our Lord God 1563, shall by writing ... preaching or teaching, deed or act... maintain or defend the authority, jurisdiction or power of the Bishop of Rome, or of his see, heretofore claimed, used or usurped within this realm ... or by any speech, open deed or act, advisedly and willing attribute any such manner of jurisdiction, authority preeminence to the said see of Rome, or to any bishop of the same see for the time being, within this realm ... that then every person so doing, their abettors (&c.) ... being thereof lawfully indicted or presented within one year next after any such offences by him committed, and being thereof lawfully convicted or attainted at any time after, according to the laws of this realm, for every such default and offence shall incur into the penalties .. provided by the Statute of Provision and Praemunire made in the sixteenth year of the reign of King Richard the Second."

It will be noted that this Statute names the "bishop of Rome" in so many words. The previous Act, 1 Eliz. c. 1 had defined him only by general terms within naming him in so many words.

person who had not as yet been required to take it.¹ The second offence against this law was made high treason.²

That this law was meant to be enforced strictly is not in accord with the facts.³ Subsequent events show that it was not applied. The year following the passage of this act is described to us as a "peaceful year."⁴

1 "... and all schoolmasters and public and private teachers of ^{children,} children, as also all manner of persons that have taken or hereafter shall take ^{any} any degree of learning in the Common Laws of this realm, as well utter-barristers as benches ... in any house or court, and all principal ^{treasurers,} treasurers, and such as be of the grand company in every Inn of Chancery, and all attorneys, protonotaries and philizers towards the laws of this realm, and all manner of sheriffs, escheators and feodaries, and all other ^{persons} persons which ... have been or shall be admitted to any ministry or office in the Common Law or any other law, ... and all officers of any court whatsoever, shall take a corporal oath upon the Evangelists, before ^{any} they shall be admitted ... to take upon them to ... exercise ... any such vocation, office (&c.) as is aforesaid ..."

2 "And for the stronger defence and maintenance of this Act, it is further enacted ... that then every such offender for the same second offence ... shall suffer the same pains ... and execution as is used in cases of high treason."

3 "It has been justly observed, however, that the draconian severity of this law was even from the first intended more in terrorem ⁱⁿ than in earnest." Meyer, p. 50, with reference to Gee, p. 195.

"It is certain that Elizabeth did not wish this law to be ^{enforced} enforced in its full severity." Hallam, Constitutional History, p. 76.

4 Pollen, p. 84.

It was in this year, according to the same writer, l.c., that Pius the Fourth said in Consistory: "From England the news is that Catholics are treated more mildly by the Queen; that she is less bitter every day and seems milder." Reference to Maziere Brady, Episcopal Succession, ii, 327.

In 1563, the year previous to this, the proposal to excommunicate the Queen of England had been rejected at the Council of Trent. Vide ante, pp. 79-81. This fact may have had some bearing, no doubt it did have, on the milder treatment which the Catholics were now receiving. This was one of the periods which are bright spots for the Catholics. It justifies the assertion that the Elizabethan State was truly tolerant in so far as it could be in the ^{state} sixteenth century.

It does not seem as if the Government took very many actions against the Catholics during the two following years. It was not until the year 1567 that they were again molested seriously. In that year there was some fear that Philip might invade England, due to complications in the Netherlands. At this time the suit of the Archduke was also revived. The Earl of Leicester complicated matters still more by pressing his suit. But it was the Catholics that suffered.¹

From now on there is dissatisfaction in the country. The sequence of events in Scotland brought this about. Mary had been married to Lord Darnley, an English noble, a Catholic, the next heir after Mary to the English throne.² From this union (consummated on July 29, 1565) James VI of Scotland, afterwards James I of England, was born (July 19, 1566). Mary, who had hitherto ruled her Protestant country peacefully for five years, had proclaimed Moray a rebel. He fled to England, where he was treated as an exile, not being received by Elizabeth. David Riccio had in the meanwhile made himself useful to the Queen of Scots. Darnley grew jealous of him and Riccio was murdered almost in the presence of the Queen during the evening meal on March 9, 1566. On February 10, 1567, the room which Darnley, the husband of the Scottish Queen, was occupying was blown up by ^{-des}gunpowder, and he was found dead nearby. By whom the deed was perpetrated is a debated question. The Earl of Bothwell seems to have been rather deeply implicated. The public believed that Mary was in some way connected with the murder. Bothwell, having carried Mary off to Dunbar (on April 19, 1567), married her (May 15, 1567) according to

1 Froude, VII, p. 180 et seq.

2 Cf. Pollard, Hist. of Eng., App. II for genealogical table. Ibid., p. 258-276

Protestant ceremonies. Rebellion was rife in Scotland. Mary was captured and imprisoned in Lochleven; she escaped; she was defeated at Landside; she fled to England (May, 1568). Here she became the center of the Catholic activities in England.¹

In the following year the Uprising of the North took place. While the movement itself did not have as its motive the placing of Mary Stuart on the throne of England, her presence in England helped to percipate the uprising. The troubles which had been brewing might otherwise have passed over peacefully.²

The dominatⁿ feature of the North was still feudalism.³ Economic distress⁴ and an anti-puritanical if not a pro-Catholic sentiment⁵ were the main causes of the dissent in the North.

1 Cf. Pollard, op. cit., pp.258-276; Kurlbaum-Siebert, Mary Queen of Scots, passim.

2 "Mary Stuart's arrival in England gave backbone to a resistance which might otherwise have succumbed peacefully to the absorbing pressure of the national monarchy." Pollard, op. cit., p.281

3 "The only clear cause for immediate action was loyalty to feudal chiefs, who were threatened by the new men; and this was all through put forward as the primary motive for action." Pollen, p. 136.

4 "In the first place, the destruction of the monasteries and the transference of their lands, in many cases to absentee courtiers, continued to increase unemployment and poverty. Secondly, the decay of the Borders involved a decline in a prosperity which depended upon horse-breeding and the provision of other requisites for Border garrisons. Thirdly, the council of the North now sat only at York, instead of migrating to Newcastle and elsewhere to accomodate suitors; and this put all who had business before it to considerable expense in travelling. Finally, the interruption of the wool trade with the Netherlands in 1568-9, which caused local disturbances in Norfolk and Suffolk, also inflicted no little injury upon Northumbrian towns, where the wool from the moors was marketed and packed for transport across the North Sea. For these drawbacks the north derived no compensation from the maritime adventure and commercial expansion which were converting the south to enthusiasm for progress in politics and religion." Pollard, p.281.

5 "...For most of the rebels it was a fight for the Old Faith against the new-made official religion." Atteridge, The Elizabethan Persecution, p. 44

Elizabeth summoned the northern Earls to submit to the Oath of Supremacy. Finally, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland raised their standard, and with the cry "God speed the plough" the rebellious subjects from the northern part of England were finally in revolt. They began to reestablish the Old Religion in Durham. Ten days later the movement began to falter and within two months the rebellion had been crushed. No less than eight hundred had to pay for their disloyalty with death.¹

The movement, in as much as we are concerned with it, shows us that the cry of restoring the Old Religion was not strong enough to rally a sufficient number of supporters to carry its slogan into effect. It shows us that the Old Religion had lost its dominance in England, and that any attempt to lead England back again to the See of Rome would end in failure. Other methods would have to be adopted in the future. We must also remember that the religious motive was not the only one which caused this revolt. It was a powerful one, but it should not be overestimated. It shows too where the strength of the Catholic party lay. It was only in the "Hinterland" of the North that the Catholic religion had its ardent supporters.²

1 "No fewer than 800 suffered execution, sometimes for other reasons than their guilt. Care was taken to make at least one example in every village represented in the rebels' camp; and where ~~the~~ only one rebel joined, he was executed. Elsewhere the proportion of victims to offenders sank as low as six to one ..." Pollard, p. 296 with reference to Sharp, Memorials.

