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Abstract of Thesis

Against a background of destroyed church interiors, alienation of their property, abolition of the Mass, economic failures, and political unrest, Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole attempted to revive the lost world of Catholic England, ruthlessly destroyed during the previous twenty years. For Mary and Pole, the aims were imperative and never in any doubt. It reflected their belief that not only had the country lost its moral and religious compass; its identity as a nation had been threatened, deprived of the ecclesial and cultural sources from which its unity and integrity as a state had developed. History has often judged them harshly for the manner in which they set about their task. The historical sources that provide details of these years, both official and polemical, are sometimes ambivalent in assessment of motives as well as failure or success. They are either the record of a regime desperately and vainly enforcing an outmoded and alien religious settlement on an increasingly hostile population, or an account of the painful and painstaking birth pangs of a re-invigorated Catholicism, opposed by a small but determined and well-organised group. Opponents could be seen as typical of a general mood of rejection and growing revulsion at returning Catholic practice. It is also possible to note them as isolated examples of revolt by a minority favouring the new religion, against the generally accepted and increasingly successful revival of the traditional faith.

The Marian religious project is defensible, as not only ultimately viable but also valid in terms of prosecution and planning for the time and place. Engaging with this Herculean task of reform, recovery and revival was an intelligentsia of spiritually innovative individuals, led by Cardinal Pole. Their inspiration and the dynamic of their agenda is ideologically linked to the nascent movement of reform begun in the pontificate of Paul III (1534-1550). Crucial to the Catholic revival in England was re-construction both materially and metaphysically of aspects of religion denounced or destroyed by the changes of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Properly equipped worship; the centrality of the Holy Eucharist; adequate priestly formation; catechetical instruction; clerical authority and Papal Supremacy were all emphasised and included in long-term plans for future development. The lost aspects of piety would all flow from these mainsprings of orthodoxy. All of these prerequisites formed elementary props in the strategies for reform of the Church worldwide during the latter half of the sixteenth century. The indigenous Catholic revival in Marian England lit a torch that led the way to this later initiative. Most of the observable results of what was achieved have long since been destroyed. Only the textual records reveal the extent of that loss. The long held historical narrative that defined Mary’s reign as a tyrannical imposition of an alien religion upon the English and Welsh has been countered by another more evidence-based, in recent decades. This study is another contribution to that debate.
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Chapter I: A House Divided Against Itself

1. A Bankrupt Inheritance

When Queen Mary I was finally proclaimed on 19 July, after a successful coup against the government of the Protector, Northumberland, following the death of Edward VI on 6 July, and then made her triumphant entry into London on 3 August 1553, it was the occasion of jubilation in the capital.¹ It signalled the initiation of a process of gradual but consistent effort to recover the nation’s religious heritage and homogeneity, repudiated in successive stages in the reigns of her two predecessors. The more traditional and commonplace historiography of this short period traces a narrative of negative impact and futile imposition. It also tends to blame the Marian persecution for the sub-culture of anti-Catholicism that characterised the centuries following. An established historian of the period, G.R. Elton, has written: “… the fires of Smithfield and the like places all over southern England created an undying hatred of the pope and of Roman Catholicism which became one of the most marked characteristics of the English for 350 years.”² Whether the 286 who were burnt,

together with some 27 others whom it is reported died in prison between the years 1554-1558, are viewed as martyrs, according to John Foxe’s historic compendium, or are judged as religious and political extremists, identified as such by the historian Philip Hughes in the mid-twentieth century, their deaths have defined Mary’s reign for many historians. The idée fixée that it was as much obscurantist as oppressive is also prevalent among earlier generations of historians. A.G. Dickens is prominently representative of this school of thought. Elton and Dickens, who were hugely influential in historical studies at one time, largely followed the earlier well-trodden path of Stow, *Holinshead Chronicles*, Collier, Fuller, Burnet, Froude and Dixon. The ultimate verdict of “guilty as charged” has not entirely been overturned. In more recent times, David Loades, devoting considerable space and research to writing about the Marian reign, is less negative overall. However, he arrives at much the same conclusion of Mary’s ultimate personal failure as others before him. “Mary’s ecclesiastical restoration, may have appeared to be popular but it failed to win hearts and minds where it actually mattered most, among the political elite”. Other research would tend to question that conclusion. For example, Jennifer Loach’s study of the voting patterns in parliament for the various stages of Mary’s religious policy suggests a rather more pragmatic if not partisan approach to it. Loades claims that

---

“Mary’s reign was a failure in terms of her own aims and priorities”.9 If she died before her revolution was complete then it is probably true. Could the evidence, insofar as it can be found, lead to a conclusion that death not politics robbed her of the potential harvest of a very short season of sowing?

Inspiration for negative judgements of Mary and her regime are traceable back to the Elizabethan age and the various editions of Foxe in particular. He has remained for the most part the principal source of continuous narrative of the Marian years. His distinctive anti-Catholic bias can be taken for granted as reflecting a pronounced repugnance for the old religion. It later fed the fear of Catholicism and the need to demonise it and deprive it of the oxygen of survival and subsistence. Subsequent historians largely accepted the polemical slant of Foxe as a true reflection of the state of the nation, faced with the tyranny of Catholic Mary. Even if she was not entirely to blame for the policies, both the religion she personified and the choice of husband who shared it made it impossible for her to have had the good of the country at heart. But is Foxe’s account a vindication of the losing side under Mary, which under the Elizabethan settlement needed to justify repressive attitudes to Catholicism while at the same time fearful of its resurgence? This is but one of the questions to be asked about the standard versions of Mary’s reign. More and more, alternative answers are being offered to old questions. New strands of investigation are shedding light on the nuanced historiography that stems from generations of interpretations of the *The Book of Martyrs*. Lately, for example, a series of essays edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman challenges the historical themes of tyranny, popery and the providential disaster associated with them. This is but one of a number of recent

---

studies of aspects of the reign shedding new light on hitherto forgotten or ignored data that is relevant to a proper evaluation of the reign and its policies. What is emerging from current writing is a narrative that recognises the possibility of an alternative commentary that asks more questions about the previously accepted historical judgements. It also takes into account the culturally woven historiographical patterns of religious identity and solidarity deriving from Foxe and others which distort evidence of support for much of Mary’s policy – including the secular burnings of those convicted by ecclesiastical courts – and their consequent embroidery by later historians.

By the time that the final reworked edition of Foxe appeared in 1583 the country had undergone almost a generation of religious transformation leaving hardly any physical evidence or ceremonial patterns of how it looked in the autumn of 1558. By the final quarter of the sixteenth century the minority faith in Mary’s time had triumphed politically and Catholicism had been outlawed and effectively almost driven underground. The story told by the official historians from then on was consistently from the perspective of the original minority – those who had suffered in Mary’s reign. It accepted their victory after her demise as predestined and providential. Consequent unimpeded access to propaganda and power in the reigns which followed seemed both necessary and justified. By the end of Elizabeth’s reign Mary’s achievements had been obliterated. Histories failed to mention the virtually complete destruction of monumental features – except insofar as they were evidence of the removal of superfluous imagery – or the gradual recession into the margins of society of the majority Catholic religion. This inevitably obscured the possibility of a genuine historical appraisal of what might have been a popular and indeed potentially
successful policy. At least one of the questions to be discussed is whether there were defensible and identifiable reasons that prompted Mary’s religious revolution. Was the revival of a confessional Catholic nation on the mostly ruined remains of its former glories always a doomed and discredited enterprise? Reconstructing a verifiable positive narrative is far from facile. Yet there is a lot to be said about it. Past history simply denied the justice of recognition of some success because of the presumed unpopularity of Catholicism compounded by the punitive actions to restore it. This historical judgement appears to be mostly settled in the view that it could not succeed because it was oppressive and its time had come and gone.

For several decades now that view has been subjected to closer scrutiny and investigation. A modern and alternative critique based on existing and alternative sources of information was overdue and began to appear. It is no longer assumed by historians that the problem was essentially Mary’s Catholicism and its imposition. An example of the new approach is Lucy Wooding’s study proposing Mary’s reign as a uniquely English experiment in Catholic revival that had every chance of eventual success.\(^\text{10}\) This is new and different. For much of history written before the second half of the twentieth century her reign plays like a personal tragedy, serving as the prelude to an aurelian Elizabethan epic. Some accounts still echo this view. Diarmaid MacCulloch, in his study *Reformation*, identifies Mary as a woman not without qualities but hopelessly encumbered with a tragic past.\(^\text{11}\) This view is kinder to Mary, but still largely pejorative.

Relevant to the whole discussion of this evolutionary period of modern statehood, the interpretation of the actual dynamic of Reformation politics and progress in England is still undergoing a thorough re-appraisal.\(^\text{12}\) New lines of enquiry and examination of the accessible facts have opened up. Eamon Duffy’s research has ably demonstrated that after a vibrant and productive period of popularity of traditional religion in the earlier half, for much of the second half of the sixteenth century the country was divided unequally between a still largely popular religious tradition and a minority confession which had been intruded into the life and worship of parishes with devastating and destabilising effect.\(^\text{13}\) The earlier cohesion and consolidation was dissipated by so many rapid religious changes. From this viewpoint Mary could be said to represent an initiative to recover order and unity by reconstructing the edifice of traditional faith upon which the previous stability had rested. Although there were undoubtedly elements within the country that supported them, the religious revolutions of Henry VIII and Edward VI cannot be defended as expressions of the popular will (even allowing for parliamentary approval) but that of the monarchs and their executive. They were never representative of a majority on any level.\(^\text{14}\) The highest demographic representation of the new faith – even in London – could never have risen to more than 20\%.\(^\text{15}\) Duffy’s research concludes that in the country generally the new religion failed to win over most minds and hearts.\(^\text{16}\) Felicity Heal notes that while obedience in the case of government-inspired destruction is evident the motivation for it is less clear.\(^\text{17}\)


\(^{15}\) Doran, and Freeman, eds., *Mary Tudor Old and New Perspectives*, pp. 3-4.


Martin Bucer written from Cambridge in May 1550 conveys the impression of change fuelled by coercion and accompanied by apathy:

Affairs in this country are in a feeble state: the people are in want of teachers. Things are for the most part carried on by means of ordinances, which the majority obey very grudgingly, and by the removal of the instruments of ancient superstition: and some persons have been, and still continue to be, very docile pupils, with carnal liberty and spiritual bondage … Of those devoted to the service of religion but a very small number have as yet entirely addicted themselves to the kingdom of Christ.\(^{18}\)

The situation Mary inherited in 1553 was still fluid and not favourable to recent changes. She was not alone among prominent survivors of the changes in diagnosing both the causes of unrest and division and their cure. Bishop Stephen Gardiner and Cardinal Reginald Pole concurred. With Mary, they shared both the principal direction of the reconstruction as well as historic blame for its repressions. In varying degrees, her failure is represented as theirs also. Defenders of their reputations have also contributed to greater knowledge of the problems they faced. In a major critique of his career, Thomas F. Mayer has recently reassessed Pole more positively.\(^{19}\) Though written a long time ago, James A. Muller’s study is still a relevant source of information on Gardiner’s career and ultimate Catholic conviction.\(^{20}\) Stephen Redworth’s biography provides a more up to date assessment of the politician and later Chancellor’s profile as a major player and conservative influence in the religious drama of his age.\(^{21}\) Like most of the hierarchy of his time who derived from Catholic appointments under Henry, his unorthodox views in that reign rendered him heretical while his resistance to The Prayer Book gained him a

---


\(^{20}\) Muller, J., *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (New York, 1926).

reputation of duplicity with its supporters. His notoriety among the gospellers outlived him and will be considered later in this study.

If seen from the Catholic point of view, the evisceration of the remaining vitals of doctrine and liturgy during Edward’s reign awakened the conservative bishops to the hazards of arbitrary royal supremacy. “What the Edwardian experience had clearly taught them was that there could be no secure defence of the truths of the Catholic faith without a commitment to the universal Church.”

They had behaved as politicians rather than prelates, as much a part of the ruling class as the nobility and gentry though not drawn from its ranks. The peers likewise seem to have had what might be termed a conservative instinct. Was this native zeitgeist or expedient self-interest? Perhaps a mixture of both, depending on the anticipated outcome. When it came to parliamentary endorsement for Mary’s reversal of Edward’s religious policy they voted solidly for the old religion. It is surprising, despite the claims built up during several centuries of historical comment, to discover just how little actual evidence exists for opposition from the Lords, on religious grounds, to Mary. Support for the new religion hardly featured in debate. Uncertainty concerning the retention of lands and goods acquired during the monastic confiscations of Henry’s reign did.

Evidence shows that the resolution of land issues in favour of the owners removed the main obstacle to eventual reunion with Rome. While this does not argue total commitment to the traditional faith it cannot be proposed as evidence of dissent from its teachings or zeal for the reformed religion. By 1558 aristocratic sympathy for Catholicism does not seem to have faded. Unlike the bill in 1554 to re-unite the nation to the Roman obedience, which was passed unanimously by them, the 1559

cornerstone legislation of the entire Elizabethan settlement, the Act of Uniformity, received only 21 votes to 18, with a sizeable number of peers and bishops absent for various reasons.\(^\text{24}\) An early twentieth century Catholic historian noted that if peers had voted with their consciences, and had there been fewer vacant sees and no bishops in prison, the religious settlement would have been rejected early on and continuity maintained for longer.\(^\text{25}\) The ruling class endorsed Mary’s religious change but did they also endorse its punitive policy against the gospellers? In assessing support for government policy under Mary, the question of how the ruling class responded to the prosecution of the religious dissidents suggests a degree of complicity on their part. Evidence from Council records and locally indicates that they were actively engaged in the places where most arrests were made.\(^\text{26}\) That could of course mean that they were simply anxious to be in favour with the regime but can it be judged that their diligence at times goes beyond mere compliance or cooperation?

The attitude of the common people – other than the very few who braved the fires of persecution – has to be often inferred rather than clarified. Records of replacement and recovery of church worship and ornament which are extant could be useful indicators of support. It is not as clearly defined as canvassed opinion but has to be viewed through the prism of a variety of contingencies and influences, financial, social and political. Since nothing now remains of its material effect, the material evidence of support is easily ignored or set aside. In most studies on religious and


secular Tudor history undertaken before the second half of the twentieth century popular support for Catholicism is scarcely considered.\textsuperscript{27} Relying on recent research it is impossible to ignore the evidence for it. Ronald Hutton’s study has provided sufficient examples of it from the extant records of parishes in the years of religious change.\textsuperscript{28} His research embraced 198 sets of records, representing the majority of those extant, which do not cover the whole country but are uniform in their patterns of positive reaction. Only one set for the whole of Wales and one each for the northernmost counties of England survive. Yet, the pattern of homogeneity is unmistakable. Condensing the details into a summary, it looks to have been a case of compliance with compulsory removal and destruction with reluctance marking every stage of the changes away from the traditional faith. Lights went out in Henry’s reign but images remained. The injunction to buy a parish Bible was mostly flouted. Conversely, in the Marian years, Hutton notes not only compliance with the restoration of Catholic worship but of going well beyond the basics to achieve it.\textsuperscript{29} Comparable studies show that responses to Edward’s injunctions reveal obedience but also attempts at evasion and pre-emptive action ahead of confiscation in most communities.\textsuperscript{30} Was this action in favour of tradition or an example of attempts at conservation of parish property? Both motives may be linked by a common desire at temporary adjustment to unpredictable outcomes. It does now seem anachronistic to attribute the achievement of stripped churches by 1553 to later historical presumption of popular repudiation of Catholicism.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid. pp. 128-30.
Assessment of the extent of public reaction to the burnings, may depend on the location and frequency of the occasions. Grounds for suggesting the general hostility to Catholicism apparent in John Foxe’s martyrology can be questioned even from within the text itself. How secure and definite is the application of the notion of general support to those convicted, based on incidences of individual encouragement offered by well-wishers? More specific examples of it are confined for the most part to those areas such as London and places in Essex and Sussex where numbers of the adherents to the new religion were strongest. That would be hardly surprising. But it must be stated that contemporary reaction in favour of the persecuted reveals only one side of the story. The rebuilding of the church interiors on a much wider scale is another.

Because of the evidence for the unpopularity of Edward’s religious radicalism, suggested by the researches of such as Duffy, Hutton, Haigh and Palliser, can it be argued that this meant correspondingly greater support for Catholicism? It certainly argues for a considerable proportion of at least a persistent nostalgia, hardly surprising in nation so enthusiastically Catholic for one thousand years. The high profile given to the vocal and active followers of the new religion has obscured at times the silent majority. As Palliser states, the exile of several hundred seriously opposed and influential people is not insignificant but is fractional in a population of 3 million. What may at first distinguish the prominent exiles was their intellectual standing and this may colour judgements of their relative importance. The appeal of Catholicism

was more broadly based but the extent of doctrinal catechesis of the masses initially
less than comprehensive. When has it ever been otherwise? Eamon Duffy, as well as
Ronald Hutton and Jack Scarisbrick, have demonstrated effectively that the practice
of the traditional faith in England before Henry’s revolution had been vibrant, popular
and productive of community cohesion in the early decades of the sixteenth century.
How could this have survived legislation depriving people of every previous outlet of
popular expression and public support? Stoic acceptance of change and radicalisation
where it can’t be resisted is one thing. The willing embrace of previously shunned and
visually stark alternatives is quite another. Those old enough to have experienced and
exploited its attractions and influence are least likely to have been enthusiastic about
its banishment. Some of the previously cherished habits of prayer must have survived
– especially within the older generation – through the years of turmoil; maybe even in
some cases because of them. By 1553 there could well have persisted residual
attachments upon which to rebuild more solid structures. The mutability of the times
as well as the material preservation of church goods from confiscation suggests a state
of resignation that could also anticipate better days in the future.33

The contention that Mary failed to use constitutional and consultative means to
restore the old religion is likewise challenged by recent studies. Felicity Heal
recognises the Queen’s political impulse to bide her time while continuing to be
decisive: … “the key religious change of reconciliation with Rome had to be achieved
with political consent, and that it therefore had to wait until the appropriate time … it
was first necessary to annul and repeal by act of parliament many perverse laws made

33Haigh, C. English Reformations, pp. 210-211. Marsh, C., Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century
by those who ruled before her".  

Similarly, Jennifer Loach has demonstrated in her study of Mary and her parliaments, a recognition by them of their power but of ultimate compliance with her wishes. Legislation initiated by her and her Council was passed with a comfortable majority. It would seem from this perspective at least that G.R. Elton’s sweeping generalisation about the reign as a failure seems to ignore its parliamentary record. Studies such as those of Loach were undertaken with research and study using traditional sources as well as some previously unused documents. In considering this approach it will be relevant to look at the situation inherited by Mary as seen from the perspective of some contemporary sources with their positive and negative contemporaries contrasted.

2. Perception and Potential

Monarchs of the later Tudor period faced serious challenges at the beginning of their reigns but those of Mary were unique. The first female monarch to succeed, she represented as well as personified a complete reversal of the religious programme that preceded her. The politics of potential alliances and relations with either France or the vast dominion of her Hapsburg relations would always have been major influences to be carefully considered. Relations with both these bigger and more powerful states had played significant parts in the previous Tudor reigns. Whichever alliance Mary embraced was bound to disadvantage the one she rejected. Charles V was quick to
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sense an opportunity not be missed, bringing Mary’s dominions into his territorial orbit. Religion was not absent form his designs, including the achievement in the eyes of Europe of restoring Catholicism to them as a consequence. Achieving his aim took time and the delay is one of the factors of to be considered in the short time frame of the Marian period. Was valuable time lost and reunion sacrificed in the first eighteen months of the reign by the delay in the arrival of the Papal Legate, Cardinal Pole, as he himself insisted? Diplomatic considerations argued that his arriving too soon would have been perilous. Mary was persuaded against his entering England immediately. At least that is what she is reported as having told Giacomo Soranzo, the Venetian ambassador to England.

The Cardinal’s early arrival would undoubtedly have accelerated the campaign to restore the old faith. However, it is unlikely that his immediate presence could have materially affected the necessary structural repairs to the churches which still depended on parliamentary approval. The disposal and dispersal of property had by no means begun or ended with opponents of the old religion. Many of Mary’s co-religionists had by now benefitted from the bonanza of acreage and accessories that came onto the market as a result of change. Support from these beneficiaries could not be assured. Nor would it be available from those directly in control of the administration of the churches. Initially, in addition to material deficits in coin and kind, Mary’s bench of bishops and their preferred worship presented a major block to her intentions. The episcopate was Protestant; and the liturgy was heretical. It was they who for the most part had driven the agenda of destruction and devised the

39 Haigh, C., Reformation and Resistance, p. 195.
liturgical forms that went with it. A letter of November 1552 from the bishops to the Privy Council, stated that since most of the altars in the country had been taken down, the remainder needed to be removed in order to avoid further disputes. Letters exchanged between the reformers in England and their colleagues abroad rejoice in the ritual cleansing of the churches and by spring of 1550 all the altars in the diocese of Rochester were down, by the mandate of Bishop Nicholas Ridley. With equal zeal he set his sights on the church interiors of the diocese of London, spared by Edmund Bonner. Soon after Ridley’s translation to London on 1 April, 1550, swift removals followed. The continental reformer John Stumphius, writing to Henry Bullinger, notes approvingly of these achievements: “The bishop of London too has cast down throughout all the churches committed to his charge, the altars which had been hitherto retained for the administration of the holy eucharist.”

In the autumn of 1552, the chronicler of the Grey Friars had noted that:

…the 25 day of October [1550] was the plucking down of all the altars and chapels in all Paul’s church, at the commandment of the bishop then being Nicholas Ridley, and all the goodly stonework that stood behind the high altar, and the place for the priest, deacon and subdeacon; and would have pulled down John of Gaunt’s tomb, but there was a commandment to the contrary from the council, and so it was made all plain as it appears.

This destruction was also recorded by a contemporary court chronicler. A letter from Sir John Cheke to Henry Bullinger dated 7 June, 1553, praised his pupil, King Edward: “He has removed images from churches, he has overthrown idolatry; he has abolished the mass and destroyed every kind of superstition.”

41 OL, vol. I, p. 79.
43 Chronicle of the Grey Friars, p. 75.
The whole paraphernalia of centuries of Catholicism was swept away. Martin Bucer, writing to John Calvin in Geneva, in 1550 records:

The first day of November being All Hallows day, the new service of the book called Common Prayer began at St Paul’s, the Bishop of London exceeding himself. This day all the copes and vestments were put down through all England, and the prebendaries of St Paul’s left their hoods and the Bishops their crosses, so that the priests and clerks shall use none other vestments at service nor communion but surplice only; as by Act of Parliament in the Book of Common Prayer more at large is set out. After the feast of all Saints the upper choir in St Paul’s Church in London, where the high altar stood, was broken down and all the choir thereabout, and the table of the communion set up in the lower choir where the priests sing.\textsuperscript{46}

The re-modelling of church interiors according to Geneva was complete when in 1553 the Duke of Northumberland coveted the surviving plate of the parish churches, cloaking it in the genuine but nonetheless useful reforming zeal of the young King. \textit{Wriothesley’s Chronicle} noted the extent of the Royal Commission’s mandate in the spring of 1553 to seize anything and everything of value:

\textit{…in the months of April and May this year [1553] Commissions were directed through England for all the Church goods remaining in Cathedrals and parish churches that is to say jewels, plate, ready money, copes, vestments and other metals of brass and copper, the churchwardens to make a true inventory of all such goods and to bring it to the Commissions and, after the inventories were brought in, all such goods were taken away to the king’s use, that is to say, all the jewels, gold and silver, as crosses, candlesticks, censers, chalices, all other goods of gold and silver and ready money, which should be delivered to the master of the King’s jewels in the Tower of London, and all copes and vestments of cloth of gold, cloth of tissue, and cloth of silver to the master of the King’s wardrobe in London, and all other vestments and copes to be sold and the money delivered to the King’s treasurer, Sir Edmund Peckham, knight. Reserved to every cathedral and parish church a chalice or cup, or more with tablecloths for the communion board, at the discretion of the Commission.\textsuperscript{47}}

\textsuperscript{46} OL, vol. II, pp. 78-79.
The Commission was still vigorously pursuing its mandate when Mary came to the throne. Specific details of plate and ornament feature in Eamon Duffy’s detailed research on the subject, providing samples of inventories of parishes assessed for the sequestration of decades of benevolent donation linked to the Mass. In consequence of which the ceremonial splendours of the latter are to be replaced by the simplicity of the Prayer Book requiring that the chalices, vestments and other accumulations be substituted for the bare essentials: “a communion cup, a quantity of linen for the table, and often a cope or vestment, almost certainly to be made into a carpet rather than worn.”

It is a narrative as much of ancient benefaction and generosity as of previously unparalleled levels of greed directed towards sacred objects. Antonio Guaras’ account of Mary’s succession records the confiscations as a strategy of Northumberland to possess all the resources he could to consolidate his position in power in the event of King Edward’s death. Some of this loot was still in transition to royal treasury by the time that Mary arrived in London. Its attempted restoration to thousands of parishes, was a task that would continue to occupy her throughout the reign. Ronald Hutton’s earlier study provides samples of destruction and alienation of Church goods and shows that the removal of altars from almost every parish church had proceeded apace from 1549 onwards. Further away from the jurisdiction of Cranmer and Ridley it took longer to achieve, but was equally extensive. Four Lancashire parishes in 1552 and one in Wiltshire in 1553 still had altars. Ely and Norwich had made compliance with all the regulations throughout Edward’s reign. Wales has no official record but a poem written around 1553 describes the churches as “universally empty of altars, roods, pyxes and

holy water stoops." The recorded success of this operation should not though be immediately judged as a triumph for its ideology. The presumption of willing submission to the destruction and removal of traditional patrimony suggested in older histories of the period finds is countered by the research of Hutton, Duffy, already mentioned and also Scarisbrick.51

The ideology and evangelical motivation for the progress of the Reformation and its success in some areas under Edward is given exhaustive and sympathetic treatment by Diarmaid MacCulloch. Nevertheless, he recognises that contemporary figures suggest only 17% support in London with Essex and Kent flowing closely with 14% and 12% respectively.52 Looking beyond Mary’s reign, he maintains that the Catholic interregnum could not prevent Edward’s church experiment paving the way for that of Elizabeth. Yet the question remains of how the wrecking of the people’s churches under Edward can be justified at all since it enjoyed so small a proportion of support from the people on whose behalf it was carried out. What it certainly did was to severely disadvantage Catholicism without ending its hold on the popular imagination. Literally removing the foundations of the faith ultimately saddled the vast majority of people with the huge cost in material terms of attempting to repair and restore their loss. It would seem that large numbers of them were prepared to undertake this mammoth task. The measure of this undertaking has to be acknowledged in defence of Mary’s Catholic restoration and contrasted with the much smaller one of sporadic resistance to it.

Much that was achieved was done in the face of economic shortfall on the part of government and people. Finance was not initially a strong plank in the Marian structure of government. Mary inherited huge debts and a debased coinage.\textsuperscript{53} While Mary had to forego income restored to the Church, priests and people were required to finance the parish programmes of restoration, the priest being responsible for the ornament of the chancel, vicarage and rectory, and the parishioners for the nave and exterior of the church.\textsuperscript{54} Financing the restoration from parochial as well as diocesan funds is one of those aspects of the restoration that is most easily overlooked as indeed it had been until recent decades. Since little remains of the many reconstructions undertaken and for which money was paid, the story must be told from available entries in the relevant extant parish accounts. A number of important facts have emerged, throwing light on a dusty and materially invisible record. A study undertaken by R.H. Pogson opens up the question of just how problematic the financial situation continued to be but it also shows how diligent and resourceful was the bureaucratic effort employed in attempting to bring order out of the chaos.\textsuperscript{55} The same study registered new evidence of the key role played by Cardinal Pole in this drive for solvency and efficiency which will be examined a later chapter.

The loss of the monasteries had removed a bulwark of faith and public charity and support from many parts of the country. This network of refuge and religious example could not be replaced in one lifetime. On the other hand, support for the new religion was available from immigrants who had flocked to England to enjoy the

\textsuperscript{53} Debts left by Edward VI amounted to just over £185,000, equivalent to several billions in modern values. Calculation based on National Archives, Currency Converter, online. \textit{CSPD, Mary I, 1553 - 1558}, no.16.

\textsuperscript{54} Whatmore, L.E., \textit{Archdeacon Harpsfield’s Visitation}, 1557 (Catholic Record Society, 1950 & 1951), pp. 6-7.

\textsuperscript{55} Pogson, R.H., ‘Revival and Reform in Mary Tudor’s Church: A Question of Money’, in C. Haigh, ed., \textit{The English Reformation Revised}, pp. 139-56.
benefits of its free profession in Edward’s reign. Did they on that account present a substantial threat to the restoration of Catholicism? They were unlikely to be instantly receptive to its return. A.G. Dickens devotes a great deal of attention to them in his major work of the English Reformation. Judged from the perspective of change from the old to the new, he represents them as a major force for good. By implication they can hardly have been less engaged in the early struggles with Mary’s Catholic revival than their native co-religionists. Some estimates put the number of foreigners residing in London alone at around 6,000. Others place it much higher. A considerable number of these were of the new religion. In a letter to his reformist friend, Albert Hardenberg, the pastor of a community in Bremen, Germany, Martin Bucer tells him that he knows of at least six to eight hundred German Protestants in London. The government viewed them as a threat and some at least would eventually leave during Mary’s reign. As early as 16 September, the Privy Council addressed a letter to the Mayors of Dover and Rye expressly commanding them “… to suffer all French Protestants to pass out of the realm and carry with them all things forbidden by the laws of the realm”. Evidence that many of the foreigners in London at the beginning of the reign remained throughout is not lacking. Demographically, London and undoubtedly other parts of the Southeast harboured potentially hostile communities of the new religion in not insignificant numbers. None of these foreigners is recorded as having paid the ultimate price for their beliefs. But at least in the early months of the reign it is not fanciful to suppose that they were well

61 APC, vol. IV, p. 349.
represented among the hostile crowds that are mentioned by contemporary sources. In a volatile situation, the levels of indigenous as well as immigrant enthusiasm resulted in quite a heady mix. Likewise levels of varied individual conviction or lack of it. Ralph Allerton, representative of this acquired religious independence, on trial before Bishop Bonner in April 1557, identified three religious attitudes in England;

The first is that which you hold: the second is clean contrary to the same, and the third is neuter, being indifferent, that is to say observing all things that are commanded outwardly as though he were of your part, his heart being set against the same.63

The situation of an unfinished revolution which had achieved the abolition of traditional religion resulting in a radical alternative coupled by indeterminate individualism emerges from this confrontation. Martin Bucer, writing from Cambridge to John Calvin in Geneva, acknowledged the problems faced by the reformers:

The bishops have not yet been able to come to an agreement as to Christian doctrine, much less as to discipline, and very few parishes have pastors qualified to their office. Most of them are sold to the nobility, and there are persons, even among the ecclesiastical order, and those who wished to be regarded as gospellers, who hold three or four parishes and even more, without ministering in any of them; but they appoint such substitutes as will be satisfied with the least stipend, and who for the most part cannot read English, and who are at heart papists. The nobility too have, in many parishes, preferred those who have been in monasteries who are most unlearned and altogether unfit for sacred office; and this merely for the sake of getting rid of the payment of the yearly pension.64

63 Foxe, p. 2038.
In recovering England as a vital province of the universal Church, the Papacy
and the conservative hierarchy were equally pilgrims journeying towards a definite
destination but through an uncharted terrain. In ecclesiastical terms, the schism
represented the complete breakdown of structures of juridical as well as sacramental
validity and continuity. Understanding the remedy necessitates appreciating the
malaise from the Catholic juridical viewpoint. Before Henry VIII’s quarrel with
Rome, Canterbury and York represented two provinces of the universal Church. An
action of parliament – although the Holy See lacked the immediate effect of sanction
to deter or reverse it – had no canonical authority according to ecclesiastical or
international law as previously understood to alter the real status of the Church in
England. In familiar terms, it had abandoned the family home but was still a
daughter, now seen as wayward. The separation only enjoyed legality in England,
once parliament had voted for what the king had demanded. What then followed was
in theological terms the apostasy of the hierarchy. It was not their acceptance of his
presumed title of Supreme Head on earth of the Church in England, “so far as the law
of Christ allows”, rather their surrender to Henry of their bulls of appointment by the
Holy See and their re-appointment by the king, through the agency of a layman,
Thomas Cromwell, as Vicar General, that changed a schism into a heresy. It was a
previously unheard-of procedure both in ecclesiastical and international law at the
time. Their purely devolved secular authority thereafter rendered all their
ecclesiastical and sacramental acts illicit, from the point of view of Canon Law.65

King Edward’s Council introduced more radical changes, abolishing the Mass and the
Catholic rite of Ordination. Those ordained according to this Ordinal were invalid
from the Catholic point of view and incapable of administering valid sacraments other
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than Baptism and Matrimony. At the outset of Mary’s reign, churchmen like Stephen Gardiner and Thomas Cranmer were valid bishops but there was no cleric in the country that could licitly perform the coronation according to Catholic rites. Dispensations were needed from Pope Julius III, so that Bishop Gardiner could conduct the ceremony – Cranmer being formally bound to the Prayer Book liturgy – and under arrest for his public written challenge regarding the restoration of the Mass. The illicit function of clergy and the schismatic state of the nation would not be fully corrected until Pole’s arrival in November 1554. The most complete study to date of the canonical and theological implications of the situation is Ernest Messenger’s classic work.66

Coupled with the complications involved in lapsed jurisdiction and invalidity was the problem of clerical marriage which did not invalidate the priestly state of one properly ordained but placed him in the morally unsound position of concubinage. A unique solution to the problem was found by the Parson of St Nicholas Cole Abbey, Mr Chicken, who sold his wife to the local butcher.67 Among the majority conservative Catholic faithful, the existence of married priests inevitably led to disrespect. Robert Parkyn recorded that “The common people would point them with their fingers in places where they saw them”.68 A recent study on the impact and extent of clerical marriage reveal patterns of something akin to a north-south and east-west divide.69 Its findings indicate that deprivations of clergy under Mary amounted to one third in London (including Essex) and a quarter in Norfolk and Suffolk while
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66 Messenger, C.E., *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood.*
in York it was barely one tenth and in Lancashire only 7 out of 257 clergy.\(^7\) Figures for Exeter, Coventry and Lichfield and Lincoln indicate somewhat less than ten percent of deprivations for marriage. It is important here to make the distinction (not made by Helen Parish) that although the deprivations were for marriage, separation from spouses was not automatic. Only those validly ordained – i.e. before the introduction of the new Ordinal under Edward – had to separate from their wives as guilty of “interpretive bigamy” according to canon law. Those ordained by Edwardine rites were not regarded as genuine priests. They could therefore validly marry but were deprived because incapable as laymen of holding a benefice.\(^7\) These complex issues of the Marian restoration are too easily considered in the light of later clerical freedom to marry and are consequently viewed as elements of persecution emphasised by older historians. It was much more a matter of correcting something regarded as an abuse. Canon law forbade clerical marriage without dispensation. From that perspective the deprivations were the application of normal Catholic procedures designed to restore ecclesiastical integrity. It was the relative scale of deprivations, the public awareness, and the previous state approval of it that was unprecedented in England.

Whereas in 1553 the reversal of the Catholic liturgy was welcomed among the majority though repudiated by gospellers, the prospect of the transfer of property back to the church disconcerted even religious conservatives. For the poorer section of lay people who, because of the dissolution, had lost out in different ways, their plight would continue, regardless of their faith.\(^7\) Both sets of people presented problems to
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\(^7\) Ibid. p. 188-9.
\(^7\) Ibid. Also, Messenger, E., *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, vol. II, pp. 13-17.
the new government but it was the better-off who needed immediate assurance since their support counted. The initial reticence of the political class, apprehensive of the loss of their recent gains had to be overcome. Representative of this group in the Council was the Earl of Bedford, previously commander of the troops that suppressed the Prayer Book rioters in the West Country in 1549. Early in Mary’s reign in a fit of anger at the prospect of being required to return any of the lands he had acquired, he is reported to have torn his rosary from his belt and thrown it into the fire saying that he valued “his sweet abbey of Woburn more than fatherly council that should come from Rome.”

He was probably not untypical of the newly enriched. Later assurance of ownership assuaged his choler. The property transfer had included diocesan as well as monastic income and land. The bishopric of Durham was dismembered by Northumberland. Bishops were appointed to London and Winchester on greatly reduced stipends. The Henrician dioceses of Gloucester and Westminster were suppressed altogether when legislation to divide confiscated income from Durham was enacted. None of this had anything to do with reform but was simply opportunism on the part of those who used the coercive power of government to enrich themselves at the Church’s expense. Convocation, the clergy’s own consultative body could only acquiesce, control having passed to the Crown.

Identifying the creed of the politicos who surrounded Mary is an imprecise exercise. Those surviving from the previous two reigns were adept at re-invention of loyalties. Some who outwardly and even actively accepted the changes under Henry and Edward conformed in Mary’s reign and accommodated still further the religious
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74 Heal, F., *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, pp. 201-206.
reversal under Elizabeth. Northumberland, who in Edward’s reign had been foremost and even radical in prosecuting the prescriptions of the new religion, gave public witness of returning to the Catholic fold just before his death. His public avowal was regarded as a major coup for the government. The sincerity of his conversion will be discussed in Chapter II. The Earl of Derby may also serve as an example of an aristocrat whose religious affiliation evades precise detection.

A man like the Earl of Derby was brought up a Catholic, swallowed the monastic estates when the opportunity offered, raised no open protest against the Edwardian innovations in religion, was a loyal supporter of Mary and the Catholic reaction and an equally loyal servant of Elizabeth and fairly robust as a magistrate in enforcing Anglican worship after 1559.76

It is arguable that self-interest mixed with political realism affected their reactions to policy. This is the point made by Stone in the work just quoted.

The view that an established Church was an essential support for a hierarchical society and a monarchical government was almost universally held in the sixteenth century, and accounts for the early acceptance of the slogan *cuius regio eius religio*. It was thought that a state could not survive unless its members subscribed to a single church and a single doctrine. Peers were under particular pressure to conform to the established Church, whatever it might be.77

Whatever plan of action was afoot, if success seemed possible acting in concert looked to be the best option. Northumberland’s attempt to alter the succession had at least the signed support of his fellow councillors. Their early efforts to abandon him, recorded in some sources, throw doubt on their enthusiasm.78 But again it seems
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77 Ibid.
they acted in unison. Mary was willing to pardon them in what most historians agree was a move both wise and merciful. They easily accommodated their loyalty to the Queen and the religious conservatism of the reign.

Mary was not fortunate in respect of the unpredictability of economic, dynastic, political and sanitary contingencies. Her short reign coincided with adverse periods of weather, bad harvest and epidemic. The summer of 1554 was largely wet and that of 1555 resolutely dry. In the autumn of that year violent storms destroyed what was left of a poor harvest. Machyn describes the weather as “the greatest rain and floods that ever was seen in England”.\textsuperscript{79} In fact it rained from 20 September until the 13 October. 1556 was one of the driest, hottest summers that anyone could remember. The harvests of 1557 and 1558 were poor again due to cold and wet weather. Widespread illness occurred in 1557 and 1558. The economic effects were of course hardship for some and death for many others. A “sweating sickness”, presumably influenza, caused the deaths of many of the older generation and the clerical casualties from this were particularly high.\textsuperscript{80} The despondency of mood and the sense of gloom can be imagined, especially as apocalyptic literature made the most of the misfortune. “God did so punish the realm…that in the last two years of the reign of Queen Mary so many of her subjects was (sic) made away…”\textsuperscript{81} In an age when people were more inclined to see natural disasters as direct punishments from God for real or presumed offences against Him, it was not difficult for opponents of the old religion to point to the crises as God’s judgement on the country for its reversion to idolatry.

\textsuperscript{79} Machyn, \textit{Diary}, p. 94. 
\textsuperscript{81} Wriothesley’s \textit{Chronicle}, vol. II, pp. 90-91.
Among the unexpected and subsequently troublesome obstacles to be overcome, was the election in 1555 of a pope who was probably unstable. The great German historian Ludwig Pastor’s judgement of the personality of Paul IV, based on contemporary accounts, is fairly succinct:

He could endure no contradiction and lost his temper very readily. It was in keeping with the majestic, stern and peremptory manner which was characteristic of him that he always took the leading part in a conversation, and whoever wished to get anything from him had to be very careful not to interrupt him…

It will be appropriate to look more closely at this Pontiff and his relations with England in a later chapter.

Historically, all the presumed deficiencies of Mary’s reign blend into the two streams of criticism: outstanding failure in policy and pitiless persecution of the innocent, typified by the burnings of individuals for religious dissidence. No monarch is held in greater loathing than she in popular historical mythology because the most-remembered detail of her reign is the hundreds of people put to death in just four years. The loss of Calais and the childless demise of the Queen seem to offer providential confirmation of her final nemesis. Before the twentieth century, there were few historians who challenged the view of Mary’s callous and vindictive motivation unmitigated by even the finer feelings that would normally be expected to affect feminine intuition. Recent decades have seen a huge effort to examine in greater detail the causes, the characters and the complexities of both the prosecutions
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and their protagonists, resulting not in any justification of the policy but in a greater degree of understanding of its purpose and a more evidence-based critique of its political and religious impact. On this, more will be discussed in detail later in this study. Suffice it to say at this point that for all the massive propaganda value of the Elizabethan and later promotion of the horrors of the Marian burnings and of the tyranny they exemplified, they may not have been seen in so repulsive a perception by many contemporaries. Violent public executions were an accepted outcome for many convictions during these centuries. In religious terms, the death in large numbers of opponents was seen as desirable and provided sometimes providential confirmation of divine justice comparable to that of the Old Testament. In a letter to Bullinger in Zurich, dated 3 March, 1554, Peter Martyr wrote: “And now to mention a few things you will be glad to hear. It is stated that the rebels [Wyatt’s forces] have put to death 300 mass-priests.” It proved to be untrue, but the attitude of the writer is still significant in its approval of the supposed action. The presumption that 300 priests have been eliminated in just one action reflected the precedent of the Biblical scenes which specifically depict with undisguised zeal the death of idolaters (2 Kings 20: 18-27). In a contest of this kind for the hearts, minds and souls of a nation, there could be no sacrifice too great and no suffering unjustified if it led to purification and pacification. Certainly in regard to the burnings the initiative of the government was one of deterrent as well as the elimination and weakening of pockets of resistance. The belief that Queen Mary and her advisers had any hope of succeeding in this aim is one that has been stoutly rejected in most histories of the reign. That question has

83 Henry Machyn’s Diary records the fact of the burnings without any comment for or against them. But entries preceding and following continue to chronicle with enthusiasm, the continuing Catholic revival. Examples in pp. 87, 88, 92, 93, 95-6, 130, 138-139.
once again been recently researched by Eamon Duffy and his alternative conclusions in respect of the policy will be examined in this study.

3. Historical images of a Catholic Queen

“Bloody Mary” counts for more than a passing reference in the list of those rulers who have gone down in history as monstrous. Her reign and her character are defined as no other by her presumed cruelty. In the reign following, the story received a quite definite and purposeful narrative which has remained relevant to the unpopularity of Catholicism in subsequent centuries. At last victorious, the minority conceived their former persecution as the martyrdom out of which they had triumphed. Written testimony of that struggle would serve as both a warning and a rallying point for the future. The architect of this edifice of monumental and heroic resistance laboured long and hard to create his *magnum opus*. It was John Foxe’s definitive edition in 1583 of what came to be called the *Book of Martyrs* that firmly established the narrative as well as the ideology of necessary persecution leading to the ultimate victory of the new religion. The decades he described were times of tribulation, persecution and subjection to the false and sinful religion of idolatry from which the nation and its church was delivered by Elizabeth I. That work, together with the policies that marginalised the old religion, helped to establish the new and shaped its mythology of martyrdom and mission. By 1603, the power of the chronicle of resistance dominated perceptions of the nation’s fidelity to its covenant with the Reformation. The outward structures and public profession of Catholicism had been
banished. What remained was an underground religious movement, which Foxe’s text and its illustrations helped to discredit. His religion had triumphed and emerged from the shadows of Mary’s reign to bask in the glow of established supremacy in that of her half-sister. Mary’s failure and that of her religion were seen as synonymous. Later English historians nurtured in the established religion and its identification with the nation’s expansion and emerging economic endeavours accepted the testimony of Foxe as valid for two reasons. First, they considered it to be the most complete, genuine and accessible resource. Secondly, they shared with Foxe the ideology of the superiority of the established religion over that which it replaced. A tradition regarding Catholicism as a religion of arbitrary coercion, essentially foreign and too superstitious to be rationally entertained emerged from the Elizabethan settlement. Through it England had mercifully and providentially escaped from papist tyranny. The demonization of Catholicism in Foxe easily transferred to Mary, its monarchical personification. English historians of the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth century have invariably presented her either as a bigoted tyrant or a Tudor outsider: un-English, alien and pitiless.