Cf. Pollard, op. cit., pp. 277-296; Birt, pp. 475-501; Pollen, pp. 118-141; Froude, IX. c. xviii; et alii; passim.

2 Meyer, p. 66

How the Catholics were Served by their Priests

Before uprooting the Old Religion by force, the Government wanted to strengthen the New.¹ Nor were all the officials of the Government willing to persecute or prosecute the Catholics.² This was the case especially in such part of the country like Carlisle, Durham, York, Worcester, Hereford and Exeter, the northern and western sections of the country.³ For this reason also the Government allowed those priests whom they might have suspected of not being very ardent for the cause of the New Religion to retain their parishes and serve the people.

It happened at times, oftener in the earlier years no doubt, that the same man who was the priest of the parish under the New Religion and functioned as such would likewise say mass privately for his family and friends before attending to his official duties.⁴

1 Meyer says of Elizabeth: "She was aiming at a peaceful transition, trusting to time and a mild application of the law." P.28.

2 De Quadra wrote to Philip on Nov. 27, 1561, as follows: "It is said publicly that (Lady Margaret Douglas) ... shows favour to the Catholics in the Province of York, and that consequently the Bishop dares not visit his diocese or punish any Papist." Quoted by Birt, p. 324, from Hume, Cal. of Span. Papers, i, p.144.

Froude, sVII, p. 480, with reference to a letter of the Bishop of Hereford to Cecil, Domestic MSS, Vol. XIX, writes: "In August of the same year (1561) 'the Popish justices' of Hereford commanded the observance of St. Lawrence's day as a holyday. ... A party of recusant priests from Devonshire were received in state by the magistrates, carried through the streets in procession, and so 'feasted and magnified as Christ himself could not have been more reverentially entertained.'"

3 Birt, p.339.

4 "Often the same priest read the Anglican service in public to satisfy the law and then said mass in secret to satisfy his conscience." Pollard, p.280. *satisfy*
Pollard,

The work of the hedge priests has already been mentioned in another connection.¹ They were perhaps the most active servants of the Catholic church in England during this period. We find, however, that they too sometimes gave their people a bad example in attending the Anglican services and communion.²

It was through these two classes of men that the Catholics were served during this decade, in fact up until the year 1574 when the missionaries from Douay began their work, which was not of such a compromising character.

Those in London could find other means of hearing the mass. The ambassadors from the Catholic countries had their private chaplains. These were allowed to say mass in the chapels of the embassies. We find continued proof that the Catholics of London attended these services. At times the Elizabethan Government would raid these services and arrest the Englishmen present.³

1 Vide ante, p.92f.

2 "There were even some Catholic priests -- so the most trustworthy evidence assures us -- who adopted the doctrine which distinguished between inward belief and outward obedience, and brought themselves to say mass in secret and go publicly to the protestant communion service on the same day." Meyer, p. 69f, with reference to a letter to Card. Allen in Knox, Letters of Card. Allen, p. 56.

3 Wright, II, p. 37ff, a letter written by William Fletewood to Lord Burghley in November, 1576, telling of the arrest of some English subjects while attending mass at the home of Sig. Geraldini, the Portuguese ambassador.

De Quadra writes on May 23, 1560, to the Count de Feria, "They have also arrested those that came to my house at Easter Day to hear Mass, and have declared my house suspect." Quoted by Pollen, p.65, from the Spanish Calendar, p.156.

Pollen, l.c., tells us that the French ambassador's house was raided on Feb. 2, 1560, the Feast of Purification. The English present were arrested.

Birt, p. 453f, has an account of a similar arrest "on the day of the Purification of our Lady," in 1563.

Froude, passim, likewise mentions similar incidents.

Even with the hedge priests, the duo-clergymen, and the chaplains of the embassies as their pastors, we need not suppose that the English Catholics were provided with priests to fulfill all, ~~what~~ they thought, necessary ecclesiastical functions. Nor should we suppose that there was anything like a hierarchical system among the Roman clergy. It was not until Blackwell was appointed archpriest, three decades later, that any attempt was made to organize the clergy. ¹

This lack of clergy brought about the decline of stauncher Catholicism during this period. The Catholics were deserted by Rome; Peter was sleeping.² Is it any wonder that the Catholics being in need of spiritual food would partake of the "heretical" services? Even those who were not conscious of this need attended the Anglican services to escape the penalties provided by law. They did this in spite of the rejoinders from the papal see.³

And here we wish to repeat once more that it was not force, but tolerance, that brought about the laxity among the Catholics. After the period of persecution began with the next decade the Catholics show a greater loyalty to their religion.⁴

1 Cf. Meyer, pp. 411-464, passim.

2 "No doubt the long history of the sufferings of English ^{catholics} comprised periods of much greater oppression than the first twelve ^{years} of Elizabeth, but at no other period did ^{years} catholics see themselves so utterly forsaken by the church, or so entirely cut off from all ^{communication} with Rome, as at this period -- especially in the seven years between the close of the Council of Trent and the queen's excommunication." ^{of} ... "Numerous statements in support of this view are found in the reports of the Spanish ambassador. Colecion de doc. ined. t. 89, 90, and the Span. Cals." Meyer, p.67. ^{Spain}

3 Vide ante, 86-88.

4 Meyer, p. 134 et passim. This view is not held by Pollen or ^{Atteridge} Atteridge.

The Devices of Some Catholics to Conform and to Remain Loyal to the
Old Religion.

We are told in an interesting paragraph, which we shall quote at length, concerning some of the devices used by the English Catholics, so that they might appear loyal to the State and to the Roman Church. We read: "In the days when they were bereft of pastors, the faithful of the flock discovered strange expedients for obeying the catholic church and the law of the protestant state at the same time. They drew a subtle distinction between taking part in divine service and merely being present at service without joining it. Rome forbade the former; there could be no harm in the latter. Many, therefore, entered church some time before service began and left before it was over, persuading themselves that there was no real connection between their time spent in the church and the performance of heretical service. Others fancied they satisfied their conscience by going to service but abstaining from communion; others, again, considered even the protestant communion harmless so long as it was received without inward participation -- they ate 'Calvin's profaned bread' with the heretics that they might secretly receive 'the Lord's Body' when opportunity was offered."¹ We will of course censure them for doing this. It is hardly compatible with our idea of church fellowship. Rome would and did censure them. Had not the early Christians refused to offer incense before the image of the Emperor? But, and this can be said in extenuation but not in excuse, they wanted to live at peace with their fellows.