Her fall from grace and early popularity, through duplicity and coercion, reflected the nemesis of the faith she had sought to impose. But this narrative demands that the story of the Catholic majority be set aside. This inevitably can distort the impact of religious traditionalism on Mary’s succession and on the part it played in popular response to her initiatives. At the death of Edward VI the Protector Northumberland looked to have had all the logistical and military advantages. Yet he failed. Some writers view Mary’s success in terms of the popular triumph of

legitimacy over a usurper. Seasoned political observers at the time did not consider her chances good. Her nephew, the Emperor Charles V, unable or unwilling through difficulties of his own to come to her aid, advised her to accept Northumberland’s coup. Was legitimacy the dominant factor in her favour? Recent historians are less convinced of it as the major cause of her success. Contemporary sources suggest that hatred and suspicion of Northumberland were also a decisive factor in his failure. Could it have been that it really was Mary’s religion that tipped the balance in her favour? Christopher Haigh, interprets religion as “one of the elements in Mary’s appeal”. It may have been more than that. Jennifer Loach has shown that contemporary politicians and preachers who supported Jane Grey all did so for religious reasons. She also notes that the first and clearest support for Mary came from the Catholic gentry of East Anglia and the Thames Valley. The fact is that Mary, an obvious Catholic, did succeed. The almost miraculous nature of her success lent a religious and providential aura to her accession which justified optimism for the future. It was also a triumph for the “silent majority” of traditionalists.

She was the candidate of Catholic choice and the heroine of resistance to King Edward’s innovations. It is recorded that in Framlingham, upon hearing of her proclamation in London on 18 July, she set up a crucifix in her chapel – not as
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86 Palliser, D.M., ‘Popular Reactions to the Reformation’ in C. Haigh, ed., English Reformation Revised, p.101. Elton, G.R., England under the Tudors, p. 213, emphasises Mary’s descent as the major factor in her success. Loades, D., The Reign of Mary Tudor, p. is more inclined to the view that it was Henry’s will which gave her the advantage.
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Prescott writes, in the parish church.\textsuperscript{93} On her entry into London, one source records that pictures and images of the Virgin Mary and the saints showed in windows along the route.\textsuperscript{94} These demonstrations took their cue from Mary’s own actions during the recent reign. In 1551, at the height of Edward’s religious revolution, she had ridden through London with a large retinue, all visibly carrying black rosary beads attached to their belts in defiance of new laws.\textsuperscript{95} She was the personification of traditional resistance and its only hope of prevailing. Popular support in her favour corresponded with her own instincts of the pull of attraction to the old religion which she believed was still potent. If it was a gamble, it was one that success seemed to support. Then again, perhaps the experience of her long apprenticeship had taught her to judge more correctly than her opponents the popular mood. The probability is defensible in the light of recent studies. Jennifer Loach also proposes that it was Mary’s triumph in these circumstances that justified her conviction that “Catholicism was still a political force.”\textsuperscript{96} 1553 may represent the first and last Catholic coup to succeed in English history.

Mary’s actions from then on reveal her own conviction that the traditional religion could be and should be restored. The question remains of just how traditional she was by this time. David Loades has raised questions about the consistency of her spirituality – except in regard to Eucharistic doctrine – and whether it always implicitly included a loyalty to the Papacy.\textsuperscript{97} The Sydenham Prayer Book of 1590, published as a part of the Bedingfield Papers, contains “Good Queene Maryes

\textsuperscript{93} Guaras, A, \textit{The Accession of Queen Mary}, p. 97
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\textsuperscript{95} Brigden, S., \textit{London and the Reformation}, p. 525.
\textsuperscript{96} Loach, J., \textit{Edward VI}, p. 179.
Prayer”, reputedly said by her every day of her life, exhibits appropriate elements of conventional Catholic devotion. Her spirituality developed in a time when England was a confessional Catholic state and continued through the vicissitudes of the years following its breakdown. The experience toughened rather than weakened her faith. The answer to her mature conviction may lie in a telling phrase included in her first proclamation on religion. In it, the religion she proposes to promote once again is that “she hath ever professed from her infancy hitherto”. A recent study concludes that this phrase is an unambiguous reference to the full Catholicism of her father’s early reign. Political and matrimonial considerations may have delayed the immediate achievement of this goal but it looks like having been her aim from the outset. Perhaps Cardinal Pole’s appeals to her were essentially reminders of what she already knew and intended rather than desperate attempts to persuade her of the priority of reunion.

Historians who have not accepted the view that Mary had the necessary talent or quality for a successful monarch give nostalgia, bitterness and obstinacy as reasons that explain her obsession with the past. Her actions are judged accordingly as headstrong and irrational. A.G. Dickens, for example writes dismissively of her emotional stability. The possibility that her religious sympathies might reflect the feelings of many of her sex, previously deeply involved in traditional religion, is discounted. He portrays Mary as out of touch, out of date and politically naïve.
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G.R. Elton sees nothing positive in Mary’s reign because of her single-minded devotion to Rome and her love of and alliance with Spain. A much earlier biography of Mary sees her totally at odds with progress and still backward-looking and unable to perceive the parting of the ways between the political and religious medieval and the modern. In their time these have been influential studies in forming opinions and judgements of Mary’s reign. They have emphasised its failure and marginal influence in the long term. David Loades’ assessment of the reign is not less sceptical and while he acknowledges the step by step recovery of Catholic custom and practice, it still appears as an achievement that lacks widespread support. It is weakness on the part of the Protestant mission rather than its lack of appeal to the majority that facilitates Mary’s limited success. Again, in his latest study of Mary it cannot be religious devotion or appeal that brings out the crowds to religious observances, but “the colour and glitter of these occasions”. This reads very much like a typical projection of univocal causality onto a situation that admits of alternatives. It is just as easy to claim that the colour and glitter reflected an expensive investment attributable to conviction. Negative judgements of Mary’s agenda for recovery only began to be seriously challenged with several new studies on the impact of her policies published in a continuous stream from the mid 1970’s up to the present. They faced up to and challenged head on the notion that Mary’s feminine defects coupled with her religion constituted insuperable obstacles to her success. They concentrated on the evidence of sources that either chronicled or registered
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effective and expeditious implementation of changes and analyse soberly their accessible results.

The work which had – and continues to have – a great and traceable influence on revisionist impressions of persistent appeal of traditional religion was that of Eamon Duffy. It provided detailed and direct evidence of the vigour and resilience of the Faith in the decades preceding the break with Rome initiated by Henry VIII. 110 Mary’s restoration of the old faith also received from him a sympathetic treatment based on previous research and sample evidence from parish records. As a positive contribution previously overlooked, he also pointed up the serious efforts in areas such as preaching, printing and liturgical reconstruction made by the Marian regime and largely supported by parochial initiatives. 111 As already mentioned, Christopher Haigh edited a series of essays among which were studies by Rex Pogson on the attempts at financial solvency involved in the Marian revival and an essay by Ronald Hutton on the local impact of that religious changeover. 112 These essays departed from the conventional view of failed and unpopular initiatives and were constructive and comprehensive in their research. In the years following, several major studies, reflecting a positive assessment of Mary’s campaign of re-Catholicising the nation, have appeared in print. 113 Susan Brigden studied closely the situation in London during the time of the Reformation and paid particular attention to the years 1553-1558 concluding that the traditional image of a city mostly ill at ease with Catholicism lacks justification. In 2009 Eamon Duffy’s study of the central themes of the methods
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of promoting and re-packaging the old faith on the one hand and the prosecution of staunch supporters of the new religion on the other presented a robust defence of the former while underscoring the political, strategic and ultimately deterrent implications of the latter.\(^\text{114}\) He was able to demonstrate that the policy of burning those convicted of heresy – however repugnant its purpose and instigation to later sensibilities – registered a perceptible impact of diminishing resistance and was less abhorrent to contemporaries than is usually believed. This theme will re-emerge for fuller consideration in chapter III.

To gain a fuller picture of the complexities and character of Mary’s reign, older histories and biographies are perennially useful as reference works and provide commentary on earlier historiographical lines of enquiry and conclusion. Some – like Messenger and Hughes already mentioned – are written primarily from a Catholic and apologetic perspective. The analysis of theological and doctrinal issues they contain helps to elucidate contentious areas of difference. More recent biographies expand and reveal previously neglected or under-used data. In the past four years no fewer than five authors have published thorough re-examinations of Mary, particularly in respect of her being the first Queen Regnant, coming to the throne against the odds and reigning without historical precedent at home. The first of these studies to appear in 2007 was that of Linda Porter which identified the strength of Mary’s character both in its honesty as well as its determination and saw the brevity of her reign as much as the length of that of Elizabeth as a major part of the legend of her absolute failure.\(^\text{115}\) Judith Richards’ biography of Mary, published in 2009, concentrated on the feminine novelty and originality of Mary’s reign as well as the issues and difficulties

\(^{114}\) Duffy, E., *Fires of Faith*.
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with which she had to deal as the first female head of state. She concluded that too little attention had been paid to Mary’s abilities and aims which had set precedents for and made possible the smooth transition from one queen regnant to another.116 In the same year another female author published her biography of Mary, acknowledging her successes as well as her failures which are seen as both the consequence as well as the misfortune of being a woman who was conscientious and hardworking but disappointed in the emotional sphere of life.117 David Loades’ biography has been mentioned and was accompanied in the same year by John Edwards’ study which draws on Spanish sources and echoes in a greater depth of research, the earlier work of H.F.M. Prescott.118

What all these recent studies have in common is broadness of perspective and less reliance on old established pre-conceptions of hostility at every turn. The resulting views of Mary are both more comprehensive and in most cases more sympathetic than before. There are yet evident traces in David Loades’ image of Mary as a misguided oddity whose reign was mercifully short, preventing even greater disasters. In this he is following older and still resilient conclusions about Mary and her reign. Anna Whitelock judges Mary to be a successful queen but deficient in her natural character as a woman. On the crucial question of Mary’s education recent biographies tend to emphasise its positive aspects. Linda Porter in particular devotes considerable attention to the various stages of Mary’s upbringing.119 It was as good as any available at the time. Lately, Andrew Taylor’s essay published in 2011 traces the influences of humanism discernible in Mary’s education and believes that the
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over-emphasis on her traditional faith has sometimes led to misunderstanding about
the breadth of her learning.120

Under the direction of Luis Vives, the Spanish tutor brought specially to
England by her mother, Queen Catherine, a programme of studies specifically
structured for a woman who might one day rule a kingdom was devised for Mary. It
included a unique work of Vives, De Institutione Fæminae Christiane, in which
various classical authors including Horace, Lucian and Seneca were recommended.
The general character of Vives’s De Institutione was streamlined into a more direct
and detailed work of reference for Mary’s education called De Ratione Studii Puerilis.
Mary’s education was – at least up to the time of her parents’ separation – a matter of
serious and special interest in keeping with the intellectual and renaissance manners
prevalent at the court.121 The dialogues of Plato “particularly those of a political
turn” formed an essential part of her studies. Nor were the contemporary scholars of
the classical tradition neglected. Vives encouraged the reading of Erasmus’
Enchiridion and More’s Utopia. Erasmus himself praised the quality of Mary’s
erudition. An author who has done considerable research into the whole question of
English humanism in the age of Henry VIII has concluded that, “…through the
determination of her mother and the labours of scholars and tutors Mary, despite the
handicap of her sex, was given all that the new learning could provide by way of
training for a governor of the Renaissance.”122 Mary’s education seems thus to have
been a synthesis of religion and classical studies and perhaps also reflected her
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mother’s preference of personal integrity over simulation and superficiality. A classic biography of Queen Catherine judges that she was more interested in content over style which may give a clue to the kind of values she instilled in her daughter.\textsuperscript{123}

The content of Mary’s instruction provided her with what both her parents shared at that time: Catholic practice and the substance of a classical education. Her fidelity to the one did not negate the quality of her ability to be successful in the other. As an adult she was likely to be representative of many of that generation which had experienced in childhood the full impact of vibrant Catholicism before the break with Rome and had never really adjusted to what came after. It is not an implausible situation to imagine. She may have had less sympathy with the generation following, who, at the beginning of her reign would never have known the Catholicism of their parents as it had been until the Act of Supremacy.\textsuperscript{124} There must have been a large number of people of a similar age who shared her scepticism about imported novelty. Earlier biographies of Mary as the first female monarch have tended to exploit the presumption of gender weaknesses that excuse or explain her actions. Not surprisingly they have been mostly written by men. Much less positive than recent studies they stand as contributions to the continuing discussion of a personality and reign which are controversial. Agnes Strickland and J.A. Froude in the nineteenth century and biographies such as those of H.F.M. Prescott and J.M. Stone already mentioned base their sympathies on Mary’s femininity but see it as an underlying cause of her tragic story. They still write with a sense that her religion was in some ways a fault that, added to her other weaknesses, explains the worst that is reported of her.

\textsuperscript{123} Mattingly, G., \textit{Catherine of Aragon}, p. 139.
\textsuperscript{124} Edwards, J., \textit{Mary I}, p. 237.
There is a stream of thought which is known to run through a great deal of historical writing on post-Reformation England which is usually described as the Whig interpretation of English history. It has been to a great extent a current from which flows much of lack of any appreciation of Mary’s reign. She is viewed as the protagonist of a backward, primitive form of religious enslavement; a transitional figure from the slough of superstition, vainly holding back the nation’s progress to the uplands of enlightenment. Mary’s politics and religion in relation to Elizabeth’s have been officially contrasted in an unfavourable manner by historians, contributing a perspective of anti-Catholicism in the national mythology of emerging empire and nationhood.\textsuperscript{125} Attempting to scale those barriers is neither facile nor fanciful. Great leaps have been made in recent decades to seek to address an innately negative view of Marian Catholicism deriving from its immediate prohibition under Elizabeth. Studies mentioned earlier – notably those of Eamon Duffy, Christopher Haigh and his collaborators and the recent biographies of Mary by Judith Richards and John Edwards, as well as Thomas F. Mayer’s study of Cardinal Pole\textsuperscript{126} – have all identified areas of success and achievement previously discounted. The most recent researches of Thomas S. Freeman on the unabridged editions of John Foxe have made them accessible in their original literary forms. He and his collaborators have also been successful at tracing the origins and progress of the myth of “Bloody Mary”. They have demonstrated just how the legend of her cruelty, tyranny and instability of character have been part of a process initiated by Foxe onwards and finding a resurgence in the late seventeenth century with the perceived threat of another

\textsuperscript{125} ODNB, Online, Queen Elizabeth I, 1533 -1603, provides a commentary on the historiographical approaches to this period which led on to the gradual transformation of perceptions of Elizabeth’s reign, in sharp contrast to what followed with the Stuart dynasty.
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Catholic monarch becoming absolute. Mary can also be judged as a typical Tudor monarch with a style of government similar to others of that dynasty but with a distinctive objective. Unlike Henry VIII and later, Edward and Elizabeth, Mary is rarely credited with the wisdom of pursuing religious policies that accorded more readily with the instincts of the majority of her subjects. Even her alleged cruelties have to be examined in the context of the century and the struggles that it witnessed for the nation’s soul and spiritual identity.

If her revolution had lasted that much longer and her marriage been fruitful, there can be little doubt that the recollection of her reign would mark the beginning and not the end of an era. In fact her reign is projected at times as an English experience of the dreaded Spanish Inquisition and observed through that spectrum. In some senses, it does reflect the priorities of Counter-reformation Catholicism that saw coercion as a necessary arm of vigilance protecting orthodoxy. It is hypothetical but nonetheless speculative to imagine that if Mary had survived for longer, given birth, or Elizabeth had died before her, much of the world’s English-speaking nations would have derived their Christianity from Catholic rather than Protestant roots. The outcome would have been an entirely different matrix of alignment in future global politics. In reality, at Mary’s death, her aims and their purpose became immediately obsolete because inimical to the agenda of Elizabeth. Of the material evidence and spiritual revival of Catholicism in the country scarcely a trace remained for very long. Seeking to redress the balance in favour of the positive and progressive impact of what was reconstructed and recovered in those years is the primary purpose of this
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study. Reference to recent research as well as an interpretation of older texts and commentaries will form a part of this study as will some unpublished sources available in manuscript form only. The much-utilised diplomatic correspondence, Venetian, Spanish, Foreign and French, reflects some immediate but inevitably nuanced reactions. It is of a diplomatic character and can be interpreted in more than one way. It is also largely confined to reflecting the influences within the Court as well as in and around London and the southern counties. Rivalries and interests also dictated responses and reports and may reflect the diplomatic imperatives of the intended recipients. The London-based Tower and Court chronicles and the Diary of Henry Machyn provide considerable evidence of enthusiasm for Catholic ritual even within the capital itself. They help to balance the narrative of Foxe. Though Machyn had a vested interest in the funerary rites of the grandees whose obsequies he witnessed and may have organised, it is evident that their growing acceptance and commonplace occurrence within London is a feature of the later Marian years which should not be overlooked. His is a sole record but there is a sense in reading it that he might not be just a solitary observer of the phenomenon of reviving rituals but a representative of a sympathetic surge of support for it. There appears to be a profoundly civic solidarity underpinning these restored rites. MacCulloch’s judgement that in the Reformation carried on by Edward, “there was little sense of any distinctive English ecclesiastical tradition”, distinguishes the welcome return of Catholic tradition among London’s elite. The years of England’s last experience of a Catholic monarch ruling within a still largely Catholic nation are not without their shadows of persecution. Parliamentary legislation reintroduced the prosecution of those who persistently and publicly opposed its decision to endorse Mary’s policies.

Did the success of Marian Catholicism depend for a time upon the prosecution of the few? Despite the inevitable sense of revulsion that the persecution inspires, can it be acknowledged that Mary’s restoration of Catholicism, while it brought suffering to a minority, expressed the will of the majority and gave them back their preferred religious option? It is consequently essential to retell the story of those years from the majority perspective. The parochial, diplomatic and chronicle sources reveal at times an alternative narrative to the polemical sources that traditionally have dominated the debate. The missing evidence of a more tangible character is virtually all of the material structures that re-appeared in the churches between 1553 and 1558. Its construction can still be traced in part through the churchwardens’ accounts. It is the aim of this study to argue that Mary’s policy of a full return to traditional religion reflected the sympathies of the vast majority of her subjects and was consequently successful up to her death. Implicitly, it was therefore a legitimate and defensible move. Not only that, but it achieved on many fronts a measure of success and approval which were apparent in liturgical, academic, cultural and administrative areas within the Church. This study seeks, alongside recent studies, to propose it as a legitimate political and religious experiment which might if time had permitted have produced a far different nation than the one with which we are all familiar. In addition, as the research of others mentioned in this study will demonstrate, Mary’s Catholic revival paralleled and interpreted correctly the continental movement for reform in which Pole was a major player and participant. More than 50 years separate two significant studies on the Catholic recovery. Each is a study of the extent of the cultural, spiritual and religious expansion of the Church which entered on a successful path of global expansion almost immediately following its major European losses.

Catholicism was rebranded with the application of insights gained and lessons learnt from past failures. These studies also extend the time frame which the revival required to fully implement necessary reforms. This perspective should be borne in mind when assessing Mary’s short reign. The Marian experiment ought to be located firmly within the movement of retrenchment and revival and not as an isolated example of the recrudescence of discredited and obsolete religious forms. It is hoped that this study will contribute in some way to that aim.
Chapter II: Religious Reaction to a Catholic Ruler

1. **The Mass is very rife**

Sixteenth century observers of Mary’s initial triumph attributed it to both divine intervention and the unpopularity of Northumberland. Effectively, it was immediate action by local magnates, in spite of the Council’s proclamation of Jane Grey, followed by a rally to her cause of ordinary folk in East Anglia, which turned the tide of support in Mary’s favour, particularly from those who mattered.\(^{130}\) John Foxe acknowledged that it was a popular triumph brought about by divine intervention. “God so turned the hearts of the people to her, and against the Council, that she overcame them without bloodshed notwithstanding there was made great expedition against her both by land and sea.”\(^{131}\) Another Protestant source suggests that the desire to see Mary succeed as queen was shared by “almost the entire nation” but that the loyalty of London was uncertain.\(^{132}\) The same source reveals that the Council’s signing of Northumberland’s device was done to deceive him.\(^{133}\) Almost as soon as he had departed London to deal with her, and news of her increasing reinforcements came in, support for him drained away.\(^{134}\) Foxe recorded that the London crowds
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silently watched the Duke ride out, none of them wishing him “God speed”.

Contemporaries believed that divine providence brought about Mary’s triumph, defeating superior forces. The Catholic commentator Robert Parkyn believed it was miraculous. Mary also believed it. Unsurprisingly, Cardinal Pole was of the same opinion. The miracle may have come about due to the distribution of Catholic support in sufficient strength and location to make a difference. Her supporters could not have doubted that she would favour the old religion since she had never been known to support or practise the new, especially in its Prayer Book form. She had been publicly denounced at Paul’s Cross some three years earlier for her known religious sympathies.

The last day of August preached at the cross Stephen Caston, and there spake touching the lady Mary as much as he might, but he named not her, but said there was a great woman within the realm that was as great supporter and maintainer of popery and superstition, and prayed that she might forsake her opinions and follow the king’s proceedings ….

Her regal entry into London witnessed images of Catholic piety being exhibited in windows, an action which was still officially unlawful. Among the gentry who first flocked to her support a common factor was their loyalty to the old faith. It can hardly have been unsuspected that Mary had been sidelined essentially because of her Catholicism though cloaked in questions of doubt as to her legitimacy. The device by which Mary was to have been superseded by Jane Grey was, according to one study, unprecedented, illegal and illogical and “amounted to what by statute
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law was a command to commit high treason.” It was likely to have been contested at some future point. Jane’s claim was based on female descent, passing over senior lines of the royal family for junior and Frances, Duchess of Suffolk, for her daughter Lady Jane. Preservation of his religious legacy led Edward to conclude that Mary should be displaced. Even so, it was not a popular decision even though research claims some initial support for Jane in Suffolk which soon changed to total support of Mary after personal contact of Catholic gentry with others of their class.

It is at least plausible to propose that Mary’s triumph represented a victory for traditional religion and inevitably encouraged its revival. More in terms of ritual than of full reunion, the initial response was an almost instinctive liturgical reaction. This was symbolic of a repudiation of recent change rather than a restoration of Catholicism which would only arrive with Cardinal Pole in November 1554. Before that time the progressive recovery of the signs, symbols and rituals of the traditional faith but not yet its formal ecclesiology defines the early years of the reign. Mary was still de facto and de iure in political terms earthly Head of the Church. Pole essentially disapproved of any compromise with the politics of the Reformation and at this stage expressed his disagreement and proposed a return to ecclesial union with Rome. Mary shared his view but initially gave priority to the political reality of victory which was publicly acknowledged with her proclamation as queen on 19 July. It produced scenes of rejoicing and jubilation in London Her official entry into the City some
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weeks later was no less tumultuous. Mixed emotions from across the religious divides of the population may have greeted Mary’s procession into London on 3 August but the general mood on that day was one of enthusiasm. The significance of the ringing of bells “so long disused” was noted and no doubt lent an atmosphere of reverberating exuberance to the City’s noisy celebrations. By an irony of fate and history, the child chosen from King Edward’s foundation, Christ’s Hospital, by an open competition, to deliver the Latin address of welcome at the royal entry to the City was none other than Edmund Campion, the future Catholic martyr. Perhaps the fact that these children represented a school founded to nurture the new religion explained Mary’s less than warm reaction, for it was recorded that, “…she heard an oration that one of them made, but she said nothing to them”.

Once installed in the Tower after 3 August, Mary began the practice of daily Mass. The Catholic prisoners of Edward’s reign were immediately released. Bishops Bonner and Gardiner, the Duke of Norfolk and Edward Courtenay, the Queen’s Plantagenet royal relation, all came out of captivity. A contemporary account records that Bonner’s release pleased at least some people: the bells in London rang out and “As many women as might kissed him.” Mary considered a Catholic funeral for her late half-brother Edward but was dissuaded from it – by his own account – by Renard. He wrote anxiously regarding her determination, that, “…it is impossible not to be apprehensive of the consequences ....“
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arrangements resulted in the late King’s funeral being conducted according to his Prayer Book, on 10 August, “without any copes or vestments, but only surplice...” while the Queen had a solemn Requiem Mass offered in the Tower. The following day there was a Mass sung again publicly in London for the first time since the Prayer Book had become mandatory by “an old priest” at St Bartholomew’s provoking threats to the celebrant: “…after that mass was done the people would have pulled him to pieces.” Another account mentions how “to the great scandal of the good, wicked people stoned and despoiled of his vestments a clergyman who was saying Mass in his parish… and some of them were apprehended”. The impression given is of violence by a group rather than a general outburst of hostility.

Reformation historians in the past have tended to interpret dissent as a general rather than a particular phenomenon. While adherents of the new religion within London numbered thousands – with a high percentage of youth among them – flashpoints for disorder were likely in these early days of change. A proportionate positive effect on the conservative majority is equally a reasonable assumption. Contrasting sympathies of conservative reaction on the one hand and opposition on the other, reflecting attitudes to these early days of Mary’s reign, are evident in Wriothesley’s Chronicle and The Diary of Henry Machyn. The Guaras account also records hostile reaction while emphasising elsewhere a traditional majority in London of 100 to every four heretics. Written close to the events they contrast greatly with Foxe, whose first edition appeared in 1566. Strong support for Catholic revival is evident in the contemporary accounts. Later, the martyrrologist emphasises the
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increasing gloom, resistance and persecution as though it affected most people. Apart from minority status, which must have weighed heavily upon them, the reality is that in autumn 1553 withdrawal of state support for their religion was the only immediate threat to their security. The supremacy in law of the past six years was lost but there was as yet no statue to punish them for their beliefs. Organised or public hostility to the Queen’s expressed wishes and that of her government counted as sedition and was a matter of legal prosecution. The tenor of Machyn’s account, evidently rejoicing in the revival of traditional religion, contrasts so much with Foxe that past writers have tended to discount it as implausible. Machyn’s being an undertaker both adds a certain professional interest to his observations and perhaps also explains their ritual detail. Does that render his commentary less representative of the wider community? No more than if he had been a chandler, a wood-carver or a stonemason, whose business would also experience increasing demand during these years of restoration. Machyn’s lone voice can be allowed to fairly represent the majority conservative view prevalent in London at the time. That is not to overstate its value but to admit its historical relevance as a counterweight to Foxe’s narrative.

Soon after her arrival in London, Mary expressed herself publicly on religion in a proclamation to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen. In it, she said that “…She had found no better expedient than to leave each one free as to the religion he would follow … if some held to the old and others to the new, they should not be interfered with or constrained to follow any other course until the coming parliament should decide by law…” To her Council she wrote that “…she meaneth graciously not
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to constrain or compel other men’s consciences otherwise than God shall (she trusteth) put into their hearts a persuasion of the truth that she is in…”  

These statements can be taken as indications that Mary was confident that such support as existed for the new religion among her people and clergy could be left to chance and circumstance. Freedom of choice might determine the demographic majority preference for return to the old ways, strengthening her hand, before her first parliament met. Detractors of Mary view her early proclamations as cunning attempts to gain time and not genuine appeals for calm and tolerance. Likewise, she is seen as biding her time in anticipation of an all-out persecution of her opponents. These suspicions of Mary are traceable to Foxe. Judgements of her persecuting intentions sit uneasily with her clemency towards Northumberland’s supporters. Only he, Sir John Gates and Sir Thomas Palmer suffered the ultimate penalty.

That opposition to Mary would continue despite the proclamation was shown within days of its publication. On Sunday 13 August, a serious confrontation occurred among crowds gathered to hear a Catholic preacher. Several sources testify to the uproar that greeted the sermon preached at Paul’s Cross by Dr Bourne, Bonner’s Chaplain. Shouts of “kill him”, and “thou liest” and a dagger thrown which narrowly missed the preacher. Interestingly, Wriothesley’s Chronicle states that the riot occurred, “…because he prayed for the souls departed and also in declaring the wrongful imprisonment of Doctor Bonner…” The same source also describes the
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rioters and their actions as being, “…lew'd and ill-disposed persons, (who) made a hallooing and such a crying thou liest, that the audience was so disturbed …..”\textsuperscript{165} This account rather suggests – as does that of Machyn – that the rioters had little support. He describes them as “young men and women.”\textsuperscript{166} Another source describes the rioters as “vagabonds.”\textsuperscript{167} It might well have been the outburst of an unruly element of the population representative of young religious hotheads out to cause trouble in a manner not unfamiliar to civic unrest then and later. They could just as easily have been what today would be called “hooligans”. Foxe reports that Bourne was saved by the intervention of two preachers, Rogers and Bradford.\textsuperscript{168} This version of the fracas, emphasising the providential intervention of Bradford, and his subsequent arrest, was the one that gained widest credence among the Protestants.\textsuperscript{169} It seems that the arrival of Courtenay and the Lord Mayor may have helped to restore order.\textsuperscript{170}

In the twenty-six wards of London there were one hundred and fourteen parish churches.\textsuperscript{171} Other chapels within the jurisdiction numbered nine. Some of these parishes had been allocated in Edward’s reign to Protestant immigrants, which would account in part for their opposition. Their numbers constituted a sizeable minority in London and some parts of the country.\textsuperscript{172} In many ways they had been a privileged group. The most celebrated of them had been given chairs in the universities in King
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Edward’s time and their published correspondence reveals both their zeal for the new and their contempt for the old ways. Nor did they always agree about the new. Many of them were in fact refugees from their own countries because of their disagreement with prevailing religious trends. Some writers on the subject place the number of foreigners resident in London as high as twenty thousand. Others were located in those commercial towns and cities relying on overseas trade where support for alternative religious speculation was substantial. In London, where historians estimate the population to have been around 120,000 by the mid 1550s they constituted a considerable congregation. The Venetian diplomat Surian’s estimate of the combined population of London and Westminster was 185,000 in 1557.

This influence of immigrant communities as active supporters of the new religion is a not insignificant factor in its numerical strength and in its theology. The essentially continental character of the new religion as to its liturgy and ecclesiology is indisputable. The Reformation in England can be initially identified as something of a movement for independence from Rome, beginning with a royal initiative in that direction. As time went on, however, it increasingly gained inspiration and radical focus from abroad. Although most supporters of the new religion remained faithful to Cranmer’s liturgy – inspired by Genevan principles – divisions on other aspects of belief could be as sharp as the common repudiation of all things Catholic. Geoffrey Dickens accords a significant part in the continuing evolution of Protestant thought to
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foreign influence. Apart from insistence on royal supremacy, and the rejection of the monastic tradition of spirituality, little in the religious settlement deriving from Edward’s reign owes much to his father. It is much more likely that by 1547 Henry VIII thought he had bequeathed to the nation an Anglo-Catholicism that looked to the monarch rather than Rome for its authority and direction.

The extremes of iconoclasm and doctrinal revolution that followed his death owed much to the influences that Henry had believed to be held in check. In some sense he pursued a more pragmatic approach to national and local attachment to the remaining rites of the old religion. If one accepts the conclusions of the research of Duffy and others, it is a hard case to argue that persecuted hostility to Catholic rites during Mary’s reign reflected a national repugnance for them. They more reasonably represented the hostility of a percentage of the population, who looked not to Rome but to Geneva and Frankfurt for their spiritual direction and sustenance. That kind of inspiration and guidance at significant levels has been identified as an essential element of its appeal and dynamic:

When we remember that Peter Martyr, a former Augustinian monk who had been a reformer and had fled from Germany after the Interim, was made professor of divinity at Oxford in 1549, we shall realize that he was not without influence in the country of his adoption. He was not the only reformer who had found England a safe refuge from the troubles of the continent. The chair of divinity at Cambridge was occupied by Martin Bucer, who had arrived from Germany in 1549 in the company of Fagius, a great Hebraist. John a’ Lasco, a Pole, had spent six months with Cranmer in 1548. In 1550 he returned from Friesland to make his home in England and to exercise an undoubted influence upon religious thought in this country. Pullain, or Vallerandus Pollanus, a minister from Strasburg, came over with his flock after the Interim and settled under the protection of Somerset at Glastonbury. These were the most distinguished of the reformers who had
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come to England. They were not without considerable influence upon the rapidly developing movement towards reform. The foreign influence should suggest what was happening. England had at last opened its gates to the new theological learning, and the spread of advanced religious ideas quickened with the coming of the faithful.\(^{182}\)

Among their countries of origin were Italy, Dalmatia, France, Germany and Flanders. By 1550, John a’ Lasco (Laski), who had converted Cranmer to the Eucharistic doctrine of Zwingli, was naturalised and appointed superintendent of all the foreign churches.\(^{183}\) The twentieth century French historian Constant concludes that their presence and influence had the effect of utterly transforming the nature of the English church from what it had officially been at the time of the death of Henry VIII.\(^{184}\) The threat that foreign gospellers represented seems to have been recognised after Wyatt’s revolt, resulting in Queen Mary’s proclamation for the … “Driving out of the Realm Strangers and Foreigners… “\(^{185}\) Might this have been because their potential for disturbance was prominent or was it just part of a general clearout? The words of the proclamation appear to confirm the notion that the government regarded them as incidental to the potential disorder, since … [they] “have not failed to stir and comfort divers her highness subjects to this most unnatural rebellion against God and her grace…” \(^{186}\)

No foreign Protestants suffered burning during Mary’s reign. However, there is evidence of prosecutions of foreigners in York and Hull both before and during Mary’s reign.\(^{187}\) It was reported by the Imperial ambassador in early January that
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“foreign heretics” were stirring up discontent against the Queen’s betrothal to Philip of Spain.188 Mary’s second parliament of 1554, in drafting the bill which repealed the acts that had introduced Edward’s religious changes, gave recognition to continental sources: “…much false and erroneous doctrine hath been taught, preached and written, partly by divers the natural born subjects of this realm, and partly, being brought in hither from sundry other foreign countries …”189 The specific mention of foreign influence would suggest that it cannot have been an insignificant element of threat, in the perception of the government, at least in the early stages of the reign.

A dilemma regarding the gospellers’ response to Mary’s rejection of their religion arose from a principle of reformed religion that exhorted obedience to the monarch. The problem was twofold, for the monarch was both a female and a Catholic. Exhortation to obedience of King Edward had been preached as a Biblical injunction. He enjoyed the reputation of a new Josiah purifying the nation’s religion. Mary became identified with Jezebel, leading the country back to idolatry.190 Obedience to her severely tested the conscience of the gospellers as much as obedience to Edward led to hard choices for moderate Catholic consciences which had accommodated to his father’s changes. Religion by royal mandate was to suffer a setback for both traditionalists – like Gardiner – in Edward’s reign and the reformers in that of Mary. The former came to recognise that only papal authority could guarantee full orthodoxy, and the latter to look beyond royal supremacy exclusively to uphold reformation principles.

188 CSPS[p. vol. XI, p. 31.
The pace of Catholic revival was set at court. Bishop Gardiner was reported as saying Mass in the Tower quite soon after his release from prison.\textsuperscript{191} He had now become the champion and, as Chancellor, the chief executive of Mary’s state and religious policy. On 18 August Mary issued a royal proclamation:

…The queen, remembering what great dangers have grown to this realm through diversity of opinions in religion, and hearing that since the beginning of her reign the same contentions are much renewed through false rumours spread by ill-disposed persons, makes her pleasure known. She, her father, grandfather and all [ancestors] progenitors kings of this realm, with all their subjects have ever lived and died in Christ’s true religion, as her majesty is minded to maintain, agreeable to God’s word and to the primitive church, and would be glad the same were embraced by all her subjects. Yet she will not compel them to break laws of this realm in force concerning church service, but will permit all that will to use the same laws until further order…\textsuperscript{192}

Renard was quick to detect Mary’s zeal but also her caution:

She wished to force no one to go to mass, but meant to see that those who wished to go should be free to do so… She begged us to give her our opinion once more, for she felt so strongly on this matter of religion that she was hardly to be moved, and with this she cast a glance towards the Holy Sacrament that was on an altar in her chamber.\textsuperscript{193}

Renard’s account seems designed to favour his own diplomatic role but it may also indicate Mary’s willingness to seek advice on religious matters from sources beyond her Council. The ambassador seems to have had apprehensions of the hostility in London. Mary and her Council took a more robust view of the situation. Following upon the riots of the first Sunday in August, they had threatened that the liberties of the City would be withdrawn unless order was maintained. On Sunday, 20 August the preacher had a very different reception, as observed by Charles Wriothesley:

\textsuperscript{191} Queen Jane and Queen Mary, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{192} CSPD, no. 9.
\textsuperscript{193} CSPSp, vol. XI, p. 328, Letter of Renard to Charles V.
First sat next my Lord Mayor the Lord Treasurer, Marquis of Winchester, then Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Bedford, the Earl of Pembroke, the Lord Wentworth, the Lord Rich and Sir John Jerningham, captain of the guard, who had 200 of the guard with him, which stood about the pulpit with their halberds. Also my Lord Mayor and Aldermen had warned all the Companies of the city to be here present at the sermon, which stood in their liveries and hoods all the sermon time, to hearken if any lewd or seditious persons made any rumours of disorder, which was well accepted of the Queen’s Council. The preacher preaching God’s word on the Epistle of that present day, and declaring the obedience of subjects, and what erroneous sects are reigning in this realm, by false preachers and teachers; the godly edifying of the audience there present at the said sermon, and so was quietly ended without tumult. ¹⁹⁴

Another local observer also noted the pacific nature of the occasion.¹⁹⁵ Henry Machyn’s account adds the detail that “there were present all the crafts of London in their best livery, sitting on forms [every] craft by themselves (sic).”¹⁹⁶ The impression given is of malcontents held in check and civic pride and corporate security restored. It might also represent a passive and convenient conformity with the latest trend on the part of the Tudor establishment. But is it? The tone of the chroniclers suggests a sense of solidarity with and approval for this general removal of potential for disorder. Perhaps the Queen’s proclamation and her reference to the “great dangers” of division had a powerful effect on those whose livelihoods and liberties depended on law and order and lent determination to their own personal convictions.

The Queen’s religious revival was soon boosted with the news of Northumberland and his fellow conspirators’ repudiation of their Protestant beliefs on 21 August. Part of the full account records that “… mass was said with both elevation over the bread, the pax giving, blessing and crossing on the crown, breathing, turning

¹⁹⁵ *Chronicle of the Grey Friars*, p. 83.
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about, and all other rites and accidents of old time pertaining”. All three prisoners recanted and expressed regret for what they perceived as the harm caused by their apostasy. The Duke spoke for them all:

…I do most faithfully believe this is the very right and true way, out of which true religion you and I have been seduced these 16 years past, by the false and erroneous preaching of the new preachers, the which is the only cause of the great plagues and vengeance which hath light upon me and the whole realm of England, and now likewise worthily fallen upon me and others here present for our unfaithfulness. And I do believe the holy sacrament here most assuredly to be the Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ: and this I pray you all to testify and pray for me…

The full text of his speech on the scaffold was preserved in a Spanish account, later translated into English. It also appears in an account of the first year of Mary’s reign written by an Italian in the retinue of the Venetian ambassador who records that the Duke’s confession of faith was repeated in substance by Gates and Palmer. The Marian government quickly recognised the speech’s propaganda value, proved by the fact that an account of it went into several editions. Since the Protector had been a prime mover in the recent policy effectively to eradicate Catholic worship and doctrine from the country, his conversion was both surprising and a bonus to the new regime. Foxe, years later reported his change of heart as insincere and merely to gain a pardon. The Duke’s condemnation of the religious changes would have been even less welcome to Protestant sensibilities in Elizabeth’s reign as they had been in Mary’s. He announced that what had led to the troubles in the realm

197 Queen Jane and Queen Mary, p. 18.
198 Ibid.
202 Duffy, E., Fires of Faith, p. 60.
from the time of King Henry was precisely “having departed from the true and Catholic church”, reflecting the views of Mary, Gardiner and Pole, mentioned in Chapter I, above. Wriothesley’s Chronicle and the Chronicle of the Grey Friars also record the Duke’s religious change of heart. On the scaffold he publicly declared that his conversion was “what I feel from the bottom of my heart, and I am in no case to say ought but the truth.” Lady Jane Grey, Northumberland’s daughter-in-law, seems not to have believed that he turned for any hope of pardon and the bitterness of her alleged statement that “as his life was wicked and full of dissimulation so was his end thereafter” is criticism of his long pretence during the Protectorate at being a true believer in the new religion. Linda Porter’s biography of Mary accepts that his return to the old faith was genuine. John Edwards’ recent biography maintains that Jane declares his conversion to Catholicism to be insincere but since she clearly says “though other men be of that opinion, I utterly am not”, it seems to imply a rejection of that notion and a rebuke for infidelity to his previous support for the religious changes. The royal Council took his conversion seriously enough to summon 14 or 15 of the City’s Council to witness the Mass and the retraction made by Northumberland and his fellow conspirators. In summary, it seems that the Duke went beyond mere words in his retraction and maintained it on the scaffold. His daughter-in-law took it at face value and condemned him accordingly. It all points to a genuine change. The preacher Thomas Ab Ulmis, had once described
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Northumberland as “...the terror and thunderbolt of the Roman Pontiff.” That was not how he came to be remembered later.

The momentum of the unofficial restoration in some parishes in the City of London by early September 1553 was being apprehensively noted by the reformers. By 5 September, William Dalby was reporting that “the Mass is very rife; there is no news but candlesticks, books, bells, censers, crosses and pipes.” On the following day, the influential and wealthy Mercers’ Company gave orders for its altar to be set up again. The support of the merchant class began already to move towards the Queen’s religion. Elsewhere in the City, the spontaneous return of Catholicism was gathering pace. “The same day (23 August) began the Mass at St Nicholas Cole Abbey, goodly sung in Latin, and tapers, and set on the Altar and a cross...” The following day it was the turn of other London churches:

...St Bartholomew day, the old service in the Latin tongue with the mass was begun and sung in Paul’s in the Shrouds, now St Faith’s parish. And likewise it was begun in 4 or 5 other parishes within the City of London, not by commandment but of the people’s devotion.

By 27 August the Mass was back again in St Paul’s Cathedral and the altars were being restored in brick. Two entries in Machyn’s record noted full Catholic funerals of gentry in the city in that September. Soon the chroniclers were no longer commenting on the restoration, which was now old news, but rather on what may easily have been the isolated protests of outraged Protestants and the arrests of
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bishops and preachers. The random hostility to the putting back of broken altars and the celebration once more of the Mass continues to be noted but it is identifiable as the attempts at disruption by individuals or small groups. The Imperial envoys noted that by early September, “the cause of religion… is making very good progress in the kingdom.”  

However, the opposition changed from vocal and random acts of vandalism to much less easily immediately detectable use of the printing press. Already in August, leaflets began to appear calling on “Nobles and gentlemen favouring the word of God” to abandon Mary and “the hardened and detestable papists”, and to do away with Gardiner “the great devil…before he can poison the people and wax strong in religion”.  

This denunciation appeared before he had been appointed Lord Chancellor or exercised any political initiative. It may indicate their own perceived weakness of their position among the masses. Gardiner’s ability to lead where many might be willing to follow clearly demanded some pre-emptive strike.

Leadership of a kind was provided early on by Archbishop Cranmer. In a written repudiation of the Mass, which was posted up all over London, he offered to defend against all-comers the veracity of his doctrine on the Eucharist. Before long he was in the Tower.  

His open opposition to the government could not be ignored, but he had also given his approval – though unwillingly at first – to the usurper Jane Grey.  

Other spokesmen for the gospellers were similarly outspoken. John Philpot’s statement recorded by Foxe, that he would disprove transubstantiation or “…let me be burned with as many faggots as be in London”, was typical of the hard core

---
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Philpot was something of a firebrand who was uncompromising in his denunciations of his opponents. In his polemical treatise, *An Apology of John Philpot written for spitting on an Arian*, the case is argued scathingly and with a severity not untypical of the polemical religious writers of the century. Philpot’s outspoken opposition to Catholicism eventually led him into deadly conflict with the government and he ended his days a victim of the same punishment he had advocated for the Arians. Philpot may have been as much representative of a mainstream current among followers of the new religion and shared the views of Archbishop Cranmer on extremists. He regarded many of such individuals as “sectaries”, capable of the worst mischief and punishable by the most extreme penalties. The Archbishop had already set out his own punitive strategy for dealing with heresies that deviated from their own orthodoxy in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* in March 1553. This had been his master blueprint for a specifically English form of canon law, upon which he had worked extensively. Only the arrival within a few months of a Catholic ruler had delayed the promulgation of these laws, which would have introduced the death penalty for heresy as defined within the English reformed religion. This historical reality of reformation support for prosecution to death on religious grounds has scarcely been remembered.

Using her royal prerogative, Mary restored four Catholic bishops previously deprived in Edward’s reign, namely, George Day of Winchester, John Veysey of Exeter, Edmund Bonner of London and Stephen Gardiner of Winchester. They were all technically schismatics if not heretics by definition since they had accepted their

---
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appointments as bishops directly from King Henry after repudiating the mandates of their appointments by the Holy See. They had impeccably valid orders, and that was what mattered just then to Mary. Cardinal Pole did not approve of the procedure of re-installation without prior reconciliation, insisting that the latter should come first. Of course, he was right according to his principles and indeed those of Mary, but it is difficult to see what else she could have done in the circumstances. She was trying to restore some semblance of Catholic ecclesiastical polity at this crucial moment and get the sacramental and liturgical life of the Church back into the parishes to restore the outward and visible signs of the old religion where it made immediate impact upon the people. She defended what she regarded as the only possible strategy open to her in a letter to Pole at Dillingen, written on 15 November, after the parliament had repealed all the Edwardine legislation against Catholic practice.\textsuperscript{224} For Mary, the public celebration of Catholic rites was as far she could go but it would be a step in the right direction. Pole’s theological mind and spiritual priority led him to a different conclusion.\textsuperscript{225} For the time being, Papal authority impacted less and was likely to be better welcomed after familiarity with Catholic worship had again been established.