¹ Meyer, p. 69, based by him on a description given of the conduct of the English catholics in the period before the mission by the *Relatione del presente stato d'Inghilterra ... Roma, addresso F. Zannetti. 1590.*

Summary of the Situation.

Although there were no executions for the sake of religion during the period under consideration, the fines were oppressive to the Catholics. Although the Government tolerated the actions of their priests and winked at their observance of mass in secret, the attitude of their Protestant neighbors was forbidding. Although they tried to remain loyal to the See of Rome, the See of Rome disregarded them. They were barred from all public offices, because they could not with a good conscience swear to the Oath of Supremacy. We are, furthermore, told: "As early as 1564 the Spanish ambassador complained, 'the evil lies in the universal distrust, for a father dares not trust his own son.'"¹

We cannot speak of the more intimate details of the lives of the Catholics at this period. No doubt, the private letters written by them would not dare to mention their secret anguish and fears for their religion. Those that did so would possibly have been destroyed after they had been received.

We do not even know how many Catholics were imprisoned all over England at any given time during this period. The more we investigate the matter the more we feel the inadequacy of our knowledge -- even from secondary sources -- and of the possibility to know more about these details.

1 Meyer, p.170, from the Col. de doc. ined., t. 89, p.50. Span. Cal., 1558-67, p.389.

Meyer and Polle^{Hugh} gives the best accounts of such details. Robert Hugh Benson has written a novel, *Come Rack! Come Rope!* which as fiction shows what the lives of the Catholics of the following decade might have been.

PIUS V AND THE EXCOMMUNICATION OF ELIZABETH

In January of the year 1566 Michele Ghislieri became the fifth Pope of the name Pius. We are told that he was a very able man, a great leader, unlike some of his predecessors and unlike his successor, Gregory XIII, in this that he believed in principles,¹ of monastic ideals -- he always wore his friar's habit and was known as 'Brother Woodenshoe' -- with a conception of the papacy that fitted in better with the eleventh century.²

He, like his namesake, Pius IV, began with conciliatory measures³ towards Elizabeth. Soon, however, he realized that such steps would be to no avail and he early resolved to excommunicate the Queen. And yet, he too had to wait for the opportune time.⁴

1 "Michele Ghislieri, Pope St. Pius V, was beyond question the greatest Pope of the Counter-Reformation period. He had very considerable powers as an organiser and legislator, and, what was more important still, he had the gift of spiritual leadership in a very high degree. ... A man of unflinching adherence to principle, he never failed to exhort and encourage others to great deeds in the cause of the Church. ... He was so intent on great achievements that he did not fear risks." Pollen, p.142.

2 "His nickname 'Fra Scarpone,' ('Brother Woodenshoe') indicated the monastic limitations of his outlook." Meyer, p.73, with reference to Attinoni e costumi di Pio V., Arch. Vat., Borgh. I., 268, fol. 116.

3 "Though Pius V went eventually as far in hostility to Elizabeth, he began, like his predecessor, with readiness to be conciliatory. This is shown by an exchange of letters at his accession with one Bernard Ferrario, a gentleman of Pavia. ... Though nothing seems to have resulted from the correspondence, we see from it and kindred documents that Pius was not at first without hope of Elizabeth's conversion, and that gentle measures might be effective." Pollen, p.143 with references to Arch. Vat., Arm. lxiv, n. 28, correspondence of the Protector Moroni, ff. 111 to 117, March to May, 1566.

4 Meyer, p.74

"But even a Pius V. must wait for the right moment to ensure the success of such an act." Ib., l.c.

Cf. also Pollen, p.144ff.

The Uprising of the North seems to have provided the occasion.¹

Steps were taken for the excommunication of Elizabeth. An indictment was drawn up.² Witnesses were called.³ And on February 25, 1570,

1 I am not certain what information the Pope had regarding the uprising. He knew that it was taking place, but it seems as if he hoped for its further success. Pastor, History of the Popes, XVIII, p.214, tells us:

"Pius V. frequently assured the Spanish ambassador that he had issued the bull of excommunication in response to the requests of the English Catholics, who had scruples about taking up arms against Elizabeth as she was not declared a heretic and deposed by the Pope; that his intention had been to encourage them, and that since the English Catholics had asked for the sentence against Elizabeth, he could not in conscience refuse it." References to letters from Zuniga to Philip II., Corresp. dipl. III., 291, April 10, 1570; 307 seq., Apr. 28, 1570; 397, June 10, 1570; et al.

2 The commission was opened on Feb. 5, 1570 by Alexander Riaro, Unitore Generale of Causes in the Pontifical Court. The indictment reads as follows:

"WHEREAS some years back the Kingdom of England was infested by heretics, schismatics and infidels, and whereas Queen Mary had entirely extirpated the said heresies, and brought back the said Kingdom to the obedience to the Holy See; she, the said Queen Mary, dying, and Elizabeth her sister succeeding: the latter, where she ought to have followed her sister's footsteps, and to have exhorted the said people to live in Christianlike and Catholicity, NEVERTHELESS this same Elizabeth, instigated by the devil, as is notorious, inexcusable, and of public fame, erecting her horns against the apostolic authority, HAS forced and compelled the peoples of that kingdom, and in particular Bishops, Archbishops, and other ecclesiastical persons, to take a wicked oath against Church liberty, not to recognise any other supreme governess, whether in ecclesiastical or in temporal causes, except herself, the asserted Queen, and this under grave, afflictive and even corporal pains. ALSO she has visited the said Bishops and others with her pretended commissaries, and deprived, despoiled some of them for refusing the said oath, and bestowed the bishoprics, benefices, etc., on heretics, married men, and non-clerics. ALSO she has consigned to prison all who hear divine offices and the Mass according to the order of our Holy Mother Church, and leaves them to perish and to die. WHAT is still more detestable, scandalous and of worst example, she makes laws, prints heretical books on the administration of the Sacraments and divine offices, and commands them to be observed. ALSO she does not fear to live and to allow sermons to be preached in the heretical and Calvinistic manner, and to tolerate condemned and manifest heresy, and to hear ecclesiastical heretical causes; she forbids priests to celebrate more Catholic; she is present at heretical sermons; she allows meat on forbidden days; she has the Lord's Supper celebrated more haeretico; and commits other enormous crimes. These things are public to the whole world, inexcusable, notorious, and redound to the contempt of the Apostolic See." Pollen, p.147f. After comparing the translation of the bull which he gives with the original, I have reasons to believe that also this indictment is not translated quite accurately, e.g., "governess."

3 Pollen, p.148, gives the following names of the witnesses: Sir Richard Shelley, Thomas Goldwell, Maurice Clenog, Nicholas Morton, Henry Henshaw, Edmund Daniel, Edward Bromburg, William Gyblet, Richard Shelley the younger, William Allot, Richard Hall, D.D., Thomas Kytton and Henry Kytton.

Elizabeth was declared excommunicated.¹ Having usurped the headship of the Church, undone Mary's work, allowed heresy in the realm, abused the mass, tolerated Calvinistic practises, and other such crimes;² she was declared a heretic, an abettor of heretics, and deprived of her title to the throne of England. Her subjects were released from obedience to her.³ This bull, Regnans in Excelsis, goes the full length of all papal claims over princes and kingdoms.⁴

The bull was not published in the usual manner, but steps were taken to have it brought to England. It was sent to Alva in the Netherlands, to France, and to Poland.⁵ Philip was very displeased when he

1 Pollen, p. 159 gives a detailed discussion of the correctness of this date. Blunt, II, p. 448, gives the date as Feb. 27, 1570, with reference to Fuller's Ch. Hist., ii. 491; Cardwell's Doc. Ann., i. 328. In view of what Pollen says, I cannot except Blunt's date.

2 Cf. the counts of the indictment. Vide ante, p. 103n.

3 The bull is found in a condensed translation in Pollen, pp. 149ff; Prothero, p. 195f has an abridged form in the original; Mirbst, pp. 348-9 has it almost complete. I have carefully compared these three. I am quoting according to Prothero:

"Illius itaque auctoritate suffulti, qui Nos in hoc supremo justitiae throno, licet tanto operi impares, voluit collocare, de apostolica potestate plenitudine declaramus praedictam Elizabeth; haereticam et haeticorum fautricem, et eisque adhaerentes in praedictis anathematis sententiam incurrisse, esseque a Christi corporis unitate praecisos; quin etiam ipsam praetense regni praedicti jure, necnon omni et quocunque dominio, dignitate privilegioque privatum; et item proceres, subditos et populos dicti ac caeteros omnes qui illi quomocunque juraverunt a juramento hujusmodi ad omni prorsus dominii fidelitatis et obsequii debito perpetuo absolutos, prout nos illos praesentium auctoritate absolvimus; et Praecipimusque et interdiciamus universis et singulis proceribus, subditis, populis et aliis praedictis, ne illi ejusve monitis, mandatis et legibus audeant obedire. Qui secus egerint, eos simili anathematis sententia innodames ..."

4 Pollen, p. 151n, points out that, compared with the sentence of Henry VII "the possible extension of the sentence to the subjects of the monarch are here very much reduced." A phrase in the preface of this bull, "Petri- que successor Romano Pontifio in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandum," shows nevertheless that the Pope had no small ideas of what his authority was.

5 Pastor, XVIII, pp. 215-218. It was sent to these places on account of the fact that merchants from England were likely to become acquainted with it there. The bull did not appear in Rome until May.

heard about the sentence.¹ And so were the other powers.²

The importance of the bull consists in this that it brought about a still more complete severing of England from Rome. Whereas formerly attempts had been made to reconcile these two powers, attempts were now made to keep them still further apart. It also awoke the English Catholics to a full realization of what the breach with Rome really meant.³

Elizabeth answered the Pope's bull with a proclamation which ^{sounds} sounds quite tolerant.⁴ Legal statutes followed which reflected the action of the pontiff.⁵ Conspiracies, the training of men beyond the realm of England for the promulgation of the Catholic faith in England, Mary Stuart's increased prestige among the adherents of the Old Religion, follow as a result or as a by-product of this sentence.

1 Meyer, p.78, tells us that Philip sent word to Elizabeth ^{nothing} "that nothing the pope has ever done displeased him as the late declaration." ^{Reference} Reference to Foreign. Cal., 1569-1571, No. 1083.

2 Alba protested through the Spanish ambassador in Rome. The King of France would not publish the bull. Pastor, XVIII, p.217. The Emperor Maximilian II, at the instigation of Elizabeth, remonstrated with the Pope and asked for its withdrawal. Ibid., XVIII, p.221. — "Nevertheless the bull met with ~~un~~animous reprobation from the crowned heads of Europe; ..." Pollard, op. cit., p.299.

3 "Henceforth the bull awakened among the Catholics the consciousness that they could not be excused for attendance at Protestant worship on the plea of obedience to the queen." Pastor, XVIII, p.221.

4 "Her majesty would have all her loving subjects to understand, that, as long as they shall openly continue the observation of her laws, and shall not wilfully and manifestly break them by their open actions, her majesty's means is not to have any of them molested by an inquisition or examination of their consciences in causes of religion; but to ^{accept} accept and entreat them as her good and obedient subjects. She meaneth not to enter into the inquisition of any men's consciences as long as they shall observe her laws in their open deeds." Klein, p.37f, from S.P., Dom., Eliz., vol. LXXI, nos. 16 and 34.

5 In 1571 13 Eliz. Cap. ii, "An Act against the bringing in and ^{putting} putting in execution of Bulls and other instruments from the see of Rome," was passed by Parliament. Prothero, pp. 60-64.

DOCTRINAL CHANGES FROM THE OLD RELIGION

The breach of England from Rome did not consist only in the denial of the Pope's authority and the substituting of the Queen's. The dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church were likewise set aside and another system of doctrine was introduced.

The Articles of Religion and two Tomes of Homilies gave the ^{Church} of England its doctrinal character. Of these we consider the Sermons and Homilies more important for our purposes, not however from the viewpoint of Symbolics. They are more important for our purposes because they were better known to the people. In the edition of the Homilies of 1562 the following words were appended to the title: "Certain Sermons appointed by the queen's majesty, to be declared and read by all parsons, vicars, and curates, every sunday and holiday in their churches: and by her grace's advice perused and overseen, for the better understanding of the simple people."¹

We cannot suppose that the "simple people" were conscious of the doctrinal mutation in these Homilies, at least not to their fullest extent.² Evidently, however, a presentation of the official doctrine of the Church of England on "every sunday and holiday" could not but infuse a different viewpoint into the minds of the people. Since they were not so well acquainted with the doctrines of the Roman Church, the doctrines as set forth "by the queen's majesty" must have left its impression on them, an impression that took them away from Rome.

1 "Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth; etc." Third American Edition, p.ix,note.

2 Froude, VII, p.338, in connection with the considerations which were weighed by Elizabeth about sending a delegate to the Council of Trent, remarks: "The majority of her subjects were under the prejudice which it was unsafe to disregard, that they were still members of the corporate Catholic Church."

The first tome of Homilies which was issued (1547) was brought to life during the reign of Edward VI. Archbishop Cranmer is thought to be the editor and the writer of a majority of these twelve sermons. In the year 1562 they were re-issued. A second tome of Homilies was issued which together with those of Edwardian origin were "to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they be understood of the people."¹

The sermons set forth in the first book, those dating from 1547, bear the following titles:²

- I. A fruitful Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture.
- II. Of the Misery of all Mankind.
- III. Of the Salvation of all Mankind.
- IV. Of the true and lively Faith.
- V. Of good works.
- VI. Of Christian Love and Charity.
- VII. Against Swearing and Perjury.
- VIII. Of the Declining from God.
- IX. An Exhortation against the Fear of Death.
- X. An Exhortation to Obedience.
- XI. Against Whoredom and Adultery.
- XII. Against Strife and Contention.

The second series of Sermons and Homilies contains sermons with the following titles:³

- I. Of the Right Use of the Church.
- II. Against Peril of Idolatry.
- III. For repairing and keeping clean the Church.
- IV. Of good Works; and first of Fasting.
- V. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
- VI. Against Excess of Apparel.
- VII. An Homily of Prayer.
- VIII. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
- IX. Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.
- X. An Information to them which take offence at certain places of Holy Scripture.
- XI. Of Alms-deeds.
- XII. Of the Nativity.
- XIII. Of the Passion, for Good-Friday.