Whatever Pole’s strong reservations, based on theology and ecclesiology, Mary’s pragmatism is defensible as a temporary solution. That is not to dismiss Pole’s urging of reconciliation but to place it in the chain of the most difficult options available to Mary in those early months of her reign. Another immediate priority was the need for priests and in September 1553, in London, and in early 1554, in Exeter and Oxford, there was a rush of ordinations to every grade of cleric.\textsuperscript{226} There are records of at least nine clerics who had previously received their orders according to King
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Edward’s Ordinal being ordained with Catholic rites at this time.\textsuperscript{227} His new bishops were less persuadable. Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley, having aided and endorsed the political conspiracy against Mary and continuing to denounce her policy, were imprisoned. Heresy was not the charge but contempt of the Queen’s expressed desire for an end to conflict and hostilities on both sides. Neither seems to have appreciated what may have been a demonstration of the government’s authority intended to get them to tone down their opposition. Conviction of the rightness of their cause overrode all other considerations and they continued to be outspoken in their criticisms thus exposing themselves to more serious charges of treason. Meanwhile, the deprived bishops were replaced by the Catholics Edmund Bonner (London), Cuthbert Tunstall (Durham) and Nichols Heath (Worcester) all of whom had been deprived in the previous reign.

Unsurprisingly, the Mass and its attendant rituals dominated Marian Catholicism.\textsuperscript{228} Its return both heralded and signified the reversal of the previous reign’s priorities. The reputation of being the first place in the country at large to revive the Mass may have gone to Melton Mowbray where the altar was already in place for a requiem for King Edward.\textsuperscript{229} Oxford University’s Catholic majority resumed Catholic worship from the day of Mary’s proclamation. A letter from the reformer Julius Terentius to John ab Ulmis, describes the atmosphere:

The papists who had always been longing for this most wished for day, dig out as it were from their graves, their vestments, chalices and portasses and begin mass with all speed. In these things our Oxford folk lead the van; at the
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proclamation of Mary … even when the event was still doubtful, they gave such demonstrations of joy as to spare nothing. They first of all made such noise all day long with clapping their hands that it still seems to linger in my ears; they then even the poorest of them, made voluntary subscriptions, and mutually exhorted each other to maintain the cause of Mary; lastly at night, they had a public festival, and threatened flames, hanging, the gallows and drowning to all Gospellers.\textsuperscript{230}

According to the parish registers of Much Wenlock, the parish priest began again to sing the Mass, “more antique et secundum usum Sarum”, in early September.\textsuperscript{231} Round about the same time the clergy of Shropshire restored the Mass claiming legal right from the proclamation.\textsuperscript{232} Kent took a little longer, but following the lead of the suffragan bishop Richard Thornden, who suddenly abandoned his reformist credentials and celebrated full pontifical Mass, other priests soon followed his lead in restoring the Mass.\textsuperscript{233} At Addisham, some people took down the communion table on 27 August but during the night others replaced it. A furious confrontation between Catholics and the rector and his parish clerk took place after the service on 3 September. Bitter words were exchanged. “Ye are both heretic knaves and have deceived us with this fashion too long, and if he say any service here again I will lay the table on his face”.\textsuperscript{234}

Parishioners at Poole in Dorset began to demand the Mass and, when their minister Hancock refused, they set up the altar themselves and hired a French priest to say Mass for them. The minister got some supporters of his to pull down the altar during the night. The parishioners responded by setting up an altar in a house belonging to a former Mayor called Thomas White and having Mass there while the
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Service continued in the church. Hancock then threatened the priest’s helper with a handgun should he ring the bell to summon folk to Mass.\textsuperscript{235} The stand-off continued until the minister fled abroad.\textsuperscript{236} In other places ministers reacted against the trend in the same way. At Coventry, a minister desired them “hanged that would say mass”.\textsuperscript{237} A letter from the Privy Council to the Mayor and Aldermen of the city orders that he be set at liberty if he recants but if not that he should remain in prison.\textsuperscript{238}

There were reports that the gentry made efforts to revert from the Prayer Book to the Mass. They were not always immediately successful in their aims. At Crowland in Lincolnshire, the bailiff demanded that the Mass be said after the Queen’s proclamation in August. The reluctance of the curate to comply angered the bailiff who promptly commanded him to proceed with the words “buckle yourself to mass, you knave.”\textsuperscript{239} Robert Parkyn’s Narrative records that “in many places of the realm” they commanded Mass to be said again “with a decent order as hath been used before time.”\textsuperscript{240} Yorkshire seems to have gone traditional in quite a determined way. Already by September:

\begin{quote}
…there was very few parish churches in Yorkshire but mass was sung or said in Latin … Holy bread and holy water was given, altars was re-edified, pictures or images set up, the cross with the crucifix thereon ready to be borne in procession ... And in conclusion all the English service of late used in the church of God was voluntarily laid away and the Latin taken up again … and yet all this came to pass without any act, statute or proclamation or law, but only that the gracious Queen Mary in her proclamation did utter these words…\textsuperscript{241}
\end{quote}
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These early weeks brought other signs of reaction. The common people in the North, it was said, “now derided married clergy”, and “would point them with fingers in places where they saw them.” The Southwest exhibited its own form of relief at the prospect of a change. Bishop Coverdale was preaching to a congregation in Exeter when news reached there that Mary was now queen. As the word went round the congregation, the cathedral almost emptied leaving only a small number of people. The parish of St Petroc in Exeter had a priest, William Herne, who was a fervent supporter of the new religion. To their and others’ surprise, he conformed upon hearing that the Mass was now mandatory in December 1553. Having previously said to his friend Alderman Midwinter that he would rather be torn apart by wild horses than say the Mass again, the alderman latter found him vested and ready to offer; it he “pointed unto him with his finger” whereupon Herne exclaimed aloud “It is no remedy man, it is no remedy”.

From the point of view of law, both secular and canonical, the return to the celebration of Mass was not straightforward. The Queen’s proclamation had indicated her wish to allow it but a parliament had abolished it and lawyers argued that only a parliament could lawfully restore it. In that sense, the Catholic services in the early months of the reign, before parliament met, were strictly by royal mandate alone. Mary had always maintained that the changes enacted during her half-brother’s minority were arbitrary and legally questionable. A letter written by her to Somerset in June 1549 gives this as one reason for her non-compliance with the law.
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242 Ibid.
243 Duffy, E., The Voices of Morebath, p. 152.
244 Ibid. p.153.
was not the only significant person in the kingdom at that time who opposed the changes.\textsuperscript{246}

The return of the Mass and the other sacraments did not of course represent the return of full Catholicism though it undoubtedly revived the atmosphere of it. The juridical and ecclesiological precedent created by the situation led to the provision of novel solutions. In Rome the issue was understood even if, for the time being, the solution had to be temporary and pragmatic. The extent of the former recession from schism into heresy was well documented from the beginning. A copy of the First Prayer Book had been sent to Cardinal Pole, by Somerset, the Protector in 1549.\textsuperscript{247} Full and detailed reports of the major religious changes at this time were also sent to Venice by Barbaro, the Ambassador to the Republic, from where they would very likely have sent to Rome.\textsuperscript{248} It is important to the general discussion to clarify that Rome’s retrospective application of absolution by subsequent papal decree after reunion could render licit all sacraments conferred during the interim period from autumn 1553 onwards. Pope Julius III was prepared to proceed cautiously in the meantime until the complete return to juridical form. Cardinal Pole, while being impatient with the political priorities had to accept the pragmatic papal approach.\textsuperscript{249}

Upon hearing of Mary’s accession, he wrote to congratulate Pope Julius and his letter appears to show that even at that stage he understood – correctly as it turned out – that the problems of reconciling England to Rome would be less about doctrinal issues than property retention:
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… ma si bene per rispetto di molti, che sono interessati per li bene della Chiesa…Tal che a parer mio tutta la difficoltà sarà in questo punto … (…however, there are many interested parties who are yet concerned with church property … such that to my mind the whole difficulty will lie in this issue.)

Pope Julius III is said to have wept upon hearing the news of a Catholic ruler in England. He immediately appointed Pole a legate with full powers to restore and regulate whatever was amiss with the Church in England. A letter from Pole to Queen Mary, dated 13 August 155, urged her to proceed immediately to re-establish the rights of the Holy See and the Church as a priority which the providence of God, in assuring her victory, has laid upon her as an immediate duty:

Pole is bound to warn her of one single thing at this commencement of her reign, which is, that having received such special favour from the Divine goodness she be pleased well to consider from what root the great disorders in matters relating to justice and true religion proceeded … when the perpetual adversary of the human race placed in the heart of the king her father … the perverse desire … of divorcing himself from Queen Mary’s spiritual mother, and from all faithful Christians, that is to say from the Holy Catholic Church, from which he departed by departing from obedience to the Apostolic See.

For Pole the restoration of Catholicism in England was essentially a spiritual matter from which trials and difficulties must be expected and success possible above all by trust in God. While protesting her longing for his arrival and her desire to end the schism, Mary’s political judgement took precedence over her religious zeal. Delay was cautioned by Renard, the Imperial ambassador, under instructions from his
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sovereign, who wished keep Pole out of England at all costs.\textsuperscript{255} An article by Elizabeth Russell examines the case and concludes that Mary read the situation correctly and that her diplomacy and political wisdom delayed the papal embassy until the time was ripe for greater success.\textsuperscript{256} Mary told Pole’s envoy Henry Penning that much as she longed for his arrival it was impossible at that time. Charles V exerted his utmost influence to persuade Pope Julius against it and this intervention was decisive. Ludwig Pastor makes the point that all the agents of information at this time were heavily influenced by what was happening in London. The envoy Dandino wrote that: “The people of London are, it is true, hardened by heresy but in the rest of the country it is not to the same extent”.\textsuperscript{257} Mary requested that despite the interdict on the country, permission to hold regular church services and particularly High Mass for her coronation, should be given.\textsuperscript{258} Pole absolved her but continued to insist that she should place her trust in God and invite him to England before parliament met. By the time this letter reached her, she was already crowned and anticipating her first parliament.

For the present he had to endure what he could not change and confine himself to writing impassioned letters to Charles V, Mary and Gardiner.\textsuperscript{259} He was allowed eventually to travel as near to home as Brussels but later, due to pressure from Charles V, retired to Gennazano on Lake Garda in Italy. The Emperor saw him as an obstacle to his plans for Mary’s marriage to Philip, either because he opposed it as unwise or because like Edward Courtenay, the candidate of Stephen Gardiner, Pole was also a

\textsuperscript{256} Russell, E., \textit{Mary Tudor and Mr Jorkins}, BIHR, 63, pp. 272-276.
\textsuperscript{257} Pastor, L., \textit{History of the Popes}, vol. XIII, p. 270.
\textsuperscript{258} CSPV, vol. V, no. 785. CRP, vol. 2, no. 682.
Plantagenet descendant who could conceivably be himself a possible suitor, not being at this time in priestly orders. It is certain that the Cardinal at no time considered such a proposal. Charles wished to see the reunion of England and Rome as the first fruits of the marriage of his son to Mary and not as something achieved before it took place. He persuaded Pope Julius that the religious cause in England needed precisely the kind of strong leadership the Prince would provide. A letter to that effect, urging Pole to support the marriage in deference to the wishes of both the Pope and the Emperor, was sent to him by his friend Cardinal Morone on 21 December, 1553. The Pope’s initial enthusiasm for Pole’s immediate despatch did not extend beyond his early discovery of the opposition of the Emperor and he was unwilling to act against the wishes of the latter. The character of this Pope was in marked contrast to that of Paul IV, with whom Pole and Mary would have to deal after 1554. Where Paul was forceful and unbending, Julius was indolent and yielding to an unfortunate degree.

Nervous and easily dispirited, he was in no way capable of dealing with difficult situations, while his actions were always hampered by want of decisions. He wished to be on good terms with everyone, liked to see contented faces about him, and preferred the outward lustre of power to the actual possession of it.

Nevertheless, he relied on the obedience of Cardinal Pole. Even without reunion the revival of traditional religion increased almost daily. While parochial restoration of the Mass and altars had initially begun without benefit of parliamentary sanction, Mary was already initiating that process of recovery and return of church goods and plate which would go on throughout her reign. She hoped it would be an impetus and an example to others to do likewise. Official documents indicate that the
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quest for such items occupied some of the Council’s business already from the first months of the reign.\textsuperscript{262}

Before a parliament could be called the Queen must be crowned. Various dispensations – already granted by Cardinal Pole – from the Holy See, for Mary herself and for the Bishops who would take part in the ceremony would be necessary. The Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, officiated. On Sunday 1 October, Mary went in solemn procession to the Abbey at Westminster (at that time officially named Westminster Cathedral as seat of the new diocese created in the reign of Henry VIII).\textsuperscript{263} As the first accepted Queen Regnant in English history, Mary was crowned as though she was a king, with all the regalia, including the spurs of knighthood that were customary on such occasions. In all its essentials the ceremony was the fully Catholic rite that had been used for King Henry VIII. To ensure that the unction with which she would be anointed was properly blessed, she had sent to the Bishop of Arras for newly consecrated oil for this purpose.\textsuperscript{264} On 5 October, Mary’s first Parliament sat. It was opened with a Mass of the Holy Ghost and a sermon by Dr Heath, Bishop of Chichester.\textsuperscript{265}

This would be the first test of the reaction of the governing classes to Mary’s programme of restoration. It has often been the aim of earlier historians to emphasise opposition on religious grounds and at the same time to deny her any skill in management of parliaments. Recent research provides a more accurate and much

\textsuperscript{262} APC, vol. IV, pp. 344, 360, 361, 362, 371 & 376.
\textsuperscript{263} CSP, Dom., no. 20.
\textsuperscript{264} APC, vol. IV, p. 318.
\textsuperscript{265} Wriothesley’s Chronicle, vol. II, p. 103.
The direction of this first parliament was in the hands of the Lord Chancellor, Bishop Stephen Gardiner. He is credited with skill as statesman, having been in office in the reign of Henry VIII. By 1553 he was of course much older and by reason of his former support of that king’s divorce from her mother, and his favouring a marriage of Mary to her royal relative Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon, he did not command her entire confidence. Nevertheless, he shared Mary’s desire and enthusiasm for the return of the old faith and understood both politics and men. The question was: how far would this parliament go or be led towards realising a Catholic agenda in its broadest framework? Gardiner outlined the primary programme of the sitting, which was, he said, the repeal of the iniquitous laws against union with the Roman Church and to enact others in favour if it. In the first session, after some opposition from the Commons, a bill for “avoiding treasons and praemunire” passed both houses. Detail and extensive discussion of the progress of this parliament of 1553 are studied in the work of Jennifer Loach. Bills relating to “divers acts touching divine service and the marriage of priests” and the validity of the marriage of King Henry and his first wife Catherine were passed. The first repealed the legislation of the previous two reigns against the Mass and the sacraments as well as the celibacy of the clergy. From 20 December, the Mass and the rites of the Church were to be in all things as they had been in the last year of Henry’s reign. Clerical marriage was again forbidden. A proclamation gave immediate effect to the government’s wishes.

…through London and all England, that no man should sing no English service nor Communion after the 20th day of December, nor no priest that has a wife shall minister nor say mass, and that every parish to make an altar and
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to have a cross and staff and all other things in all parishes all in Latin, as holy bread, holy water, as palms and ashes…

Since married priests were *ipso facto* excommunicated according to Catholic Canon Law, they could not be permitted to continue to offer illicit Masses until their cases were examined individually and their invalid marriages and irregular status were corrected. This was a case of logical following through of Catholic ecclesiastical regulations following the patterns of earlier tradition. The bill regarding the validity of the marriage of Mary’s parents seems in some sense to have been influenced by an understanding that its passing emphasised parliamentary rather than papal authority to validity and to her rights of succession. Official papers still accorded Mary the title of Supreme Head of the Church but she had already made it clear to the Pope and to Pole that it was a mere title, necessary solely for reasons of State. Mary has been accused of using that power after the manner of her immediate predecessors. If so, she would not be the first or last Catholic monarch to have used temporal power for ecclesiastical reform. It was accepted practice in Spain, among other nations. A study written in 1937 from the point of view of the theological and canonical aspects of Mary’s early attempts to procure Catholic uniformity and practice absolves her of direct intention except in the most limited form. It is more likely that she wished to use her royal prerogative to move the agenda forward rather than to govern the Church. The reality is that she was in constant correspondence with Pole as Legate and even suggested to him that he move to Brussels in order to make it easier for her

---

to communicate with him. He had been given the widest possible powers by Julius III to deal with any and every situation that arose in connection with the schismatical and heretical status of England following the changes made under Henry VIII and Edward VI. The letter preceding the bull of Pope Julius appointing Pole as Legate, dated 6 August 1553, makes this clear.

Non aspetti da noi ricordo, o consiglio, perché sapera meglio d’ogni altro quello converrà di fare; ed il tutto si rimette alla prudenza, dottrina, e charitá e zelo suo della restituzione ed encremento rella religione nostra. (Do not wait for advice or counsel from us, because you will know better than anybody else what is suitable to be done; and everything is referred to your prudence, learning, charity and zeal for the restoration and growth of our religion).

Mary wrote to Pole expressly repudiating any desire on her part to exercise control over the Church as Supreme Head and stating clearly her own belief in the doctrinal distinction between civil and ecclesiastical power. This letter makes it clear that if at the beginning she needed to use the legal framework of royal supremacy to make the necessary changes to restore Catholic worship, it was very much a temporary expedient until normal Church authority could be restored.

Meanwhile in the capital, the first Convocation of clergy in this reign had been meeting. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of London’s Chaplain, John

---
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278 “...titulum illum non convenire regi; distinctas potestates, dignitates, et officia; regem a sacerdote accipere; corpus politicum nihil commune habere cum ecclesiastico; sexum nostrum considerandum, cui nihil minus convenit quam talis titulus, aut tituli usus; exposcere nos ab illis, ut, si aliud impetrari non possit, suspenderi ad aliquod tempus ea, quae hanc assumptionem, nostrae conscientiae adversantem, concernunt, donec alius conveniantius remedium inventi possit.” (… that title is not appropriate to a monarch; the powers, honours and duties are different; the monarch receives from the priest; the body politic has nothing in common with its ecclesiastical counterpart; our gender must be taken into consideration, since nothing is less appropriate to it than such a title or the use of such a title; we demand this of them, and, if nothing else can be achieved, we shall request that the assumption of this title, which would be against our conscience, shall be suspended for a time, until some more suitable remedy shall be found). T-D, vol. II, p. ci. Epistolari, vol. IV, p. 119.
Harpsfield. Four definitions were produced which re-affirmed Catholic sacramental belief and practice.\textsuperscript{279} A disputation in the long chapel at St Paul’s between the new and the old appears to have been inconclusive. Thus far Mary’s government had achieved without great difficulty the legal restoration of Catholic liturgy and doctrine. At the same time, Mary began the tortuous and complicated process – never to be brought to a conclusion during her reign – of restoring alienated property to the Church. The first to benefit from this generosity was the collegiate church of Wolverhampton, which was a part of the forfeiture of lands arising from the Duke of Northumberland’s attainder. On 26 December the lands of old pertaining to that church were restored and the compensation back-dated to 1548.\textsuperscript{280} By now, the question of her marriage had begun to take precedence over everything else. For Mary, much depended on the right choice of husband as a guarantor of strength and support and the hope of an heir that precluded the possibility of a Protestant succession. On 29 October, she had already given her irrevocable answer regarding it to Renard, the Imperial ambassador, as kneeling with him before the Blessed Sacrament, she had promised to marry Philip of Spain.\textsuperscript{281} It would appear from this that she was taking a decision which was essentially motivated by her religious faith but temporal conditions were not absent. This is borne out by the ambassador’s further comment that her decision to marry was conditional on Philip’s agreement “to all the conditions necessary to the welfare of the kingdom”.\textsuperscript{282} We may infer from this account that this is not the action of a woman so enamoured or politically naïve


\textsuperscript{281} \textit{CSPSp}, vol. XI, pp. 328-329.

\textsuperscript{282} Ibid.
that she will marry at any cost. Religion played a major part in her motivation but it is also balanced by sound political advantage.

Renard reported to his master that Mary had consulted Paget, Arundel and Petre, at least.283 These men were seasoned councillors. It is certain that – whether or not from self-interest – Paget had worked hard behind the scenes to bring about the marriage. It was said that he had suggested such a match as “the finest in all the world” already, on the day of her entry into London.284 The certainty of the forthcoming marriage became public towards the end of the year. Its implications constituted a severe setback for French influence, Henry II being an arch-enemy of the Hapsburgs whose dominions surrounded his on the land sides. His ambassador in London, de Noailles, manipulated a network of the disaffected and by every means sought to ferment discord wherever possible. It is certain that without the influence of this representative of a Catholic power, the cause of the Protestants in England at this time would have been seriously deficient.285 It is also certain that Edward Courtenay, the Queen’s rejected suitor, was deeply involved in the plot that followed. Elizabeth, though not so directly involved it seems, was at the very least intended to replace Mary as ruler, and marry him. How much she knew can only be surmised. It can never be known how Elizabeth would have acted if the Wyatt rebellion had succeeded.

284 Harbison, E.H., Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary, p. 72.
Biographers of Mary and historians mostly conclude that the marriage to Philip was an unpopular choice. Diarmuid MacCulloch suggests that knowledge of the Hapsburg predilection for gaining territory by marriage may have influenced the hostility of her subjects. He and others have noted, however, the political and dynastic advantages to England that came with it. Judith Richards weighs up the case for and against a foreign marriage and also emphasises Mary’s clear intention of maintaining a distinction between her status as a reigning sovereign and her duties as a wife. Stone described the marriage treaty negotiated by Gardiner and the Charles V as the most honourable to the English nation, far beyond any before or since. Philip would be a king in name only and no Spaniard would hold office under him. In every respect the real ruler would continue to be Mary and the throne would pass to her descendants only and not be inherited by him or his, should she die childless before him. A son born to them would inherit all Mary’s kingdoms and also the Low Countries (now Belgium and Holland), a considerable addition to English territory across the Channel. Despite these advantages, discontent still stalked sections of the political establishment and the streets of London and it remained to be seen how deep and potent it might be. Gardiner thought the marriage a far greater concern than “that of the heretics”.

Parliamentary approval in October 1553 established the legal framework for the return to Catholic rites. By the end of that year, the response was largely
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favourable but there was refusal in some places, notably in London. Gardiner responded in characteristic style on 4 January, 1554, to this reality:

…being Wednesday the lord Chancellor sent for the churchwardens and substantiallest of 30 parishes of London to come before him, upon whose appearance he enquired of divers of them why they had not the mass and service in Latin in their churches, as many of them had not, as St(?) in Milk Street, and others; and they answered that they had done what lay in them. 292

The increasing spectacle and majority revival of traditional religion soon became obvious. On St Paul’s Day, 25 January, 1554, London witnessed a great procession of priests in gold copes, making good copy for Machyn. 293 The survival of the copes provides an interesting detail of conservation in troubled times, as can be learned from his later entry in 1558.

That a certain Arthur Sturton … was the receiver of all copes of cloth of gold that was (sic) taken out of all the churches, and he did deliver them unto certain parishes again into them that could know them, the which were taken away by king Edward VI time by the device of the duke of Northumberland and certain of the bishops of new doctrine that was then: and now, when the good queen Mary came to the crown she let every parish for to have them again by her coming to the crown, if they were not given to other places in England: but Trinity parish had not their cope of cloth of gold again. 294

292 Queen Jane and Queen Mary, p. 41.
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2. “For the good of the Kingdom and to bring it fully to true religion”. 295

The days of panic from 29 January to 8 February, during the rebellion which followed hard upon the heels of the news of her impending marriage, showed Mary as eminently equal to the task of confronting it. 296 She showed little fear throughout but prayed a great deal. Her Guildhall speech on 1 February, delivered in the face of an armed threat, captures much of both her resilience and her resolve. 297 In it she rallied support as much by the cause of her religion as by her legitimate descent and an estimated 20,000 volunteers from the City enrolled for her defence. The public expression of xenophobia by Wyatt and his followers either did not convince or found little support among the masses. Likewise the Devonian gentry, who, it had been thought would rise, declared themselves “… gentlemen and others … joyfully receiving the proclamation of the articles of the Queen’s marriage, and ready for the arrest of the lately proclaimed rebels…” 298

In overcoming this first serious challenge to her rule – unlike the government during the Prayer Book rebellion in the West Country in 1549 – Mary declined to use foreign troops, relying on her own levies. The custodians of London were determined it should not surrender to a rabble. When, after several days, Wyatt reached Ludgate, the royal commander Sir William Howard shouted down from the walls “Avaunt

295 “per benefizio del regno e per ridurlo in tutto alla vera religione”… Letter of Cardinal Morone to Cardinal Pole, 21 December 1553, on the necessity of the marriage of the Queen to Philip of Spain.
297 Foxe, p. 1442.
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traitor, thou shalt not enter here.” 299  Retreating to Temple Bar, Wyatt found himself surrounded and was soon in the Tower, a prisoner. On 9 February, a Te Deum for the Queen’s victory was accompanied by the ringing of the bells of every parish in London. 300  One positive aspect of the revolt from which Mary could draw comfort was that it was not on the scale expected and mostly localised within Kent. 301  Success seemed like a confirmation for Mary of divine support but it was also a turning point in her attitude of previous clemency to rebels. This time she allowed herself to be persuaded that executions were after all a necessary part of strong government. Around 49 rebels were executed at various places in London. 302  Estimates of the Imperial ambassador put the total figure at 100-200 and his French counterpart at 400 executions in all around the country. 303  Both are exaggerations. Many prisoners were spared, including 400 paraded before the Queen at Whitehall Palace with halters round their necks. 304

Mary’s earlier extreme reluctance to execute her cousin Lady Jane Grey and her young husband Lord Guildford Dudley was now overcome by political necessity. This time there was no reprieve. Bishop Bonner’s Chaplain and also a Chaplain to the Queen, John Feckenham, a former Benedictine monk, offered to seek to engage with Lady Jane in the hope of converting her. 305  He afterwards wrote that he was impressed by her gentleness and faith and had hopes that he might have succeeded. Foxe records this as an attempt to force a conversion of a staunch young Protestant
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martyr. The question is whether one believes the testimony of the monk or of the martyrrologist. The executions of Lord Guildford Dudley and Lady Jane Grey – already arraigned and sentenced to death but pardoned, though kept in the Tower since November 1553 – finally took place on 12 February 1554. Circumstances had dictated their fate without much complicity on their part. It is not without interest that contemporary analysts such as Stow and Holinshed were uncritical of the execution of the young couple in the Tower. The blame for the tragedy may be fairly placed with Jane’s father, the Duke of Suffolk, who committed a further act of treason, having been pardoned already for his involvement in Northumberland’s conspiracy, by joining Wyatt’s rebellion six months later. In consideration of whether or not the predominant motive of the rebels was religion it cannot be without significance that Gardiner’s residence was targeted for singular destruction.

Wyatt, when he lay at Southwark, trained a gun, of five large pieces of ordinance that he had, upon Winchester Palace, the residence of Gardiner: at the same time some of his followers, and they not common men, proceeded thither and completely sacked the house. The bishop’s victuals they consumed, and plenteous store it was: they carried away everything, even to the locks of the doors: of his library they made such havoc tearing in pieces or cutting to pieces every volume in it, that they went up to their heels in fragments.

David Loades argues for secular and political reasons behind the conspiracy and that no Protestant religious leader lent them support. But there is strong evidence for religious motivation, including the fact of Wyatt being advised by Bishop Ponet and the lack of any leading Catholic sympathiser – other than the unreliable figure of Courtenay – among his following, though the suspicion of the

marriage being linked to a return of church lands regardless of the faith of their owners was voiced. All the leading conspirators were Protestants. Evidence that has come to light seems to point to desire for a restoration of the Protestant ascendancy lost by the succession of Queen Mary to the throne. The government’s official report laid the blame squarely on “heretics and foreigners”. However, the role of the French in giving encouragement to the conspiracy to seek to prevent the political union of an Anglo-Hapsburg alliance cannot be ignored and the implications of the imminent prospect of an England dominated by Spain undoubtedly fed into the general sense of resistance. Mary herself never seems to have been in any doubt from the beginning that religion was the principal motive for the revolt although the main objection focused on her marriage. Neither did her Guildhall speech ignore the religious hostility she believed was behind the rebellion: “the matter of the marriage seemed to be but a Spanish cloak to cover their pretended purpose against our religion”. The later effect of the trial of one of the conspirators, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, will be discussed in the next chapter in the context of religious-inspired opposition to Mary. Despite the volatility of the situation, for the second time within the first year of her reign Mary overcame opposition and achieved a personal victory in her determination to marry as she chose. Politically the outcome was not so certain since in the Council and in the April Parliament – first proposed to sit at Oxford and then changed back to London – there were strong indications of divisions and Gardiner’s programme of legislation was partially derailed.
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Loach describes as “a curious bill” confirming Mary’s regal rights to be identical with her male predecessors was passed.\textsuperscript{317} Loades, on the other hand sees it as “of the utmost importance” for future regal precedent.\textsuperscript{318}

In the spring of 1554 married priests in London were deprived of their livings, since by law all priests were now forbidden to be married.\textsuperscript{319} Though this was now a legal offence, they were already in contempt of universal Church law. In accordance with its canons they were under censure of excommunication \textit{latae sententiae}, the customary penalty for valid priests who attempted marriage without due dispensation. They could not legally be proceeded against until the civil law was once again in conformity with that of the Church as it had been before 1534. Four of the hierarchy, York, St David’s, Lincoln and Chester were also deprived.\textsuperscript{320} Palm Sunday, Holy Week and Easter were kept officially as of old, “…with also bearing of Palms, and creeping to the Cross on Good Friday, with the Sepulchre lights and the Resurrection on Easter day.”\textsuperscript{321}

Bible texts were painted out of all London churches and the Blessed Sacrament restored to the altars.\textsuperscript{322} Another event of this Palm Sunday generally receives much greater attention in historical commentary. On that day, 18 March at 10 o’clock in the morning, the Lady Elizabeth was conveyed to the Tower by boat.\textsuperscript{323} These were fearful times for her but her later triumph and success in so many ways adds lustre to the legend of her providential survival. By 1554, she had seen much and
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learnt much in her young life and undoubtedly had played a cautious waiting game. Yet she seems to have understood that she was not without friends in the Council and that Mary would only condemn her on firm evidence of her guilt. A remark later attributed to her by Foxe – if true in itself – in her father’s day, and later in her own reign, would have placed her in jeopardy: “She marvelled much what the nobility of the realm meant, which in that sort would suffer her to be led to captivity, the Lord knew whither, for she did not”.  

From the point of view of religious polemics, her confining had its propaganda value then and in the time to come. At the time she certainly had her supporters among the Queen’s advisers but that sympathy was not overwhelming. Her guilt remains questionable though always unproven. Interestingly, she seems to have benefitted from the moral support of John Feckenham, whose intercession on her behalf – it was said – saved her from worse treatment than she might otherwise have received. Elizabeth’s trial failed conclusively to prove her guilt though letters to the De Noailles in cipher were produced. It was Mary’s determination to follow the letter of the law that she herself had restored in her first parliament – that treason must be proved clearly before any English person could be convicted – that protected Elizabeth from Council members and others who advised execution. She survived then because Mary was not ruthless enough to eliminate her. The Tower remained her comfortable prison for three months. Later she was allowed to go to Woodstock under the supervision of Sir Henry Bedingfield. There she wrote with a diamond on a
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window pane, the words which perhaps outline both her character and her cunning, “Much suspected by me. Nothing proved can be, Quoth Elizabeth, prisoner”.

In March 1554, Mary quickened the pace of reaction and her own direct involvement with a set of detailed instructions, accompanied by a letter from her to Bishop Bonner empowering him to carry out measures aimed at restoring the Canon Law of the Church, removing convinced Protestants and installing loyal Catholics.\(^\text{328}\) It included injunctions on Easter duties, provision of proper requirements for the celebration of Mass, searches for unlawful books and ballads and the enquiry into the teaching of schoolmasters as well as instructing boys on the manner of answering and serving the priest at Mass. It establishes her determination to push forward the drive towards Catholic practice even without the benefit of juridical reunion with Rome. The two episodes, the shaved and vested cat, hung at the Cross at Cheapside on 9 April and the shot fired at the preacher at St Paul’s on 10 June, represent continuing hostility but in themselves look to have been isolated and less significant than sometimes considered.\(^\text{329}\) One account described the cat incident as “villainous” and the object itself later shown in defiance to the entire congregation at St Paul’s by Bishop Bonner.\(^\text{330}\) The attack on Catholic revival was being conducted on a sporadic levels of violence without much effect, but was soon to be conducted on the more insidious and intractable medium of libel. Mary had abrogated the law framed by Henry VIII that libels on the sovereign were punishable by death. This may have provided the opposition with just the sort of loophole they could exploit. Areas of the country during these months were flooded with scurrilous pamphlets, “… horrible lies
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and seditious words against the Queen’s Majesty and her council”, the discovered authors knowing that a brief spell in the pillory would be the only inconvenience for their crimes.331

On 1 April, 1554, Bishop Gardiner consecrated six new bishops at St Mary Overy.332 The Queen’s influence is again detectable from among a list of twelve suggested names which accompanied a letter from the Queen to Cardinal Pole, to be forwarded to the Pope, dated 24 February.333 This letter stands as an example of Mary’s maintaining the sovereign’s prerogative of presentation of bishops to vacant sees exercised by her predecessors. Because of her failure to prioritise reunion with Rome before all else, he has been criticised for being, like some of the clerics she chose “not Catholic in the full sense”.334 Her personal orthodoxy has been affirmed while the practical difficulties of acting officially upon it have been understood and placed in context.335 Her letter makes it clear that she had chosen these men because the union with Rome had to be achieved through Parliament, and to improve the chances of this happening:

There is no more efficacious remedy than to have good and Catholic prelates, who, being amongst the most important members of this Parliament, can by their own votes and by persuading others to side with them, give assistance to this cause.

On 2 April, Mary rode in state to open the second parliament of her reign. She had initially decided to hold it in Oxford – where traditionalism was certain – but had
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been persuaded by the civic authorities of the loyalty of London.\footnote{336 \textit{Chronicle of the Grey Friars}, p. 88. Tytler, P.F., ed., \textit{England Under the Reign of Edward VI and Mary}, vol. II, p. 310.} There was still unfinished business from October 1553 and both the Queen and Chancellor hoped for better results on religious change.\footnote{337 Loach, J., \textit{Parliament and Crown}, p. 93.} He especially wished to see the early restoration of the authority of the hierarchy.\footnote{338 Ibid.} However, debates still reflected anxiety over the ever-present question of the secure ownership of former church property, now held by many – including more Catholics than Protestants – who had acquired it through gift, sale or re-sale over twenty years.\footnote{339 CSPSp, vol. XII, p.46.} As an indication – if one were sought – of her personal conviction, Mary desired to abandon the title of Supreme Head of the Church. Opposition in parliament did not rest on belief but on what was perceived as a challenge to property ownership and therefore to be resisted.\footnote{340 Ibid.} A scare arose from a bill to restore the bishopric of Durham, though it eventually received a comfortable majority. But it led to exchanges which clearly showed the extent of this anxiety.\footnote{341 CSPSp, vol. XII, p. 95.} Gardiner had attempted in this session to exploit the recent victory over Wyatt and the presence of the new bishops to further the aims of reunion but as before he was unsuccessful.\footnote{342 Heal, F., \textit{Reformation in Britain and Ireland}, p. 174. See also, Loach, J., \textit{Parliament and Crown}, p. 93.} The six new bishops were consecrated the day before it met and took their seats accordingly. Nevertheless, a bill for the revival of the heresy laws – to include the death penalty – which Gardiner tried to bring in at this stage was not passed. It would succeed in the next parliament with much the same membership. Meanwhile Gardiner wrote to Pole setting out the problems related to church property and asking for reassurance that it was not to be an issue of restoration.\footnote{343 Muller, J.A., ed., \textit{The Letters of Stephen Gardiner}, pp. 464-66.} What is clear is that the heresy bill was lost owing to this issue. Opposition to the Chancellor
was led by Lord Paget, a peer of considerable influence, suspicious of Gardiner’s intentions and fearful of reaction. Gardiner was defeated by the material self-interest of the members and also by the suspicion of some that Elizabeth would be legally disinherited.

An important part of the strategy for the recovery of religious identity involved the oversight of the universities and the surveillance of schoolmasters. The first would be easier to observe but simple logistics of distance and numbers would impose restraints on the latter. As we have seen already, Oxford was quick to re-establish its majority fellowship in favour of traditional religion. On 20 August 1553, Queen Mary sent a letter to Bishop Gardiner as Chancellor of Cambridge. The overthrow of the original statutes in the time of King Edward was now to be reversed.

Because we know that where order is not kept, all things grow to confusion we require you and all scholars, servants and others under you to live as appointed by the ancient statutes, according to the ordinances of the founders and grants of our predecessors.

A letter to the same effect was sent to Sir John Mason, Chancellor of Oxford. From 1555 onwards, Pole was to make the overhauling of the universities one of the major planks of his platform of revival. This programme and the Marian approach to education and the universities will be studied more fully in Chapter V. Suffice it to record at this point that education was regarded as a potent remedy for the present malady of religious confusion and for future consolidation. A serious

---
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examination of schools was begun and followed through.\textsuperscript{349} A twentieth century study reveals that records of expulsions of masters from schools were slender.\textsuperscript{350} Attempts were made to examine all schoolmasters and teachers of children. Some new schools were founded. “Of her own bounty”, the Queen founded a grammar school each year of her reign and private individuals founded a further fifteen.\textsuperscript{351} As early as October 1553 the Commons had discussed a bill to give lands for grammar schools which was passed by 27 November.

The feast of Corpus Christi (24 May) in London brought “many goodly processions in many parishes” but there was one assault on a priest.\textsuperscript{352} The number of processions needs to be noted against the unique hostile action. In early July there was the “spirit in the wall” diversion. A young girl was deployed to speak against the Mass, confession and the Queen’s marriage, upon which attention now focused. She spent a short time in prison but was afterwards released.\textsuperscript{353} Speculation about Mary’s intended husband continued unabated. Ostensibly, opposition to Philip, then and historically, focused on his being a Spaniard. Actually his genealogy exhibited a considerable variety of royal bloodlines. The outlook, attitude and first language of the prince were indeed Spanish – due to his having been born and brought up there. His fair hair and blue eyes betrayed his German Hapsburg descent and his grandmother on his father’s side was Burgundian of English descent. His mother was Isabella of Portugal, a country long allied to England. Spain as a nation was at that time much more a peninsular than a political reality, its composite unity being derived from dynastic inheritance. Charles V, Philip’s father, was heir separately to the
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crowns of Castile, Aragon and Navarre, each with their own parliaments, taxation system and customs as well as linguistic variations. A Hapsburg alliance had frequently been a part of the diplomacy of Henry VIII and while he had open hostilities with France he refrained from war with the Emperor. English history’s patriotic emphasis on later hostilities centred on Catholic Spain in the reign of Philip II, as well as England’s official rejection of the faith he championed, and greatly influenced subsequent perceptions of him. The legends additional to the actual history of the Spanish Inquisition have also shaped this historic profile.\(^{354}\)

As a potential bride, Mary was probably at this time more matronly in appearance than maidenly. It would be true to say that her essential value to her suitor related more to her inheritance than her attractiveness. Giacomo Soranzo, the Venetian ambassador to England in 1554, a critical and one might say otherwise neutral observer, penned an official portrait of Mary for his political masters:

…her face is round, with a nose rather low and wide, and were not her age on the decline, she might be called handsome rather than the contrary. She is not of a strong constitution … She is of very spare diet, and never eats till one or two p.m., although she rises at daybreak, when after saying her prayers, and hearing Mass in private, she transacts business incessantly until after midnight, when she retires to rest; for she chooses to give audience not only to all the members of her Privy Council, and to hear from them every detail of public business, but also to all other persons who ask it of her. Her Majesty’s countenance indicates great benignity and clemency which are not belied by her conduct, for although she has many enemies, and though so many of them were by law condemned to death, yet had the executions depended solely on her Majesty’s will, not one of them perhaps would have been enforced; but deferring to her Council in everything, she in this matter likewise complied with the wishes of others, rather than with her own. She is endowed with excellent ability, and more than moderately read in Latin literature, especially with regard to Holy Writ; and besides her native tongue, she speaks Latin, French and Spanish, and understands Italian perfectly, but does not speak it. She is also very generous, but not to the extent of letting it appear that she

rests her chief claim to commendation on this quality. She is so confirmed in
the Catholic religion, that although the King her brother, and his Council
prohibited her from having the Mass celebrated according to the Roman
Catholic ritual, she nevertheless had it performed in secret, nor did she ever
choose by any act to assent to any other form of religion, her belief in that in
which she was born being so strong, that had the opportunity offered, she
would have displayed it at the stake, her hope being in God alone, so that she
constantly exclaims, ‘In te Domine confide, non confundar in aeternam! Si
Deus est pro nobis, qui contra nos?’  

The Queen’s faith was no less deeply rooted than that of her future husband
who shared her traditional convictions. The personal and political reasons which
influenced her choice feature prominently in recent biographies. It was likely that
what most attracted Mary was that Philip was a serious Catholic. His journey to
England and to his bride, took him first to Santiago de Compostela, the shrine of the
Apostle St James. There he was observed for the first time by English
representatives. After Confession and Holy Communion he prostrated himself upon
the bare floor, like any other pilgrim. It is recorded also by the same author that the
Earl of Bedford, commissioned by the Council to travel there bearing the marriage
contract for Philip to sign, was impressed by the prospective bridegroom, declaring
“God be praised for sending us so good a king as this!”

Setting sail from La Coruña on 12 July, the future king was brought by a fair
wind to Southampton within eight days. London celebrated the news of his arrival
with bonfires, bell-ringing and feasting in the streets. The only royal marriage in
England of two regnant Catholic sovereigns was celebrated in Winchester Cathedral.

---
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Never before or since has that church witnessed so magnificent a ceremony. One account of the marriage from a later copy of a contemporary manuscript is included as an appendix in the published version of *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Queen Mary*.361

On Wednesday the 25 July, being St James’s day, the prince, richly appareled in cloth of gold, embroidered, with a great company of the nobles of Spayne, in such sort as the like hath not been seen, proceeded to the church, and entered in at the west door, and passed to the traverse, all the way on foot; and to the church he had no sword borne before him. Then came the queen’s majesty, accompanied with a great number of the nobility of the realm, the sword being borne before her by the earl of Derby, and a great company of ladies and gentlewomen very richly appareled; her majesty’s train was borne up by the marquess of Winchester, assisted by sir John Gage her lord chamberlain; and so she proceeded to the church; the kings and heralds of arms in their coats going before her from her lodging on foot to the church, where entering at the west door she passed on till she came to the traverse. Then did the bishop of Winchester, lord chancellor of England, which did the divine service, assisted by the bishops of London, Durham, Chichester, Lincoln and Ely, all with their crosiers borne before them, came out of the quire to the mount. … Then the lord chamberlain delivered openly for the solemnification of their highness’ marriage, how that the emperor had given unto his son the kingdom of Naples. So that it was thought the queen’s majesty should marry with a prince, now it was manifested that she should marry with a king; and so proceeded to the espousals.