1 Article XXXV of the Articles of Religion. Cf. Certain Homilies, etc. p.194

2 Ibid., p.xv

3 Ibid., p. 142; cf. p.598f, Art. XXXV.

- 109
- XIV. Of the Resurrection, for Easterday.
 - XV. Of the worthy Receiving of the Sacrament.
 - XVI. An Homily concerning the coming down of the Holy Ghost, ^{whit-} for Whit-sunday.
 - XVII. An Homily for Rogation-week.
 - XVIII. Of the State of Matrimony.
 - XIX. Against Idleness.
 - XX. Of Repentance, and true Reconciliation unto God.
 - XXI. An Homily against Disobedience and wilful Rebellion.¹

These thirty-three homilies, it will be noted, touch on many of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. From them we will take several samples to show that they were not always in accord with the teachings of the Catholic Church.

The Heresies of the Homilies

In speaking of the "heresies" of the Homilies we take the word "heresy" from the standpoint of the Catholic Church.

The first homily sets up the authority of the Bible as the norm of faith.² Since, however, it is not polemic or apologetic but merely didactic in its character, it does not repudiate by express words the traditions allowed by the Roman Church. One sentence does occur which speaks against them:³

"Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the New and Old Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions, devised by men's imagination, for our justification and salvation."

In reading these sermons we are struck with the frequent references to the Church Fathers, notably to St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Hierom (Jerome), and to others.⁴ It must be said, moreover, that there is hardly a page without a passage from the *Scripture*?

1 This last sermon was not incorporated in the book of Homilies until the year 1571. Cf. Ibid., p.v.

2 Cf. especially p.1 and p.3.

3 Ibid., p.2

4 Ibid., passim.

170
The Lutheran doctrine of justification by grace alone is set forth in these Homilies:¹

"For all the good works that we can do be unperfect, and therefore not able to deserve our justification: but our justification doth come freely by the mere mercy of God, and of so great and free mercy, that, whereas all the world was not able of themselves to pay any part towards their ransom, it pleased our heavenly Father of his infinite ^{mercy} mercy, without any our desert or deserving, to prepare for us the most ^{precious} jewels of Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied."

Consequently we find also that the doctrine that our works ^{merit} increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life² is repudiated. After quoting Eph. 2, 10 the homily continues:³

"And yet his meaning is not by these words to induce us to have ^{any} affiance, or to put any confidence in our works, as by the merit and deserving of them to purchase to ourselves and others remission of ^{sin} sin, and so consequently everlasting life; for that were mere blasphemy against God's mercy, and great derogation to the bloodshedding of our saviour Jesus Christ."

The doctrine of the sacraments differs from that of the Church of Rome. We read:⁴

"And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a sacrament, namely, for the visible ^{signs} signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the ^{promise} promise of free forgiveness of sin, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two: namely, baptism, and the supper of the Lord."

The homily on the Lord's supper condemns both the mass and the distribution of only the bread to the laity. The Roman doctrine is censured in the following words:⁵

"We must take heed, lest, of a memory, it be made a sacrifice; ^{lest} lest, of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest, of two parts, we have but one; lest, applying it for the dead, we lose the fruits that ^{be alive.} be alive."

1 Ibid., p.19f.

2 Sess. VI. Can. XXXII.

3 "Certain Sermons and Homilies, etc." p.247. Cf. ibid., pp.50-54.

4 Ibid., p.316

5 Ibid., p.396

Another part of this homily reads:¹

"For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in his institution, to make Christ thine own, and to apply his merits unto thyself. Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention."

The scholastic view of repentance is not upheld. The "schoolmen" are mentioned directly in the following sentence:²

"Therefore they that teach repentance without a lively faith in our saviour Jesus Christ, do teach none other but Judas' repentance, as all the schoolmen do, which do only allow three parts of repentance, the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction of the work."

The most vehement denial of any part of the doctrine of the Roman Church or its practises is found in the sermon treating on images. This homily is almost entirely Puritanic in its strain. It is the longest of the discourses. Images are not allowed as an adiaphora:³

"Where they say that images, so they be not worshipped, as things indifferent may be tolerated in temples and churches; we infer and say adversative, that all our images of God, our saviour Jesus Christ, and his saints, publicly set up in temples and churches, places peculiarly appointed to the true worshipping of God, be not things indifferent, nor tolerable, but against God's law and commandment, taking their own interpretation and exposition of it."

The homily is directed also against relics:⁴

"Is this agreeable to St. Chrysostom, who writest thus of relics? 'Do not regard the ashes of saints' bodies, nor the relics of their flesh and bones, consumed with time: but open the eye of faith, and behold them clothed with heavenly virtue, and the grace of the Holy Ghost, and shining with the brightness of the heavenly light.' But our idolaters found too much vantage of relics and relic-water, to follow St. Chrysostom's counsel. And because relics were so gainful, few places were there but they had relics provided for them."

Other practises of the Church of Rome are condemned in these words:⁵

"...papistical superstitions and abuses, as of beads, of St. Agathe's letters; of purgatory, of masses satisfactory, of stations and jubilees, of feigned relics, of hallowed beads, bells, bread, water, palms, candles, fire, and such other; of superstitious fastings, of fraternities or brotherhoods, of pardons, with such like merchandize, ... etc."

1 Ib., p.399

2 Ib., p.481f.

3 Ib. p.200

4. Ib.p.210

5 Ib., p.52

In one place monkery and the abuses connected with that institution^{-tion} are censured, especially the three vows:¹

"First, under pretence or colour of obedience, to their father in religion, (which obedience they made themselves,) they were made free, by their rules and canons, from the obedience of their natural father and mother, and from the obedience of emperor and king, and all temporal power, ~~whom~~ of very duty by God's laws they were bound to obey. And so the profession of their obedience not due was a forsaking of their due obedience. And how their profession of chastity was kept, it is more honesty to pass over in silence, and let the world judge of that which is well known, than with unchaste words, by expressing their unchaste life, to offend chaste and godly ears, And as for their wilful poverty, it was such, that when in possessions, jewels, plate, and riches, they were equal or above merchants, gentlemen, barons, earls, and dukes; yet by this subtile sophistical term, Proprium in communi, that is to say, Proper in common, they mocked the world, persuading, that notwithstanding all their possessions and riches, yet they kept their vows and were in wilfull poverty."

We naturally expect that the authority of the Pope be expressly^{expressly} repudiated. In one place he is called anti-christ, and in another his power is declared to be false:²

"He ought therefore rather to be called anti-christ, and the suc-^{suc-}cessor of the scribes and Pharisees, than Christ's vicar, or St. Peter's successor; ..."

"And concerning the usurped power of the bishop of Rome, which he most wrongfully challengeth as the successor of Christ and Peter; we may easily perceive how false, feigned, and forged it is, but also by the fruits and doctrine thereof."

The Roman Church is declared not to be the true Church:³

"The true church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's^{God's} faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath^{and} always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacrament's ministered according to Christ's whole institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. ... Now if ye will compare this with the church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd, you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true church, that nothing can be more. For neither are they built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesu; neither yet do they order the sacraments or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as he did first instituteⁱⁿ and ordain them: but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they seem to be converted into a new guise."