Her wedding ring was, by Mary’s choice, a plain band of gold. She had said that she wished to marry as “maidens did of old custom”. Another account of the Prince’s arrival, reception and the wedding, as well as the succeeding weeks, is provided by an anonymous writer, but preserved in published state papers.362 The author recalls that during the service “All the while, for an hour, she (Mary) remained with her eyes fixed on the sacrament. She is a saintly woman.”363 A fuller account is also provided by an Italian in the retinue of the Venetian ambassador and emphasises
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the splendour of the occasion. Verses presented by the Winchester scholars and written by John White, bishop of Lincoln and later of Winchester, celebrated the common descent in four ways of both spouses from John of Gaunt, third son of King Edward III. The impressive number of royal titles now shared by Mary and Philip as monarchs of England would not be matched until the twentieth century. According to Foxe, the marriage was consummated in Winchester before the couple moved in slow stages to Windsor.
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366 They were King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, Ireland, Princes of Spain, and Sicily, Archdukes of Austria, Dukes of Milan, Burgundy and Brabant, Counts of Hapsburg, Flanders and Tyrol. Later, in 1556 the royalty of Spanish dominions on the Iberian peninsula together with its possessions overseas would be added, after the abdication of the Emperor Charles V in July of that year.
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Chapter III: Road to Reunion and Revival

1. “Peter ceases not to knock”

The England which witnessed the marriage of the Queen in July 1554 and the ecclesial communion which celebrated it were still officially in schism. It was ironic that Charles V, Catholic defender of orthodoxy on the continent, should have consented to his son marrying the sovereign of a nation that was still schismatic. But she was a Catholic reigning monarch and both her religion and her territorial possessions were crucial to his strategic plans. He had achieved two major ambitions: the practical encirclement of France and the potential for his heir to be instrumental in restoring English dominions to reunion with Rome. Success would be a testimony to the Pope and the Catholic powers of the strong government that his son had introduced into an apparently turbulent English situation. Charles had previously persuaded Pope Julius III that Mary needed the strength of Philip to “subdue the ferocious English and re-establish Catholicism”.\(^{368}\) Perhaps he exaggerated her weakness. The prospect of the marriage had provoked the most serious rebellion of her reign (Wyatt’s) but she had overcome it without his aid. Did that mean that the opposition to her husband less real than imagined? How much genuine anti-Spanish feeling, as opposed to French-inspired activity, actually fuelled the engine of antipathy is difficult to assess. In reality any foreign husband of a first queen regnant

presented problems of acceptability and political influence.\textsuperscript{369} A new study suggests that the levels of anti-Spanish feeling in the country at this time were significant, largely caused by a reputation for their cruelty and rapacity in the Americas rather than their religion.\textsuperscript{370} Such theories may enjoy the benefit of hindsight, drawing on later hostilities that are often linked to the Marian experience. Evidence suggests that Philip both entered into the spirit of the government of his latest realm and was accepted at that level by those with whom he closely worked.\textsuperscript{371} From a distance, and for spiritual more than political reasons Pole was more sceptical at first. His priority was and remained reunion.\textsuperscript{372} Delay for him spelt betrayal of a principle. There is no reason to suppose that because he was more spiritually motivated he discounted political realities. Rather, he saw them in the light of a political rationale to which Machiavellian intrigue was anathema. Nevertheless, the Cardinal had to await the diplomacy of Pope Julius and the Emperor as well as his own written advocacy to Philip and Mary for the advance of that agenda which he had proposed from the beginning. His goal of reunion was also theirs. It only differed in its mode of achievement and timing. Pole believed it should come first. The Emperor’s purpose on the other hand was to make sure that Mary’s marriage to Philip was an accomplished fact, with reunion consequent to and dependent upon it.

Mary’s cautious approach had the more immediate and evident cause of uncertainty regarding attitudes to papal supremacy. Her instincts appear to be matched by her experience with her first two parliaments, alluded to in Chapter II. Quite soon after her accession, Cardinal Dandino, the Nuncio in Brussels, had sent his
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representative Francesco Commendone to Rome in September 1553 to report to the Pope and the Curia following a secret visit to Mary. As a result Rome decided that delay was the only possible course.\footnote{CSPV, vol. V, nos. 784 & 785. CRP, vol. 2, nos. 678 & 679.} Advisers to the Emperor, such as Cardinal Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, and Diego de Mendoza, also counselled delay until Mary should be well-established.\footnote{CRP, vol. 2, no. 677.} At that time, Pole’s own agent, Henry Penning, seemed to be of the opinion that Renard was the main culprit in counselling delay and that he [Penning] had been told by several Members of Parliament that Pole’s arrival would give pleasure to everyone and the only problem was the question of security of lands acquired from the Church.\footnote{CRP, vol. 2, no. 689.} De Noailles, the French ambassador, believed much the same thing, recognising Pole as the only person who could prevent Mary’s marriage to Philip.\footnote{Lingard, J., \textit{History of England}, vol. IV, p. 200.} It remains plausible that Pole’s earlier successful arrival could have made a significant impact and even changed the course of the history of the Marian years.

Was Mary being politically astute by deterring Pole from coming, as Elizabeth Russell suggests?\footnote{Russell, E., ‘Mary Tudor and Mr Jorkins’, \textit{BIHR}, 63, pp. 263 – 276.} She followed the advice from the Emperor as correspondence shows.\footnote{Hughes, P., \textit{The Reformation in England}, vol. II, pp. 216-17.} The historian Philip Hughes believes that the failure to follow Pole’s advice from the beginning – especially as a native and one who understood well the English character – was ultimately disastrous to the project of Catholic revival.\footnote{Ibid. p. 221.} Elizabeth Russell on the other hand believes that credit is due to Mary for her use of procrastination as a shrewd political device.\footnote{Russell, E., ‘Mary Tudor & Mr Jorkins’, \textit{BIHR}, 63, pp. 266-67.} If the case for speedy reunion is examined from the point of view of political pragmatism, delay looks like a defensible
strategy. Looked at from the point of view of its juridical and ecclesiological perspective, Pole’s priorities were compelling. His view of a church operating separately from its spiritual Head is clearly one of institutional and theological deformity.\textsuperscript{381} Time was also lost that would never come again. None of the principal players could have foreseen that. Pole eventually accepted the marriage, which had delayed his coming, as a benefit, writing to Cardinal Morone that it “would provide the greatest arm for establishing matters of religion”.\textsuperscript{382} Thanks to the provident exercise of papal dispensing and validating powers, all the deficiencies formerly affecting spiritual and sacramental actions relating to the English church could be rectified once reunion was reality.

An increase in traditional religion in the eighteen months prior to Pole’s arrival anticipated and possibly facilitated the cause of reunion. By the end of 1554 a majority had restored high altars and possessed most or all of the vestments and ornaments as well as some or all of the necessary books for Mass.\textsuperscript{383} Mary’s marriage was as much a marker for future security of her religious restoration as an intimation of it as a preliminary step to papal jurisdiction. Without the certainty of a Catholic heir which marriage implied, everything that reunion and restoration procured would be imperilled. All of these connected contingencies would coalesce into a combined commitment on the part of the principals to pursue integration into the Catholic fold.

On 29 July, Pole wrote to Charles V congratulating him on the marriage of Philip and Mary.\textsuperscript{384} Philip understood that the security of ownership of church
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property still constituted a barrier to the success of Pole’s legation. Although the Cardinal had received from Pope Julius III, on 6 August 1553, full powers to treat of this issue as he thought “right and necessary”, he had not yet – for what he regarded as sound spiritual reasons – made known this information to the interested parties. The Pope was content to waive the return of all moveable goods that had been alienated but assumed that land could be a matter of negotiation. Pole was empowered to absolve those who had moveable goods but this could be delayed in cases of refusal to restore lands also alienated. Land acquired could be sold, but only to benefit the Church. The Pope was easily persuaded to make more concessions but it was not until May 1554 that he issued a new bull. Pole made known only in June 1554 the details of the Pope’s permission to allow the present holders of former church property to retain it. Pole feared that such concessions would be seen as a matter of bargaining regarding a moral imperative, which he was not prepared to countenance. However, these negotiations made the whole process more protracted. Pole – no doubt inadvertently – contributed to the delay in coming to fulfil his own mission by not making the concessions public earlier, thus removing the suspicion that surrounded his legation. The new bull was still too imprecise for the property owners’ peace of mind and the Privy Council’s acceptance. Uncertainty and delay continued. In the middle of August the Imperial ambassadors in England wrote to Philip advising against the immediate sending of Pole and claiming that papal authority was more objectionable than the Mass in England, and that no restitution of Church property was practically possible because “… most of the people here, especially your Majesty’s own councillors, have grown rich on church revenues.”

385 T-D, vol. II, pp. cx –cxv, gives the full text of the Papal Bulls granting various faculties to Pole.
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It is another indication again that security of tenure rather than religious conviction was the continuing motive for opposition. It took three months from June for positive clarification, in the form of a papal brief, to satisfy the property holders.389

On 17 August the royal couple came to Southwark to dine and stay with Bishop Gardiner. The following day they entered the City in state.390 Machyn omits mention of this important event but concentrates on details of preaching and of the Catholic funerals of gentry in the city.391 A description of the pageants set up for the visit features in another chronicle of the time.392 The same source records the displeasure of Bishop Gardiner upon seeing a painting of King Henry VIII bearing a Bible in his hand inscribed *Verbum Dei*. He commanded its removal and replacement with a pair of gloves.393 An account of the arrival in London and impressions of it and its inhabitants, from a Spanish source, was less than complimentary.394 Robbers abounded, they claimed, and religion seemed in retreat. They thought that at this time the Mass was rarely celebrated and meagrely attended. The Spaniards were thoroughly unpopular. This author appears to be the first to suggest that Mary will be childless, also observing that tapestries which line the walls of royal residences are plunder from monasteries because of the their religious themes.395 There is praise of the countryside and the seasons, but only to visit and not to abide.

These courtiers from Spain – and one assumes that the writer was such – no doubt reflect the average visitor’s scepticism about an uncongenial environment. It
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would be easy to consider London and the Home Counties, beyond which it is unlikely that they travelled much, as typical of the rest of the country. Mutual misunderstanding as well as political intrigue increased the tension. Renard, the Imperial ambassador, reported to his master that in September it was discovered that the French had put fake Spanish coins into circulation which caused no end of commotion.  

Recent and older religious hostilities were also in evidence, with an attempt to set fire to a church in Suffolk during Mass and the fact that Catholics are now the majority shareholders in church property and will resist any attempt at recovery by Cardinal Pole. By mid-September he also reported that “heretics who left the country last year are rapidly returning.”

From his monastery near Brussels, Cardinal Pole penned a letter to Philip on 24 September, again full of allegorical images from scripture, reminding him that it was “Peter, who ceases not to knock” and in which he depicted a state built on shifting sand, if welcome was refused to the representative of Peter, also reminding Philip that it had been loyalty to Mary’s title that had kept him (Pole) out of England for so long. In Pole’s view, instability stalked the state that built on purely secular foundations.

And if you lay the foundations of your rule elsewhere, you may be sure that you are building upon sand … it is your duty to restore that order, as God has called you to do and your duty plainly bids you, you must not begin otherwise than by building on the rock which rests in its right place.

---
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Charles V still advised delay. By October Renard was reporting to Granvelle, Bishop of Arras and first minister of Charles V, that Philip, when he entered London on Michaelmas Eve, was well received. A sermon by Bishop Gardiner at St Paul’s had drawn 10,000 people and his words explaining and expounding the errors of the reformers struck home. Machyn, who was there, said “it was as great an audience as ever I saw in my life.” Renard’s letters also expressed confidence that the rumours of Mary’s pregnancy were true and saw it as a good omen for the future.

September brought the visitation of his diocese by Bishop Bonner of London. He produced articles of religion and set out regulations for the keeping of patronal feasts. There were one hundred and twenty four articles of inquiry, all relating to pastoral and liturgical requirements. Renard reported to his master that they were ill-received. The protest, though vociferous, came apparently from just three parishes, hardly representing widespread objection. Nevertheless, some historians attach great importance to this apparent revolt. Following the protests, the Lord Mayor ordered the shops and inns to be closed during divine service. Whatever disturbance occurred, it did not rate a mention in other contemporary accounts. The significance placed upon it by later historians all derives from Foxe.

---
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In September, Bartolomé Carranza, Pole’s old Spanish Dominican friend, was warning him about anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish feeling in England.\(^{408}\) This needs to be placed in context with the overall impression being conveyed by imperial correspondence to Pole and the Holy See, which was that Philip’s presence would strengthen the cause and diminish the opposition. The presumption was that the Prince’s presence was more essential than Pole’s. However, there could be no reunion without a legate and, once his previous attainder by Henry VIII had been removed, the way was clear for Pole’s return both as Legate and close relation of the Queen. In October, Charles V wrote to his agent Eraso, that Paget was the man to organize support for Pole’s legation, the success of which depended on the security of ownership of church property.\(^{409}\) In mid-November, with confirmation of the Queen’s pregnancy now public knowledge, things began to move more quickly.

The veteran churchman who was the Pope’s representative to restore the link between the English people and Rome was now 54 years of age but seeming older. By any standard he was a remarkable figure, who might – if he had been ambitious – have been Pope in the conclave of 1549 which finally elected Julius III.\(^{410}\) Pole represented for many people in England the epitome of that noble English cultured and classical Catholic scholarship that had flourished under Henry VII and for the first half of the reign of Henry VIII. He was a near-relation to Mary and also a son of the Countess of Salisbury, her former governess and the brother of Henry, Lord Montague, both executed in 1538 and since then a family under suspicion. Pole’s career as a papal diplomat and his writings made him one of the key figures in the pontificates of Paul III (1534-1549) and Julius III (1550-1555). Pole stood for what
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looked at times like an increasingly minority political philosophy which rejected the subordination of principle to expediency refined to a subtle art by Machiavelli in his work *De Principe*. Pole once described the work as “written by an enemy of the human race”. 411 It was this repudiation of unprincipled opportunism that underscored his opposition to Henry VIII and his divorce, for which he was forced into exile. 412 His attachment to the Catholic tradition of his royal ancestors was never in any doubt. His sojourn in Italy and involvement in its new wave of reforms gave him a wider view and bigger vision of the Church beyond his native shores. It had also earned him enemies. The origins, essentials and progress of the campaign against his orthodoxy have been outlined and analysed particularly in two studies. 413 Pole was an eminent spiritual adviser to a circle of Italians known as the “spirituali”, profoundly interested in reform and personal sanctification, some of whom embraced Protestantism. Pole would suffer by association and by suspicion about his efforts to find credible points of convergence in Lutheran and Catholic doctrine of justification. Friend and adviser to three popes, he would end his days in England unjustly suspected of heresy by Paul IV (Caraffa). In a later chapter, the difficulties created for Mary and Pole by the relentless and irrational prejudices of this Pontiff will be considered.

In the autumn of 1554 Pole was accepted by Julius III as the only and most appropriate candidate to preside over his country’s return to the Roman obedience. There can be little doubt that Pole’s presence in England served to inaugurate a new chapter in the story of Catholic revival. Apart from full integration into the Universal Church it would establish a new approach to dealing with the religious crisis of the

recent decades, reflecting his own – and the Queen’s – observation and diagnosis of the problem. His emphasis on the necessity of the Roman Primacy would supersede previous uncertainty in England and form a basis for theological and spiritual renewal.\textsuperscript{414} Ably assisted by scholars such as Nicholas Harpsfield, the Primacy would be promoted as essential to Catholicism, going beyond the merely juridical and embracing the very nature of Catholicism. Its loss was illustrated with vivid examples of the calamities that befell nations which had removed themselves in the past from Roman obedience.\textsuperscript{415} A conciliar definition of the Primacy would be enshrined in the decrees of the Synod of 1555 establishing it for the first time in England as a reference point for the future.\textsuperscript{416} Additional to this was a connected pastoral vision. It understood clearly and incorporated the Tridentine emphasis on top-down direction and the catechetical roles of bishop and priest, the importance of seminary training, the liturgy of the Mass and proper reservation of the Sacrament. These were elements that shaped Catholic reform and resurgence to counter the challenge of the Protestant reformers.\textsuperscript{417} He has been accused of neglect in respect of the vital aspect of preaching, printing and help from the Jesuits but as recent studies show these criticisms are both unfounded, unwarranted and outdated.\textsuperscript{418} Among the easily overlooked but most innovative aspects of Pole’s management of Church affairs in England, was his decision to pool diocesan resources to better distribute available
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funds.\footnote{Pogson, R. H., ‘Revival and Reform in Mary Tudor’s Church: A Question of Money’, in Haigh, C., \textit{The English Reformation Revisited}, pp. 139-156.} A fuller examination of Pole’s agenda for recovery will form the third part of this chapter.

The account of the embassy sent by Mary and Philip to Brussels to arrange for Pole’s coming is interesting as much for its details as for the insights it provides concerning the views of Lord Paget, one of the shrewder politicos in the Council.\footnote{CSPSp, vol. XIII, pp. 87-92.} He was frank about the drawback for strong government of a Council that was too numerous and suggested its reduction, leaving Philip pre-eminent, although “the English had a natural hatred for foreigners and were not without some hostility to Spaniards.”\footnote{Ibid., p. 88.} The nobility, he suggested, was now pacified and it was the common people, incited to be factious during the troubles of the previous reign, who needed severe action. On religion, he was certain that property rights were crucial to the support of the elite for the re-establishment of unity with Rome and he urged a pragmatic approach because:

Many of them [the owners] were persuaded of the truth of their opinions, others had been born or bred in them, and all this could not be uprooted at once, but must be dealt with gradually and with moderation … thus the supremacy of the holy apostolic see would be duly recognised, but the rope must not be strained to breaking point.\footnote{CSPSp, vol. XIII, p. 89.}

Granvelle, the author of this report, seems to have had confidence in Paget’s judgement of the situation. His conclusion is that:

The reasons mentioned by Paget show the dangers of trying to right matters at one blow, so it will be well to remember how the Catholic King and Queen went about the reduction of the Moors at Granada, and how the Apostles themselves, in the early days of the Church, were in the habit of putting up
with certain things until such time as the weaker brethren had grown firm in faith and become strong enough to bear the stricter rule. On 6 November, Renard reported that the Council was now unanimously in favour of Pole’s return. The necessary procedures for reconciliation and the proper ecclesiastical forms could now be carried through, with endorsement by a parliament. The propaganda value of this successful return and the achievement of England’s recovered unity with Rome was fully recognised by the government and given continental publicity. Accounts of Pole’s arrival and reception are described in a letter written by one of his suite and published in Italy in December 1554, and from a letter in the Quirini collection. Another account is provided by a letter written by John Elder and intended for publication in Scotland. Philip and Mary began the process for Pole’s formal reception by a proclamation issued on 10 November commanding their subjects to recognize and submit to his authority as a papal legate and on the same day a licence was issued for him to come into the kingdom and lawfully exercise his authority. There was no recorded protest against the proclamation.

The third parliament of the reign dealt with the business of the Cardinal’s mission and legislation for the return of England to the Catholic fold. Significantly the writs did not include the royal title as Supreme Head of the Church. No attempt was made to alter the composition of members either by the creation of more peers or the exclusion of those deemed to be potential opponents. Accounts of the opening
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Mass and ceremonial indicated that it was a magnificent occasion. Both monarchs attended the Mass of the Holy Ghost in Westminster Abbey in their state robes, separate Swords and Caps of Maintenance being carried before them. The splendour of the robes and the number and quality of the retinues of peers in attendance made a great impression. Bishop John White of Lincoln preached a sermon in which he urged that parliament should enact “bonas leges quae respiciunt cultum et honorem dei” (good laws which respect the worship and honour of God).

The immediate business in hand was the removal of that taint of treason upon the name of Pole, which he had borne for nearly twenty years. Summoning a representative group of both houses to Whitehall, Philip spoke – presumably in Latin – to reassure them of the purely spiritual character of the restoration and to urge them not to forget the loyalty of their ancestors to the faith:

The mercy of God now calls upon you to return, through obedience to the Roman Pontiff, to the flock of Jesus Christ, incorporating yourselves in His Catholic Church …Vote for this measure, and may God enlighten your understanding and move your hearts, for whose service and providence it is proposed and set in motion.

A bill to revoke the act of attainder against Pole passed every stage of debate in three days.

In the Lords there was no dissent and only two hesitant voices in the Commons, one of those due to a scruple about having sworn the oath of supremacy.
On 22 November the new bill received the formal assent of the King and Queen in the House of Lords, in person.\textsuperscript{434} 

From his own diary, it is evident that one of the delegation chosen to oversee the return of the Cardinal was William Cecil, carrying out his first duty in royal service during this reign.\textsuperscript{435} There is evidence that he and Pole, though differing in religious sympathy, were on friendly terms.\textsuperscript{436} Arriving in Dover, after what he himself describes as a miraculous sea journey – a forecast storm not having occurred – on the same day, and being met by Lord Montague and Bishop Thirlby of Ely, the Cardinal proceeded in stages to Canterbury, where he was welcomed enthusiastically by huge crowds and addressed by Nicholas Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury, using a Latin pun on his surname as “\textit{Polus qui aperis nobis polum regni caelorum}” (The pole who opens for us the axis of the kingdom of heaven).\textsuperscript{437} Sailing from Rochester, in the royal barge, which at the express desire of the Sovereigns displayed the insignia of his legatine status, a cross, two silver pillars and two poleaxes, he arrived at Gravesend where the Earl of Shrewsbury presented him with the act restoring him to his former dignity, bearing the royal assent and sealed with a golden seal. The Bishop of Durham delivered his legatine commission which, though couched in the diplomatic terms of such documents, nevertheless indicated the limits of his authority. He could only exercise it with formal royal consent.\textsuperscript{438} This phrasing might represent the cautious influence of Philip, already used to the subtleties of

\textsuperscript{434} \textit{Journal of the House of Commons, 1547 – 1628-29}, p. 38.  
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exercising royal power in Spain and deferring spiritually to the papacy while conscious of a dynastic heritage of political confrontation as well as communion with it. But it could also be recognition of a customary *exequatur* privilege in England, limitation the exercise of papal legislation to the consent of the monarch, in previous centuries. Attended by a flotilla of boats bearing other distinguished figures, Pole’s journey took less time than was anticipated so that he arrived at Westminster an hour sooner than expected, the royal pair being still at dinner. He was greeted by Bishop Gardiner at the landing place and by Philip at the palace gates of Whitehall. Mary received him at the top of the great staircase and after spending some time in conversation with her he finally left the palace and retired to rest at Lambeth Palace.

In a letter to Charles V, dated 23 November, Renard recorded that the Earl of Derby had picked up a paper deliberately left lying around which threatened him with beheading if he attended parliament or made any concessions to the Spaniards. However, “This so greatly irritated Parliament that measures are being taken for the punishment of slanderers, and to legislate on the subject for it is clear that pure malice inspired it”. If Renard’s observation was correct it represented a perception by the legislature of published threats to established order, and a determination on their part to take steps to deal appropriately with the offenders.

The next three days were unique in English history. They witnessed the undoing in a remarkably short time of the whole of the legal framework of the religious settlements of both Henry and Edward. As one parliament had willingly enacted it now another as willingly undid it. Who can generalise about their motives? Obedience
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to the monarchs, self-interest, convenience, genuine faith, must all have been present. Perhaps also there may have been relief at a stabilising return to former traditions. Whatever their sentiments regarding the spoils and the prosecution of the policy that had encouraged and promoted it, Lords and Commons alike gave the return to Catholicism almost unanimous support. While a *Te Deum* was being sung in St Paul’s Cathedral in thanksgiving for the Queen’s pregnancy, parliament was summoned to Westminster to hear the Legate speak. The speech – typical of both the literary style and scholarship of the writer – was replete with allegorical images from scripture annunciating not only the causes of the schism and its ruinous legacy but also offering a manifesto of judicial means through which could be legally constructed new spiritual foundations bringing a brighter and more pacific future.

The following day representatives of both Houses agreed on a petition to the Sovereigns asking for reunion with Rome. Only one dissenting voice, described by Renard, the Imperial ambassador, as “a man who enjoys no consideration”, opposed the otherwise unanimous voice of those present. David Loades suggests that the petition was largely the draft of the council. Jennifer Loach has provided clear evidence that it was drafted and agreed upon in one day by a committee of both Houses. In it, they expressed themselves “very sorry of [sic] the schism and disobedience committed in this realm”. On the 30 November the royal pair attended at Westminster and were presented with this petition which was then given to the Legate. All kneeling, he then absolved those present of the censures – not the individual sins – incurred during the
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schism. The response to the prayers and the singing of the *Te Deum* afterwards was whole-hearted and enthusiastic. Pole described a “marvellous silence” while he spoke and a resounding “Amen” was heard when he pronounced the blessing. Most historians express scepticism about the underlying motives of this approval for reconciliation, seeing it as dependant upon the recognition that no material sacrifice was required for the return of the kingdom to the Roman obedience. Figures such as Cecil and Bedford have been suggested as examples of insincerity in this regard. A pair of cynics do not make a consensus. Philip’s letter to Pope Julius betrayed no apparent reservations as he wrote:

… today, the feast of St Andrew, in the afternoon, all this kingdom, by the unanimous agreement of those who represent it, and with great repentance for the past, and contentment over what they were about to do, have given their obedience to Your Holiness, and to the Holy See and the Legate, at the Queen’s intercession and mine, absolved them …

2 December, the first Sunday of Advent, witnessed something not seen in London for at least a generation. Pontifical Mass was celebrated in St Paul’s Cathedral, in the presence of the Cardinal Legate and the King. The pomp and solemnity of the occasion is evident in the accounts that have survived. One report mentions the great devotion of the senior members of the congregation: “…old men and women and those who had hoped for this event shed tears of joy”. Only those nearing forty years of age and over would have had clear memories of anything like this in the cathedral. In a sermon lasting two hours, the Bishop of Winchester, also Chancellor of the realm,
preached on the text “Fratres, scientes quia hora est jam de somno surgere,” (Brethren, you know that it is now the hour to awake from sleep) from the Epistle of the Mass for that day. It is clear from the text of this sermon that Gardiner both recognised the significance and rejoiced in the magnitude of the event.⁴⁵¹ A crowd, estimated at 15,000, which gathered outside St Paul’s to hear the Chancellor preach, were told that the King and Queen had “… restored the Pope to his supremacy; and that the three estates assembled in Parliament (representing the whole realm) had submitted themselves to the same”.⁴⁵² Then the Bishop pronounced the absolution from schism while the whole congregation knelt. It is recorded by an observer that it was “a sight to be seen and the silence was such that not a cough was heard”.⁴⁵³ In a letter to the Emperor, Renard reported that Bishop Gardiner had gone outside to preach before a huge crowd. He explained to them what had been done and publicly confessed his own error in the past, which through fear he had been led into. His words appear to have been well-received, for, the ambassador writes, “No overt sign of displeasure was observed on his listeners’ faces, but rather joy and satisfaction at seeing the King and the Cardinal and hearing about the reconciliation”.⁴⁵⁴

It still remained to repeal all the legislation that had abolished England’s Catholic identity. Evidence suggests that Pole was still on a collision course with parliament in respect of his uncompromising attitude regarding the moral principle, that the owners of church property should not be allowed to disregard the obligation to return it. The holders thought otherwise. They wanted it clearly stated that their title was good and that the Church should seek no further legal redress in the matter, beyond

⁴⁵¹ Muller, J.A., Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction, p. 384-5.
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individual and personal gestures, such as those being made by the Queen. Soon after Pole’s arrival, Philip had personally sought to persuade him that any restrictions related to possession would be resisted and would even ruin any chance of reconciliation.\textsuperscript{455} What followed has been described well by Jennifer Loach, reconstructed from a manuscript in the British Library.\textsuperscript{456} Reports of this disagreement and Pole’s threat to withdraw from England because of it resound in Renard’s letters to Charles V at this time.\textsuperscript{457} A meeting with Philip, Mary, the Council, the Cardinal and the Chancellor to resolve the deadlock proved to be quite contentious, Pole continuing to insist on the moral obligation to return the patrimony of the Church. The lawyers and constitutional experts insisted that legal precedent in England, from the time of Edward III, gave the Crown extensive rights over Church goods. Mary declared her opposition to this precedent and the meeting adjourned without any resolution. The next day, 22 December, the bill to confirm the reunion and the revocation of legislation prejudicial to the Church was further scrutinised and it was decided that a supplication of security of tenure – but not an absolute right – regarding property should be included. Effectively, Pole’s hard line position was abandoned discreetly by a nod in the direction of a moral principle. However, he still made a point of stating that the moveable goods of the Church previously seized ought to be compensated by those who had been enriched by them. It is important to note that Pole’s stance was not essentially obstinacy of attitude but rather a practical point relating to revenue. As well as the principle of legitimate possession, that of necessary funding to rebuild the Church spiritually as well as materially also applied.\textsuperscript{458} Philip Hughes has noted that there was a Reformation spirit running through the text of the bill to re-erect Catholicism in England. It is replete with

\textsuperscript{457} CSPSp, vol. XIII, pp. 124 & 130.
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references to England being a “crown imperial” and the exemption from acceptance of papal bulls “contrary to or prejudicial to the authority, dignity, or pre-eminence royal or imperial of the realm, or to the laws of this realm now being in force, and not in this parliament repealed”. Whatever consensus existed in this parliament in favour of Catholicism, it was balanced by the growth over the past twenty years of a sense of national pride and independence of foreign interference. Perhaps this alteration in the national psyche was something that Pole had neither anticipated nor understood initially.

A contiguous bill was also passed reviving the heresy laws of Richard II and Henry IV. Interestingly it had no difficulty in the Commons but there was opposition in the Lords, not because of sympathy with offenders but – wrote Renard – because “…the jurisdiction of bishops is once more established by it, and the penalties appear too heavy but it is thought a majority will be found to support it”. It passed easily. Renard reported this “of good promise”. Two historical judgements on the passage of this bill reflect its controversial character. The Catholic historian John Lingard wrote in the nineteenth century, “With whom the persecution under Mary originated is still a matter of uncertainty”. The Protestant historian, Richard Dixon, writing in 1870’s commented, “No bill ever went quicker through Parliament than the bill that lighted Smithfield”. Another bill concerning the terms of Philip’s status in the event of his being widowed after the birth of an heir was also debated. The correspondence between him, Renard, and officials in Spain indicates – should there be any doubt of the matter –
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that Philip fully believed his wife to be pregnant.\footnote{CSPSp, vol. XIII, p. 126, Juan Vazquez de Molina to Philip. Renard to Philip, pp. 121-131.} The important Catholic feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin on 8 December was celebrated in London at the Savoy Chapel, with Spanish participation adding plenty of sound and colour to the procession, providing Machyn with a lively scene to record in his diary.\footnote{Machyn, \textit{Diary}, p. 78.}

Legislation had now made the kingdom, at least in the official sense, a confessional Catholic state. By the time that parliament was dissolved, on 18 January, 1555, all anti-Catholic laws had been repealed. However, the restoration of state-sponsored traditional religion did not mean the end of all opposition to it, nor did it signal the end its material poverty of resources. Though official endorsement restored its freedom it could not immediately remedy the restrictions of two decades of loss and drift. From overseas, a powerful printed attack on the latest blow to their former supremacy came from a gospeller who was to become a font of opposition to Marian Catholicism. In a work addressed to the House of Lords, John Foxe made his first literary repudiation of the revived laws.\footnote{Strype, J., \textit{Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer}, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1840), vol.1, app., pp. 937-939.} It would not be his last.

Irrespective of the fears of Charles V and his adviser, “The alliance in [parliament] between Protestants and property-holders … had proved to be a mere association of convenience”.\footnote{Loades, J., \textit{The Reign of Mary Tudor}, p. 329.} Cardinal Pole, with the support of the government could now commence the task consequent upon the imperative of reunion that he had counselled from August 1553. As well a spiritual direction it involved the mundane and mendicant exercise of monetary provision. By 17 January, 1555, he was reported by Renard to be urging Mary to relinquish revenues formerly belonging to the Church. She
had promised 60,000 crowns but was still undecided about the rest.\textsuperscript{468} This month also saw the beginning of the public prosecutions of dissidents as well as demonstrations against their condemnation mentioned in diplomatic correspondence.\textsuperscript{469} Other sources concentrate on the pageantry of restored festivals. The feast of the Conversion of St Paul (25 January) was celebrated in London with a huge procession involving the children of the city schools, the Corporation, Bishop Bonner carrying the Blessed Sacrament under a canopy, eight other bishops, one hundred and sixty London clergy in copes and ninety processional crosses. The ceremonies concluded with a Mass attended by the King and the Legate and in the evening multiple bonfires.\textsuperscript{470} The next day the City of Westminster arranged its own procession involving one hundred clergy in cloth of gold copes and followed again by a solemn Mass.\textsuperscript{471}

This apparent show of Catholic strength was soon followed by the first victims of the revised heresy laws who were condemned in hearings at St Mary Overy. John Hooper, former Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, John Rogers, former vicar of St Sepulchre’s, John Bradford, Dr Rowland Taylor of Hadleigh and Laurence Saunders former parson of All Hallows, Bread Street were all condemned.\textsuperscript{472} John Cardmaker, former Vicar of St Brides, recanted on this occasion. On 4 February John Rogers was burnt at Smithfield surrounded by “a great company of the guard”.\textsuperscript{473} He had been a popular preacher. Hooper was burned at Gloucester, Saunders at Coventry and Taylor in Suffolk.\textsuperscript{474} Renard was concerned at the public reaction in London:
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The people of this town are murmuring about the cruel enforcement of the recent acts of Parliament of heresy which has now begun, as was publicly shown when a certain Rogers was burnt yesterday. Some of the onlookers wept, others prayed God to give him strength, perseverance and patience to bear the pain and not to recant, others gathered the ashes and bones and wrapped them up in paper to preserve them, yet others threatened the bishops. The haste with which the bishops have proceeded in this matter may well cause a revolt. Although it may seem necessary to apply exemplary punishment during your Majesty’s presence here and under your authority, and to do so before winter is over to intimidate others, I do not think it well that your majesty should allow further executions to take place unless the reasons are overwhelmingly strong and the offences committed have been so scandalous as to render the course justifiable in the eyes of the people. I think your Majesty would be wise to show firmness and to tell the bishops that they are not to proceed to such lengths without having first consulted you and the Queen.  

De Noailles, the French ambassador also reported great sympathy for Rogers: 

He was burnt at Smithfield for being a Lutheran and he met his death persisting in his opinion, so bravely that the greater part of the people here took such pleasure that they did not fear to give him many acclamations to comfort his courage. 

The poignancy of the reaction by their co-religionists to the victims – collecting relics of their charred bodies – seems ironic, in view of their utter refutation of the Catholic practice of reliquaries. Speculation as to King Philip’s reaction centres on a sermon preached at court by one of his chaplains, Alfonso de Castro, apparently denouncing the use of force against heretics, after which burnings ceased for a number of weeks. The implications of this sermon and its purpose are examined closely in Eamon Duffy’s recent work on the Marian burnings. He concludes that Philip was the instigator of the sermon; but that it is clear from his writings that de Castro did not oppose capital punishment for heretics per se but was against burning them. De Castro

---

477 Foxe, p. 1529.  
478 Duffy, E., Fires of Faith, pp. 113-14.
also deplored the haste of the executions, not knowing that the process against them had not been of short duration. In a later chapter of this study both the character of the resistance to Catholic revival and the complexity of apportioning blame for its initiation as well as justification for its methods will be considered more fully.

2. “De ecclesia reformanda”.

The strength and effectiveness of the Marian revival, immediately affecting most of the population in the majority of parishes, is obscured in John Foxe’s concentration on the hundreds of victims who opposed it. Henry Machyn’s contemporary chronicle provides something of the Catholic flavour of the London scene. A number of exemplary modern writers have sought to balance Foxe’s one-sided narrative by reference to alternative sources such as wills, churchwardens’ account books, visitation records and court act books and manuscript documents in various archives. The debate has widened to include the host of previously silent witnesses whose testimony reposes in sundry records of daily transactions affecting the lives of congregations and communities all over the country. Previously ignored elements of economic efficiency, artistic creativity and consistency of scale and a cohesive and comprehensive coordination of catechesis have emerged from obscurity. One typical criticism of Pole is his insistence upon “order, discipline and the administration of the sacraments,

---

as priorities. Others view his approach to the problem of heresy as one-dimensional, focusing on obedience. After decades of deformation and destruction of the ministerial and monumental resources of the Church, concern about the authority, respect and spiritual autonomy of the clergy as well as the material maintenance of its buildings would have to be a priority. The grasp of secular interests at every level had to be loosened, as well as unwarranted interference in doctrinal and juridical areas. As the principal agents of reform and regularization, bishops should not be servants of the State, but represent the independence and universality of the Church. And, according to Duffy the quality and effectiveness of the Marian bishops under Pole’s direction made them “the hare to Europe’s tortoise” in the speedy implementation of improved standards at all levels. The profile of the priests needed a similar strengthening. Seminaries would be the answer to the existing problem of selection and formation. The dignity of the rituals the priests conducted daily in churches was as crucial to Pole’s agenda as perceptions of their sacerdotal status. Pole is criticised by David Loades for his apparent emphasis upon the liturgical and sacramental side of religion and neglect of preaching. Thomas Mayer, following the theory of Rex Pogson, maintains Pole had an aversion to preaching as a legacy of his bad experiences in Italy. Another modern historian suggests that the emphasis of the Marian hierarchy was on clarity of doctrine and purity of ritual rather than argument against Protestant principles. Eamon Duffy’s study, which will be referred to again in a later chapter, challenges the view of Pole’s reticence about preaching, demonstrating that the evidence indicates his full
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commitment to it both personally and as a pastoral necessity. It is arguable that Pole desired an integrated pastoral programme which combined both enhanced liturgical celebration supported by effective preaching, instruction and ecclesial order. Criticism of his ceremonial emphasis may reflect scepticism identifiable with a certain model of Christianity, but misunderstands the Catholic liturgical dynamic connecting catechesis and worship. Ceremonies were a vital component of counter-reformation strategy – as much as they had been a cultural and cohesive aspect of medieval Catholicism – not only because they were visually appealing but also considered both instructive and effective in the Catholic sense of *ex opere operato*. The necessary application of liturgical form and beauty is defensible once its theological meaning is understood.

In one of his few recorded sermons, preached on 30 November, 1557 the Cardinal developed the theme of integrated ceremonial and evangelical connection. It is a theme that will bear further examination in the final chapter.

Funding occupied much of Pole’s energies from the outset. He and his team were supremely innovative adapting ways to offset deficits by redeploying available surpluses. In barely two years, and considering both internal difficulties and external pressures his achievements invite admiration as well as recognition. Reliance on a reservoir of religious sympathy among the older generations initially aided his efforts. The young were inevitably less responsive and required skilful and careful

---

attention.\(^{495}\) It was not lacking and was of a style and quality reflective both of the passage of the years of conflict and the lessons to be learnt from them.\(^{496}\) One aspect of the changed scenario was that generally the Bible featured more directly in Marian Catholicism than it had before the schism. English Bibles were not withdrawn from circulation – though the texts that had been painted on church walls in Edward’s time were covered over.\(^{497}\)

It was an accepted principle that legal enforcement of religious discipline was a moral imperative at this time, and welcomed. But the government of the Church was to be based on an ecclesiology of spiritual independence of theological debate and decision. The history of royal influence in ecclesiastical matters was long but the excesses of recent experience had shattered illusions that it was always beneficial. As suggested by one historian of the Counter-Reformation, the weakness of the Papacy in the earlier part of the sixteenth century may have led to the notion that royal supremacy might aid reform.\(^{498}\) Educated lay involvement and interest in Catholic reform had a long pedigree and was evident in the royal houses from whom Mary descended and this tradition of piety and was evident in her education.\(^{499}\) Her task necessitated not just patronage but also providence of state support for the Church and punishment for those who offended against it or who were judged guilty of heresy.\(^{500}\) She had grown up with the system of royal intervention long accepted and continued into later centuries by European monarchs. She also recognised the need for state support of Church discipline
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and the punishment of those who stepped beyond it. Strictures against those who were
described as “seditions or stir unquietness by interpreting the laws after their brains and
fancies,” was a necessity. The same spirit permeates Mary’s letter to Stephen
Gardiner as Chancellor of Cambridge. They shared this view of suspicion of
dissidence with the mainstream Protestant religious leaders who opposed them.

The relationship between Mary and Reginald Cardinal Pole is crucial to the
Marian restoration narrative. Their early lives were closely linked. Not only were they
related by royal descent from Edward IV but Pole’s mother Margaret Countess of
Salisbury had been Mary’s governess and remained loyal to her and her mother Queen
Catherine in the matter of the annulment of Henry’ marriage. Margaret, Henry
Marquess of Exeter, Pole’s brother, and their cousin Henry, Lord Montague were all
executed in 1538 for alleged treason. It looked suspiciously like revenge for Reginald
Pole’s public criticism of Henry in De Unitate, a defence of Papal Primacy. Their
executions, also conveniently for the king, removed two potential male Yorkist
claimants to the throne. This common bond of shared family suffering, connected with
the cause of the validity of Henry’s first marriage and his consequent persecution of all
who supported it, was not forgotten by either Mary or the Cardinal. Their closeness
appears sufficient to have given concern to Charles V and Julius III that Pole’s early
presence in England would jeopardise the plan for Mary to marry Philip.

There is little reason to doubt that Mary and Pole came to share the same
judgment of what had gone wrong since the break with Rome as well as the same vision
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for correcting it.\footnote{Duffy, E., \textit{Fires of Faith}, pp. 94-96.} Later copies survive of what is an original letter of Mary setting out her own agenda.\footnote{BL. Harleian MS, 444, f. 27; Cotton MS, Titus, C. VII, f. 120} She insisted on censorship of books, preaching, visitations, teaching and the punishment of heretics. Mayer defends the notion that Pole was less concerned and more lenient with punishing heretics than was Mary.\footnote{Mayer, T.F., \textit{Cardinal Pole}, pp. 273, 280.} In practice he seems to have almost never proceeded against individuals but that does not mean that he opposed the practice in principle. His representatives and suffragans in Canterbury certainly prosecuted in his name and he established a commission to hunt down heretics in Canterbury as late as 28 March 1558.\footnote{Freeman, T.S., ‘Burning Zeal: Mary Tudor and the Marian Persecution’, in Doran and Freeman, eds. \textit{Mary Tudor Old and New Perspectives}, p. 177. pp. 250-65.} Nor was Pole reticent about preaching. Mary’s emphasis on it is also echoed in Pole’s letter to his friend Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo, and on the punishment of heretics in his own homily on 30 November, 1557.\footnote{Both documents are studied in Duffy, E., ‘Cardinal Pole Preaching; St Andrew’s Day 1557’, in Duffy and Loades, \textit{The Church of Mary Tudor}, pp. 176-200.} Pole’s ecclesiology matched Mary’s latent intuition regarding the necessity of unity with Rome but it is arguable that she took longer to arrive at it. His first letters to her as queen drove home the message of failure without unity.\footnote{CSPV, vol. V, no. 766. CRP, no. 649.} Mary’s hesitation or her caution on the subject are sometimes linked to either lack of enthusiasm or \textit{realpolitik}.\footnote{Wooding, L., \textit{Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England}, pp.117-9. Edwards, J., \textit{Mary Tudor}, pp. 230-31. Loades, D., ‘The Personal Religion of Mary Tudor’, in Duffy, and Loades, \textit{The Church of Mary Tudor}, pp. 176-200.} The theologian and seasoned churchman in the Cardinal supplied the initiatives for administration and strategy for construction and consolidation. From a less intellectual and theological perspective, Mary had come to understand and share Pole’s priorities, possessing strong biblical sympathies and not a little scholarship in her
own right. In the early months of the reign she was sufficiently aware of the centrality of union with Rome to pursue it discreetly but she was constrained by circumstances beyond her immediate control. The reconciliation of November 1554 provided the catalyst that created a new compound of an integrated programme for change towards clearer definition and stricter oversight. Coupled with this top-down strategy was a strengthening of the role of clergy; both higher and lower. As will be seen, the effectiveness of the clerical directors who represented the first line of defence of the revived Catholicism constituted a major priority in the strategy of recovery.

Parallel to the parliamentary procedures of reconciliation, the Convocation of the Clergy had been meeting at Canterbury on 30 November. Bishop Bonner formally opened it with Mass at the restored High Altar, while the sermon was given by bishop-elect Baynes, of Coventry and Lichfield. Before any business was done the clerical representatives proceeded to Lambeth Palace, in the first week of December, to be absolved formally from schism and heresy, a reminder of their previous irregularity. A petition to the monarchs stating that monastic lands seized during the schism need not be restored was accompanied by another presented to Pole, asking for the restoration of proper ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In Convocation the lower house of clergy drafted a petition of twenty-eight articles to the Bishops, suggesting ways of recovering lost revenues and generally advocating the remedy of all the deviations from Catholic doctrine and practice mandated in the previous reigns. The celebrations on 25 and 26 January in London and Westminster already mentioned above were no doubt public.

515 Ibid., pp. 330- 336
expressions of a new-found confidence among the Catholic clergy. Those who witnessed them were certainly impressed.\textsuperscript{516}

The Marian bishops were – like Stephen Gardiner – in part products of the pre-Reformation nominees in royal service and new men whose selection was based on a reformed rationale. As a body they look to have been fitted to the task they now faced, wiser and hardier men, formed in the crucible of the consequences of conformity against their consciences in the time of Henry VIII.\textsuperscript{517} Thirteen owed their appointments not to political but to pastoral necessity. Philip Hughes, in some ways a critic of the Marian establishment, praises appointees as “the very type, it might be thought, which the occasion now called for, teachers and theologians and trained administrators … pastors rather than politicians”.\textsuperscript{518} The older candidates included twelve nominees of Henry VIII, four of them being ex-Benedictine abbots and one ex-Cistercian. Five of the twelve had been deprived under Edward VI for refusal to accept his Prayer Book. Survivors from the past were John Salcot or Capon of Salisbury (1539); Robert Parfew or Wharton of St Asaph (1536) and Hereford (1554); John Chamber of Peterborough (1541); Antony Kitchin of Llandaff (1545); and Robert King of Oxford, all former monks. Those restored in the early part of Mary’s reign were Cuthbert Tunstall of Durham (1522); Stephen Gardiner of Winchester (1531); Edmund Bonner of London (1539); Nicholas Heath of Rochester (1539) and Worcester (1543) – soon to be promoted to York – and George Day of Chichester (1543).