These few samples will be sufficient to give a representative view of how the Old Religion is inveighed against from the pulpit. Such excerpts as we have given, however, are rather the exception than the rule. The hearer of the homilies is often left to make his own application in regard to the doctrines set forth and their compatibility with the Roman Catholic teaching. For the most part, that which is censured cannot always be called a fundamental doctrine. The censures are directed more against the external ceremonies, life, usages and customs of the Church of Rome.

Sometimes a positiveness is lacking in these sermons, the lack of which one feels is due to an effort to be conciliatory. The spirit of Melancthon is more evident in them than the spirit of Martin Luther.

We may doubt that the common people "heard them gladly," for they are formal presentations. Although they are as a whole more practical than doctrinal, the lack that direct appeal to the simplest of the simple people which would make them homiletical models.

It is impossible to tell what part these homilies and sermons played in weaning the people away from the Old Religion. The fact that they must have been read time after time, especially in the country parishes by the vicars, would naturally have made the people acquainted with them in some degree and imbued them with a different view point.

The Articles of Religion

The official dogmas of the Church of England are contained in the Articles of Religion, commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles. Their basis is the Forty-two Articles which were compiled during the reign of Edward VI. They were adopted by Convocation in 1563. Of the Forty-two Articles seven were omitted and four new ones were ^{added.}¹ Often finding their tone in the Augsburg Confession, and other ^{- some} Lutheran ^{time} writings, they depart in a marked degree from Roman Catholic doctrine.² After comprising the XXXIX. Articles and the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent it is hard to see how "Tract 90" could have been ^{written.}³

Although I have not used an authentic copy of the Articles of Religion of 1563,⁴ nor Mansi or Sarpi, I will, nevertheless, on the ^{basis}

1 Those that were omitted were:

- X. Of Grace.
- XVI. Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.
- XIX. All men are bound to keep the moral commandments of the Law.
- XXXIX. The resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass.
- XL. The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the ^{the} body nor sleep idle.
- XLI. Heretics called Millenarii.
- XLII. All men shall not be saved at the length.

Those that were added are:

- V. Of the Holy Ghost.
- XII. Of good works.
- XIX. Of the wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the ^{of} use of the Lord's Supper.
- XXX. Of both kinds.

Cf. Blunt, ii., p. 111n.

Article XXIX was published first in 1571. Jacobs, The Lutheran ^{Movements} in England, p. 342. Camb. Mod. Hist., II, p. 588f.

2 Henry E. Jacobs, op. cit., pp. 340-342, gives a table showing the relation between the several articles and the Lutheran formularies. I have counted eighteen Articles which were drawn from the Augustana. The Apology, the Wuertenberger Articles, and ^{the} others, were also used.

3 This tract was written by Patrick Wiseman and tried to show that the Thirty-nine Articles were compatible with Roman Catholic dogma.

4 I have the Articles of Religion approval by the Episcopal Church in America in 1801 (Certain Sermons and Homilies, etc., pp. 591-599) and a German translation of the Articles of 1563 (Boeckel's Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, pp. 666-678). These two I have compared and adopted the English, rather American, version in ^{all} cases.

of what I have, to point out some of the differences and agreements between the two religious systems.¹

Religion

Doctrinal Agreement between the Articles of Religion and the Old Religion.

The following tenets of the Christian faith, among others, ^{are} are received by both religions: that there is one God, the Trinity;² ^{that} that Christ took upon Himself the human nature, so that there are ^{natures} two natures in the person of the God-man, Christ, who suffered and died for the sins of all men;³ that Christ descended into hell;⁴ that He rose again ^{from} from the dead;⁵ that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son;⁶ that sixty-six of the books of the Bible are canonical;⁷ that the ^{three} three general creeds, the Apostles, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, are to be accepted;⁸ that Baptism⁹ and the Lord's Supper¹⁰ are sacraments;¹¹ that all property should not be held in common;¹² and that Christians may swear before magistrates.¹³

1 I have not compared this with any Catholic or Anglican writers ^{the} on the subject -- with the exception of Lingard, VI, 676-678 and the Cath. Enc.I., 643c -- and my conclusions are made independently. ^{the}

2 Article I -- Catechismus Romanus, Pars I, Caput II, Quaestio I.

3 Art II -- Cat. Rom., P.I. C. III. Q IX et passim.

4 Art. III. -- Cat. Rom., P. I C. VI. ~~ARTICLE~~ I-VI

5 ART.IV. -- Cat. Rom., P. I. C. VI. Q. VII-XV.

6 Art. V. -- Cat. Rom., P. I. C. IX. Q. V.

7 Art. VI. -- Sess. IV. N.B.: Both agree that the following books are canonical: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings, I Chronicles, ^{II} II Chronicles, I Esdras (Ezra), II Esdras (Nehemiah), Esther, Job, Psalm, ^{Proverbs} Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Cantica, the four Major Prophets; the ^{twelve} twelve minor Prophets, the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. Later we will mention the Apocrypha.

8 Art. VIII.

9 Art. XXV, XXVII -- Cat. Rom., P. II. CAP. II. Q.V.

10 Art. XXV, XXVIII -- Cat. Rom., P.II., Cap. IV., Q. VII.

11 I have merely that both agree and acknowledge these two ^{sacraments} are sacraments.

12- Art. XXXVIII.

13 Art. XXXIX -- Cat. Rom. P. III., Cap. III., Q. XII.

Religion

Doctrinal Disagreements between the Articles of Religion and the Old Reli

The doctrinal disagreements between these two are such that they cannot be briefly summarized. It is only by comparing their confession that the reconcilability becomes apparent.

Although both acknowledge sixty-six of the books of the Bible to be canonical, the Anglican Articles refuse, by express words, to accept the Apocrypha which the Roman Church allows.¹ Furthermore, these Articles ^{Article} teach the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, while the Roman Church ^{must} must needs have also the traditions.²

Justification sola fidei is taught ^{almost} as clearly as in the Augsburg Confession.³ The Roman doctrine cannot be harmonized with this stand.⁴

1 Art. VI. -- Sess. IV

2 Art. VI. "Holy Scriptures containeth all things necessary ^{salvation} to salvation: so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, ^{is} is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article ^{of} of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Sess. IV. "... (the Synod) ... receives and venerates with an ^{affec-} equal affection of piety, and reverence, all the books of the Old and of the New Testament ... as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals..."

3 Art. XI. Of the Justification of Man. "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ by faith; and not for our works or deservings. Wherefore, ^{that} we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

Aug. Conf. Art. IV: Of Justification. "Also they teach that men ^{can-} cannot be justified by God of their own strength, merits, or works, but ^{are} are freely justified for Christ's sake, through faith, when they believe, ^{can} that they are received into favor, and that their sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, who, by His death, has made satisfaction for our sins. This faith ^{can} God imputes for righteousness in His sight. Rom. 3 and 4."

4 Sess. VI. Can. IX: "If any one saith, that by faith alone the ^{impious} impious is justified; in such wise as to mean, that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to the obtaining the grace of Justification, and that it is not in any way necessary, that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will; let him be anathema."