\textsuperscript{518} Williams, P., \textit{The Later Tudors}, pp. 117.
Through various deprivations, deaths and excommunications, fourteen other sees remained to be filled. Canterbury – to which Pole himself would be nominated later – and then Richard Pate(s) to Worcester, Gilbert Bourne to Bath and Wells; Henry Morgan to St David’s; James Turberville to Exeter; George Coates to Chester; John White to Lincoln; William Glynn to Bangor; Ralph Bayne to Lichfield; James Brooks to Gloucester; Thomas Goldwell to St Asaph. The latter had joined the Theatine Order in Italy, initiated by Cardinal Carrafa (Pope Paul IV), a reform congregation dedicated to a more zealous way of life for pastoral clergy. Richard Pates, a scholar, also had diplomatic experience in Brussels, was a friend of Pole and was present at the first session of Trent in 1546. Three former religious, John Holyman (Benedictine) to Bristol; John Hopton (Dominican) to Norwich and Maurice Griffin (Dominican) to Rochester, were also chosen as new bishops in Mary’s reign. A majority of these bishops had conformed or acquiesced in the proceedings of her father. Some would not live long enough to have their faith challenged once again under Elizabeth. Those who did survive to the next reign, with one exception, would remain loyal to the Catholicism of the previous reign.

Meetings with the Cardinal and members of the Council continued for a time. Pole’s earlier suspicions regarding the obduracy of all those with vested interests in status quo of property settlements appeared amply justified. These were courtiers and local magnates fully awakened to the power that reformation parliaments had given
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them and resolutely tied to their own security and retention of their recent gains.\textsuperscript{524} Queen Mary, though careful enough not to appear profligate of much-needed resources, was willing to restore whatever she could in financial and other terms but exact calculation of the cost was far from straightforward.\textsuperscript{525} She was not in a position to be bountiful. Ironically the bishops were actually in debt to the Crown from unpaid taxes in the previous reigns.\textsuperscript{526} The swings and roundabouts of enquiry into questionable gains and material losses resulting from restitution was a major enterprise. Some of the church plate and ornaments confiscated in 1553 was still in government hands and efforts were made to restore or redistribute it. Records show that parishes in places such as Taunton, Wells and Norwich received back chalices that had been taken away by Edward’s commissioners.\textsuperscript{527} The parishes of St Margaret, St Stephen and St Helen in Ipswich, all benefited from investigation of alienation by a certain Edmund Withipoll, who was ordered by the “Lords of the Council” to make restitution.\textsuperscript{528} In April 1555 compensation was paid on behalf of Philip and Mary to eight parishes in the city of Exeter for church plate taken away in the previous reign.\textsuperscript{529} Both the enquiry and the restitution testify that government concerns in these years were not entirely punitive but also had a dimension of public-spirited mitigation of parochial hardship resulting from previous alienation of their church plate etc.

Gestures of vandalism against the prevailing mood of restoration appeared inevitable, given that it appeared to have gathered momentum. With the Queen now
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anticipating the birth of an heir, on 14 March, 1555, “certain villains”, it was said, broke the head and the top of the crozier of a statue of St Thomas Becket, over the Chapel of the Mercers Hall.\textsuperscript{530} This City guild had been among the first to restore Catholic worship within its chapel on 6 September 1553. The restoration of the statue of their Patron was only another provocation to the gospellers. On Easter Day, 4 April, a priest was attacked with a knife at St Margaret’s, Westminster, by a mad former monk, causing outrage among the congregation.\textsuperscript{531} These and similar examples of dissent, as well as the government’s and the Church’s response to them, will be examined more directly in Chapter IV. With repercussions still unsuspected by Pole and his sovereigns, the indolent and easy-going Julius III, died on 5 March to be replaced by the pious and bibliophile Marcellus II, Marcello Cervini, who was elected on 9 April. He had every intention of advancing the reform agenda, but only twenty-two days later he was dead. On 23 May, the cardinals elected Paul IV, Gianpietro Carafa. A Neapolitan and sworn enemy of Spanish interests, and a man of suspicious temperament in respect of the spiritual insights of all who did not appear to share his views, the policies and attitude of Paul IV would have a direct and not at all positive impact upon England’s slow movement towards Catholic rehabilitation. He would outlive both the Queen and the Cardinal by just ten months.

\textsuperscript{530} Wriothesley’s Chronicle, vol. II, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{531} Machyn, Diary, p. 84. Wriothesley’s Chronicle, vol. II, p. 127.
3. **Grandeur and Obedience**

Two schools of thought contend for the ultimate judgement regarding Pole and the Marian experiment. One group represent it as basically sterile and outdated legalism and ritualism.\(^{532}\) Another, concentrating on its overall coherence and application of novel elements as well as theologically competent personnel, defend it as a positive experiment in post-Reformation Catholic recovery.\(^{533}\) Locating his vision in the proper context of Pole’s continental and conciliar experience not only helps to explain it but to justify it. It is arguable that Pole attempted to recreate in England a version of that renascent Catholicism that he had experienced in Italy in early manhood representing a conscious effort to re-assert and re-define the Roman Church. Beginning with Pope Paul III (1534-1549) the papacy had taken the first steps towards reform. It did not always follow conventional lines of reform but was as much monumental as mystagogical, seeking to edify — sometimes literally — as well as to educate. A programme of building, emphasising in art and architecture the recovery of nerve and the affirmation of authority against its repudiation, was designed to instil confidence and inspire a new and greater sense of mission. With the genius of Michelangelo at his service, Pope Paul planned various projects throughout Rome, architectural statements to both the faithful and to critics of the Papacy that it had not only survived intact the physical as well as theological assaults of recent decades but was capable of transcending them. The boldness of the scheme is still partly evident in the complex of


buildings that still form Rome’s Capitol. In other areas of papal Rome, artistic and impressive settings for worship and the elaborate display of symbols of papal authority illustrated not just the Church’s magisterium but its confidence that its visible head represented the supreme spiritual power in the Christian world. As Kenneth Clark intimated in a personal review of the papal achievements of the period, the reconstruction of baroque Rome, begun with Paul III, served the purpose of both a spiritual and a political testament of a papacy emerging from crisis and rising above the humiliations of past mistakes, Protestant preaching and foreign invasion. The images were bold, imaginative and awesome at times in their impact.

Michelangelo had been reluctant to undertake the *Last Judgement*: under … Pope Paul III, Farnese, he was persuaded to continue it although with a rather different purpose. It ceased to be an act of atonement … and became the first and greatest assertion of the Church’s power, and of the fate that would befall heretics and schismatics.

But Paul – though himself a product a corrupt period of nepotism – did not neglect the more prosaic aspects of reform. He established the Roman Inquisition and endorsed the new religious orders of reform such as Capuchins, Jesuits, Theatines, Barnabites and Ursulines. St Philip Neri conceived the idea of the Oratory during his reign. “In Rome his (Paul III’s) name is written all over the city he renovated”. The churches built later by the new orders founded during this period testify to the grandeur and the emerging confidence in the externals of the faith that they represented. Paul’s reforming interest led him finally to set up a commission of cardinals which produced the schema *Consilium de emedenda Ecclesiae* which became the basic working document for the Council of Trent which opened in 1545. As papal delegates three key

---

figures in this assembly were Pole, Cervini (later Pope Marcellus II) and Morone. Pole’s own written contribution to the purpose and proceeding of a council indicate the maturity of his ideas and the development of his thought regarding the Church’s need for independence of movement and authority.  

His return to England as Legate gave him the unique opportunity to materialise his vision and lead its spiritual reconquest. It can be criticised, but it can also be defended by application of the credible dynamic beauty, order and ceremonial liturgy as both an ingredient of mission and a tool of evangelisation. It defined worship in many other places and was to have a long pedigree.  

To the surprise and disapproval of some, this scheme of renewal did not include the help of the newly-formed Jesuit Order. Failure to involve them is proposed as evidence of hostility to them and to their methodical preaching.  

Both conclusions are questionable. In the first place, Ignatius Loyola’s offer of help was one of training students rather than sending preachers. If Pole’s was cautious about the Jesuits per se he was not alone. On some levels, King Philip, was less than enthusiastic. Paul IV blew hot and cold about them and for a time had a personal animosity towards Loyola, after whose death he imposed restrictions on the Order subsequently abandoned by his successor Pius IV. Pole’s alleged antipathy to preaching is also advanced as an argument for lack of Jesuit involvement. Presumption of this derives from a mis-translation by Rex Pogson of a sentence in Pole’s letter of the summer of 1558 to his old friend and collaborator,
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Archbishop Bartolomé Carranza of Toledo.\textsuperscript{544} The sentence in question, “...\textit{sed nisi vel ante sit, vel simul constituta Ecclesiastica disciplina dico potius obesse verbum, quam prodesse}”, as Duffy points out, means literally “I say that the word may hinder more than help, unless it is proceeded or accompanied by the establishment of Church discipline”. What seems to be in question here is the obedient observance of rites, with care taken to provide essential catechesis in respect of them. When preaching was disconnected from Church ceremonial obediently accepted it could be for some “an empty ear-tickling entertainment, rather than a health-giving discipline and food for the soul”.\textsuperscript{545} Developed, the point looks to be that preaching cannot replace liturgy but derives its dynamic from it. This same emphasis on liturgical propriety is notable in the Canterbury Visitation articles.\textsuperscript{546} The context is that preaching had been used in recent decades as a vehicle for attacking the liturgy, in relation to sacraments, veneration of the saints and sacramentals connected with seasons and feast days and to justify the abolition of almost everything that suggested anything other than hearing and reading the word was of any value. Years of exposure to this tirade against the liturgy from many pulpits had to be countered with an effective campaign of re-acquaintance with the ceremonies abolished, matched by catechesis to explain and defend them. Providing another angle on the discussion, Duffy suggests that hesitation about the Jesuits may be linked to his own plans for a seminary at the English Hospice on the via Monserrato in Rome, of which he was Cardinal Patron.\textsuperscript{547}

Is it possible to detect more directly Pole’s identification of “discipline” with the concrete observance of ritual and worship which it seems to imply? In the St Andrew’s
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Day sermon, preached on the afternoon of 1557, the phrase “Audi legem patris tui et disciplinam matris tuae ne projicias” (Listen to your father’s law and do not throw away your mother’s discipline) is followed by a rebuke for the casting out of the discipline of Catholic ceremonies “the sooner the more ancient”. The “disciplina” that he refers to in the letter to Carranza is clearly identified in the sermon as what we would today call the liturgy of the Church. Pole preaches that the observation of ceremonies is the pedagogiam in Christum of St Paul, which begins the education of the children of God, and that the old law was full of ceremonies, “And among all the privileges and graces that God gave the people which he took to his own governance; this is reckoned the first grace, that they had such ceremonies with their law, as no nation had”. In contrast to the heretics who rely on reading alone without the sacraments, thinking to find light, the only true way to illumination is by the sacrament of Penance accompanied by appropriate prayer and fasting which removes the impediment to the light. The light must also be fuelled by oil (as in the parable of the foolish virgins). And, asks Pole, what is this oil? The works of mercy. So there is no question here of sterile observance of rites without appropriate internal disposition to charity. In summary, Pole provides us with a verbal testament of his most immediate strategy for recovery of the lapsed and the waverers: attention to the details of worship and the sacramental life of the Church as an inspiration to good works carried on by the grace that the sacraments both signify and effect.

Clergy and laity also needed the regular interaction with worship and with the communal rituals once familiar to them and favoured with financial support to bring back the lost sense of solidarity in faith as well as reverence for holy things repressed.

---
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by iconoclasm. The first priority was the *eunomia* of the Greeks, the good order deriving from ecclesial union, without which, in Catholic understanding, there was no efficacy of the rites. Pogson assesses reconciliation with the Holy See as more than half the battle and as the vital conduit from which flowed continuity, authority, validity and efficacy.\(^{550}\)

The significance of Pole’s answer in print to the schism initiated by Henry VIII, *Pro Ecclesiae Unitatis et Defensione* (usually referred to as *De Unitate*), is identified in a recent work as a supreme example of Pole’s understanding of the indissoluble link based on scripture between the Church and the Papacy.\(^{551}\) The records of the Legatine Synod of 1555-1556 are indicative of a programme that delineates and aids the realisation of this ideal devised by him with help from Bartolomé Carranza.\(^{552}\) It first met on 4 November and was dissolved on 10 February with the intention of re-convening in the autumn. It was never to meet again. J.P. Marmion in his unpublished thesis defends the originality of its decrees as deriving less from their theological terminology as from Pole’s reforming influence in their composition and content.\(^{553}\) His knowledge of canon law and of the reforming religious orders in Italy provide him a framework and with examples with which to experiment in his native land. He had also become convinced that the recovery of ground lost to the Reformation could only be achieved by “*auctoritas et disciplina*”, translatable as authority and correct forms.\(^{554}\) The synod decrees reflect a legislative blueprint for Catholic revival and reform in England based on unity, direct episcopal
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oversight, doctrinal orthodoxy, revised catechesis, seminary education for future priests and fidelity to the rites of the Church. The ultimate impact of this strategy inevitably relied on an extended period of continuity. Inevitably, its curtailment by the death of the principals and what followed was critical. Elsewhere, its influence would extend and be more lasting. The later sessions of the Council of Trent incorporated much of the synod’s pastoral decrees into its legislation and Nicolo Ormanetto, one of Pole’s closest collaborators, became a guiding amanuensis to Charles Borromeo the saintly reforming Archbishop of Milan. Similarly ecclesiastical scholars trained like Nicholas Sanders, William Allen and Thomas Stapleton and others trained during these years were at the forefront of intellectual English Catholic resistance abroad.

The synod’s immediate fruits in England were therefore short-term but from start to finish it represents a recognisable blue-print for reform and regulation. In the opening decree of the synod, the centrality and of the restoration of communion with the Holy See was marked by the inclusion of a festival of annual remembrance. It created the novel effect of a national day of liturgical celebration annually marking the original day of reunion. This was no mere excuse to invent more liturgical feasts. The long term significance of such an annual national day of remembrance has been recognised or its importance and significance. This new festival included a Solemn Mass, a sermon (which would both in any case be a customary part of the Feast of an Apostle) and a procession on St Andrew’s Day, 30 November.

---

As a useful detail of its sources and canonical reference, Bray’s edition of the synodal texts provides notes indicating precisely the earlier legislation which informed them. The second decree imports the most recent definition of Papal Primacy, transcribed verbatim from the decree of the Council of Florence of 1439. The inclusion of this decree from an older council might seem at first sight outdated and superfluous. In fact in legislative terms it is modern. A primary promulgation of such a decree in English ecclesiastical history and probably anywhere outside of Italy, it represents the latest statement on papal supremacy. Following Marmion, David Loades criticises the use of the Florentine text. It is therefore necessary to point out that the definition was, and remained, the only such explicit statement on the Munus Petrinus until that of the first Vatican Council of 1869. Papal supremacy was never discussed at Trent, though it is implicit in its decrees. By the same token, regarding Pole’s alleged failure to “discover” Trent, he could not have been unaware that its decrees still awaited confirmation by a pope. They were not fully ratified during Pole’s lifetime, a necessary protocol for their validity and passage into legislation. It was not until 26 January 1564, that Pope Pius IV confirmed all the decrees of Trent.
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560 Definimus, sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum pontificem Romanum succesorem esse beati Petri, principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem existere, et ipsin beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditem esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continentur. (We define that the holy apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have the primacy over the whole world, and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians: and that to him, in the person of St Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling and governing the whole Church as is also contained in the acts of the ecumenical Councils and in the sacred Canons). Bray, R., Records of Convocation, vol. VII, pp. 352-53. Denzinger, H. and Schönmetzer, A., eds., Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionem et Declarationem, 23rd ed. (Freiburg, 1965), no 1307.
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with the bull *Benedictus Deus*. Nevertheless, it would be inaccurate to claim no Tridentine influence in Pole’s ecclesiology. The reality is that Pole introduced into English Catholicism for the first time, the concept of what would become Tridentine ecclesiology, which continued to have a very long run. From this time on the prestige and authority of the Holy See steadily increases, after nearly two centuries of apparent weakness. This was especially evident in the role of the popes in missionary endeavours, church reform and the wider imposition of the liturgy of the Roman Rite in places where there was no continuous tradition of less than three centuries.

Pole’s broader perspective of the essential engines of reform is evident throughout the synodal decrees. Uniquely and expressly, decree number 11 provides a blueprint for the education of future priests in what is called a seminary for the first time in such an ordinance.

*… tamquam seminarium ministrorum saltem in cathedralibus ecclesiis instituatur, et conserveretur: haec eodem synodo approbante statuimus et decernimus, ut singulae metropolitanae et cathedrales huius regni pro eiusque censu et facultatibus, proque diocesis amplitudine, certum numerum puorum alere teneatur.*

(… something like a seminary for ministers should be instituted and continued at least in cathedral churches: approving this same thing, this synod enacts and decrees that each metropolitan, and cathedrals of this kingdom, in accordance with their diocesan resources, should maintain a certain number of boys to be enrolled and brought up in their faculties).

The decree goes on to give explicit directions as to the proper education of these alumni. Pole’s own personal spiritual formation evoked in him a sense of urgency to see it firmly rooted in the formation of clerics. Eucharistic devotion and instruction would be an essential ingredient. After the assaults upon the doctrine of
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Mass and the Eucharist of recent decades Pole believed that it needed more than preaching and practice to emphasise its importance. Promotion of the Holy Eucharist reserved centrally, on the altar itself, was a novel concept in liturgical design. Fr Thomas Bridgett of the Redemptorist Order noted Pole’s decree regarding it in his historic study of Eucharistic devotion.565 The synodal decree stipulates that the Blessed Sacrament be reserved in a tabernacle in the middle of the High Altar, and in such a manner that it cannot be easily moved. As with all post-Reformation Catholic churches, careful attention was paid to the structural design of the sanctuary and other parts of the chapel.

... ubi sanctissimum eucharistiae sacramentum custodiatur...decernimus adiicientes ut hoc tabernaculum in medio altaris maioris ita eminenter, omnibus conspici possit, collocetur et ita affigatur ne facile a quoquam amoveri possit.566 (... where the most holy sacrament shall be reserved... we decree in addition that this tabernacle should be placed in the middle of the high or most important altar, so that it may be conspicuous to all, and so fixed that it may not be easily moved).

Bridgett notes that in England the traditional place of reservation had been the “hanging pyx” or aumbry type.567 A modern historian has equally understood the significance for the future of this architectural emphasis on Eucharistic reservation.568 The secure location and devotional focus of devotion were considered necessary to counter attacks upon the Eucharist from outside the Church. The synod did not treat directly of the theology of the Eucharist – possibly though not certainly because it had yet to be discussed by a general council – but introduced practical rules to guard against misunderstanding and disrespect. It emphasised the continuity of Eucharistic

568 MacCulloch, D., Reformation, p. 283.
Presence by linking reservation directly to the altar of consecration and sacrifice. It is arguable that this reflects good pastoral practice in a largely pre-literate age.\textsuperscript{569}

The spirit of these decrees does not seem essentially to be just one of an unimaginative appeal to the past but of a dynamic addressing an entirely unprecedented situation with an apparatus of practical reform. What is also manifested in them is a scrupulous attention to what might be considered the small print. As the earliest experience of any attempt nationally to restore a shattered framework of religion, perhaps such attention to detail mattered. Pole laboured over aspects of regulation and observation that appear tedious to later scrutiny, especially since circumstance later obliterated both the cause and the aim of his endeavours. Reconstructing an edifice still standing but stripped of its trademark furnishing and facilities required more than tokenism and tinkering with the trappings. Likewise it needed new men in charge overall with fire in their bellies. Conscientious episcopal oversight was mandatory to replace what had been neglect in the past.\textsuperscript{570} The synod stipulates that, along with the necessity of diocesan residence for bishops, they should also abstain from secular business.\textsuperscript{571} Pole himself, following his own advice, does not appear to have attended the official meetings of the Queen’s Council, although he lived for a time at the royal palace and was certainly consulted by the monarchs.\textsuperscript{572}

Arising from the synod and necessary for its future discussion, Pole’s concern for efficiency led to an enquiry into the real state of the parish churches. Practically, that meant suspension of the Synod in the spring of 1556. In effect it

\textsuperscript{571} Records of Convocation, vol. VII, p. 359.
would be in abeyance for the remainder of the reign due to pressures unexpected at that time. Nevertheless, the pace of recovery continued at all levels.\textsuperscript{573} It is hardly surprising if generations of historians, for whom these elements were superfluous to reformed religion, see its texts and its whole emphasis as something of a dead letter.\textsuperscript{574} Pole’s most recent biographer accordingly suggests that success would have eluded him because he “refused to think about the future”.\textsuperscript{575} But the future depended upon the establishment of firm foundations in the present that would give solidity and shape to future developments. Finance for the future could only be assured by addressing and reforming the existing outmoded and inadequate methods. At a national level, it involved him and his agents in a systematic search for resources, from previously alienated property: “... he could not bring the beauty of holiness in the Catholic ritual without the vestments which had been removed and the ornaments which had been sold or stolen during the schism”.\textsuperscript{576} It may not be a strategy which finds sympathetic echoes in much of modern ideology but it relates quite naturally to the post-Reformation imperative and its emphasis on the visual and artistic as instruments of catechesis.

Marmion notes that the positive aspect of the synod was its emphasis on good pastoral practice, formation of the clergy and liturgical discipline but that the failure is in the doctrinal statements which he claims are “mostly irrelevant to the age and country to which Pole was speaking”.\textsuperscript{577} He echoes the judgement of A.G. Dickens that Pole “failed to discover Trent”. As already mentioned, confirmation of Trent was
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\textsuperscript{575} Mayer, \textit{Reginald Pole}, p. 253.
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still some way off in 1555. Nor should it be forgotten that the time frame for the full implementation of its decrees extends well into the next century and beyond.\(^{578}\)

There is thus less reason to be critical of Pole. Criticism on the grounds of legalism possibly ignores the fact that his precise drafting represents an expertise in the Canon law of the Church. This discipline is simply the application of a framework of regulation that is meant to check and prevent arbitrary interpretations and safeguard against abuses of power by individuals. As with civil law, it sets boundaries and establishes principles. The style of the text may be equally deemed exaggerated but doubtless reflects the classical mind of Pole himself.

Pole’s financial anxieties were understood by Mary. She arranged for meetings between him and several of her councillors precisely to discuss financial matters related to religion.\(^{579}\) He was also concerned with the moral aspects of retribution and recompense. It clearly represented an agenda of spiritual attrition. Sooner or later, he expected some response on this issue. Either actual possessors, or their heirs, ultimately brought up in a Catholic tradition, might eventually be persuaded to make the gesture of partial restoration or new endowment. Pole was still exhorting the moral imperative of restitution in his St Andrew’s Day sermon of 1557 when he verbally castigated the assembled grandees enriched by the former property of the Church for their persistent refusal to respond to the moral obligation to repair and restore damage to their local churches and to endow foundations to aid the poor.\(^{580}\)

Evangelical exhortation to charitable giving as an essential of the doctrine of partial salvation through good works was strongly present in pre-Reformation Catholicism.


\(^{580}\) *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. III, pt 2, pp. 482-484.
and, as an answer to its rejection as a salvific exigency by Protestants, was affirmed in the first session of Trent.

With the Queen at least, Pole had some success. In the autumn of 1555, she created a precedent with a statute whereby first-fruits, tenths and the income from appropriated benefices which still remained in royal hands were renounced.\textsuperscript{581} Previously her Council had been insisting upon their payment as recently as April of that year.\textsuperscript{582} In September 1555, they advised the publication in English of the bull of confirmation of the Legate’s indulgence of ownership of goods, so that people should not “give ear to seditious rumours.”\textsuperscript{583} Only from royal bounty could Pole anticipate any immediate response to his need for funding for his reforms. The loss entailed in the suppression of monasteries and later sequestration was crippling. Estimating it in financial terms of fifty years ago Geoffrey Dickens suggested more than half a billion pounds derived from the dissolution – to which must be added the later value of the chantries and plate.\textsuperscript{584} Some monastic revenues had previously helped to support schools, priests, hospitals and alms-houses in parishes all over the country which – if there were still priests to serve in them – now had little or no subsistence. The revenues lost to the Church could not be recovered in a lifetime, let alone three years.

While the synod was enacting legislation for reform, the respective officials of Church and Crown sought ways to bring some order into the chaotic financial situation. The record of their efforts indicates not only a painstaking capacity for planning and organisation but the thoroughness of the research that was done. A
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settlement from previous reigns that needed to be properly administered was the list of former religious to whom pensions were due by agreement. By February 1556, that list had been produced.\(^{585}\) The cost to the royal exchequer amounted to the sum of £36,372 6s 21/4d (equivalent to well over four million pounds annually in today’s money). Sums no longer due to former recipients, for one reason or another, could be transferred to needy parishes. Patient enquiry and investigation in this regard easily becomes a historical footnote. Its importance in the overall scheme of efficient and effective management merits greater attention. Pogson’s research makes it possible to evaluate the significance of the Cardinal’s methodical approach and fiscal resourcefulness. The documentary evidence records a system of sourcing and funding that repaid effectively the effort it demanded. Funds were managed in a manner not previously attempted or anticipated. Where the Cardinal’s instructions were faithfully followed – as by Bishop Bonner in London – the resulting record indicates a positive outcome.\(^{586}\) Pole’s insistence on ecclesiastical financial security as a \textit{sine qua non} of his overall strategy can be dismissed as irrelevant. But according to Eamon Duffy, in reality it “takes us to the heart of vision for a renewed English catholicism, his vision of counter-reformation”.\(^{587}\) The churchman heading the Marian drive for religious revival from 1555 onwards was more radical in his aims and more successful in his achievement of them than is generally reckoned.

While Pole was experimenting a strategy for recovery and renaissance of the English Church, the Papacy was entering a new phase of Italian patriotic belligerence. The Neapolitan Paul IV was already embarking upon that career of opposition to the interests of the Hapsburg dynasty which partly defined his reign. A
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tall spare man whose movement and energy belied his seventy-nine years, his eccentricity of manner and temperament was well defined in Pastor’s volume recording his reign.\textsuperscript{588} Cardinal Pole and his sovereigns had to deal with a Pope who “saw the ecclesiastical ideal in the century of Innocent III, when the Papal power was at its zenith”.\textsuperscript{589} He was also fully aware that the cardinals directly under the influence of the Hapsburgs who had attended the conclave that elected him had been instructed not to vote for him and he was not a man to forget or forgive easily.

The other and more affecting disappointment to Mary in 1555 was the failure to give birth to a child. In the spring she had gone to Hampton Court to prepare for her expected delivery.\textsuperscript{590} On 30 April there were tidings in London that a prince had been born, but as quickly came news that it was not so.\textsuperscript{591} The medical circumstances relating to Mary’s condition are considered in a modern study by Elizabeth Furdell.\textsuperscript{592} Whatever the cause, the lack of an heir was a shadow over the relationship of Mary and Philip and raised the spectre of uncertainty about the future. The sources are silent about the prospect of an heir after April. In August, the court moved from Hampton to Oatlands and then returned in state to London via water from Greenwich.\textsuperscript{593} Mary had recently restored the Franciscan Friars Observant there, where she had originally been baptised.\textsuperscript{594} By 29 August the Privy Council was meeting there rather than at Hampton Court.\textsuperscript{595} Mary had to accept the decision of Philip to leave for Brussels to defend his and his father’s interests in the Netherlands. He had long intended it but the
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haste and drama of his departure can all too easily be identified as consequent upon
the failed pregnancy. Perhaps it was, but there is no clear evidence to show it. It is just
as likely that the declining health of his father, and his responsibilities to him and their
dynastic network of territories, weighed heavily on Philip. On 29 August he left
London and by 3 September he had sailed from Dover.⁵⁹⁶

Chapter IV : Resistance and Retribution

1. “The plague of God justly come upon us”

Easter 1555 appears to have marked a kind of turning point in relation to the critical mass of support for the Catholic recovery in London itself. The imperial ambassador wrote that “An incredible number of them took the holy sacrament.”

By June of that year Dr John Story, a layman and Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford, could write to the exiled Edward Courtney, Earl of Devon, that London was “daily drawing partly for love, partly for fear, to conformity…” But the Marian reaction had begun to set in even earlier, as Foxe would later record:

In November [1553] the people, and especially the churchmen, perceiving the queen so eagerly set upon her old religion, they likewise for their parts, to show themselves no less forward to serve the queen’s appetite (as the manner is of the multitude commonly to frame themselves after the humour of the prince and the present time) began in their choirs to set up the pageant of St Katherine, and of St Nicholas, and of their processions in Latin, and all after their old solemnity and their gay gardeviance and grey amices.

In the two years following Mary’s accession quite a lot had happened to realise the worst fears of those who had enjoyed religious dominance in the previous reign and they began to be overwhelmed with the tide of returning Catholicism.
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Wherever it had been weak – and even in London where it had strongest support – the new religion was losing ground to the old. Considering the situation at the beginning of Mary’s reign in July 1553, the omens for continuity did not look very promising. Edward VI, depicted as the biblical ruler Josiah, full of reforming zeal, and idol-smashing, had given way to a ruler who would be compared to Jezebel, notorious in the Bible as the promoter of the worship of Baal and the persecutor of God’s prophets.601 The followers of this hermeneutic believed that they represented biblical purity, sweeping away the impedimenta of superstition and idolatry.602 Hatred of the Mass, with its immutable doctrine of transubstantiation, was at the core of this utter repudiation of traditional religion.603 Now it was to be placed again at the heart of the national religion. Between the position of those who believed in the Catholic Mass and its subsidiary devotions and pieties, and that of repudiation of such doctrines, no compromise was then possible.604 Typical of the hardliners was Thomas Mountain, Parson of St Michael’s Paternoster, in the City of London, who when questioned by Bishop Gardiner whether he would ever say Mass again, replied, “No, my Lord, God willing; never while I live, knowing that I do know; not to be drawn in sunder by wild horses”.605

From the point of view of English Christianity today it is difficult to see how images or the celebration of the Mass could excite such revulsion. Awareness and extent of the iconoclasm that had preceded Mary and would follow her, and deeply

root itself in English Protestantism, is itself a major project of research.\textsuperscript{606} It was an evident problem in England during Cardinal Wolsey’s tenure of office.\textsuperscript{607} The range and variety of the strictures and prohibitions against imagery and the historic form of the celebration of the Eucharist has few contemporary parallels within contemporary Christianity, though much that would be called evangelical religion today is suspicious of ritual and images. The form of this revulsion to traditional Catholicism that coloured the whole of the Edwardine reform movement was – to judge from their writings – almost pathological. Historical development in the Anglican Communion and its modern liturgical approach to Eucharistic celebration are a world away from the mindset that produced Cranmer’s Prayer Book of 1552. Altars, images and vestments, all things anathema to the earliest form of the Anglican Order for Holy Communion, are now a normal feature of worldwide Anglican worship. In Queen Mary’s reign reformation religion radically and vehemently rejected all of these adornments as abuses and aberrations. For most of today’s Catholics in the United Kingdom, the Mass in its ordinary form in the vernacular and with communion under both kinds is normative in parishes. The appearance of many Catholic churches today renders any identification with traditional iconography or continuity of worship from centuries past difficult to discern. This makes it harder to grasp the radical differences of theology and worship of Prayer Book and Missal in Mary’s reign. They were much more evident in the sixteenth century.

With the coming of Mary, immediate support for traditional religion was bound to be accompanied by a backlash against those who had had opposed it in
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Edward’s time. Legal precept as well as communal preference now affected public worship and belief. The religion of old certainties and communal cohesion had been gradually replaced by one changeable by secular mandate. In 1534 the argument of supremacy in the Church seemed a political one between a distant foreigner and the native ruler whose will was enforceable by statute. However, it was not destined to end there. Traditional religion was attacked and although King Henry’s otherwise conservative approach to some essential Catholic doctrines held the line officially, in many the piety of a millennium was steadily undermined. Under Edward VI, parliamentary abolition of the Mass and several sacraments and a campaign of wholesale iconoclasm eviscerated the remaining vitals of Catholicism. The effect of this on many local communities was to unleash the tyranny of religious and also social anarchy. By 1549, it had brought rebellion in the West Country, followed by savage reprisals. In 1553, the unprecedented succession of the first Queen Regnant coincided with her determination to end the novelty of recent religious innovation. The reality of the uncharted road ahead of the first female monarch coupled with her retroaction in favour of the older religious tradition presented a curious paradox. The Crown itself as former arbitrator and promoter of change now sought a return to older religious certainties. The combination of the force of their convictions with previous success versus defiance of the lawful monarch left protagonists of the new religion with the choice of conversion or confrontation. Considering the gains made during the reign of King Edward – and they were many and significant – they had a great deal to lose.
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609 Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549, p. 37.
Mary’s earliest political tactic suggests that she anticipated that she could succeed by persuasion.\textsuperscript{611} Fairly soon, it seems the negative responses to her overtures of peace led to a toughness at odds with her initial clemency.\textsuperscript{612} Providentially she may have believed that her early triumph in succession would be the prelude to overcoming further opposition. This is evident in her second proclamation on religion.

First, her majesty, being presently only by the goodness of God, settled in her just possession of the imperial crown of this realm, and other dominions thereunto belonging, cannot now hide that religion, which God and the world knoweth she hath ever professed, from her infancy hitherto; which her majesty is minded to observe and maintain for herself, by God’s grace, during her time, so doth her highness much desire, and would be glad, the same were of all her subjects quietly and charitably entertained.\textsuperscript{613}

MacCulloch views it as Mary “…gradually recoiling from any prospect of a substantial toleration…” but acknowledges that at the time it was “…widely seen as giving her royal authority for the open celebration of the mass”.\textsuperscript{614} Encouragement of the latter does not necessarily exclude toleration. It may be suggested that if hostile reactions to her cautious approach had not followed she might have inclined less to coercive methods than eventually ensued.

Just a few days before this proclamation the notorious incident of the near-riot and the dagger thrown at Dr Gilbert Bourne, a royal chaplain, at Paul’s Cross had given some indication of hostility that was unwilling to countenance a return to the old order. In Foxe’s account – similar to that of Julius Terentius in a letter written from Strasbourg to John Ab Ulmis, on 20 November, 1553 – Bourne was rescued by
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two evangelical prebendaries of St Paul’s, John Bradford and John Rogers. He states that their calm intervention protected Bourne and prevented a riot. Machyn’s account stresses the role of the Mayor and Edward Courtenay, who, had they not been there, “there had been great mischief done”. Raviglio Rosso’s account states that Bourne was only saved because the Mayor appeased the dissenters by putting another preacher into the pulpit who preached “secundo il costume loro” (after their custom). Following this, Mary’s proclamation focused on law enforcement. Diarmid MacCulloch – essentially following Foxe’s interpretation – sees it as another example of her early move away from toleration. The Council took the whole incident very seriously indeed. The gravity of the incident led to the imprisonment of Bradford and Rogers as “seditious preachers”, after full investigation by the Council. In the case of Bradford he was placed under arrest, while Rogers was committed to the Tower. Rogers had preached an inflammatory sermon on 6 August at Paul’s Cross on “pestilent popery, idolatry and superstition” and exhorted his hearers to remain faithful to King Edward’s religion. Following this, the Council had examined him but let him go. Clearly after the Bourne incident public order became a priority. The implication is evident here that Rogers and Bradford as potential leaders in inciting disorder. Suspicion of the preachers as a source of civil disturbance led to stricter vigilance in respect of them and resulted in a sustained campaign of arrests around the country which netted some of the more illustrious representatives of their calling. The civic authorities of the City also acknowledged the danger of losing their age-old rights of self-governance unless they could assure
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control of the situation within its boundaries. Action against sedition or opposition to “the Queen’s proceedings” is clearly the issue which drove the agenda for the Council. It could not be for heresy since laws against it would not come into force until Mary’s third parliament in the autumn of 1554.

The opposition to Mary’s plans for restoring state support for the majority religion had early and eminent leadership in Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. It was always unlikely that these two, with a history of conflicting interests, would ever be reconciled. He was the architect of all that she abhorred and was inevitably hostile to her restoration of what he had made it his life’s work to undo. He had been the first signatory to King Edward’s will disinheriting Mary and Elizabeth – though he later claimed to have been under pressure from Northumberland. Following Mary’s successful coup he was not immediately arraigned but summoned to appear before the Council to answer questions. After a severe reprimand he was ordered to confine himself to Lambeth Palace. He was still legally functioning as Primate. On 10 August, while the Queen undertook to have a Requiem for the late king celebrated in the Tower by Gardiner, Cranmer in Westminster Abbey officiated at the Prayer Book service for the dead. A rumour went round that the Archbishop had pledged himself to say Mass before the Queen and when it was again publicly set up in Canterbury Cathedral by the vice-Dean he was said to have been behind it. This was too much for a man whose reputation rested solidly on repudiation of the Mass. On 7 September he wrote a passionate denial in which he not only rejected the Mass but
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also denounced it as a device of Satan.624 Publication of this document appears to have been undertaken by John Scory but there is some doubt about this as the manuscript version extant is dated 1557.625 The background to Cranmer’s attack on the Mass was the continuing extension of its restoration and the Queen’s proclamation of 18 August requiring among others things that “… if any man… shall go about to stir the people to disorder or disquiet, she mindeth according to her duty to see the same most severely punished according to her highness’s laws”.626 The Archbishop was no doubt making a stand on what was for him a principle but it was a direct challenge to his lawful sovereign. He was confined in the Tower on 14 September together with Hugh Latimer.627

Effectively Cranmer was now Archbishop in name only and the diocese of Canterbury was administered by the Dean and Chapter of the cathedral. As a metropolitan, originally accorded a papal mandate and the pallium on appointment, and as legatus natus by virtue of his primatial status, in traditional terms a formal process requiring papal approval was needed to formally depose him. His sojourn on the Tower was not the harsh proceeding it had been for former victims of royal displeasure such as Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher. On the contrary, there was a fair degree of comfort and conviviality appropriate to his former position.628 His confinement was followed by that of the two bishops, Miles Coverdale of Exeter and William Barlow of Bath and Wells, on the pretext of debts to the royal exchequer. The position of all the 23 bishops who had been appointed by Edward or had
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acquiesced in his religious settlement was both an issue and a problem for Mary from
the beginning. None of them had committed any crimes but their position was
grounded on a purely legal religious settlement which the Queen did not accept as
lawful or religiously sound. These were leaders who had laboured to impose by law a
pattern of religion she believed alien to the majority of people and to international
law. Parliamentary approval for this policy of total religious revolution beyond even
the spread of schism allowed by her father had been procured in the minority of the
young king. This was for Mary a major argument against the validity of the religious
changes legislated in Edward’s reign. In a conversation with Bishop Ridley in 1552
recorded by Foxe, she stated “… that laws of such magnitude made during the
minority of her half-brother, she could not consider as binding”. 629 She went on to
point out to elucidate the inconsistencies of religious interpretation from the time of
her father compared to Edward’s, justifying her refusal to change. To his suggestion
that she should not refuse God’s word, she responded, “I cannot tell what ye call
God’s word: that is not God’s word now that was God’s word in my father’s day”. 630

Edward’s appointees owed their positions to hostility to Catholic doctrine and
to the Mass in particular. They had mostly emerged from preachers nurtured in the
years when Thomas Cromwell had dominated the political scene and those protected
by Cranmer, significantly in London and the southeast. 631 Wherever they were
appointed there was a sustained campaign against the Mass. Miles Coverdale of
Exeter was a typical exponent of their commitment to change, describing the Mass,
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among other things, as an “abomination”. 632 Coverdale was closely in tune with Nicholas Ridley in London whose reign witnessed the destruction of so much of the medieval religious patrimony of that diocese. On 9 July, before the death of Edward was made public, he had denounced both royal daughters of Henry VIII as “bastards” in a sermon at Paul’s Cross and predicted “…that she [Mary] would bring in foreign power to reign over them, besides subverting also of all Christian religion then already established.” A contemporary source records the popular reaction: “…all the people was sore annoyed with his words so uncharitably spoken by him in so open an audience”. 634

For Mary, these bishops were not only opposed to her religion but they were suspect of disloyalty. A further complication from her point of view was that some of them were invalidly consecrated in a rite devised by Cranmer and lacking essential Catholic elements. All of them held their appointments exclusively by royal mandate and were therefore intruders in canonical terms. The conge d’elire or rite of nomination was one used by many Catholic monarchs and England had been no exception, but before the break with Rome the papal mandate had always been sought and no appointment was valid until it had arrived. In the bull Eius qui immobilis, Pope Paul III had excommunicated Henry VIII and all who had supported or endorsed him, lay or clerical “…fautores, adhaerentes, consultores et sequaces… tam laicos quam clericos…”. 635 Thus every bishop in her dominions at the time of Mary’s succession – not excluding Gardiner – was formally heretical, even if, as in his case materially doctrinally reconciled. Provisional reconciliation could be effected through faculties
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possessed by the legate, Cardinal Pole, essentially a temporary measure pending the restoration of reunion with the Holy See without which there could be no true restoration of Catholic status. David Loades alleges some inconsistency regarding Mary's Catholic credentials in her use of the royal supremacy to remove the bishops appointed by Edward.\textsuperscript{636} Given the unusual and unprecedented nature of the situation, the practicalities of effecting the necessary changes of direction were bound to be pragmatic and piecemeal. In such an extraordinary circumstance Mary could obtain dispensations from Pole for actions which would be retroactively validated later on. The early replacement of bishops of certain attachment to the principles of the Prayer Book religion had to be a priority for the Queen.

Resistance to the continuing restoration of the Mass came from the impeccable source of a legal challenge mounted by Sir James Hales, Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. A man of the strictest propriety, who had actually opposed the alteration of the succession by Northumberland, he now showed the same candour in respect of the early spontaneous celebration of the Mass in Kent.\textsuperscript{637} He judged the priests to be in breach of the law. For this he came under the suspicion of Bishop Gardiner who refused to swear him in at the parliament of October 1553, alleging that he should have greater respect for the Queen’s proceedings. Later imprisoned in the Fleet prison, he made recantation in the presence of Bishop Day, only to repent of it and inflict wounds upon himself in anguish. He was released, but two years later ended his own life by drowning, near Canterbury. Foxe moralises about his end as a warning to all who recant. Among the early arrests for “sedition” were one Fisher, from Amersham; John Melvyn, a Scotsman; seven persons in Bedford; and Mr
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Simmonds, Vicar of St Michael’s, Coventry. In the weeks following the coronation on 1 October 1553, Archbishop Holgate of York was sent to the Tower for contempt. Several other entries in the Acts of the Privy Council indicate arrests of individuals for similar offences in Coventry, and of one Huntingdon from Lynn in Norfolk for “a railing rhyme against….the Blessed Sacrament”.

Officially, Parliament would be the place to test the strength and character of any representative and legal opposition, the very institution that had previously passed the legislation ending Catholic practice and profession. Here less happened than might have been expected, if the mood of opposition to traditional religion suggested by later writers was to be believed. A protest in the form of withdrawal from the civic Mass was expressed by Bishops John Taylor of Lincoln and John Harley of Hereford. The former was sent to the Tower after examination. Records of the parliamentary proceedings in the Lords have been lost but it is certain from available sources that there was some hostility in the Commons to the government’s principal bill abolishing the felonies of praemunire introduced since the time of Henry VIII. The bill was eventually passed with a two-thirds majority. Such resistance as there was seems to have been grounded in a desire to maintain the notion of royal supremacy to guard against any papal pressure to redistribute property originating from previous confiscation, rather than a rejection of traditional religion. Two other bills were lost to the government. One, giving the Queen the right to bequeath the throne as she chose and another to revive the heresy laws lately abolished by the Protector Somerset. The bill dealing with the Queen’s marriage passed easily.

640 Foxe, p. 1434.
642 Ibid.
During the parliamentary sitting Convocation met at St Paul’s and on 18 October there was a disputation between Catholic clergy and those sympathetic to the new religion. It was attended intermittently by many from royal circles and the City but appears to have been inconclusive as the audience “… were never the wiser for it”. In the midst of these gatherings in London a publication in English of Bishop Gardiner’s book *De Vera Obedientia*, with Bonner’s preface, in defence of royal supremacy appeared on the streets. To the acute embarrassment of the lately restored bishops who had previously endorsed its theology, the preface to the new edition ridiculed their *volte face* as “doublefaced and idlebellied”. Gardiner seemed to be a particular target for the opposition. The author of the preface – afterwards identified as John Bale, made Bishop of Ossory by Edward VI and now living abroad – described the Chancellor as “the common cut-throat of England”. This was an initial phase of the future campaign to demonise Gardiner, about which more will be said later in this chapter. A pamphlet also in circulation at this time called on nobles and gentlemen favouring the word of God “to withdraw from the queen and… the hard-hearted detestable papists” and to exterminate Gardiner, described as “the great devil… before he can poison the people and wax strong in religion”. This perhaps represents an early perception on the part of the opposition that Gardiner is a person to be reckoned with. But was it because of his skills in persuasion or his powers of prosecution? As a key figure in the political field and a long-serving and capable one at that, he undoubtedly represented a vigorous prosecutor of the regime’s policy or retrenchment. Printed pamphlets proliferated around London during these months.
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They predicted a short reign with retribution for the Chancellor, and of rebellions to come.\textsuperscript{648} In December, the “seditious moving of the inhabitants of Maidstone to the framing of a Supplication for retaining still their new religion”, by William Smith, led to his examination by the Privy Council.\textsuperscript{649} Similar religious dissent provoked letters in January 1554, requesting action for Sir Henry Tirrel in Sandon, Essex, and with the same purpose in Colchester to Lord Rich and Sir John Wentworth in February. Sir Henry received further instructions to deal with dissenters in Ongar, later in the year, particularly “…all such that shall condemn the Queen’s Highness’ orders set forth in religion, and keep themselves from coming to Divine Service”\textsuperscript{650}.

Whether in response to the government’s early clampdown on public dissent or as well thought out strategy for survival, there were early moves on the part of a serious number in the upper echelons of the Protestant minority to go into exile.\textsuperscript{651} Either way, it was previous to any punitive laws against them although Foxe describes it as a response to persecution. Christina Garrett, whose book on the subject, written in 1938, remains the principal study of the identity of the exiles, sees the departure to the continent of up to 800 in terms of a migration of the intelligentsia which had William Cecil as its inspiration and sponsor. She also suggests that Bishop Gardiner encouraged it to remove potential leadership figures.\textsuperscript{652} Stephen Muller had earlier stated that Gardiner used the threat of a summons to encourage departures but implied that it was used for foreigners, basing his judgement on a letter of Renard’s.\textsuperscript{653} Whether by choice or by apprehension of trouble ahead, this was the first major
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response of the gospellers to the changing scene and it occurred well before any overt
persecution for strictly religious heterodoxy had begun. Rather than conform or
openly resist, this group chose exile and – as it turned out – later constituted a
powerful and persistent source of hostile publicity aimed at the regime they had
escaped. 654 Among those joining this exodus were academics from the universities.
Within a short time of Mary’s accession Stephen Gardiner was appointed Chancellor
of Cambridge and Sir John Mason to Oxford. By 20 August, Mary was writing to
them to see that “all scholars, servants and others under you to live as appointed by
the ancient statutes”. 655 In an exodus of a considerable number of the more capable
talent of the Protestant persuasion, up to 60 graduates from Oxford and 76 from
Cambridge joined such luminaries as Peter Martyr (Vermigli) and Edwin Sandys in
their escape to the continent. The importance and significance of the purge and re-
branding of the universities as centres of orthodoxy would be one of the major planks
of reconstruction of intellectual Catholicism. 656 Further reference to this
transformation will be made in chapter V.

The events of early 1554 introduced a new and greater threat to Mary’s
security, overtly centred upon her choice of husband: Wyatt’s rebellion – arguably in
equal measure motivated in opposition to her marital plans as against the revival of
traditional religion. It seems to have sharpened her awareness of the potential for
political instability manifested by militant supporters of the new religion. The high
water mark of armed protest may have been reached with this revolt. The conspiracy
of a handful of disaffected gentry condensed into a plot to force a change of monarch
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upon the country with the intention of simultaneously halting the Spanish match and Catholic revival. The first overt challenge to Mary’s plans of marriage to a foreigner had taken the form of a peaceful deputation from members of both Houses in October 1553 to persuade her against it. Her personally worded rebuke to them on that occasion had been firm, immediate and unequivocal. She displayed a typically robust and determined Tudor attitude to what looked to her less like counsel and more akin to lèse majesté.

If we may agree with the historian David Loades in regard to her successful coup in July 1553 that … “in one sense Mary’s bid was the only successful rebellion against a Tudor government, in another (and far more important) sense the dynasty had survived its most dangerous crisis”, so the spectre raised by Wyatt’s conspiracy was as much one of armed rebellion against the lawful monarch as of resistance to religious retrenchment. Nevertheless Wyatt’s conspiracy looks suspiciously like an attempt at the crystallization of minority religious discontent into an armed movement centred in parts of the country with sizeable sectors of adherents to radical religion. The official account of it assumes that disaffection with the increasing ascendancy of traditional religion was at the heart of the conspiracy. David Loades insists political and secular motives underpinned the revolt and the accusation of a religious motive was entirely the creation of Mary. Judith Richards declares that “the conspirators were united less by a shared religious position than by a fear of imminent Spanish
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domination.” John Edwards, is of the view that the revolt was focused on “regime change.” Linda Porter includes “uncertainties about the role of a female ruler” among other familiar causes. French interference is not doubted by anybody. No conclusive proof of Elizabeth’s complicity was ever found. The religious character of the revolt may have been obscured by Wyatt’s refusal to overtly present it as the cause but history identifies religious discontent leading up to it. Susan Brigden traces several strands of popular and printed activities in London associated with the mood of religious dissidence against the Spanish marriage. She also believes that the spoliation of Bishop Gardiner’s library by Wyatt’s rebels suggests a Protestant vendetta. Bishop Ponet, Gardiner’s Protestant successor in Winchester was among Wyatt’s advisors during the rebellion. He had been appointed to that see by King Edward and was reported as saying, “he would pray unto God for their [the rebels] good success”. The solely political credentials of Wyatt are placed in doubt by contemporary accounts though the crucial phrase on religion is missing in the transcript of Machyn’s diary. Circumstantial evidence that the revolt hinged on strong affiliation to the Protestant cause was the fact that no prominent figure engaged in it can claim to have had Catholic sympathies. It was treason associated with religious dissidence in a manner too readily connected to be seen as a coincidence. There can be little doubt that its seriously de-stabilising potential shaped the view of both the Council and Queen Mary. Investigations concluded that the aims of the
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conspirators could only have been accomplished by Mary’s deposition. The time for leniency now gave way to stronger indications of enforcement. The Chancellor, Bishop Gardiner, gave voice to his own sharpening reaction in a sermon preached in the presence of Mary and her courtiers on 11 February:

... he asked a boon of the queen’s highness that like as she [the Queen] had extended her mercy, particularly and privately, so through her lenity and gentleness much conspiracy and open rebellion was grown ... which he brought then in for the purpose that she would now be merciful to the whole of the commonwealth, and conservation thereof, which could not be unless the rotten and hurtful members thereof were cut off and consumed.

It seems that Bishop Gardiner had perceived the threat that dissidents posed in very stark terms. On this evidence Foxe attributes to the Chancellor the initiation of the later policy of burning those convicted of heresy and also claims him as the first – perhaps the only one – among those first in favour of it to abandon it. But surely this is to antedate the persecution to a year before the heresy trials began. Those trials for heresy commenced a year later, in the spring of 1555. Gardiner was a key figure in the London prosecutions that year but he was dead by November. A recent article has examined the gradual taking shape of the figure of Gardiner as “wily Winchester” and the “common cut-throat” in the polemic of persecution. His demonization reflected a need to provide a focus for the increasing bitterness of the gospellers at their failure to gain the upper hand. Gardiner represented the most powerful force for reaction in the reigns of Henry and Edward and became the architect of Mary’s early parliamentary attempts to restore full Catholicism. His intellectual and persuasive
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powers also made him a formidable opponent, easily attracting the hatred of the opposition due to his high office. His image as inconstant due to his abandonment of royal supremacy also proved an easy stick with which to beat him. Yet he cannot be claimed evidentially as an enthusiastic persecutor of heresy.\footnote{Foxe , p. 1047.} Foxe expanded and moulded the ultimate propaganda image of Gardiner as a combination of all that was hostile to the Protestant cause and included the accusation – on the flimsiest of evidence – that he had actively sought the death of the Princess Elizabeth.\footnote{Ibid. 1060-63.} Thus Gardiner continued in legend to be the arch-villain of the epic evangelical struggle over three reigns and passed into history as the mainstay of Marian persecution.

In 1554, aside from obvious rebellion, prosecution for sedition was the only punishment available to the government against those who were deemed to be vocally and actively militant. It took various forms. An expansion of the verbal and literary means of dissent was developing as a major weapon for the opposition and a target for official prosecution. The Council noted an increase in attacks on Mary and her religion by the spread of “seditious rumours” and by anonymous and often scurrilous printed tracts.\footnote{APC, vol. V, 28, 29, 30 & 34.} Though obviously a recurring irritant in general, these portents of imminent disaster failed to rally sufficient support to ensure a successful rebellion. Neither xenophobia nor religious zeal proved a spur to parts of the country, other than Kent, to join Wyatt’s forces – though 500 of London’s trained militia went over to him.\footnote{Queen Jane and Queen Mary, pp. 38-39. Wriothesley’s Chronicle, vol. II, p. 108.} When the Duke of Suffolk tried to rouse towns from Surrey to Warwickshire through which he rode to garner support, his speeches and even his money failed to move the masses. If the attitude of the members in the parliament of 1553 indicates
anything, there was never much chance of support for rebellion among the ruling class. Jennifer Loach’s extensive research shows that despite historical insistence to the contrary, militant opposition to Mary’s marriage involved four members of the Commons: Sir Peter Carew, Sir Edward Rogers, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton and Sir Edward Warner.\textsuperscript{679} The conspirators may have believed that support for their aims was more widespread. They were deceived in this. From across the Channel, tacit support was offered by Henry II who, it appears, never really thought much of their chances of success.\textsuperscript{680} Renard was convinced of French involvement in a conspiracy from December onwards.\textsuperscript{681} The extent of it is well documented in Harbison’s study of diplomacy during Mary’s reign.\textsuperscript{682} Dynastic rivalry far removed from religious zeal motivated the French king’s policy. Northumberland had sought his support for his own dynastic schemes but Henry already had a candidate of his own in Mary Queen of Scots soon to be married to the Dauphin. She was cousin to the English Queen and a Catholic. Should disaster befall the Tudors, France looked to gain much from the succession. There is evidence that in reality de Noailles was contemptuous of both Mary and Elizabeth and was hopeful for the prospects of the young Scottish Queen.\textsuperscript{683}

Despite the government victory over the rebels, the failure to procure a conviction of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton was reported to be a major setback for the Queen. Renard wrote that the jury which refused to convict him were “heretics to a man” and that the Queen was upset for days about the verdict.\textsuperscript{684} Her reaction seems
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to bear out the report of displeasure. The recalcitrance of the jury was punished with imprisonment for a time. Religion looks like being at the root of their truculence and the evidence of the trial also points to it being a major factor in the defendant’s part in the plot. Sir Nicholas certainly admitted it as a motive. His able and eloquent defence of his innocence of anything other than spoken dissent and apprehension of Spanish brutalities procured his acquittal. Ironically, it was Mary’s own abolition of her father’s law, incriminating conversations as treasonable, and reverting to a more humane statute of Edward III that formed the basis of his defence. Essentially, he was being indicted under a statute no longer in force.

The Throckmorton family was mixed in its support for both the new and the old religion. Sir Nicholas himself, though Protestant in belief, claimed that he had been the secret informant of Mary regarding Edward’s death. A letter written by Cecil to Mary exonerates him of consenting to oppose her succession. The maintenance of the legal succession may have inspired him but he found the prospect of the Queen’s marriage to Philip of Spain unacceptable, fearing both its religious and political impact. If a conviction had been determined, only the Queen’s pardon would have saved him. Sir Nicholas owed his religious views to foreign influences but his politics were strictly insular. At home, his conviction might have opened the way for a trial of Courtenay and Elizabeth. The aftermath of Wyatt’s revolt brought about the comfortable confinement of Elizabeth in the Tower. It probably spelt the beginning of a more distant approach to her from Mary. Following her release for the Tower
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after three months, she was sent from the court into the keeping of Sir Henry Bedingfield, a loyal supporter of Mary.\textsuperscript{691} Her half-sister remained both inscrutable and overtly compliant.

Mary’s victory over Wyatt gave her the second major political advantage after her successful coup against Northumberland. London had stayed loyal. But, was it dependable? Mary did not think so. She considered moving her next parliament to Oxford and for the next few months the relationship between her and the City cooled with intermittent manifestations of discontent and mockery of the traditional religion carried on by its opponents.\textsuperscript{692} Mary and her government responded to the rebels with greater severity than that shown to the conspirators in the previous July. There were hangings at various points in the City.\textsuperscript{693} It is difficult not to view this as a lesson in terror typical of the period. Lady Jane Grey and her husband Lord Guildford Dudley suffered the extremes of the law for the treason of her previously pardoned father, the Duke of Suffolk who also was executed. Less significant culprits received more merciful treatment. Marched to Whitehall with halters round the necks, some 400 of the rebels knelt before the Queen and were pardoned.\textsuperscript{694} Foreign representatives of the new religion were targeted for exclusion. On 17 February a proclamation ordering all unknown “stranger” merchants not “denizens” of the city to depart within 14 days on pain of loss of goods or imprisonment.\textsuperscript{695} It suggests a genuine apprehension on the part of the government that the volume of foreigners in some way contributed to the dissent in the capital. The time had also come to deal with this threat and with the

\textsuperscript{691} Foxe, p. 2121.
published attacks from abroad. An increasing stream of printed libels — mostly from the pens of the religious exiles — was threatening not only stability but legitimacy. The content and menace of these tracts were identified then and later as intolerable to any government of the period. Archbishop Parker, himself later a major figure of the Elizabethan establishment, declared that such books as were published in Mary’s reign made him “shudder as he read them”, for,

… if such principles be spread unto men’s heads, as now they be framed, and referred to the judgement of subjects to discuss what is tyranny, and to discern whether his prince, landlord, his master, is a tyrant – by his own fancy and collection supposed; what Lord of he Council shall ride quietly minded in the streets among such desperate beasts? What minister shall be sure in his bedchamber?696

If Mary was indeed frustrated by the failure to convict Throckmorton she did was found more positive events to distract her. Major religious events in London attended by the Queen demonstrated not only the reviving strength of Catholicism but were also reminders of its former splendour.697 The gospellers responded with two well publicised gestures of contempt. First, a vested cat with a tonsure and clutching a paper made to look like a host was hung upon a gallows in Cheapside.698 Then a violent attack upon a priest carrying the Blessed Sacrament by a man wielding a dagger also caused a stir.699 During May, five individuals were set in the pillory for “lies and seditious words” against the Queen and her Council. 700 These random incidents, regularly noted as examples of universal discord need to be weighed against the contemporary reports by the same writers of growing and popular response to the returning Catholic rituals. The Queen now went further along the road to enforcement
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of the parliamentary acts in favour of the traditional religion passed by her first parliament. The *Injunction to the Bishops* issued in the spring of 1554 set out specific standards of religious observance and they were also intended to deal with subversive publicity. They exhibited a more robust approach and a less conciliatory tone to dissenters than earlier proclamations. They were framed in an atmosphere that signalled more direct intervention and greater control. The *realpolitik* that rebellion had impressed upon Mary that the formerly triumphant minority would not fall into line without coercion manifested itself in precise terms as her accompanying letter indicates:

And remembering our duty to Almighty God, and very much to our regret and evil contention, and to the no little slander of other Christian realms, and in a manner, to the subversion and clear defacing of this our realm: and remembering our duty to Almighty God to be, to foresee, as much as in us may be, that with all virtue and godly living should be embraced, flourish, and therewith also, that all vice and ungodly behaviour should be utterly banished and put away, or, at the least wise, so nigh as might be bridled and kept under that godliness and honesty might have the over hand; understanding by every credible report and public fame, to our no small heaviness and discomfort… the like disorder hath been done and used like to continue and increase, unless due provision be had to reform the same…”

The emphases outlined in the injunctions which followed struck at the heart of the cherished gains so recently acquired in the previous reign. The disorders provoked by the supporters of the new religion were now attributed to the breakdown in former disciplines dating from the time of Henry VIII. What the preachers regarded as freedom to choose, the Queen regarded as licence to corrupt. The bishops were to immediately suspend use of the Oath of Supremacy; to prevent suspected

---

sacramentaries (i.e. those who denied the efficacy and necessity of all seven sacraments) from being appointed; deal with heresies among the clergy; suppress books and ballads causing discord; remove married priests and religious; restore processions; use Latin; baptize and confirm as of tradition; preach sound sermons and examine school masters to ensure their doctrinal orthodoxy; and lastly, ensure that children can follow the Mass.

Few historians have given much direct attention to these injunctions. But Roger Dixon an Anglican historian writing in the nineteenth century has.\textsuperscript{703} He considers it significant “that the former discipline was to be restituted in whatever way” and views the method used as exhibiting “much of the Tudor management” rather than an exercise of the royal supremacy.\textsuperscript{704} In preparation for the forthcoming second parliament of the reign Mary deprived seven married Edwardine bishops. In a formal use of distinctive styles of documentation, the letters of deprivation to the former religious (Robert Holgate of York, Robert Ferrar of St David’s, John Bird of Chester and Paul Bush of Bristol) were in Latin while those to the seculars (John Taylor of Lincoln, John Hooper of Worcester and John Harley of Hereford) were in English. Now that statute law enacted by her first parliament was the same as that required by the Church, they could no longer legally hold office and be married. It was yet another indication of Mary’s determination to pursue legal redress of former changes and of the increasing weakness of the lately all-powerful forces of the former regime. The incoming Catholics bishops were: Nicholas Heath to Worcester, George

\textsuperscript{703} History of the Church of England, vol. IV, pp. 132-135,  
\textsuperscript{704} Ibid. p. 135,
Day to Chichester, Robert Parfew (or Wharton) to Hereford, John Holyman to Bristol, George Cotes to Chester, John White to Lincoln, Henry Morgan to St David’s.\textsuperscript{705}

In 1554, Easter fell on the 25 March (one of the earliest dates it can occur). Preceded by Palm Sunday the previous week, the Holy Week ceremonies leading up to it would be celebrated with Catholic rites for the first time since the introduction of the Prayer Book in 1549. Welcomed by the many who had endured its abolition it would be another indication to the minority of ground lost. As part of the \textit{Injunctions} mentioned already, it was preceded by the deprivation of all married clergy who refused to part from their wives, by the painting out of the biblical texts from the walls of the churches and by an exhortation for all of age to do so to fulfil their annual Easter duty of Confession and Holy Communion at Mass.\textsuperscript{706} The narration of the return of the Holy Week ceremonies was the occasion for Foxe to record with evident satisfaction the stealing of a Host from one London church.\textsuperscript{707} On the political front, questions still remained of what to do about Elizabeth, whose profile as a figurehead of the Protestant cause was not in doubt, despite the fact that she was outwardly conforming. The illicit printing campaign continued throughout 1554 clearly identified her as its heroine. Pamphlets and books appeared in London which among other things looked to Elizabeth as England’s saviour, attacked Philip and the Spaniards and predicted dire warnings of apocalyptic disasters still to come.\textsuperscript{708} Despite this adverse propaganda neither the regime nor the Queen’s marriage plans were derailed. Within months, another step toward full Catholic integration, negotiations for the return of Cardinal Pole, were successfully concluded.
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Reconciliation of the realms to the Holy See was a further major political and religious success for Mary, the first Queen Regnant. By any unbiased view it represents a remarkable outcome for a woman who eighteen months previously looked to have stood small chance of even succeeding to the crown.

The strength of the regime seemed assured and the prospect of an heir who would eventually consolidate its gains no doubt helped. At the centre there was solidity but the peripheries were still plagued by the persistence of the seditious preachers and their prevalence in and around London and the southeast. Imprisonment appeared to be neither a deterrent nor a solution and further and more stringent measures seemed to be necessary.\(^{709}\) Perhaps accidentally or consequentially, with the parliamentary stamp of approval for full Catholic restoration came the revival of the legal sanctions to deal with those who were deemed to represent a threat to it. By the beginning of 1555, with the Legate now living in London and the realms restored to full unity with Rome, the full weight of the campaign to drive home the message began to swing into action. As Eamon Duffy has recently pointed out, the action against the most intransigent of those arrested was not carried out in isolation or univocally. Rather it was part of a wider strategy to capture minds and hearts in a battle which both sides saw as almost cosmic and needing to be won outright.\(^{710}\) The strategy always and everywhere included an intellectual and literary defence of the faith and was not just the exercise of blind vindictiveness against a minority.\(^{711}\)

Similarly — as in his heavily nuanced manner — even Foxe indicates, in the lengthy accounts he provides, the decision to finally hand defendants over to penal execution was only taken after the most laborious attempts to persuade them to recant or
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conform.\textsuperscript{712} Any attempt to comment on the series of executions which followed from 1555-1558 must take into account not only the rigour of the process but also the element of redemption which the hunters sought to procure for the hunted. In almost every case they would have preferred to receive back those they regarded as lost rather than condemn them to what they regarded as much spiritual as physical death.

The first instances of public execution by burning began in February.\textsuperscript{713} As already mentioned in Chapter II, they were followed by a period of abeyance of the prosecution usually attributed to a sermon by Alfonso de Castro, a Dominican chaplain to King Philip.\textsuperscript{714} During that time, a conspiracy, led by a Cambridge Protestants, came to the notice of the Council.\textsuperscript{715} Michiel, the Venetian ambassador, reported to his superiors that people now expected severe measures on the part of the government.\textsuperscript{716} To make matters worse, a copy of the bull of Pope Paul IV against the alienation of church property was sent into England by the Protestant exiles in Italy and caused a major upset.\textsuperscript{717} The extent and vigour of the policy of restraint and retribution of the disaffected would fall largely on the shoulders of those in authority, both in government and locally. How committed to such were they?

In general it may be argued that the loyalties of the ruling class were to the government of the day. A conservative tendency among the majority of them would make them less inclined to the new religion which was after all, as a recent historian has described it, “religion of protest”.\textsuperscript{718} There was only one peer who opposed the

\textsuperscript{712} Ibid, pp. 143-44.
\textsuperscript{713} Machyn, Diary, p. 81. Chronicle of the Grey Friars, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{714} Foxe, p. 1553.
\textsuperscript{716} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{718} Heal, F., Reformation in Britain and Ireland (Oxford, 2003), p. 248.
complete restoration of Catholicism in November 1554. As a possible indication of their lack of serious commitment to the new religion, only a handful of the gentry and none of the nobility perished in the burnings of those who were declared heretics. Some of earliest restorations of the Mass were at the insistence of local gentry. To the majority, the stability of government – as long as it meant no material loss – was what counted most. The parliamentary opposition that might have coalesced into a major opposition melted away once the perception that no challenge to the security of their new acquisitions was to be mounted by Church or State. Only four members of the Commons were prepared to take their opposition to the point of open revolt. Some of the most prominent of the Tudor grandees, such as the first Earl of Bedford, died apparently in the bosom of the Catholic Church. It is arguable that he is more representative of the majority than someone like Lady Knyvet, who remained staunchly Protestant and undisturbed in a life that spanned four reigns. William Cecil, a rising star in the political firmament and the founder of one of the most famous of English political dynasties, was from the outset committed to the new religion. However, he was chosen as one of the official delegation sent to Brussels to escort Cardinal Pole back to England.

The evidence is formidable, that it was generally “covetousness” that underlay most of the upper class opposition to Catholic restoration, just as it influenced support for the Reformation. The following example may serve to illustrate the point.

---
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Thomas Thacker of Repton in Derbyshire was not slow to recognise the potential danger that Catholic revival posed to his previous gains.

… alarmed with the news that Queen Mary had set up the abbeys again (and fearing how large a reach such a precedent might have) upon a Sunday (belike the better day the better deed) called together the carpenters and masons of that county, and plucked down in one day … a most beautiful church belonging thereunto, [Repton Priory] saying, ‘He would destroy the nest, for fear the birds should build therein again.’

The motive in this case is not difficult to detect. It was certainly not religious fervour. The conclusion that economic considerations sometimes played their part in decisions for or against religious persuasion is inescapable. Relatively, the expense of a Catholic over a Protestant form of worship could have been decisive. Thacker’s action is far from unique. It exemplifies the greed that took advantage of circumstances to consolidate its gains. Even allowing for rhetorical effect, the avarice of the time is echoed in a sermon preached at the court of Edward VI — who was absent on the occasion — by Bernard Gilpin, Rector of Easington in Durham and a nephew of Cuthbert Tunstall. Describing “… now the robberies, and open oppression of covetous cormorants, have no end nor limits, no banks to keep in their vileness … thousands in England, through such, beg now from door to door …” Doubt regarding his sincerity is arguable. He conformed under Mary and became Archdeacon to his uncle but later he accepted the Elizabethan settlement. It is also possible that he was a genuine advocate of conscientious concern. His pastoral priorities in this sermon appear to be more related to social justice than to severance
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with the past. Genuine or rhetorical, the social misfortunes arising from the greed for plunder are identified elsewhere.\textsuperscript{735} The willingness of those who could to profit from the asset-stripping of churches and their attendant charities led to the deprivations that abounded by the end of Edward’s reign.\textsuperscript{736} Sermons preached by both Latimer and Ridley in London in 1549 and 1550 denounced the “devouring spirit of covetousness which now so universally reigns”.\textsuperscript{737}

The interests of stability and security rather than religious attachment continued to dominate parliamentary debates.\textsuperscript{738} A law was enacted making it treason for those who openly wished that the Queen might die or change her religious views.\textsuperscript{739} The hard core of opposition on religious grounds, defying the law forbidding preaching and public declaration against the faith, or obstinate refusal to conform to ecclesiastical law and regulation in church were mostly individuals of little political influence. The consensus of revolt lay in repudiation of Catholic doctrines on liturgy and biblical interpretation. Though not all uniform in approval of its contents, loyalty to the rites set forth in the \textit{Book of Common Prayer} also gave a focus of unity to the cause. Nevertheless, it is clear that divisions existed and were deep in areas such as support for episcopacy and liturgical experiment.\textsuperscript{740} More radical views were certainly well represented among dissidents. How many of those who suffered the ultimate penalty in Mary’s reign would have been considered dissident and criminal in the previous reigns is not easy to assess.\textsuperscript{741} Anabaptists
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have been identified among those considered heretics both in Edward’s reign and in Mary’s. The term is one that has been applied fairly loosely to extremists and the exact nature of their creed is difficult to define. It may be understood to include anyone who refused to accept established ecclesiastical order of any kind. There is no doubt that it was considered a threat by the Protectorate as the following reference shows.

At the time [1547] he [Gardiner] and Ridley were appointed to deal with the Anabaptists of Kent: for divers of that sect had lately fled from Germany hither; and began to infect the realm with odd and heretical opinions: and particularly spoke contempuously of the holy sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.

Again, in 1552, further action was deemed to be necessary.

A commission was directed this year, dated October, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and other worshipful persons in Kent, to make enquiry after sundry heresies lately sprung up; and after the examination and punishment of erroneous opinions, as it seems, of the Anabaptists and Arians; of which sort some now, notwithstanding former severities, showed their heads.

A recent study of the situation in Kent offers some interesting insights into the complexity and composition of religious dissidence there. Those who might be described as “the disaffected” were minority communities who in most cases avoided confrontation with the authorities and some of whom took refuge in Calais, little more

---
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than 20 miles from the coast. Some who stayed and openly protested were detected in visitations to the Canterbury diocese made in the years of Pole’s primacy.\textsuperscript{746}

The areas of confrontation with Catholic doctrine that Foxe includes in his transcripts of interrogations subsequently became mainstream Protestant opinions.\textsuperscript{747} They included disagreement on papal primacy, ministry, interpretation of scripture, the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Denials of Catholic teaching on such doctrines largely make up Foxe’s account since questions about them formed the basis of the bishops’ enquiries. More radical elements of doctrinal disagreement also surfaced in some cases, which would have made such individuals heretical in the eyes of mainstream Protestants but it is clear that Foxe chose to omit these details, providing in such cases only the name of the victim.\textsuperscript{748} Of the 312 people whom Foxe reports were burned or died in prison the reasons for the arrest of 108 of them are unknown.\textsuperscript{749} As it stands therefore it cannot be ascertained with absolute certainty how many of those burnt were radical even by the standards of Reformation consensus.\textsuperscript{750} Foxe published several editions of \textit{Acts and Monuments} between 1563 and 1583. The last is an enlargement of the others. One famous incident of prosecution refers to the “Maidstone seven”, burnt on the King’s Meadow, on 18 June 1557, about which Foxe had written evidence which clearly indicated that these victims were indeed radically heretical in their opinions against the Trinity and the
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humanity of Christ. Foxe suppressed this information because by the time of writing such radicalism was out of step with Elizabethan religion.\textsuperscript{751}

The legal framework for the prosecutions, which Foxe scarcely mentions was not just Mary’s support for it but parliamentary legislation. Only political and property considerations prevented its passing into law in April 1554.\textsuperscript{752} The revival of the law de haeretico comburendo, against heresy – originally framed to punish Lollardy in the early fifteenth century and only lately abolished by the Protector Somerset in 1547 – was debated for the second time in the reign in Mary’s third parliament in the autumn of 1554. It passed rapidly and unopposed in December.\textsuperscript{753} Diarmaid MacCulloch’s contention that the bill was introduced “reluctantly” may be true, but its passage was hardly slow. Canon Dixon’s judgement, “No bill ever went through Parliament as quickly as this”, is revealing.\textsuperscript{754} Once all doubt relating to property was removed, acceptance of the bill followed.\textsuperscript{755}

The ideological and political raison d’
\textit{etre} as well as the progress and consequence of Mary Tudor’s Catholic revival have received fresh treatment in Eamon Duffy’s study \textit{Fires of Faith}. His arguments reversing the judgement of the sequence of failures attributed to the regime because of its most notorious policy of the burning of 286 convicted heretics are compelling. He also extends the responsibility well beyond the usual suspects of the Queen and her bishops. The commission included Privy
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Councillors, officers of state, grandees, local magistrates, clergy and lawyers and – often forgotten — many local worthies. The reality of the collective responsibility of those closest to the Queen, such as King Philip, Cardinal Pole, Bishop Gardiner and the Privy Council, as well as the bishops, and the wider political elite for the persistent prosecution and support for the policy is convincingly affirmed. It is clear that some victims were detected by persistent non-conformity: behaviour in church or failure to attend. Hostile reaction to the ceremonies of the church, particularly the Mass, betrayed heretical sympathies. Following the Marian emphasis on the Catholic liturgy as the cornerstone of reform, it is hardly surprising that support for it should be seen as the supreme touchstone of orthodoxy. Given its wholesale rejection during the previous reign it comes as no surprise that respect and reverence for it should not only be legally enforced but failure to honour it be seen as unlawful as well as suspect. Among the London prosecutions the charge “denial of the Mass” was prominent. It is the aspect of prosecution which Foxe commonly and securely emphasises at a time when legal rejection of the doctrine was a hallmark of Elizabethan religion. Polemic against the Mass runs through Foxe’s writing. A full translation into English of the Sarum Rite, with its rubrics, is provided, not for instruction but for denigration. It is clear that the gospellers devoted a great deal of their sharpest literary output to condemning the Mass. John Rogers, one of the ministers who was burnt for heresy on 11 February, 1555, described the Mass as “…the idolatrous Mass, with all like superstitious trumpery…” Rowland Taylor, also a minister, in a letter to his wife just before he too became a victim to the flames at Hadleigh in Essex, gave free literary rein to his antipathy:
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Yet they will be called catholics faithful and true Christian people, defenders of the holy mother church: but truly they take part with the prince of darkness, with Antichrist, with Jezebel. They will not be called papists, Pharisees, Jews, Turks, heretics and so forth: but whatsoever they will be called, God’s religion had never more evident adversaries.  

He was likewise forthright in his repudiation of the Mass:

The mass as it is now, is but one of Antichrist’s youngest daughters, in which the Devil is rather present and received than our Saviour, the Second Person in the Trinity, God and man. O Lord God, heavenly Father, for Christ’s sake we beseech thee to turn again England to the right way it was in, in King Edward’s time, from this Babylonical, Jewish, spiritual whoredom, conspiracy, tyranny, detestable enormities, false doctrine, heresy, hardness of heart and contempt of thy word…

The ferocity in these sentiments not only provides a flavour of the force of repudiation of the Mass but explains the bitterness of the hostility to it which brought him into conflict with the law then in force.

Such published and broadcast opinions were identified as equally attacks on the State itself and on the Sovereigns as upon their religion. The identification of this type of religious disaffection – criminal since Mary’s first parliament – and sedition, which was likewise a crime, seemed unavoidable. The application of the revived laws against heresy gave the government once again the ultimate sanction of prosecuting it as a capital offence. For persistent offenders the courts and the authorities simply ran out of patience and applied the full weight of the law. Their repeated offences ensured that the officials had no difficulty in finding evidence to justify its continued
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crackdown on the disaffected.⁷⁶⁴ Overt treasonable intent was never far from detection. At the same time, the official policy was not slow to emphasise the need for vigilance and the nature of the threat. One of the most effective Catholic polemics against the protestant backlash, Miles Hogarde’s Displaying of the Protestants, provides the clearest definition of their perceived danger, observing that treason was the “handmaid of heresy”.⁷⁶⁵ Though there was general acquiescence in Mary’s accession, as consolidation of the Catholic revival became apparent the opposition sometimes became more flagrant in its rhetoric. John Rogers, already mentioned, who perished at Smithfield on 4 February 1556, was typical of this genre: “...king Henry VIII, in his time made his daughter the Queen that now is, a bastard ... the queen that now is hath repealed the act that made her a bastard ....”⁷⁶⁶ Another dissident called Bartlett Green described the Queen as “not yet dead”, in a manner sufficient to warrant the condemnation of the Privy Council.⁷⁶⁷ It is significant that these slanders, as well as written libels were made in response to Mary’s legitimacy as Queen. The writers and preachers of these views felt justified in their opposition. The basis of it was Mary’s failure — in their opinion — to rule “according to God’s word” which rendered obedience to her questionable.⁷⁶⁸ Original non-acquiescence eventually became stoic resistance. Rowland Taylor of Hadleigh, an early victim, wrote a letter in defiance of the recent laws passed by parliament – without opposition in the Lords and by a majority of 270 to 80 in the Commons – voting in October 1553 to restore the Mass.⁷⁶⁹ The law actually was framed in part against the publication of the views that he held. The preamble to the bill made clear its rationale in setting aside the
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previous religious settlement as “new things devised by a few from the singularity of their own minds … strange opinions and diversities of sects … unquietness and discord…”

Regardless of the doctrinal position which the dissidents sought to defend and promote, or their vulnerability to persecution, their use or abuse of religious conviction as a means to promote dissent amounted to sedition. The regime had basically closed ranks against them and was politically unwilling to allow them space or platform for their inflammatory views. Their stridency sometimes alarmed even their co-religionists. In a letter to Calvin in Geneva from David Whitehead and others in Frankfurt, dated 20 September, 1555, the views expressed in a recent pamphlet by Knox would, he said:

…supply their enemies with just ground for overturning the whole Church. For there were interspersed in this publication atrocious and horrible calumnies against the Queen of England, whom Knox called at one time the wicked Mary, at another time a monster. And he exasperated King Philip also by language not much less violent… This we can assure you, that that outrageous pamphlet of Knox’s added much oil to the flame of persecution in England. For before the publication of that book not one of our brethren had suffered death, but as soon as it came forth, we doubt not but that you are well aware of the number of excellent men who have perished in the flames …

Though the persecution is clearly unjustifiable, for modern sensibilities, the death penalty was at that time and for several centuries thereafter a visible deterrent. Almost certainly its use for a set of beliefs subsequently adopted as the national religion, vigorously propagated and uniquely tolerated for centuries, makes it peculiarly paradoxical. Modern notions of religious freedom in the western world
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make it seem bizarre. Not long after Mary’s death her record of persecution was being excoriated even as contemporary prisoners and felons were regularly being horribly executed in different parts of Queen Elizabeth’s dominions, and in her reign and for several thereafter scores of women were hanged for alleged witchcraft. This does not excuse Mary’s religious persecution but allows it to be seen in its temporal context. In later and a scarcely less scaremongering situation the propaganda of the cruelty of Mary’s policy became a useful weapon in the political campaign to demonise all Catholic monarchs. For a very long time it became an essential ingredient in the culture of anti-Catholicism as a crucible of national identity and independence.

The relatively short period of time during which the persecution lasted did procure for it a reputation and intensity hardly equalled. Up to now there appears to have been no consensus among historians as to exact numbers. Historical precision is much in debt to the researches of Thomas S. Freeman. His analysis of Acts and Monuments provides a figure of 313, to include all those named as having been burnt and a further 26 believed to have died in prison. His research is the most comprehensive yet and concludes that the authentication of some victims included by Foxe remains hard to ascertain. In the minority of cases where details are provided by Foxe, victims appear to enjoy considerable public support though there are instances when he admits that the contrary occurs. Support was most likely in the cities and towns where the new religion had sizeable numbers of adherents. However, it cannot in every case be confidently construed as support for the religious beliefs of the
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condemned. Ordinary human compassion for neighbours in extremity undoubtedly provided another motive.\textsuperscript{775}

Attempts to encourage retraction in the certainty of clemency are also suggested – viewed by Foxe as temptations to betrayal of the cause – in an effort by the prosecutors to persuade those arrested to moderate or change their religious opinions. The narrative is essentially dedicated to those who did not. Rowland Taylor, Vicar of Hadleigh, already mentioned, was one of those who steadfastly rejected all attempts to avoid condemnation. His first interrogation by Bishop Gardiner, sometime in April 1554, as detailed by Foxe – and presumably substantially correct – shows the former to be remarkably willing to hear him out. Taylor – whose refusal to entertain any spirit of conciliation is commented upon as an example of unassailable resolution – is shown as determined and beyond persuasion.\textsuperscript{776} His steadfastness in his opinions inevitably ended in his condemnation. Even then, efforts were made locally to persuade him to a form of acceptance that would allow him to be pardoned. The Sheriff of Essex at Chelmsford appears to have done his best:

And being at supper, the sheriff of Essex very earnestly laboured him to return to the popish religion, thinking with fair words to persuade him; and said, “Good master doctor! We are right sorry for you, considering what the loss is of such a one as ye might be, if ye would. God hath given you great learning and wisdom … and me thinketh it were a great pity you should cast yourself away willingly, and so come to such a painful and shameful death…. Doubt ye not but ye shall find favour at the queen’s hands. I and all these your friends will be suitors for your pardon.” \textsuperscript{777} 

John Hooper, burnt at Gloucester in 1555, had visits in the Clink prison in January of that year from Bishop Bonner, Abbot Feckenham, Dr Chedsey and
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Archdeacon Harpsfield, who, as well as “… most grievous threatenings… ”, also “… used all outward gentleness and significations of friendship …” to persuade him to change his mind.  

Considering the status of these clerics, who were all what might be called theological big guns of the Marian establishment, it is hard to believe with Foxe that their intention was more to persecute than to persuade. For the prosecutors, the value of a conversion was always preferable to a conviction. Much time was spent in such efforts. In the account given by Foxe of the apprehension and trial of Fr George Marsh, a priest from Lancashire, a great deal of time elapsed between his arrest at the behest of the Earl of Derby and his burning. Every possible persuasion was made to re-convert him. There was little support for his doctrines in his home county and although there were others accused of heresy only Marsh was burnt. It was his influence rather than his beliefs which the authorities feared. The same is true of the famous John Bradford whose letters to his clients in the Lancashire area were believed to be a major factor in the maintenance and continuity of such Protestant support as there was in that county. He too was targeted for several conversations by outstanding Catholic clerics in the hope of his conversion. Foxe provides extensive transcripts of these interviews. It may be concluded that if the “persecutors” in Foxe’s account went to such lengths to dissuade their victims or to gain their outright conversions then that same sympathy as likely operated within a large number of the ordinary population too. Indeed evidence can be found in places where Catholicism
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was undoubtedly strong – such as Lancashire – that an attitude of hating the heresy, rather than the heretic existed.\textsuperscript{784}

London, with its large population, presented a mixture of support and hostility to the victims. Majority Catholic parishioners who had been powerless to prevent the break-up of their churches in Edward’s reign seized the opportunity provided by the Catholic regime to bring those responsible to justice. There are instances of denunciations that may indicate that the long-suffering majority reacted against iconoclasm when they were free to do so.\textsuperscript{785} In terms of geographical concentration, the distribution of successful prosecutions gives the largest number to London and the Southeast and none to Wales, the north of England and the south west of England. Where enclaves of gospellers were established awareness of their presence and risk of detection was increased. No doubt the heightened sense of being under siege and adrift produced a special brand of solidarity. Outside of London smaller groups sought to survive. Records of congregations investigated indicate that their numbers varied from 20 (Shakerley in Lancashire), to 11 (Brighthamstead in Sussex), while Foxe mentions a congregation of 40, rising to 200 on occasions, in London.\textsuperscript{786} Those living in areas where vigilance was effective faced the greatest risk, particularly if they drew attention to themselves or were denounced. In the beginning, exemplary local punishment followed conviction.

The largest number of burnings took place in five urban centres: 43 in London; 40 in Canterbury; 23 at Colchester in Essex; 17 at Lewes, in Sussex and 14
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at Stratford (not then part of East London).\textsuperscript{787} Not all of those burnt at Smithfield came from London. In terms of social status, there were 25 ministers, 8 described as gentlemen, the rest either artisans or traders. The number of women burnt was 58, a figure that on one level identifies extraordinary feminine resolution in choosing death rather than conformity and on another may indicate exceptional courting of disaster. Agnes Priest from Cornwall, burnt in 1558, though her husband and children remained devout Catholics, and much to their discomfort, seems to have gone out of her way over a number of years to broadcast her opinions to the point of nuisance.\textsuperscript{788} No consideration could persuade her to discretion until she was finally condemned. By this time she had become totally isolated from her distraught family. Capital punishment of women – usually by hanging – was an all too common occurrence and so less shocking then than now. Public execution for treason, with all its concomitant brutality, right up to the end of the seventeenth century was never far from many people’s experience and hanging remained so for much longer. It took a very long time for such examples of harsh justice to fade from most western societies.

In view of early indications of Mary’s inclination to clemency it might have seemed unlikely in the first months of the reign that such a concentration and continuation of drastic measures would be either employed by her government or necessary to deal with religious dissent. The response to its necessity and persistence of it identifies the cause as rooted in the character of governments of that century. When persuasion failed they inevitably resorted to force in the manner for which the law provided.\textsuperscript{789} Official statements give a clear indication of the rigour with which such dissent is to be pursued. At the same time, the burning of those convicted of
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heresy was part of the “theatre of justice” that underpinned the government’s “commitment to the catholic restoration”. Recourse to capital punishment was understood by all as the solution to outright persistence in civil disobedience arising from heresy. It was proposed that the political and spiritual health of nations demanded it.

2. “The English Athaliah”

Sections of the inflammatory material which fuelled the government’s determination to reduce the influence of the gospellers reflected hostility to Mary not only as a Catholic but as female ruler. Protestant religious sympathy was particularly hostile to rule by women who were seen as inferior. Bishop Latimer in one of his sermons is quite specific on this point: “As it is a part of your penance, ye women, to travail in bearing your children, so it be a part of your penance to be subjects unto your husbands, ye are underlings, underlings, and must be obedient.” John Ponet, the deposed Bishop of Winchester wrote a treatise from his exile on the Continent expressing his opposition to Mary from a biblical perspective, excluding any compromise: “So that now both by God’s laws and man’s, she ought to be punished with death”. That was in 1556 and after the burnings had begun. But the antipathy was there from early on. In a letter of Henry Bullinger to John Calvin dated 25 March 1554, early examples of hostility based on scripture – in all probability quoting John Knox – anticipated Mary’s downfall:
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And if the reigning sovereign be not a Deborah, but an ungodly and tyrannous ruler of the kingdom, godly persons have an example and consolation in the case of Athaliah. The Lord will in his own time destroy unjust governments by his own people, to whom he will supply proper qualifications for this purpose, as he formerly did to Jerubaal, and the Maccabees and Jehoida.  

The image of Mary as “the English Athaliah” had already gained mythological status among the brethren almost as soon as it was clear that she would be Queen. By 30 August, Bullinger wrote from Geneva to his friend Theodore Beza, foreseeing nothing but disaster ahead in England. Unfortunately for them both, the prevailing balance of power was about to swing decisively in favour of Catholicism. Was their pessimism justified? Despite the recent impositions of their young “Josiah” upon the still unconverted masses and the largely conservative ruling class, the turning of the tide would reveal more obviously the superficiality of their former gains. This element of the Pyhrric victory of Protestantism under Edward, largely at the immense cost of the nation’s irreplaceable religious and artistic patrimony, is only recently being investigated. It removed one religious but did not replace it with anything nearly so deep seated. As Claire Cross emphasises, the Edwardine imposition of a Protestant liturgy and doctrine, and the implanting of pockets of informed believers in some towns and cities, did not make for uniformity of belief. What it most certainly did do was to leave behind a focus of resistance in centres where it would be far from easy to dislodge. There still remains the fact so well illustrated by Eamon Duffy that the slide away from the new religion became close to an avalanche in some places where it had been most unexpected. Awareness of this circumstance is
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crucial to interpreting the atmosphere in which the Marian campaign against the dissidents was carried on.