The Anglican Articles teach that good works done before justification have the nature of sin¹ and that works of supererogation² cannot be allowed. This is opposed to the Catholic doctrines on these points,

Whereas the Old Religion has seven sacraments,³ the Anglican confession has only two, distinctly stating that they reject the remaining five sacraments of the Old Religion.⁴

1 Art, XIII. Of Works before Justification. "Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin."

Sess. VI. Can. VII. "If any one saith, that all works done before Justification, in whatsoever way they be done, are truly sins, or merit the hatred of God; or that the more earnestly one strived to dispense himself for grace, the more grievously he sins: let him be anathema."

2 Art. XIV. Of works of Supererogation. "Voluntary works, besides over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare, That they do not render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: Whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded to you, We are unprofitable servants."

This is so clearly a refutation of the Catholic doctrine that I am not citing any quotation setting forth that doctrine. Cf. Cat. Rom., P. I., Cap., XIII., Q. IX.

3 Sess. VII. Can. I. (On the Sacraments in General). "If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, or, that they are more, or less, than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema."

Cf. Sess. VII. Can. I. (On Confirmation). Sess. XIV. Can. I. (On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction). Sess. XIV. Can. I. (On the most holy Sacrament of Penance). Sess. XXIII. Chapter III (That Order is truly and properly a Sacrament). Sess. XXIV. Can. I. (On the Sacrament of Matrimony).

4 Art. XXV. "...Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown, partly by the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed by the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

Transubstantiation is rejected by the Anglican Articles of Religion, but is held by the Catholics;¹ the Catholic doctrine of the mass is not tolerated;² the adoration of the sacred host and carrying it in processions is repudiated;³ the administration of the sacrament sub utraque is substituted for the administration in one kind only;⁴ and the real pre-

1 Art. XXVIII. "... Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

Sess. XIII. Can. II. "If any one saith, that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood -- the species only of the bread and wine remaining -- which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema."

2 Art. XXXI. Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross. "The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous and dangerous deceits."

Sess. XXII. Can. I. "If any one saith, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema."

Cf. Sess. XXII, passim.

3 Art. XXVIII. "... The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

Art. XXV. "... The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them."

Sess. XIII. Can. VI. "If any one saith, that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external of latria; and is, consequently, neither to be solemnly borne in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy church; or, is not to be proposed (proponendum, set before, exposed) publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters; let him be anathema."

4 Art. ~~XXXI~~ XXX. Of both kinds. "The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people; for both parts of the Lord's sacrament by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike."

Sess. XXI. Can. I. "If any one saith, that, by the precept of God, or by the necessity of salvation (necessitate salutis, as necessary for salvation), all and each of the faithful ought to receive both species of the most holy sacrament not consecrating; let him be anathema."

Cf. Sess. XXI. Can. III.

sence is denied.¹

Other Catholic doctrines condemned by the XXXIX Articles are: the doctrine of purgatory;² the celibacy of the priests;³ the authority of the church of Rome;⁴ and the primacy of the Pope.⁵ Among other things the use of any language but the vernacular is inveighed against.⁶

1 At. XXVIII. Of the Lord's Supper. "... The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves ^{one} to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as tightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread that we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. ... The body of the Lord is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, ~~not~~ only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the ~~body~~ body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper, is faith."

Sess. XIII. Can. VIII. "If any saith, that Christ, given (exhibitum, presented), in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be anathema."

Cf. Sess. XIII. Can. I. et passim.

2 Art. XXII. Of Purgatory. "The Romish doctrine concerning ^{purgatory} purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrenty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."

Cf. Sess. XXV. The repudiation of the Catholic doctrine is ^{directly} directly asserted and calls for no statement directly from the Catholic confession.

3 Art. XXXII. Of the Marriage of Priests. "Bishops, priests, and deacons, are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve the better to godliness."

Sess. XXIV. Can. IX. "If any ^{have} one saith, that clerics constituted in sacred orders, or Regulars, who ~~are~~ solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, ...; let him be anathema:..."

4 Art. XIX. "... As the church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." ^{Article} - ~~Article~~

By its own words this Article must be called a "heresy" by Catholics.

5 Art. XXXVII speaks of the power of the civil magistrates also over clerics. Since the Act of Supremacy, q.v., pp.31f., abolished ^{authority} the authority of the pope there is no separate article concerning it. Throughout the Articles, however, the primacy of the Pope is indirectly denied by repudiating doctrines which he had sanctioned.

6 Art. XXIV. The use of Latin by the Catholic church is condemned by ^{by} implication only.

720

There are many things in these Articles that we have passed over, not wishing to make the discussion too lengthy. For instance, we have seen nothing concerning the doctrine of the ^Church, the hierarchy of the Anglicans and their claim to the Apostolic succession. What we have shown, however, is sufficient to show that that the Elizabethan religious settlement, unlike that of Henry's, departed in its dogmas from the Roman ^Church.

St. Louis, Missouri,
April 16, 1930.

CONCLUSION

At last! We are at the end of our composition. A "composition" is something that has been placed together. That is what our labors have been. We have placed together certain facts in an attempt to show the Religions of a nation at a time when a radical change has been made. We have tried to show one of these Religions, the Old Religion, in its relation to the State, existing (alas!) outside the pale of the law. In spite of the hundred and eighteen pages we cannot but feel that the presentation has been wholly inadequate. Much has been passed over, e.g., the Old Religion in the Universities of the country, the nobles and the Old Religion, etc. What has been given has often been given out of all due proportion to its value. As a whole we have dealt with the topic according to the material we had. But then, Elizabeth has been mentioned almost always only as the Queen, and very seldom as a human being. That has been an achievement, if we may call it that. The temptation to devote pages after pages to her alone was great; and we have avoided that to a large measure.

The bare statements of facts could hardly be avoided, since they were treated oftener in footnotes. That it was an uninteresting way of dealing with the topic, I do not doubt. It is only with an apology that I can close.

St. Louis, Missouri,
April 15, 1930.

Carl S. Meyer

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The books marked with an asterik (*) have been read entirely.

- (*) Aikin, Lucy, *Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth*. ¹⁸²¹ Boston 1821
Two volumes.
- (*) Allen, William, *A True, Sincere and Modest Defense of English Catholics that Suffer for their Faith both at Home and Abroad, against a False, Seditious and Slandorous Libel, Entitled: "The Execution of Justice in England."* First published in 1584. Reprint of 1914 St. Louis (B. Herder). Two volumes.
- (*) Anthony, Katharine, *Queen Elizabeth* New York (Alfred A. Knopf) ¹⁹²⁹ 1929
- (*) Atteridge, A. Hilliard, *The Elizabethan Persecution. Did its Victims suffer for the Old Faith or for Treason?* ^{Victims} London, ¹⁹²⁸ 1928
- (*) Belloc, Hilaire, *A History of England. Vol. III: The Later Middle Ages. A.D. 1348 to 1525.* ^{middle} New York (G.P. Putnam's Sons) 1928
- (*) Belloc, Hilaire, *How the Reformation Happened.* ^{Robert M.} New York (Robert M. Mc Bride & Co.) 1928
- (*) Birt, Henry Norbert, (O.S.B.), *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement, A Study of Contemporary Documents.* ^{Settlement} London (George Bell and Sons) 1907
- (*) Blunt, John Henry, *The Reformation of the Church of England, Its History, Principles, and Results.* ^{2^d} ^{London} London (Rivingtons) 1882
- Böckel, Ernst Gottfried Adolph, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche.* ^{evangelisch-} Leipzig (F.A. Brockhaus) 1847
- Burnet, Gilbert, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England.* ^{England} Three volumes. New York (D. Appleton & Co.) 1843
- Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II., *The Reformation.* ^{(at the} Cambridge (At the University Press) 1903.
- Canons and Decrees of the ^Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent. Translated by the Rev. J. Waterworth. ^{Trans-} Chicago (The Christian Symbolic Publication Soc.) ^{Christian}
- Catechismus Romanus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Pareschos Pii V. Pontificis Maximi iussu editus. Editit Adolphus ^{Pii V.} Busse. ^{Busse} Two volumes. Bielefeld (Velhagen & Klasing) 1859