Apart from the August riot at Paul’s Cross in 1553 occasioned by the sermon of Doctor Bourne, the subsequent notorious incidents against Catholic revival in London, mentioned in earlier chapters of this study, registered disgust but very little alarm in the contemporary English accounts that have survived. Later history saw in them the tip of the iceberg of protest and the burnings were a confirmation of the strength and volume of the opposition. This is certainly one interpretation of what was happening. There are others possible. Claire Cross proposed a different view in suggesting that Mary’s greatest mistake was in giving much more prominence through their persecution to the Protestant zealots than they would otherwise have obtained. Certainly past history recalls much more easily the unique and draconian policy of penal pursuit of those who stood out against the prevailing tide. The historical judgement of the increasing support for them and strong reaction against the burnings is one that has been answered by many historians in the affirmative. Andrew Pettegree and David Loades join other older historians who see the Marian strategy against the Protestants as strengthening the opposition without any hope of reducing the appeal of their creed. The latest challenge to that view has come from Eamon Duffy. He argues first, the case for the increasing resistance of the hardliners as in part a desperate response to losing ground everywhere rather than a sign of their
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growing popularity. Secondly, he argues for the success of the policy in terms of decreasing numbers of victims by June 1557. Thirdly, in contrast to older conclusions, he sees no loss of nerve or impetus by the regime in its pursuit of its aim right up to 1558. From the point of view of the driving force behind the policy, Duffy’s conclusion points out the Privy Council backed by the Queen and ultimately Cardinal Pole and those around him, with the bishops in a lesser role. The picture that emerges from the study is of a well-directed campaign of attrition, backed by explanatory propaganda and in association with an equally vigorous textual and literary output. Also relying on the cooperation of local magnates it seems to have been mostly sure of their loyalty when required to act. While emphasising the basic inhumanity of the penal character of the persecution as seen through later eyes, nevertheless the policy was not only justifiable from the point of view of the situation at the time but also succeeded to the extent that it ended as a decline in the number of victims was evident. From the perspective of positive religious response to the government’s policy, rather less attention was formerly given to the dramatic local and official volume of parochial support for Catholic revival that has since been investigated. More will be said concerning this in chapter V.

Thomas Cranmer, and the handful of Edwardine episcopal nominees who chose to face trial and death rather than conform or convert, were remembered as heroes by subsequent generations of Protestants. Nevertheless the episcopal character of the new religion, along with the liturgy, was one of those greatly debated issues.
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both during and after this time. The strategic departure of potential clerical leaders seems to have had the effect of raising the profile of lay leadership among the beleaguered Protestants who remained. This became a strong feature of the resistance within the country and perhaps those who faced death saw themselves as pioneers leading the way. Rather less risky literary opposition from the exiles, who constituted an elite group, came from abroad. The list provided by Garrett names sixty-seven priests among them. It has been suggested that the strong lay-involvement reflected to some extent that of the old guild and confraternity structures, re-modelled.

Writing and campaigning abroad while keeping in touch with their brethren in England in adversity gave the disparate groups a kind of unity. In adversity there was solidarity. The Catholic authorities were not slow to exploit their reversal of fortunes while simultaneously revealing the weaknesses in their doctrinal position. Counteracting opposition propaganda, the government sponsored an orthodox offensive of its own from 14–22 April, 1555, arranging a Disputation at the church of St Mary the Virgin in Oxford, with Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer pitched against thirtyfold representation of Catholic theologians. Information about this event comes entirely from Protestant sources, presenting it as a victory for Ridley, being the younger and fitter of the three. He and Cranmer were imprisoned in Oxford. From
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there, Ridley was able to build up a network of correspondence with other imprisoned and exiled co-religionists.\textsuperscript{811}

Some respite was afforded the preachers at this time by the freedom allowed them to correspond and write and they took full advantage of it. Something like a propaganda war, involving printed material, continued to offer an effective means of protesting against the old religion which had previously been conducted from pulpits and by demolition of church interiors.\textsuperscript{812} As with many struggles for supremacy, discrediting the alternative regime was a strategy for both sides. Some zealots of the new religion argued for persecution as a just outcome for previous complacency and insufficient zeal of all but a small minority. Success dependant on a more vigorous pursuit and more serious commitment by all concerned ranked equally with the reproach that purification would only come because of persecution. Present adversity, exiguity and unpopularity indicated its divine mission rather than its invalidity or singularity. Exilic accommodation was formative in theological and liturgical structures that would strongly affect the Elizabethan religious settlement.\textsuperscript{813} On the Catholic side, the Marian authorities were neither slow nor slender in their application of the printing and distribution of texts to proclaim and defend the medium and the message.\textsuperscript{814} By the same token, as will be commented upon in Chapter V, preaching as an essential element of the restoration was promoted and used to great effect.\textsuperscript{815}

By 1555, both the strength of the government’s position and its determination to prosecute key opposition figures, enabled by the revived legislation against heresy,
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procedures against the three imprisoned bishops could begin. Doctrinally as well as politically, all three had a record of opposition to Mary which was both too persistent and too theologically disparate to be reconcilable. The state-backed pursuit of radical changes previously embarked upon at their instigation had left a legacy of division, destruction and disorder utterly repugnant to Mary. Heresy equivalent to treason formed the principal charge against them at their trials. Following older judgements some recent authors attribute vengeance as Mary’s motive that heresy alone should condemn them.  

Such historical conclusions can be inferred rather than proved. Her reasons may not have resided solely in the memory of their support for the divorce of Queen Catherine and the marriage of Anne Boleyn. It is as likely that abhorrence of the religious changes they sponsored and initiated affected her attitude. Her proclamations and correspondence regarding heresy reveals a robust aversion to it matched by a determination to see it punished to the fullest extent the law allows.

The trials of the three – as recorded in Foxe’s memorial – showed Ridley to be the most skilled at his own defence while Cranmer and Latimer fared less well. The polemics evidenced in the transcripts provided exemplary material of the extent of the defence of the cardinal Reformation ideas for which the bishops died. They could be read with satisfaction in the Elizabethan age in the knowledge that their sufferings were the inevitable prelude to their elevation to heroism and even martyrdom. Latimer and Ridley both suffered at Oxford on the same day (16 October 1555), the former perishing speedily while the latter endured a slower torture. Cranmer was to suffer last of all, perhaps because he was the most eminent and perhaps also so that he might live long enough to witness the total dismantling of the

---

religion he had done so much to erect. His various retractions may have been attempts to evade the inevitable but it was never likely that he would be spared the flames. He died affirming his repudiation of the Mass, the Pope and the religion of the Queen. John Foxe’s account describes his end as both noble as well as edifying.\(^{819}\) An alternative account from an eye-witness is more ambivalent and critical of the stubbornness of the fallen archbishop.\(^{820}\) Back in London, Machyn recorded without comment the fact of the burning on 21 March.\(^{821}\) Wriothesley noted it with equal brevity.\(^{822}\)

Not long after the burning of Latimer and Ridley and while parliament was sitting for the fourth time in the reign another great protagonist of the period finally left the stage. On 14 November the Chancellor, Stephen Gardiner, died.\(^{823}\) His death removed a key figure from Mary’s circle of close advisers and deprived her of his experience and wisdom. He has been depicted as something of a bogey-man. Foxe suggests that he was earnest in the beginning that a policy of retribution should be employed harshly against the Wyatt rebels in order to make examples of them and deter others.\(^{824}\) Another source seems to confirm this.\(^{825}\) Perhaps he knew more than he let on about the nature of the conspiracy from the inside.\(^{826}\) This was a year before the heresy laws came into force and so the Chancellor’s strictures must be assumed to relate essentially to those who were rebels. Earlier in this chapter the demonization of Gardiner as a scourge of Protestantism has been examined. He lived for less than one
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year after the heresy laws came back into force. During that time he condemned John Rogers, Laurence Saunders, Bishop Hooper, Rowland Taylor and John Bradford.827 There were no burnings in his own diocese of Winchester, perhaps due to his previous careful stewardship. During the later years of the reign there were burnings at Salisbury (3) and Newbury (3) under his successor John White.828 The earlier seventeenth century historian Fuller exonerates Gardiner of direct responsibility for burnings but sees him as the guiding hand of the persecution of the regime’s opponents, even accusing him of wishing to bring about the death of Elizabeth.829 The only evidence for this is a comment reported by Renard which Gardiner’s biographer Muller suggests was intended to give the ambassador the impression that the Chancellor agreed with him about the danger posed by Elizabeth.830

Mary herself bears historically both the reputation and the ultimate blame for the burnings during her reign. Her letter directing the manner and purpose of the punishment is quoted as standard evidence.

Punishment of heretics ought to be done without rashness, not leaving in the meanwhile to do justice to such as by learning would seem to deceive the simple; the rest to be used that the people perceive them justly to be condemned, whereby they shall understand the truth and beware to do the like. Especially in London I would none burnt without some of the councils’ presence, and everywhere good sermons at the same.831

The extant document is a copy from the century after these events and is usually accepted as genuine. Further evidence of her direct involvement is provided
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by Foxe in the form of a letter addressed to Bishop Bonner and sent on 24 May 1555 in which he is rebuked for his delay in dealing with heretics and urged to proceed.\textsuperscript{832} However, as Prescott points out, it was sent out in her and Philip’s name, and at a time when Mary was virtually confined in her room at Hampton Court, seeing very few people and in expectation of the birth of a child.\textsuperscript{833} It is entirely plausible that she might even in this condition be insistent that the pursuit of heretics not be neglected. Still, it might be prudent to see the letter in the broader context of a government policy document. As a third instance brief, a letter was sent to the Sheriff of Hampshire, in August 1558, rebuking him for staying the execution of a heretic who recanted at the last moment. Despite the overwhelming body of opinion in former times that failed to see any justification for the Marian persecution, at least one Protestant historian saw the policy in terms of a cruel political necessity.\textsuperscript{834} It has also been understood before now as representing the only approach to religious deviance possible at that time. “Both orthodoxies [Catholic and Protestant] looked on heresy as the deadliest of capital offences, a sin against the soul that could wreck both church and state.”\textsuperscript{835}

Whether or not Mary bears the whole responsibility can be answered with an emphatic no. Philip is sometimes seen as a restraining influence upon her but there is little evidence for this apart from a sermon preached by one of his chaplains, Fray Alfonso de Castro, reported by Foxe and followed by a month of cessation of
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burnings. Philip’s own record on the burning of heretics leaves little doubt that he endorsed it. On Easter Day, 14 April, 1555, there was a major incident of violence at St Margaret’s Church in Westminster in which William Flower, a former monk, attacked a priest with a knife who was distributing communion. A Spanish priest attached to the church at that time was Bartolomé Carranza, who later became Archbishop of Toledo. Some years later, wrongly accused of heresy, he deposed in a written statement made to the Inquisition, where he was on trial, that he had advised King Philip that Flower deserved to die because the case was “atroz y muy feo y una grande injuria del Santissimo Sacramento” (an atrocious and very ugly thing as well as a great insult to the Most Holy Sacrament). There was no suggestion that the King did not share this view. In fact a letter was sent to Bishop Bonner, urging the trial and conviction of Flower. De Castro’s own views on the burning of heretics had already been expressed in a work written before he arrived in England, which showed a somewhat different approach from that suggested by Foxe. Cardinal Pole has also been considered less enthusiastic than Mary but there is little evidence to support this. Archbishop Carranza later described him as “blando” (soft) in relation to the punishment of heretics. But that can only be due to his emphatic statement in a letter to the bishops written in 1555 by which he urged that every effort should be used to get heretics to repent. If they did not, it was necessary – echoing the Queen’s own command – that a preacher should be present to explain and justify the punishment, protecting the people from “the false piety and bogus courage” of the
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victims. Pole’s St Andrew’s Day sermon of 1557 also makes clear his attitude justifying the burning of unrepentant heretics. Pole’s record in Canterbury and its province leaves no room for doubt that he insisted that his senior clergy prosecute with the full vigour of the law.

Though by contrast only a few people suffered burning in Edward’s reign, it was nonetheless accepted among the gospellers generally as justified. Archbishop Cranmer had burnt two dissenters and proposed legislation in 1553 to burn those who opposed the Prayer Book doctrine on the Eucharist. He was reflecting contemporary attitudes. John Foxe is the fullest detailed source of the procedures against his co-religionists as exclusively Catholic cruelty. His nuanced accounts have coloured subsequent judgements as indeed they were meant to. Other sources close to the events are much less sensational. Machyn, the Chronicle of Thomas Wriothesley, and the Chronicle of the Greyfriars record various burnings routinely without comment. Renard, the Emperor’s representative reports in his letters of January and February 1555 about the popular reaction in London against the earliest of the burnings. Previously, in December 1554, he had written to the Emperor rejoicing that the bill against heretics had received parliamentary approval. In March of 1555, King Philip wrote to his friend the Count of Feria, that “…things have been going better and better. Some heretics have been punished”. Renard’s real concern or apprehension over potential trouble seems not to have been shared by the King.
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Many other criminal convictions commonly brought the death penalty, a familiar sight in a society not unused to violence in all its forms. To appreciate the extent of regular executions a reference to research on crime and punishment in the sixteenth century may serve to illustrate. There are no general records available but the nearest sample available is of the assizes of the county of Devon from 1598. Figures show seventy-four convictions involving the death penalty. Based on that figure it is estimated that within one calendar year no fewer than 2,960 death sentences were likely within the forty counties of England, at a time when the population was a fraction of what it is today. Not all of them may have been carried out, but this statistic indicates the reality of the frequency of public execution. The burnings represent one of the most terrible forms of it but its equivalent in hanging, drawing and quartering was no less gruesome.

Two interpretations of the Christian faith contended for over a century for the soul of a continent. The Marian experience was an example of this unbridgeable split. It was a strategy that sought uniformity based on a majority preference for a millennial tradition, hagiographical ornamentation, ritual integrity, magisterial interpretation and universal authority. Its opposite, exemplified in the pages of Foxe, delineated a dynamic of destruction of all iconography, a controlled evolution of forms, independent interpretation of Scripture and a linguistically intelligible and straitened liturgy. A compromise between such contrasting religious traditions was not possible. The history of Europe in the rest of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century is a testament in blood to the struggle for dominance of these
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creeds, to determine the character and politics of the European mainland and the continents and peoples subsequently colonised by their respective conquerors.

In England, it later came to be an accepted orthodoxy that the resistance of the few and the example they left inaugurated a renaissance of enlightened Christianity which subsequent commentators, applying a hermeneutic of continuity or discontinuity, may applaud or deplore. The eventual imposition of a faith based on Reformation principles intentionally preserved and extended the recollection of the Marian fires. The survivors cultivated a mythology justifying, in both senses, their political victory in England. It took that and much more in the way of abolishing the rites and demolishing the material restoration to procure a religious majority in its favour. Most historians view the Marian persecution as self-defeating in almost every sense save one – the legacy of early martyrs to the later triumph of their cause. That may be so, but possibly only because the Catholic restoration ran for so short a time before its nemesis arrived with the Elizabethan settlement. The latter succeeded only by a determined pulverisation of almost every trace of the positive achievements of its predecessor and the propagation to the fullest extent of the cruelties by which it had sought to restore Catholicism. Historically, it is indefensible to conclude that virtue or malice, competence or incompetence, was exclusive to one side or the other. Just as serious questions of policy and propriety arise from a study of the prosecution of the burnings, so equally questions regarding the manner and motives of the resistance that caused it have to be answered. The historian James Gairdner, writing in the early part of the twentieth century, was until recently one of the few prepared to be critical of
the martyrs. More recently, Eamon Duffy, as already noted, has re-opened the
discussion and provided new insights and arguments.

Chastisement, often severe, is evident in the official reaction to religious revolt
in this period. The study of foreign religious upheavals that produced civil and
national turmoil reveals perspectives that elucidate the complexities of the conflict in
England. Where novelty prevailed it was ultimately politically and socially
revolutionary. It proved to be so in the politics of England as of other states. Where
the old religion triumphed it proved itself eminently capable of regeneration and
resurgence. At times the application of coercion was congruent with Catholic
reform from the late decades of the fifteenth century. Few could see any possibility of
disarming the threat to the unity of Christendom without it. In a broader sense the
burning of those considered heretics — though less numerous and intense — had a very
long history before Mary’s reign and would continue to be enforced as a penalty for
Arianism and Anabaptism under Elizabeth and James I. The last such burning was
in 1610 and the death penalty for heresy was not finally abolished until 1677. By law,
custom and common consent, the sixteenth century, much more than at other times,
offered nothing in redress of the perceived crime of recidivist and unrepentant heresy
except burning.

---

Gairdner, J., *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII to the
Death of Queen Mary* (London, 1912).


The position of the Marian Bishops who prosecuted the dissenters according to law was unenviable, especially those who had previously acquiesced in the schism. They had once provided the oxygen for spread of the errors against which they now had to proceed. Foxe was not slow to recognise and publicise their embarrassment in the reviling and ridicule of their tormentors by those under investigation. Gardiner openly admitted his previous hypocrisy. He had never accepted the theology of the Prayer Book. Some of the individuals he and his fellow bishops pursued were too steeped in the ideology of reform to have resort once again to Catholicism. Some unschooled individuals who had fallen under the influence of a selective and doctrinaire spirituality, could not be persuaded out of it. Perhaps their stubbornness in some cases was precisely because of their simplicity. Their sacrifice made them heroes to their own but their elimination solved a problem for the government, reducing the numbers of those actively hostile. Even in their former strongholds, numbers of committed devotees of the new religion were in decline. It has been argued that while Mary lived, the new religion could make little headway against Catholicism. Eamon Duffy proposes an equally favourable outcome for the Marian policy of burning persistent and obstinate offenders against the Catholic revival.

Foxe’s transcripts with their accompanying commentary created a sustained narrative of Catholic oppression and consequent weakness. Likewise it evolved a tradition of radical resistance to popery and the tyranny it exemplified. An almost mythical sense of the providential selection of the English people to oppose Catholicism in all its forms resulted. Something akin to a Biblical belief in the pre-

---

856 Foxe, p. 1544.
859 Fires of Faith, pp. 80-84.
destination of the nation to be the bearer of a torch of anti-Romanism grew out of the
memory of the ashes of Smithfield in London, Lewes in Sussex, and other such
places. Those mythologies have periodically re-invented a consciousness of a national
characteristic ever since.\textsuperscript{860} Though it may be argued that those who suffered under
Mary deserve no more or less sympathy than the victims of Henry VIII or Elizabeth,
their importance in the chronology of evolving nationhood is vastly more
significant.\textsuperscript{861} Despite this, the view that the persecution rendered futile and
contributed to the ultimate failure of the attempt at the Marian restoration of
Catholicism is no longer unchallengeable.

A certain scepticism regarding the existence of a widespread sense of outrage
at the burnings would appear also to be a prudent conclusion. There was sympathy
for the victims among their kith and kin and close neighbours, but there was also
indifference and even hostility from those who considered their sentence to be just.\textsuperscript{862}
In the decades after the persecution became an admonitory narrative, the faith it
represented became synonymous with a tradition of English liberalism and patriotism.
Catholicism became by legislation and by implication foreign, disloyal, oppressive
and backward. It seemed logical and just to excoriate the persecution of the new
religion, following the attenuation of the old to the status of a penal sect, ostensibly in
the interest of liberty and national security. That was not how it would have been seen
by most people between 1553 and 1558, either by the ruling class who endorsed the
legality of the persecution in Parliament, or by the majority of the Queen’s subjects in
sympathy with her religion and used to capital punishment for numerous offences. In

\textsuperscript{860} MacCulloch, D. \textit{Reformation}, p. 285.
\textsuperscript{862} Duffy, E., \textit{Fires of Faith}, pp. 155-162.
any event, regarding the opinion of the masses throughout the country we have no survey or sample to guide us.

Foxe still reigns supreme as a source but his limitations are now more obvious. Still he must be allowed his genuine examples of human solidarity with suffering evident at times in his account. Episodes like the burning of John Noyes at Laxfield, in Suffolk, when all but one of his neighbours doused their fires to prevent the ignition of the pyre. The sympathy of local villagers and townsfolk for one of their own in these dire situations is only to be expected. It did not necessarily imply support for the beliefs of the victim but an understandable compassion for an apparently honest neighbour brought to the extremity of execution. From the point of view of simple contrast and comparison there was one striking difference of attitude in those who died for the Protestant religion under Mary and those who suffered similarly for Catholicism in Elizabethan times. Few if any of the former were recorded as praying for their sovereign when execution was imminent whereas it was recorded as an almost invariable valedictory testament in the case of the latter.

\footnote{Foxe, pp 2021ff.}
Chapter V: Restoration and Recovery

1. De reformatione ecclesiae

Reform is a relative concept, in the sense that what one observer proposes as progress may be thought regression by another. For those who favoured the new religion, reform demanded a complete break with the past, even extending in some cases to vandalising the tombs of the dead. The fact is that in Edward’s reign this agenda failed to move the overwhelming mass of the population but had a profoundly damaging impact spiritually and socially. It is probably not an exaggeration to say that they were both traumatised and confused by it. Critics of the Marian Church do not always allow for the almost complete failure and unpopularity of its antecedent. They take little note of the losses in religious iconography that accompanied it. Consequently, the material and ornamental restoration led by the Marian Church is discounted and its aesthetic appeal undervalued. Catholicism embraces both austerity and ostentation and historically has provided for both. The post-Reformation period reacted against iconoclasm and inaugurated a huge expansion in the visual and ornamental expression of liturgy and piety. It took decades to achieve on the continent but was only effective on a smaller and shorter scale in England. It therefore seems to merit little attention and even less appreciation in the broader sweep which saw England officially move from traditional religion to total Reformation within a thirty

year period. The years from 1553-58 appear as a disastrous interruption of progress in this perspective. Academically this may result in conclusions that it was a sterile experiment.\textsuperscript{865} In historical terms it has been a short and logical step from Elizabethan propaganda of demonising Catholicism to eventually portraying it as utterly incongruous. For centuries of the traditional English “Whig” historiography, Catholic equates to antiquated, un-enlightened and irrational. Protestant conveys dynamic, enlightened and rational and consequently appears quite simply irresistible to modern man. From that perspective England never did and never would have experienced progress at any level under Catholic Mary, however long her reign, since it represented an irretrievable and superseded lost cause. The emphasis paced upon it as “foreign” gradually made it into something quite alien to the English temperament. The programme of ecclesiastical, educational and liturgical reforms initiated by Cardinal Pole and undertaken by the Marian Bishops and Cardinal Pole came to be viewed as a last-ditch attempt to enforce a papist tyranny. At best the efforts of those years amounted to an attempt re-package an outdated religion which had had its day. On historical and cultural terms this critique is questionable and can hardly survive the examination of sources relevant to the time. Among others, the studies of Christopher Haigh and Eamon Duffy, already mentioned, have been ground-breaking. A recent study of the patterns of Marian spirituality and theology has also provided new and positive insights to benefit greater appreciation and understanding of those years.\textsuperscript{866} In every category of Counter Reformation convention, the model of the Marian revival provides favourable comparison with other and longer experiments. As one might expect, the nuance of the revived spiritual and liturgical life is susceptible of interpretation as to its traditional and novel content.

\textsuperscript{865} Dickens, A.G., \textit{The English Reformation}, pp. 2809-81.
\textsuperscript{866} Wizeman, W., \textit{The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor’s Church}. 
Lucy Wooding maintains that traditional doctrine on Purgatory, Saints, the Virgin Mary and religious life “remained a peripheral concern”.\textsuperscript{867} She also sees a tension between Pole’s doctrinal emphasis on papal authority and its general perception as an issue of jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{868} William Wizeman contests this conclusion. He certainly agrees with her that there were novel and more precise writings aimed at clearer catechesis. He defends them as Christological and biblical in emphasis yet firmly linked to the Petrine ministry.\textsuperscript{869} They also promoted an eschatology that included suffrage for the souls in purgatory (though with little reference to indulgences) and re-affirmed the proper role of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints as intercessors and patrons.\textsuperscript{870}

It might be useful at this point to refer to earlier continental attempts to promote reform and counter the spread of heresy. Catholic Church reform started well before Council of Trent. It was undertaken on different levels in Spain and Italy before the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{871} Re-connection with the evangelical ideals, preaching and dignified liturgical celebration formed the core of this continental movement. It was the complete antithesis of the iconoclasm on the Reformation model and the degradation of sacramental life. Reform was conceived as organic, in continuity with the spirituality of antiquity and building substantially upon it and the doctrinal foundations already established. Genuine reform was, literally as well as metaphorically, built on existing structures. Consolidation of faith; concern for the learning and lifestyle of the clergy; the proper celebration and accessibility of the

\textsuperscript{867} Rethinking Catholicism, p. 177.
\textsuperscript{868} Ibid. p. 128 – 36.
\textsuperscript{869} The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor’s Church, pp. 127-36.
\textsuperscript{870} Ibid. pp. 241-50, 251-54.
liturgy; the strict regulation of cloistered life and charitable foundations that brought relief to those in misery, all featured in reform.\textsuperscript{872} It should come as no surprise that all of these features are to be found in Marian England. Some of what took decades to achieve abroad was also advanced within a fraction of the time during Mary’s reign. Both she and Cardinal Pole from varying though similar perspectives sought to recreate as soon and as much as possible the shattered fabric of the nation’s Catholic heritage. Fidelity to the ancient faith, forged through painful experience, shaped and inspired their agenda. Pole may have been among those who sought some dialogue with aspects of Luther’s position on justification by faith.\textsuperscript{873} However, the Cardinal saw and promoted reform in terms of continuity and sacramentality, and the personal holiness of the clergy, as leaders who were themselves reformed and exercised authority in accordance with traditional hierarchical principles.\textsuperscript{874} His task involved the application of principles of reform learnt abroad suffused with Counter-Reformation ecclesiology which was both intuitive as well as canonically interpretive.

The denying of the people of the traditional rituals and devotions begun under Henry and completed under Edward had been neither welcome nor anticipated.\textsuperscript{875} Restoration meant much sacrifice, substance and effort in financial and practical terms. Recreating the historical narrative of this recovery is still a work in progress. Nevertheless, we now know more about it than was the case 50 years ago. It is entirely evidence-based and acknowledges both temporal as well as circumstantial factors. Samples of parish records survive in sufficient numbers from which details may be gained of the work of reconstruction. The parish records of Morebath in

\textsuperscript{873} Mayer, T.F., \textit{Reginald Pole}, pp. 152-61.
\textsuperscript{874} Duffy, E., \textit{Saints and Sinners} (Yale, 1997), p. 164.
\textsuperscript{875} Hutton, R., ‘The Local Impact of the Reformation’ in C. Haigh, ed., \textit{The English Reformation Revised}, p. 122-123.
Devon have been mined as rich vein of information embracing 25 years, spanning four reigns.\textsuperscript{876} Those of Ashburton parish church in the same county, like Morebath, “ritually cleansed” previously, show evidence of restoration on all levels during Mary’s reign. By 1555, the High Altar and three others, the rood, and several images had all been restored.\textsuperscript{877} The restoration accompanied the recovery of much of the social as well as the devotional side of Catholic parish life. These parish records are revealing. Is it safe to consider them as typical? Where records, telling a similar story exist in other and far-flung areas of the country they do register a trend, which is illuminating. While it is the case that samples of parish records for this time are fewer than one would wish, the existing ones mostly point in the same direction: towards reconstruction. The records of change from Prayer Book austerity to Catholic iconography detail what might be mere conformity but could also be community consensus in action. Morebath had continuous oversight by one man, Sir Christopher Trychay, guiding his parishioners through Edward’s iconoclasm to Mary’s Catholic proceedings – the latter more congenial for both rector and flock. In Elizabeth’s time he went on to conform in steady strides – as did many other Catholic priests – to her settlement. Yet records show his instinct and that of the people had been traditional. How typical was he? It is not easy to tell but Catholic revival in Morebath was not an isolated example.

The spontaneous return of Catholic worship in so many places mentioned in Chapter II of this study anticipated a government-backed programme. Does the extent of the initial spontaneity reveal something of the lingering attraction of the Mass? It

\textsuperscript{876} Duffy, E., \textit{The Voices of Morebath}, pp. 152-168.
\textsuperscript{877} Hanham, A., ed., \textit{The Churchwardens' Accounts of Ashburton, in Devon, 1479 – 1580}, Devon and Cornwall Record Society, N.S., 15 (Torquay, 1970), pp. 128-141.
seems the risk involved in its early revival was not a deterrent.\textsuperscript{878} When illegality gave way to lawful celebration introduced by the parliament of 1553, the stream of revivals became a torrent.\textsuperscript{879} Perhaps those weeping “tears of joy” and crying “Jesus save her Grace” as Mary entered London on 3 August understood exactly what her victory meant in religious terms.\textsuperscript{880} Nevertheless the cautious approach to restoration exhibited in London parishes was most probably shared by others.\textsuperscript{881} Before parliament met, no parish was legally free to restore the Mass even if the majority were inclined to do so and it was not mentioned in Mary’s first proclamation on religion.\textsuperscript{882} Parliamentary approval could be cited to overcome the hostility or hesitation of civil leaders in places where minorities previously supported by the government held sway. Where the Catholic cause was supported by local magnates the return of the Mass occurred more readily.\textsuperscript{883} This of course meant the setting up of altars and ornaments but the expense for some parishes meant that the arrangements continued to be fairly makeshift.\textsuperscript{884}

Crucially, in the capital, which was likely to be a showcase for the rest of the country and the focus of particular attention by the government, it was not until autumn 1554 that Bishop Bonner’s programme of Articles and Injunctions for parishes began seriously to encourage as well as to monitor full restoration backed up by official oversight.\textsuperscript{885} Even so, restoration was well advanced in a good many

\textsuperscript{878} Haigh, C., \textit{English Reformation}, pp. 207 – 8.
\textsuperscript{879} Ibid. pp. 208-11.
\textsuperscript{881} Brigden, S., \textit{London and the Reformation}, pp. 583-93.
\textsuperscript{882} \textit{CSP, Dom.}, no. 9. T-D, II, app., p. xci.
\textsuperscript{883} ‘Robert Parkyn’s Narrative’, p. 308
\textsuperscript{884} \textit{Harpsfield’s Visitation}, pp. 17, 48, 51, 54, 235, 261.
parishes. From the beginning the determination of the Queen influenced this restoration and with her, though solely by correspondence until November 1554, that of Cardinal Pole. His return to England involved the new direction of ecclesiastical government in a manner calculated to change its dynamic. The Legatine Synod of 1555, whose decrees have been examined and commented upon in Chapter III, delineates the new direction intended by the Cardinal. The time following the synod represent the most productive period of the Marian church, the achievements of which relate in part to material restoration, since destroyed, and to liturgical and catechetical resurgence, only traceable through records and correspondence.

The extent and solidity of the material restoration was sufficient to shock the gospellers. As outlined in Chapter III, more long-term and careful approaches to the liturgy and the Sacrament of the Altar, clerical training and formation and catechetical instruction introduced a programme of reform. The education and formation of boys specifically for the priesthood, and linked to the bishop in his cathedral church, was an entirely new and remarkable element of reform that took into account the changed situation with regard to the universities and aspects of increasing literacy among the laity. Pole sought to replace the inadequate system that had at times produced clergy ill-equipped – even if personally worthy – to deal with the realities of the post-Reformation world. But he wanted their abilities to be developed for the benefit of their flocks. A main criticism of the system of provision of pre-Reformation clergy in England had often been the siphoning-off of the cleverest to court, and other administrative jobs, leaving the less able to the parishes. The synod sought to

elevate the pastoral responsibility of parochial clergy as their essential function.\textsuperscript{889} Obligation of residence within the diocese was affirmed.\textsuperscript{890} It is true to say that episcopal residence and attention to pastoral \textit{munus} had been for centuries a problem for the Church. The legislation of the Synod reiterated older legislation but should not be seen as less innovative on that account.

The synod also gave a lead in defining the proper use of the Scriptures. Church Bibles in use from 1538 onwards had allowed access officially for the first time to reading the Scriptures in English. The problem for the Marian bishops was not the vernacular text but fidelity to the original Latin Vulgate and the misleading character of Tyndale’s marginal notes, which interpreted the texts in an unorthodox manner. Reading of the Bible was never condemned by the Marian authorities.\textsuperscript{891} The official texts were considered corrupt, not the interest shown in them by the laity. Almost the last act of the synod on 20 December 1555 was a decision to commence a Catholic translation of the New Testament.\textsuperscript{892} The Catholic hierarchy of Mary registered clearly their intention to allow and promote reading of the Bible in the vernacular. Hesitation regarding scripture reading was as much related to concern about the Lutheran canon of \textit{sola scriptura} as the basis for faith and doctrine as to the illicit use of the text admitting of wrong interpretations.\textsuperscript{893}

\begin{footnotes}
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\end{footnotes}
Official reaction to the synod was positive. The Venetian ambassador wrote to the Doge in approving terms about the synod and its participants.\textsuperscript{894} Cardinal Pole wrote to Cardinal Carafa – nephew and Secretary of State to his uncle Paul IV – setting out his intentions and hopes for the synod.\textsuperscript{895} Opinions on the synod vary from to the positive to the dismissive.\textsuperscript{896} A recent biographer of Pole claims that the clergy were against him, longed for his departure and that overall the decrees remained practically a dead letter.\textsuperscript{897} If partly or wholly true, it would merely reflect familiar clerical response to attempts to bring them to heel. They were no different from parish clergy as a body in any other time and place in the history of the Church. Nevertheless, presumption regarding the drift of the lower clergy as conformable is a contentious issue. A scholarly and well-researched study published in 1907 goes a long way to correcting this view,\textsuperscript{898} likewise a typewritten monograph, analysing from the Bishops’ Registers, early Elizabethan deprivations in the Province of Canterbury, which was completed in 1972 and circulated privately, which will be examined in the final chapter of this study.\textsuperscript{899}

As Archbishop of Canterbury he employed the full weight of his office to exemplify diligence in preaching and visitation of his diocese and Province. On 25 March 1556, Pole preached in St Mary the Arches, otherwise known as Bow Church in London – a peculiar of the diocese of Canterbury where he received the pallium.\textsuperscript{900}

\textsuperscript{894} CSPV, vol. VI, pt 1, no. 269.  
\textsuperscript{895} CSPV, vol. VI, pt 1, no. 270.  
\textsuperscript{897} Mayer, T.E. Reginald Pole, pp. 243-244.  
\textsuperscript{899} Field, C.W., The Province of Canterbury and the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion (Hailsham, 1972).  
According to Archbishop Becadelli of Ragusa it was the second of a series of sermons he delivered in various churches of his diocese after becoming Archbishop.\footnote{CSPF, p. 220.} The substance of his sermon was preserved in a letter of his Italian secretary, Marc Antonio Faitta, to Dr Ippolito Chizzola.\footnote{CSPF, vol. VI, pt 1, no. 473.} Pole explained the meaning of the Pallium, emphasising papal jurisdiction in conferring it, and went on to talk of peace in obedience and the importance of seeking guidance from “\textit{curati et ordinarii}” (curates and ordinaries) in reading the Scriptures. Faitta also reports that eight excellent sermons were preached at court during Lent and describes the Queen’s participation in the Maundy Thursday and Good Friday ceremonies and the ceremony of touching for the scrofula. The visitation records for Lincoln, printed in Strype’s \textit{Ecclesiastical Memorials}, provide information of conditions within the counties of Lincoln, Leicester, Huntingdon, Bedford and Buckingham, with the Deanery of St Alban’s in Hertfordshire.\footnote{Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. III, pt. 2, pp. 389-413.} The bishop at this time was John White (afterwards translated to Winchester) who conducted the visitation on behalf of Cardinal Pole, in whose metropolitan province the diocese lay. Altogether out of about 225 churches visited, the chancels of some 200 were still in need of repair, 23 parishes were vacant and 5 still had married incumbents. However, only one, St Neots (Hunts), is described as having no altars of any kind; Rotheley, as lacking many ornaments and paintings, and William Smith of Kimbolton (Hunts), had forcibly removed the rood, “\textit{absque consensus parochi}”. Some 50 cases of impropriety or religious heterodoxy were discovered and one person reported burnt for heresy – Thomas More of Leicester, in June 1556.
The complete Visitation records for the diocese of Canterbury for 1557 – with a shorter form for 1556 and 1558 – in the edition printed by the Catholic Record Society in 1950 are probably the most complete record of the state of its parishes in that last full year of the reign. The enquiry was based upon a series of 54 Injunctions that covered every aspect of lay and clerical response to Catholic practice. The Visitation was completed over a three-month period from July to September, with several adjacent parishes being visited each day, some in the morning and some in the afternoon. Details in Latin are given of the name of the incumbent priest, the number of his congregation and its communicants. There are also significant detections of non-practice and dissidence. In considering the findings noted it should be borne in mind that that under Cranmer’s direction the diocese had experienced a serious and consistent programme of material destruction and catechetical direction aimed at the eradication of the old religion. It began in 1534 with radical preachers and ridicule of old customs and ceremonies, and from 1547 onwards a total implementation of the practical demolition mandated by Edward’s injunctions was carried out. Altars, images, roods, glass, vestments, plate, and much else besides had all been taken away, in conformity with the law. Cranmer was known to have been thorough in this respect. By 1550 all altars and images in Kent were down and out. Theft and misappropriation had also played a part in the spoliation of the churches. The Visitation records reveal the often expensive efforts at restoration

905 Ibid. pp. 9-16.
910 Lydden, River, and St John’s Hospital, Harpsfield’s Visitation, vol. I, p. 63, 66, & 137.
and the missing items tell the tale of the extent of the previous stripping out of almost everything of any value.

From 243 churches in the sample, just 4 were described as decayed, as opposed to ruinous, which did not then imply the altogether extreme state of disrepair that it does today.\textsuperscript{911} Altars of stone were lacking in 40 of them. A small number had used tombstones – as presumably easily available and quick to set up – in place of proper altar slabs of stone. In some cases, the stone or \textit{mensa} of the altar had been relocated as church paving, usually in a side-aisle. This could have meant either degradation, by making a point of walking on the consecrated surface where Mass was previously celebrated, or alternatively an attempt at preservation by discreet placement in a corner. Floor relocation was found in Biddenden, Egerton, Loose, Ashford, Goudhurst and Maidstone. The latter three parishes produced unrepentant followers of the new religion and Maidstone had three of its altar stones in the floor, surely a mark of disrespect. Former altar stones were also located in local chimneys: at Sutton Valence and Hartlip. In Rainham, it was lying in the churchyard.

Evidence of rood replacement is abundant. Three figures of Jesus, Mary and John were altogether missing in just 3 churches (Ham, Shaddockhurst and Wychinge).\textsuperscript{912} Incomplete (just the figure of Jesus) or unpainted roods in a further 57 testify to efforts at replacement. The injunctions required carved roods of a standard size to be set up, a considerable expense and a practical challenge to procure the necessary carver. Sums paid out for a rood Mary and John and the image of the patron – which was also required to be set up – at Newindon parish amounted to 34s 4d.

\textsuperscript{912} Ibid, pp. 71, 101, 234.
Most replaced roods constituted new carvings or images but it is also possible that some were originals, preserved from destruction. The image of the patron saint was lacking in just 16 churches and was found unpainted (signifying newly carved) in a further 47. Regarding reservation of the Sacrament, 34 of the usable churches failed the test of required standards. Every parish lacked some basic items of furniture, plate or vestments either in quantity or in quality. Silver chalices and or patens are missing in around 39 churches. Particular vestments – such as the several copes of liturgical colours used for the Sarum rite – are yet to be provided in a good many parishes and there are a significant number of instructions requiring provision of holy water stoops and special containers for taking the Sacrament to the sick. Many places lack covers and locks for their baptismal fonts and there is a scarcity of linen in many others. Considered in practical terms, previous labour costs for tearing down and breaking up the patrimony of decades – if not centuries – were small. Funds needed to put it all back obviously much greater. Sales or safekeeping might result in the eventual generous return by the new owner of alienated items but could also involve the cost of buying them back. Nevertheless, Harpsfield’s findings match, in general terms of steady replacement, the samples found elsewhere in the country.⁹¹³

Roger Hutton’s study of samples of over 134 parishes across the country from the time of Mary shows “a considerable homogeneity in the process of Catholic restoration”.⁹¹⁴ Altars, vestments, copes and essentials had all been provided while most churches had been decorated more than the legal requirement.⁹¹⁵

---

⁹¹⁵ Ibid.
accounts from Cratfield in Suffolk – a county exhibiting a mixed pattern of religious affiliation – show similar trends. Most church plate was sold as early as 1549 and compliance with removals of furniture was complete by 1553. The parish was active and generous in support of Mary’s cause. By the winter of that year the rood and altar were back up and restoration continued each year thereafter until in 1557, when a hanging pyx and even the Lenten veil were in place. On the other side of the country in Halesowen, the altar was back before the end of 1553 and repairs continued to be made, with the rood and its loft completed by 1556.

While in the southern counties progress in material restoration was well under way by the middle of the reign, in the northwest region of the country restoration was much slower but still progressive. Chester, the diocese in question, was poor in funds and for much of the time lacked the strong leadership of a bishop. George Coates, although quite dynamic in his administration, was not consecrated until April 1554 and died early in December 1555. His successor, Cuthbert Scott, was not chosen until late in 1556. The diocese was crippled by debt, which factor greatly impeded material improvements, but despite this handicap the overall picture may be judged as decidedly positive. Significant advances in administration and in parochial response included several episcopal Visitations during the Marian period. Increased efficiency of the consistory court is evident in the number and quality of its judgements, going from 46 adjudications between the years 1547-50 to 133 in years...
1555-58. Clerical discipline also improved and candidates for the priesthood rose consistently in Mary’s years, having previously been falling since 1525. By 1558 the number of ordinations reached a diocesan record with five ceremonies in one year during which Bishop Coates ordained 70 priests, 57 deacons, 76 subdeacons and 63 acolytes – a high proportion of which clerics were Lancastrians.\textsuperscript{923} Haigh points out that the reasons for this increase must have been religious rather than economic since there were no new clerical posts available and existing clergy were sufficient to fill the existing ones.

The pattern of church restoration in the region is likewise positive.\textsuperscript{924} Records indicate a steady drive towards replacement, aided by energetic popular fund-raising in some areas. The return of goods to parishes, which had been previously confiscated but not yet sent to London, also aided rapid restoration. Education received a boost with the refounding of Manchester College.\textsuperscript{925} New staff included figures such as Laurence Vaux, a staunch defender of the old Catholic tradition who went on to be a key figure in the post-Marian recusant movement.\textsuperscript{926} The clergy appear to have been well chosen. Other initiatives of the period included the founding of a grammar school by Queen Mary at Clitheroe in 1554 and of another at Huyton in 1556. The initiatives for Catholic revival were mostly local with improved administration and wholesale rebuilding of damaged churches. The influence of the government – largely effective through the Earl of Derby – was negligible after he left the court following the Spanish marriage and thereafter took very little interest in affairs in London for the rest of the reign. Where records exist they show popular response. The
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Churchwardens’ Accounts for the town of Ludlow, in the diocese of Worcester, detail a prompt, continuous and considerable restoration of the parish church from 1553 onwards.\(^927\) By 1554 the rood, altar and many other things necessary were back up and the glass in “St Margaret’s chancel” was being replaced.

The northeast of the country is less easy to assess in terms of material replacement but there seems little doubt that Catholicism was hugely popular. Few places in that region had not abandoned the Prayer Book by the autumn of 1553.\(^928\) “And so in the beginning of September there was [sic] very few parish churches in Yorkshire but mass was sung or said in Latin on the first Sunday of the said month or at furthest on the feast day of the Nativity of our Blessed Lady”.\(^929\) Nevertheless natural caution may still have exercised control in regard to expenditure and expectation. The neglect reported in York Minster in a visitation of 1538 was still visible in 1559.\(^930\) The dissolution of 9 religious houses, not to mention chantries and other charitable institutions, had left many scars upon the face of the city of York and no doubt led to much uncertainty about the future in a place traditionally hard-nosed and business-like.\(^931\) Nevertheless such scarce records as are extant reveal that the statutory liturgical changes of the Marian period were duly carried out.\(^932\) It could not be – in so short a period – on the scale of what went before because so much had been lost, sold or ruined. Wills for those years indicate some reserve about long term confidence as indicated by bequests for lights to burn in parish churches for up to a
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year. More permanent funding may have been viewed as risky and the future too uncertain for long-term investment. The clergy appear to have been on the whole devout and well-respected but mostly elderly and given to making the best of whatever situation they found themselves in. This is not an unusual clerical response in a crisis. There is however an important source relating to the diocese of York in more general terms that offers insights into its effective administration and accommodation to restored Catholic practice. An analysis of the Legatine register of Cardinal Pole reveals a very precise indication of the extent and utility of appeals to the legate’s spiritual authority, which were not only relatively numerous but also dealt with in efficient and methodical terms.  

East Anglia had been the original starting point of Queen Mary’s successful coup in 1553. It is reasonable to suppose that traditional religion in this part of the country was fairly well supported. At Hadleigh, the hero of Foxe’s account of the Marian persecution, Rowland Taylor, was opposed by a large number of his parishioners who wished to restore the Catholic ceremonies of Holy Week in 1554. Taylor was outmanoeuvred by the majority, who soon brought in a neighbouring priest to offer Mass for them despite a stand-off which lasted some days and included altars being set up and then pulled down in the night by the parson’s supporters. According to Foxe he spent a great deal of his time preaching against the revival going on in the countryside all around him. This is evidence from an unexpected source that there was indeed revival. Cratfield parish – already mentioned above – was forward in Catholic restoration. The parish church at Long Melford in Suffolk, as later described by its Marian Churchwarden, Roger Martyn, had been one of the
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glories of East Anglian Catholicism immediately prior to the religious changes ushered in by Henry VIII. The pillage and damage wrought during the reign of Edward VI did not even spare the monuments and tombs of the dead. Not even the fact that the Vicar was a safe Catholic appointment made on the recommendation of Mary herself – who had been given the right of presentation by her half-brother – saved the church from his commissioners. From 1547 to 1553 there was a gradual destruction of images and a selling-off of furnishings, vestments and plate. However it was in 1553 that the greater and most valuable part of the plate was finally surrendered to the royal commissioners. It appears that little of value was left by them. Nonetheless, heroic efforts were made during Mary’s reign to recover and restore something of the lost grandeur. An entry describes both the extent and repudiation of the damage and the some effort to recover what had been lost:

The premises scattered abroad and delivered to sacrilegious persons which paid little or nothing for them, were many of them spoiled and mangled, and some that were saved which we bought again as it appears afterward in the year of our Lord 1553.