Catholic Encyclopedia

- (*) Certain Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Third American, from the ^{the last} English Edition. Philadelphia (Edward C. Biddle) 1844
- Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular of the ^{Lateran} at St. Monica's in Louvain. Edited by Dom Adam ^{Hamilton} (O.S.B.), London - Edinburgh (Sands and Co.) 1904
- (*) Creighton, Mandell, Cardinal Wolsey, London (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.) 1906
- (*) Creighton, Mandell, Queen Elizabeth, London (Longmans, Green & Co.) 1899
- Ellis, Henry, Original Letters illustrative of English History. ^{Second} Series, Vol. II. London (Harding and Lepard) 1827
- Encyclopaedia Britannica
- (*) Froude, J. A., The Divorce of Catharine of Aragon New York (Charles Scribner's Sons) 1891
- (*) Froude, J.A., History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. Vol. VI and VII New York (Scribner, Armstrong, and Co.) 1873
- Froude, J. A., History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. Vol. VIII and IX
- Gasquet, (Abbot), A Short History of the Catholic ^U Church in England London 1903 Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur
- Gasquet, (Cardinal), A History of the Venerable English College, Rome. An Account of its Origin and Work from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. London (Longmans, Green and Co.) 1920
- Gee, Henry, and Hardy, William, Documents Illustrative of English Church History. Compiled from Original Sources. London (Macmillan and Co., Limited) 1910
- Green, J.R., A Short History of the English People. New York (The Colonial Press) Three volumes. 1900
- Guilday, Peter, The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795. Vol. I. The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795. London (Longmans, Green and Co.) 1920
- (*) Hackett, Francis, Henry the Eighth. New York (Horace Liveright) 1929
- Hallam, Henry, The Constitutional History of England from the Accession of Henry VII. to the death of George II. New York 1859 from the fifth London edition

Hume, David, The History of England from the ^Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Abdication of James the Second, 1688
A New Edition Vol. III Philadelphia (Porter & Coates)

(*) Martin, A.S., Sir Walter Raleigh New York (Alfred A. Knopf) ¹⁹²⁶ 1926

International Encyclopedia

Jacobs, Henry Eyster, The Lutheran Movement in England during the ^{Reigns} of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. and its Literary Monuments. Revised Philadelphia (General Council Publication House) 1908

(*) Jessing, Joseph, Die versuchte Ausrottung der katholischen Religion ~~in England~~ durch die Staatsgewalt unter Heinrich VIII. und seinen Nachfolgern. Dem Protestanten William Cobbett nacherzaehlt. Freiburg in Breisgau (Herder'sche Verlagshandlung) 1874

(*) John, Gwen, Queen Elizabeth, Boston (Small Maynard and Co.) ^{The} Roadmaker Series. 1924

(*) Klein, Arthur Jay, Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth, Queen of England. Boston and New York (Houghton, Mifflin Company) 1917

(*) Kurlbaum-Siebert, Margarete, Mary Queen of Scots. Translated from the German by Mary Agnes Hamilton. New York (Harcourt, Brace & Co.) 1929 Published in Germany as "Kampf und Liebe der ^{from} jungen Maria Stuart."

Lindsay, Thomas, A History of the Reformation, Vol. II. New York ¹⁹²⁵ 1925

Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of ^{Queen} Elizabeth. Edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. William Keantinge Clay. Cambridge (At the University Press) 1847.

(*) Meyer, Arnold Oskar, England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth. Authorized translation by the Rev. J.B. McKee. London (Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co. ^{Ltd.}); St. Louis (B. Herder), 1916. Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur. The German edition was published as Vol. VI of the Bibliothek des Kgl. Preussischen Historischen Instituts in Rom. Rome, 1911 (Loescher & Co.)

Mirbst, Carl, Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstums und des Roemischen Katholizismus. Vierte Auflage. Tuebingen 1924

Pastor, Ludig, Freiherr von, The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. Drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other sources. Edited by Ralph Francis Kerr. Vol. XVIII. Pius V. (1566-1572) St. Louis (B. Herder Book Co.) 1929

- (*) Pollard, A.F., Henry VIII. London (Longmans, Green & Co.) 1919
- (*) Pollard, A.F., The History of England from the Accession of ^{Edward VI} Edward VI. to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603). Vol. VI of ^{William} William Hunt and Reginald Poole's The Political History of England. London (Longmans, Green and Co.) 1910
- (*) Pollard, A.F., Thomas Cranmer and the ¹⁴⁸⁹ English Reformation (1489-1556) New York (The Knickerbocker Press) 1904
- (*) Pollard, A.F.; Wolsey, London (Longmans, Green & Co.) 1929
- Pollen, John Hungerford (S.J.), Acts of English Martyrs hitherto unpublished. London (Burns and Oates, Ltd.) 1891
- (*) Pollen, John Hungerford (S.J.), The English Catholics in the ^{Reign} Reign of Queen Elizabeth; A Study of their Politics, ^{Civil} Civil Life and Government. 1558-1580, From the Fall of the Old Church to the Advent of the Counter-Reformation. ^{Green} Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur. London (Longmans, Green and Co.) 1920
- Procter, Francis, A History of the Book of Common Prayer, ¹⁵⁴⁹ Fifteenth Edition London and New York (Macmillan and Co.) 1881
- Prothero, G.W., Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Fourth Edition. Oxford (At the Clarendon Press) 1913
- Smith, Preserved, The Age of the Reformation, New York, 1923
- Stebbing, George, The Church in England, London, 1921. Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur.
- (*) Stephenson, Henry Thew, The Elizabethan People. New York (Henry Holt and Co.) 1901
- (*) Stone, J.M.; The History of Mary I., Queen of England, as found in the public records, despatches of ambassadors, ¹⁵⁵³ in original letters, and other contemporary documents. London (sands and Co.) 1901
- Strickland, Agnes, Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest Vol. II. New edition, carefully revised and augmented London (George Bell & Sons) 1906
- (*) Strickland, A., Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest Vol. III. New edition, carefully revised and augmented London (George Bell & Sons) 1906
- (*) Strachey, Lytton, Elizabeth and Essex, A Tragic History. New York (Harcourt, Brace & Co.) Third Printing, Dec. 1928
- Wright, Thomas, Queen Elizabeth and her Times. Two volumes. ¹⁸⁵⁸ London, 1838