Throughout the next three years the replacement of the altars, furnishings and images continued. The account entries show that the prices paid for the statues probably indicate that they may have been of poorer quality than the originals they replaced. “For the making of an image of Mary and John, 11s. For painting and gilding of the rood, 10s”. The church ales, which had long been a source of money for the upkeep of the church, were revived and drew people from considerable distances away. It would appear that the parish assisted some nuns, though obviously
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not in an established religious house. An entry in the accounts for 1555 records, “Laid out to the nuns for mending of the vestments 8d”. These may have been among the religious sheltered by the Bedingfeld family in their Suffolk home.\(^3\) By 1555 the parish at Long Melford had switched its expenditure to the repair of the steeple. The extent and popularity of the restoration must have been considerable since the accounts indicate that parts of the structural restoration of these years were not removed until 1562.\(^4\) Some of the windows have survived.\(^5\) One aspect of Edward’s reformation that could not be undone was the lime wash that covered the extensive murals. Charity to the poor sometimes went hand-in-hand with bequests to the church. Simon Coleman, clothier of Melford stipulated in his will that, “A payment of 40s yearly to the churchwardens of Melford, to be paid at the place called the Jesus Altar…at the feast of All Saints, for ever…to give and distribute unto the poorest people of Melford”\(^6\)

Norwich – then the second city in the Tudor realm and the episcopal seat of a large diocese - had also some strong Protestant influence by reason of its trade links to the continent.\(^7\) Although only around 5% of its wills exhibited traditional formulas in the last year of King Edward’s reign, not a great deal can be read into this as evidence of religious sympathies.\(^8\) In such a sensitive area where legal documents involving the passing on of property and wealth were vital, it would be natural for people to be cautious enough to employ whatever formula might be deemed “politically correct” whatever their personal convictions. As an indication of religious
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feeling in the city, the burnings have traditionally commanded more attention than the
evidence for Catholic revival. Between 1557 and 1558 there were 8 victims of
burning.\(^{945}\) The narrative of recovery and revival side of the story has been
acknowledged in greater detail.\(^{946}\) The four most prominent of the Protestant divines
either recanted – John Barrett and Peter Watts – or, fled abroad – Thomas Rose and
Robert Watson. From 28 October 1554, the city and diocese came under the
leadership of Bishop John Hopton who together with his chancellor, Michael
Dunning, set about the task for which they had been chosen. Foxe paints them as
unequalled for “straitness and cruelty”, but his accounts of their interrogation of those
brought before them on charges of heresy can also be read as an intent to argue them
out of their convictions or even to persuade them to a discreet silence about their
views.\(^{947}\) Given the prevalence of greater numbers of the reformed religion in
Norwich, the absence of more prosecutions for non-observance of the Catholic
religion under Mary may betoken a successful return to the faith or conformity of the
inhabitants induced by fear of prosecution by the largely Catholic ruling class. As in
many other examples of a continuing return to traditional religion during this time the
conclusion as to why often remains a matter of speculation. The fact of the recovery is
beyond dispute.

West of London, in the county of Berkshire, the town of Reading, in the
diocese of Salisbury (Sarum), which had been the site of one of the most famous
abbeys in England, with three other thriving churches within the borough, had seen a
sharp decline in its fortunes and status from the time of the abbey’s closure in 1539.

\(^{946}\) Houlbrooke, R., ‘The Clergy, the Church and the Courts in the Marian Restoration in Norwich’, in
Duffy, and Loades, eds., The Church of Mary Tudor, pp. 124-146.
\(^{947}\) Foxe, pp. 1731-2, 1936, 1942-3.
Unpublished Churchwardens’ Accounts of one of its parish churches, St Laurence, are among the most complete in England and date from 1410.\textsuperscript{948} Those of the other Reading churches, St Mary’s and St Giles’s, have been transcribed.\textsuperscript{949} Research on these published and manuscript archives corroborates the view expressed in a PhD thesis of 1987 that “the extent to which Catholicism was restored represented as much an achievement of the laity as it did of the assertion of royal authority obediently observed”.\textsuperscript{950}

The manuscript Churchwardens’ Accounts of St Laurence and the published accounts of the other two churches bear this judgement out and consistently reveal a pattern of enthusiastic and extensive restoration. The borough was one of the earliest of those places to show loyalty to Mary. Its archives record that:

The 21\textsuperscript{st} day of July [1553] in the first year of the reign of our sovereign lady Queen Mary, the Mayor and the inhabitants there sent out of the borough of Reading in aid of the Queen’s Majesty against the Duke of Northumberland, 10 soldiers well harnessed and well weaponed at the costs and charges of the said Mayor and inhabitants.\textsuperscript{951}

Copies of both Mary’s first letter to the Council in London and the reply sent in the name of Jane Grey are to be found in these archives. Queen Mary demonstrated her interest and approval by appointing Sir Francis Englefield, one of her closest friends and a Privy Councillor, as high steward of the town and the hundreds of Reading and Theale, on the 10 October 1553, in succession to William Parr, Marquis
of Northampton, who had been sent to the Tower on 26 July for rebellion. The town was to be rewarded for its loyalty by a visit of Philip and Mary on their return to London after their marriage in Winchester. Foxe records one of his accounts of an outstanding witness to the new religion in Reading at this time. One John Bolton was detained for saying that the Mass was “against the will of God and contumelious to Christ.” Bishop Gardiner – who was returning to London with the royal couple – asked to see Bolton and the bishop, as recorded by Foxe, was “reproved to his face” by him. Interpreting between the lines of Foxe’s polemic it looks very much like another attempt by a Catholic bishop to win over a convert – which did not succeed. Bolton remained in prison for nearly a year, allegedly chained up harshly, and having lost his reason, was then released on the orders of Sir Francis Englefeld – as related by Foxe. There is a curious entry – apparently for 15 September 1553 – of one John Saunders, a burgess, being expelled from the company: placed in the pillory and losing his ears for “seditious and slanderous words by him spoken against the King’s honourable Council”. Whether this was political or religious dissent or both is not clear.

The churchwardens’ accounts of St Laurence were used for a history of the church in 1883 which records one or two entries from them. They in fact exhibit a sequence of entries from which can be traced evidence of the destruction under Edward VI and the revival under Mary. The church lost all of it Catholic furnishings. No fewer than 6 altars had been removed from the church by as early as 1549. The
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High Altar was sold for 6s/8d to a Mr Bell in 1549.\textsuperscript{957} It was restored very quickly after the accession of Mary. The expense of putting it back again is recorded just four entries on from those for purchasing a communion book and extra wine for Easter 1553.\textsuperscript{958} Mr Bell appears to have preserved the best part of the altar, thus enabling its rapid restoration. The replacements of altars around the church continued through 1554. In 1557 the accounts record their consecration:

Md. That in the year of our Lord 1557 and the third and fourth year of the reigns of So[v]ereign lord and lady Philip and Mary by the grace of God King and Queen of England, &c., the Second Day of May being, Wllm. Ffynche Suffragan unto the Bishop of Bath & Wells hath hallowed the church yard of the p[ar]ish of St Laurence in Reading. And also the same day and year hath hallowed in the said p[ar]ish five altars of stone that is to wit, the High Altar of St Laurence; in the chancel next called St John’s Chancel one altar called St John’s Altar: in the body of the church the middle altar there called J[es]us Altar; in the south side there one altar called our Lady Altar of the Nativity; and in the north side there one altar called St Thomas Altar”.\textsuperscript{959}

Records also show that there was diligent enquiry into the whereabouts of goods disposed of in the previous reign.\textsuperscript{960} In 1547, all the images – 7 major images including one of Our Lady and several other smaller ones of other saints, in niches around the church – were all removed. The accounts for Mary’s reign do not mention their restoration. It is possible that they were either too expensive to replace or had been preserved and were restored without expense. The rood was replaced with its loft and survived until sometime into the reign of Elizabeth. The churchwardens’ accounts make no mention of when it was removed. In 1556 the scripture texts that had covered over the wall paintings since 1547 were painted out.\textsuperscript{961} Accounts show that in 1555 the sum of 9s 4d was collected for the “holy loaf”, the restoration of a
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former custom that had lapsed during the reign of Edward VI. These revivals and replacements were initiatives of the laity and are convincing evidence of their determination to get back to what they had before the Edward’s injunctions compelled removals and destruction. As is evident from the records, formal ecclesiastical recognition had to wait until 1557 when the consecration of altars put back between 1553 and 1554 took place.

There is further detail of expenditure on items of worship raised from the revival of gatherings which had traditionally been held in the past to raise funds. Contrast between financial support under Edward and increased funding under Mary is also evident. In 1552 the receipt from what is called “the devotion of the parishioners” is ominously written down as “n[ihi]”.962 By 1557 it was 10s 8d.963 Receipts for Easter 1552 amounted to 29s 8d.964 The receipts for the same festival in 1556 were 56s 2d.965 An expense item listing two shillings paid out as “… smoke ferthings otherwise called peter pence,” suggests a return to the traditional annual English tribute to the Holy See (Peter’s Pence) from 1554.966 Nevertheless, St Laurence’s fared less well than its two sister churches in Reading, St Mary’s and St Giles’. Whereas the former suffered after 1536 onwards from the Abbey’s closure and was from 1554 actually without a regular priest, the other two had resident Catholic priests and thrived in the Marian years. Thomas Thackam, the Protestant vicar of St Laurence, had boasted in the first days of Mary’s reign that he “…would seal his doctrine with his blood, and stand to it even unto death”.967 But soon he
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changed his mind – as he was reminded years later in 1571, when he was back as vicar in the reign of Elizabeth – “… Thackham brought into the church leaves of the old popish service, and that he, with others, did help to patch together the books, and to sing the first Latin evensong in the church of S. Laurence.”

The accounts of St Mary’s in Reading commence with details of church goods sold to the parishioners in 1550 to the value of £77 2s. 7d. It would seem that most of these were restored to the church in Mary’s reign. The accounts from 1550 to 1553 simply itemise payments to individuals – mostly without indicating exactly for what – but in the later years they do indicate a fair amount of expenditure on masons and joiners and stone. One must presume that they were busy putting back altars and replacing other church furnishings that had been removed in Edward’s reign. Another sign of gradual and communal return to Catholic tradition are the receipts from the Paschal, Maytide and Hocktide gatherings. Comparison for the years’ accounts from 1556 to 1561 show that in 1556 (when they seem to have recommenced) receipts were £3 11s 1d with the highest amount being received in 1558 of £4 12s 3d. By 1561 receipts had fallen to just 10s 6d. Receipts for these gatherings do not appear after that year.

At St Giles’ church in Reading, the records indicate a rapid return to Catholic custom and order. The newly acquired communion table was sold for 2s, having been just recently made at a cost of 3s 10d. A master mason was engaged to rebuild the stone High Altar. The rood re-appeared from its place of safe-keeping and was
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repainted and restored – an interesting example of concealment, lending credence to the possibility that other images survived and were similarly brought back into service. The church’s stock of vestments was retrieved from alderman Thomas Aldworth and a missal purchased for 5s. The sample from all of these parishes provides evidence of what we find in Eamon Duffy’s research of the parishioners having in many cases bought and preserved items from their churches in the time of Edward’s confiscation which were then returned to use during the reign of Catholic Mary.972 Entries in the accounts continue to show additional outlay on items for church use and ornament right through the reign.

The accounts of the Berkshire parish of Stanford-in-the-Vale, (now in Oxfordshire) indicate a purchase by the Vicar, Mr Fawckener, of most of the more valuable items inventoried by Edward’s commissioners.973 There is also a list in the same place of items not included in that inventory, suggesting perhaps further evidence of concealment. In Mary’s reign there is a note that items were renewed during her reign but the page has been torn resulting in those details being lost. However, benefactions to the parish, including linen, curtains and a pyx are listed, from a Mrs Dorothy. Thomas Whitehorne, presented a vestment of “yellow sarcenet.” Stanford was comfortably up and running with the restored religion from early on. The Berkshire parishes in the sample seem to represent more than conformity. There is an earnest and consistent return to the rhythm and rituals of faith interrupted during the reign of Edward VI. The stripped-down service of the Prayer Book and gutted church interiors can have appealed very little to communities nurtured in the comforting rites of the old religion. Reading had its Protestants too but they never

represented anything like the majority or commanded the allegiance of even those who ran the borough. The town appears to have been loyal to Mary from the beginning and Catholic in the majority. No fewer than forty soldiers were recruited and fully kitted out at a total cost to the borough of £18 6s 8d, to go abroad to fight for King Philip in July 1557.974 The entry in the Borough Records reflects a sense of pride in this contribution as well as a sense of money well spent.

From the first entry in his diary that records the return of the Mass to London on 23 August 1553, Henry Machyn chronicles with evident enthusiasm and regularity the return of Catholic ritual to the capital.975 His keen eye for detail and his professional involvement in funeral rites of the nobility and gentry in various churches provide a textual commentary on the continuing return of ceremonies forbidden in the previous reign.976 St Paul’s Cathedral had its High Altar restored and Mass began to be celebrated between August and early September.977 The Coronation of Mary on the first day of October by Bishop Stephen Gardiner in Westminster Abbey began the legal process of re-establishing Catholicism. Oil for her anointing was procured from the Bishop of Arras, Antoine de Granvelle.978 Full Catholic rites used at the ceremony overlooked the fact that they were technically illegal. The parliament called immediately after quickly dealt with such anomalies and by 1 November they were not only legal but also mandatory.
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The progress of Catholic revival in London is partially traceable in the writings of Charles Wriothesley and Henry Machyn. A great deal in the way of public display of religion is suggestive of a general restoration in the city.\footnote{Chronicle of the Grey Friars, pp 86, 88. Machyn, Diary, pp. 49-50, 51, 62, 66, 69, 78.} Of course it is not easy to assess popular enthusiasm from this and in the beginning at least some churches and their congregations stood out against the revival. Bishop Gardiner’s summons of 30 London parish representatives in January 1554, enquiring why they had not restored the Mass, shows this.\footnote{Queen Jane and Queen Mary, p. 34.} An un-named church (almost certainly St Mary Magdalen) in Milk Street and “others” are investigated. Whether this group is drawn from the whole of the London Diocese with its estimated 641 churches (47 of which were exempts or peculiars and so outside the jurisdiction of the bishop) rather than the 114 in and around London itself is not clear. Obviously if from the former, it represents a much smaller proportion of the whole. Bishop Bonner’s Register lists 24 resignations and 118 deprivations in 1554, drawn from the whole of his diocese.\footnote{Dixon, R. W., History of the Church of England, vol. IV, p. 156.} The capital must have had its share of clerical dismissals from among this group, thus removing opposition from that source. The restoration is hardly affected by them, and later records further into the reign suggest a growing transformation of Londoners into a visibly Catholic community. That might be some way off complete conversion but the impact of daily ritual, public profession and government pressure should not be discounted.

The man overseeing this transformation was Bishop Edmund Bonner, restored to his former see of London in August 1553 following his release from prison.\footnote{Wriothesley’s Chronicle, vol. II, p. 96. Chronicle of the Grey Friars, p. 82.} Vivid descriptions of his irascibility feature in Foxe’s memorial as well as alleged
instances of his notorious cruelty.\textsuperscript{983} He may well have been irascible but not all of those examined by him ended up as Protestant martyrs.\textsuperscript{984} Like Gardiner he had been a supporter of royal supremacy but later opposed the imposition of the Prayer Book. From the beginning of Mary’s reign he was identified as a major force in the Marian revival in London. His diocese included the county of Essex as well as London which continued to include pockets of resistance that caused him no small problems.\textsuperscript{985}

The situation in 1553 which Bonner faced as bishop in his diocese was one of established resistance to Catholicism on a scale greater than any other as well as demolished church interiors. London churches had been reduced to shells of their former glory largely by compulsion and dominant minorities but some by consent of the parishioners.\textsuperscript{986} The phrase applied to London, used by John ab Ulmis in a letter to Bullinger already in 1548, “\textit{arae factae sunt harae}” (the altars have become pigsties) gives some indication not only of the extent of the destruction but also of the spirit that inspired it.\textsuperscript{987} Nicholas Ridley’s short period as Bishop of London — succeeding the deprivation of Bonner in 1550 — accelerated the destruction. The High Altar in St Paul’s appears to have already gone before he arrived, but he removed the table that replaced it from the old high point to the level of the nave.\textsuperscript{988} Upon his reinstatement in August 1553 Bishop Bonner lost no time in inaugurating a restoration. On his own authority he issued injunctions and began a series of visitations.\textsuperscript{989} The matters enquired of were thorough to the last detail. Bonner could
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never be accused of being slack in the pursuit of his goal. His actions, predictably, were not welcomed everywhere though the historian Dixon’s comment that they “raised a storm in London” seems overstated since, representatives of only three parishes in the entire diocese told Bonner they could not fulfil his demands.  

Whatever the opposition from a minority of his flock, evidence of the success of his endeavours may be deduced from the extent of what was destroyed later, after 1558. The daily bonfires of roods and other images went on for nearly a month, in 1559, an indication of just how much had been put back previously.

The abandoned religious observance and monastic tradition was the furthest away from memory, the most expensive element that could be restored and the most difficult to materially recover. It had been the fruit of a millennium of endowment, lost in less than ten years. Mary’s failure to resurrect more than a handful of the defunct religious houses is attributed to either lack of enthusiasm for that kind of spirituality or an indication of its being a low priority. But realistically how much time and resources were available to Mary to allow for many new or revived foundations? It seems unreasonable to expect more than a modest number of such large structures of this kind to be founded. Cardinal Pole was committed to bringing back religious houses from the beginning. It was still reflected as a priority in his preaching to the Londoners on 30 November 1557. This sermon is one of the few extensive texts of such that survives but the beginning is missing. What remains is redolent of the man and his ideals. The opening sentence relates the casting down and
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suppression of the monasteries as the overturning of the wealth both of the realm and
of the prince himself. He later contrasts reproachfully the number of religious
institutions in London with the scores of such in the cities of Venice and Florence. He sought to encourage and awaken in his audience a desire to return to their original
religious use or to newly endow foundations, using the wealth previously extorted
from the suppressions of Henry VIII and his son. It is unlikely that Mary was any less
keen than Pole to opportunely make good as much of this seizure as she reasonably
could. But there was always serious opposition to this from the vested interests that
were threatened by it, as the example of the destruction of the priory church at Repton
in the first weeks of her reign suggests.

It would have been well-nigh impossible for Mary to have made moves in the direction of restoring many more religious
houses without raising suspicions among even her enriched co-religionists. On 3
January 1555 the bill that gave legal status to the re-union with Rome had also
confirmed in their possession those who held former Church lands thus reducing
much of the apprehension over security of tenure that had been current.

Nevertheless, the relative shortness of the period of tenure would have been enough to
have fed apprehensions of long-term security.

Revival of religious houses was always matter of personal initiative on the part
of the property owners or the Crown. From 1555 onwards significant attempts were
made, establishing Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, Carthusians, Bridgettines
and Knights of Malta by royal patronage. The conversion of Westminster from abbey
church to cathedral had occurred with the erection of a diocese of that name by Henry
VIII in 1540. The Bull Praeclara carissimi of Pope Paul IV, issued in 1555,
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effectively legitimised the previous abolition of the Benedictine monastery, clearing the way for a new foundation within the existing buildings. The abbey’s historic location, well within the royal influence and accessible from Whitehall, made it an ideal beneficiary of royal bounty. There is no question but that Pole wanted and intended to restore it and similar religious houses. He had Canterbury as well as London in mind as he wrote to the Abbot of St Paul’s Outside the Walls, in Rome.\footnote{Knighton, C.S., ‘Westminster Abbey Restored’, in Duffy and Loades, eds., \textit{The Church of Mary Tudor}, p. 77-8.} Pole had begun moves to revive Westminster Abbey as early as 1555. He had previously written asking support from the President of the Benedictine Congregation of Monte Cassino.\footnote{CRP, no. 1436.} The significance of this choice has lay in the fact of its being a Cassinese Congregation of Benedictines sprung from a reform movement of the early fifteenth century and reflecting the very best of the traditions of the ancient rule. In the event, the help that Pole sought never materialised. What he now set up was effectively a new foundation.\footnote{CSPV, vol. VI, pt. 1, p. 27.} The impetus for the Marian monastic revival came in April 1555 when John Feckenham, the Dean of St Paul’s, and fifteen other monks appeared at court in their Benedictine habits.\footnote{CRP, no. 2020. CSPV, vol. VI, pt 2, no. 904.}

The Venetian ambassador, who recorded their appearance in a letter to the Doge and Senate, also reported that the Queen had invited exiled Dominicans and Franciscans to return. According to him, they were well received by the public. He seemed in no doubt that, though few in number, Mary had every intention of returning as many of the former religious houses as she possessed. Most were by now in private hands either as individual estates or smaller units of land. The first recipients of the royal bounty were the Franciscan Friars Observant. On 7 April – Palm Sunday – their
old house at Greenwich was restored to them. This, the place of Mary’s baptism, must have been one that was close to her heart but it was also a place over which she had ownership and the right to bestow it elsewhere. Later, on 23 March 1556, it was there that Cardinal Pole was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. On the same day, the Dominicans were restored at St Bartholomew’s Smithfield, thanks to a surrender of land on the part of Richard (Lord) Rich, whose perjured testimony had in 1534 procured the conviction of Sir Thomas More.

The re-establishment of Westminster took longer than expected. Some of the delay was probably due to Pole’s anticipation of help from Monte Cassino. It did not materialise. There was also opposition from the Dean and Chapter of the erstwhile cathedral. However, compensation for their loss of income was found and the former Canons were provided with rights to prebends and pensions by the Crown. By November 1556 Pole had decided to proceed without the help from Monte Cassino that he had sought and on the 21st of that month the abbey was revived, with “… the new abbot of Westminster put in, doctor Feckenham, late dean of St Paul’s and 14 more monks sworn in …”. On 29 November, the new Abbot was consecrated with great ceremony by Bishop Heath, in the presence of Cardinal Pole and many other prelates. In a letter to his friend, the Bishop of Ragusa, the Venetian grandee, prelate and life-long friend of Pole, Alvise Priuli, praises the restoration. He wrote that the Cardinal had sought at least to devise a new constitution for the abbey by the stipulation that the Abbot’s rule should initially last for only three

1003 CRP, no. 1436.
1005 CRP, no. 1703.
1006 Machyn, Diary, pp. 118-119.
1007 Ibid., pp. 119-120.
years – following the Italian custom. The 28 new monks who had joined were of the highest calibre and had given up lucrative and responsible positions to adopt the strictest form of monastic life. Considerable amounts of money were spent during Mary’s reign in renewing the abbey’s store of vestments, as well as plate, and the restoration of the rood. One of the fruits of this revival of the abbey’s former monastic life was the restoration of the tomb of St Edward the Confessor, despoiled during the reign of Henry VIII.

The xx day of March was taken up at Westminster again with a hundred lights king Edward the confessor in the same place where his shrine was, and it shall be set up again as fast as my lord abbot can have it done, for it was a goodly sight to have seen it, how reverently he was carried from the place that he was taken up where he was laid when that the abbey was spoiled and robbed; and so he was carried, and goodly singing and censing as has been seen, and mass sung.

It was sufficiently complete and impressive for the Duke of Muscovy – envoy from the court of Ivan the Terrible – to visit it as part of his itinerary during his stay in London that year. The present surviving superstructure is almost certainly a work of the Marian period. If so, it is one of the very few religious monuments of the Catholic revival to survive undamaged from the time of Mary’s death. The restored monastery eventually housed 36 monks and postulants and 50 ancillary residents of various kinds – including choral clerks and boys.

---
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By May 1557 the Venetian ambassador reported that there were now seven religious houses in England. Apart from Benedictines and Franciscans and Dominicans, already mentioned, the Carthusians were established at Sheen, the Bridgettines at Syon and the Dominican nuns at Dartford and then at King’s Langley, the former property of Anne of Cleves, fourth wife of Henry VIII, who returned to the Catholic faith during Mary’s reign. Also restored was the hospital at the Savoy – a charitable institute originally founded by her grandfather Henry VII – which Mary endowed with lands. It was the only such foundation to survive beyond her reign. The Knights of St John, whose old Priory buildings at Clerkenwell had been granted to Mary as a London residence by her father, were revived in 1557. On 30 November, Sir Thomas Tresham was installed as Grand Prior of the Order with four other knights. By letters patent dated 2 April 1558 the King and Queen restored to the Knights all their former properties in the possession of the Crown. It is estimated that 11 religious houses following a variety of rules were set up again during Mary’s reign. Other benefactions included a restored Archdeaconry of Wells (May 1556), a guild and chapel of St Faith in London (July 1556) and the re-founding of a hospital of St Leonard at Stoke by Newark in Nottinghamshire (1558).

This record perhaps provides an indication of what in future years might have been repeated elsewhere, if time had allowed. Gradual conversion and education of the younger generations and greater economic and social stability might have led to other examples of benefaction. Scepticism among historians about the benefit of and
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interest of Mary and Pole in religious houses is not lacking. The material reality of the foundations and Pole’s reference in the 1557 sermon to the need for them surely makes indifference difficult to verify. It might be more in keeping with the facts to suggest it was a cause with which Mary identified. Lack of means and opportunity should not imply lack of interest or enthusiasm. Against the conclusion of indifference, recent scholarship inclines towards a more realistic appreciation of both the willingness to revive religious houses and the interest they engendered. Within so brief a period of potential – in reality barely two resourceful years – and acknowledging the huge drain of war and economic depression on resources, the revival of several houses should fairly stand out as an achievement for which to give credit. It merits more than just a footnote in the history of a short reign. In late 1557 perhaps Pole thought the example of the Queen and the temper of the times made it a favourable time to stir consciences. If his words had any hope of finding a response he did not live long enough to rejoice in it.

2. “Our Jewel, our joy, our Judith”

By 1557, The regenerative spirit investing the heartlands of Catholic Europe was blowing steadily – if at times somewhat intermittently – through the chancels of the nation’s parish churches as well as the corridors of the Palace of Whitehall. A

---

major component of this current was the emphasis on the propadeutic potential of the liturgy. Mass, celebrated in its arcane splendour, was the obvious vehicle for popular engagement with revived Catholicism.\textsuperscript{1023} As its loss in Edward’s reign had alienated vast numbers of people, so the reinvigoration of its rituals provided a rich and colourful channel for the conveyance of recovered religious identity. It had always represented reassurance of divine intervention in this world and a pledge of safe passage for pardoned sinners into the next. Of course the intervening years of assault on its theology and then abolition of its rites could not be ignored. Adjustments had to be made to the changed circumstances and loss of confidence consequent upon the release of those negative forces. The Queen and Pole believed that the break with Rome had introduced heterodoxy, and the abolition of the Mass had removed the last bastion of Catholic defence against the errors and confusion spread and fostered by the schism.\textsuperscript{1024} From the first days of Mary’s accession the restored celebration of the Mass signalled the return to traditional religion.\textsuperscript{1025} England had for centuries its own particular version of the Latin Mass – the liturgy of Sarum, a variant of the Roman Rite — and it was in this form that it returned. Its revival in the parish, in all its forms, was paralleled by its sumptuous revival at court. The services and Masses attended by the King and Queen were of style and setting that matched the splendours of ceremonial court occasions. It was quite elaborate even within its parochial setting. The principal Mass of the Sunday began with a blessing of water and bread followed by a procession, with appropriate chants in season.\textsuperscript{1026} The participation of the Spanish residents and ecclesiastics at Court lent additional splendour. It is now well

\textsuperscript{1024} Ibid., p. 236.  
\textsuperscript{1025} Ibid., p. 229.  
\textsuperscript{1026} Missale ad usum insignis et praecellae ecclesiae Sarum, ed., F.H. Dickinson, ed., (Burntisland, 1861), pp. 29-42.
established that the Spanish clerical entourage of the King played a major part in the
 ceremonies.  

 London was again becoming used to religious spectacle on a grand scale. In 1554 Henry Machyn records with evident enthusiasm the festival of the Immaculate Conception (8 December) at the Savoy Palace with a procession in which a great number of Spaniards took part and including a corps of musicians and singers. Again, in 1556, he records a similar liturgical occasion at the Palace of Whitehall, which from the date (8 June) must have been the Feast of Corpus Christi. The king’s guards accompanied the procession, making a splendid sight, and musicians played during it and at the Mass which followed. Such application of courtly and royal protocol to solemn liturgical celebrations mirrored precisely the continental expression of similar emphasis aimed at challenging and rejecting Protestant minimalism. England was for this short period representative of a visible counter-Reformation experience. One of the greatest liturgical scholars of the twentieth century endorses this view. Predominantly, the Mass, devotion to the Holy Eucharist and the cult of the saints, which dominated the Catholic reform movement for centuries to come, and was effective also in the New World, were for brief interlude effective also in England. Exemplary of this Eucharistic piety and devotion, Pope Paul IV personally took part in Corpus Christi processions, insisted upon the finest materials to adorn altars and tabernacles and commissioned a monstrance for processional use that was worked in sapphires and emeralds.
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As elsewhere, at the Marian court music played a huge part in these liturgical celebrations. The tradition of church music that had flourished under the first two Tudors – exemplified by the composer John Taverner (1495-1545) – had been severely curtailed under Edward VI. Mass settings became obsolete. Mary’s accession ushered in period of renewed commission and composition to accompany the liturgy.\textsuperscript{1033} The list of composers who were active and producing works of high quality during this reign is impressive. Polyphonic settings requiring elaborate harmonies were once again heard in the royal chapels and Mary generously promoted and gave patronage to composers and musicians as her father and grandfather had done. Composers such as John Shepherd, Christopher Tye, Thomas Tallis, William Byrd, Robert Parsons, Osbert Parsley and Robert Okeland, all composed music for the royal chapels during those years. Marian anthems composed during the reign also reflect not only the restoration of devotion to the Virgin Mary but also paid tribute to her regal namesake for her fidelity to Catholicism. Two such works, \textit{Regina Coeli} by Robert Whyte senior chorister at Trinity College, Cambridge, and \textit{Vox patris caelestis ad sacram virginem Mariam}, by William Mundy, are identified as examples of this.\textsuperscript{1034} Regrettably, few examples of the work of Okeland and Parsons survive.

The re-appearance of music for Mass and other Catholic services enhanced not only the worship in the royal chapels but also the churches around the capital. Robert Okeland (1532-55) was organist at St Mary-at-Hill. Some motets of his survive. Thomas Tallis on the other hand is well represented among manuscripts still extant. He composed some of his most sumptuous Masses during the period of Mary’s reign. His votive antiphon \textit{Gaude gloriosa Mater} and Mass setting \textit{Puer natus est nobis} both

date from this time. The first is actually addressed to the Queen – though written in
honour of the Virgin Mary - praising her as the restorer of the true faith.\textsuperscript{1035} The
music is evocative of the period with expressive notation and phraseology. The
“\textit{potestate diabolica}” is tersely rendered while the phrase following it “\textit{liberati}”
ascends to lyrical heights. His \textit{Puer natus} setting is said to reflect the expectation of
an heir for Mary and Philip. His standing was high with the Queen, from whom he is
mentioned as having leased for twenty-one years, the manor of Minster in Thanet.

Musical scholarship attributes some outstanding pieces, a Mass \textit{Euge bone}
and two psalm settings, \textit{Omnes gentes plaudite minibus} and \textit{Cantate Domino} to
Christopher Tye (1507?-1572?). All three were written during Queen Mary’s revival
of the Mass. The extant settings for the Mass by the composer John Shepherd (1515-
1560) also date from this time. No large composition survives but the lesser settings
that have are of a style described as innovative and soaring.\textsuperscript{1036} William Byrd (1543-
1623), that “\textit{stiff papist}” as Elizabeth later described him, began his musical career
under Mary.\textsuperscript{1037} Already before the age of sixteen he had composed three magnificent
motets for the Sarum liturgy. His perseverance in the Catholic faith, spanning nearly
three entire reigns, is perhaps one of the best examples of a success story of the
Marian Catholic revival in his youth. What survives from the corpus of liturgical
music from this time provides the most eloquent testimony to the variety, energy,
creativity and importantly, confidence of this short period when the Catholic Mass
was for the last time the official worship of the nation.

\textsuperscript{1035} \textit{GM}.
\textsuperscript{1036} \textit{GM}.
\textsuperscript{1037} \textit{GM}.
Intellectual precision was another positive feature of Marian Catholicism. Winchester College was among the great scholastic institutions of the past where the old religion flourished during Mary’s reign and left a legacy of fidelity to its principles. Only one Wykehamist, Augustine Bradbridge – a fellow of New College during the reign of Edward VI – is known to have been among the Protestant exiles during the reign. Likewise only one of its alumni was burnt for heresy. He was John Philpot, a prolific and invariably vitriolic exponent of Protestant polemic. The oversight of Bishop Gardiner during the the reign of Henry VIII and later under Mary ensured a continuous and strong Catholic influence at the college – at least in terms of sacramental doctrine. John White, who succeeded Gardiner as bishop in Winchester was equally vigilant. As the bishop’s chaplain, he had joined him in supporting royal supremacy. In the reign of Edward VI, they both championed the doctrine of transubstantiation and ended up in prison in 1551 though White continued in the post of Warden of Winchester College until 1553. He was powerless to prevent the altars and images in the chapel from being demolished and a table installed for the Prayer Book service. At the same time almost the entire and impressive collection of church plate was seized by the royal commissioners though some pieces were allowed to remain if converted to secular use. However, endowments were not seized but the Masses linked to them had to be discontinued.

1040 Foxe, p. 1815.
With the accession of Queen Mary, John White became a prominent figure among those dedicated to revival of the old faith. He preached at St Paul’s in November 1553.\textsuperscript{1043} His work *Diacosiomartyrion* was published in January 1554.\textsuperscript{1044} He was nominated to the see of Lincoln and assisted at the wedding of Philip and Mary in Winchester in July of that same year. He supervised the writing and presentation of verses written by twenty-five of the pupils, celebrating the marriage and showing Mary and Philip’s common descent from John of Gaunt.\textsuperscript{1045} The Catholic influence at the college throughout the reign of Mary was probably total and is borne out by the subsequent perseverance in the faith of some who were Wykehamists during this time.\textsuperscript{1046} Records indicate that there was a considerable restoration of much that had been destroyed or lost under Edward VI.\textsuperscript{1047} The college was also well represented by several key figures in the Marian church: Nicholas Harpsfield, who became Archdeacon of Canterbury in 1554; John Harpsfield, older brother of Nicholas, who became Archdeacon of London in 1554; John Holyman, appointed Bishop of Bristol; James Turberville, appointed to Exeter; and Dr Henry Cole who received successively important appointments until finally ending up as Vicar-General to Cardinal Pole in 1557. He preached before the burning of Thomas Cranmer. John Harpsfield preached what might be considered the keynote speech of the reign, at the beginning of Convocation in 1554, during which he praised Mary and described the Edwardian preachers as “wolves that entered into the flock”.\textsuperscript{1048} John White’s successor as Warden of Winchester was John Boxall, who held that office from 1554 to 1556 at which time he became Under-Secretary of State to Queen Mary.
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He went on to become Dean of Windsor and Registrar of the Order of the Garter until the end of the reign. The Head Master from 1552 to 1558 was Thomas Hyde. He resigned his benefice and went abroad for conscience’s sake at the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign. A Wykehamist was also involved in the revival of Westminster Abbey. William Coppinger, who had been in the service of Bishop Gardiner as a lawyer and was imprisoned like him in the Tower, continued in his service until the Chancellor died in 1555, at which time he became a Benedictine novice and joined the community in Westminster.

Attention to the importance of higher education – with its immediate influence upon the quality and orthodoxy of the clergy – was a priority with Queen Mary from the very beginning of her reign. Already on 20 August 1553 she sent two identical letters to the Chancellors and heads of houses at Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Among other things the letter exhorted them to see to it that all students under them, “… live as appointed by the ancient statutes, according to the ordinances of the founders and grants of our progenitors”. Claire Cross associates the speed of Mary’s action with her vision of the key role that she and her government intended that the universities should play in the restoration of Catholicism. The appointment of Sir John Mason as Chancellor of Oxford and Bishop Gardiner to the same role at Cambridge indicated strong Catholic oversight. It was followed by something like a purge of the Calvinist divines and students from abroad who had come over in the previous reign. Possibly as many as sixty university men from
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Oxford and seventy-six from Cambridge followed the divines into exile abroad.\textsuperscript{1054} Their departure cleared the way for a complete re-engagement with Catholicism. Financial security went hand in hand with rigorous vigilance regarding orthodoxy, as over the next five years Mary both endowed Oxford and, together with Pole’s supervision as Chancellor, restored its Catholic ascendancy.\textsuperscript{1055} At Cambridge, within six months of Mary’s accession only three colleges at Cambridge – Gonville, Jesus and Magdalene – had not come under the direction of new heads. Oxford was an easier exercise since the underlying mood of the university had been much more favourable to Catholicism – a fact quickly acknowledged by the reformers.\textsuperscript{1056} Only Christ Church, Magdalene and Corpus required the removal of senior members. So secure was Oxford in its Catholicity that in the spring of 1554 it was the chosen venue for the disputation involving Archbishop Cranmer and Bishops Latimer and Ridley and the Catholic divines.\textsuperscript{1057} Following upon it they remained in prison in the city though with considerable comfort and freedom to correspond and receive visitors. They were well-supported by their co-religionists during these months.

The Queen’s endowments to Oxford have been more recently acknowledged, to the extent of assessment that its income tripled by the summer of 1554 and considerable improvements were made to the schools in the Marian period.\textsuperscript{1058} Trinity College, Cambridge – which also enjoyed the patronage of Bishop Gardiner – received an endowment at about the same time which provided funds for twenty

\textsuperscript{1054} Cross, C., ‘The English Universities 1553-58’, in Duffy, and Loades, eds., \textit{The Church of Mary Tudor}, pp. 63-64.
\textsuperscript{1056} OL, II, p. 369.
\textsuperscript{1057} Foxe, pp. 1452-89.
\textsuperscript{1058} Cross, C., ‘The English Universities 1553-58, in Duffy, and Loades, eds., \textit{The Church of Mary Tudor}, p. 66.
scholars, ten choristers and a master, four chaplains, thirteen poor scholars and two sizars.\textsuperscript{1059} Within the next year, the drama and tragedy of the trials, conviction and burning of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley gave a degree of notoriety to Oxford. It also meant that by this time there was much less sympathy there for their doctrines than might have been the case in London. Contrary to some critics of the Marian period at Oxford, the contribution made by graduates of those years to Elizabethan recusancy was outstanding. Figures such as Thomas Stapleton, Edmund Campion, and Gregory Martin and Robert Persons and Laurence Vaux, belie the criticism that the spirit which created the English mission owed little to Marian Catholicism.\textsuperscript{1060}

During 1556 Cardinal Pole commissioned legatine visits to both the universities. The copy of a document, thought to be of an original from the Queen’s own hand and written in 1555, expresses her desire that he should do so in order to “smother and extinguish all those errors and false opinions disseminated and spread abroad by the late preachers”.\textsuperscript{1061} Any remaining traces of Protestantism were dealt with as confiscated books were burnt in a public repudiation of the doctrines of the former divines. In the autumn of that same year Pole became Chancellor of both universities. The model of Christian humanism which had flourished before the break with Rome was re-established. Through him Oxford came once again in contact with reform continental Catholicism.\textsuperscript{1062} In 1557, St John’s College and Holy Trinity College were founded at Oxford as new houses and Gonville at Cambridge was re-founded as Gonville and Caius. A recent history of Cambridge in the late Tudor
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period contains little reference to the reign of Mary.\textsuperscript{1063} A history of St John’s College refers to the early and intense Marian interest to eradicate Protestantism in the university.\textsuperscript{1064} In September 1553, John Watson was elected Master and immediately introduced Bishop John Fisher’s statutes of 1530. A quarter of the Marian exiles from the university came from St John’s and included the illustrious Sir John Cheke. The contention that departures and expulsions led to a decline in academic standing is refuted.\textsuperscript{1065} The accounts show that by 1556 the full Catholic restoration in discipline and liturgy was complete. Purchase and repair of vestments is recorded as is the acquisition of items for worship. The accounts for the late years of the reign indicate “a torrent of expenditure” on such items.\textsuperscript{1066} Nor was there any less emphasis on expense for the traditional festal board of food and wine associated with the religious holydays. Older historical studies provide details of the changes during the early years of Elizabeth’s reign of personnel and removal of altars and roods, replaced during that of Mary, can be viewed as evidence of the need to de-Catholicise Cambridge.\textsuperscript{1067} Mary’s final bequest of £500 to each university with a special emphasis on supporting those intending to be priests or religious is literally the last word on her vision for their future.\textsuperscript{1068}

Mention has already been made of the part played by the Spanish entourage of King Philip in the presentation of the Mass and related devotion to the Holy Eucharist. Spanish research into Roman Inquisition Archives has provided new
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information regarding their academic involvement in the universities. David Loades concludes that the Spaniards made no significant contribution to the overall effort to revive Catholicism in England during Mary’s reign. Eamon Duffy argues differently that they constituted a major influence upon Catholic revival. Nicholas Sander, educated at Winchester and New College, who subsequently became one of the leading Elizabethan recusant clerics, later gave testament to the influence of the Spanish friars, Pedro de Soto, Bartolomé Carranza and Juan de Villagarcia. His letter to John Rastell, of around 1562, is expressive of the fervent Catholicism of the university at the time. Carranza later recorded hearing a welcoming address by Sander as Visitor to the university in 1556. Spanish influence in liturgical ceremony has been noted, particularly in the Corpus Christi processions attended by the King and Queen. William Wizeman has shown that there are overlapping features of influence common to both Spanish as well as English writers of the period.

The ecclesiastics who came over to England in the train of King Philip were men of eminent ability and stature, personally chosen by him. Don Pedro de Castro, Bishop of Cuenca; Dr Bartolomé Torres, later bishop of the Canary Islands; Don Fernando de Valdés, Archbishop of Seville and later Inquisitor General. Together with them came friars both Franciscan and Dominican: the former being

---
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Fray Alfonso de Castro and Fray Bernardo de Fresnedo; the latter, Fray Juan de Villagarcía, Fray Bartolomé Carranza de Miranda, and Fray Pedro de Soto.\textsuperscript{1077} The catechism subsequently compiled by Carranza at Pole’s request was never printed but it became the basis for a definitive publication promulgated following the later session of the Council of Trent.\textsuperscript{1078}

Upon their arrival in 1554 Carranza and his fellow Dominicans were accommodated at first in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey. His task was to absolve lapsed friars and to promote in every possible way the revival of the religious life of his Order. Later, Oxford became the main focus of his activity.\textsuperscript{1079} Included in their activities were the trial of Thomas Cranmer; the exhumation of Peter Martyr Vermigli’s wife from the shrine of St Frideswide and the reintroduction of scholastic theology. As noted in Chapter IV there can be little doubt that Carranza shared the prevalent view of heresy as a major social and religious malaise.\textsuperscript{1080} Cardinal Pole’s use of the Spaniards stemmed from the purity and fervour of their un-contaminated Catholicism. It matches his other drives towards robust practice and pastoral conviction. Evidence bears out both the correct dynamic and resulting success of his efforts.\textsuperscript{1081}

Just as public ceremonial and popular preaching featured as priorities of pastoral initiative, the literate layfolk were well catered for by the abundant use of the printed manuals for public and private devotion. No fewer than thirty-five editions of
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the Sarum Primer and four of the York Primer have survived from Mary’s reign. These were mostly the output of a single publisher, John Wayland, who acted under royal warrant. The Marian Church not only published extensively but was also vigilant in regard to restricting access to hostile publications from the opposition. Nor was quality or readership as limited for significant titles as once believed. Bishop Bonner’s *A Profitable and Necessary Doctrine and Homilies* went through ten printings and were ordered to be read from pulpits weekly in parishes throughout the 24 dioceses of Province of Canterbury. Significantly, these devotional and instructional manuals were not government-directed or restricted as to their contents as were the primers of Henry VIII and Edward VI. They did, however, have government approval. They were different in tone and style from earlier works of the sixteenth century. In comparison with earlier pre-Reformation manuals there is an absence of the piety drawn from legends of saints and a scarcity of reference to indulgences. The conclusion is unavoidable that these versions represent a new careful approach combining both new and old elements, reflecting insights gained from recent controversies, and presenting the ancient faith in a novel literary form. Original copies still extant show alterations in the form of crossings out made by users of these manuals of prayer, according to official direction or their own religious tastes. In the case of the Marian primers prominence is given to English rather than Latin texts which are sometimes marginal or absent altogether. While the primers were serving their purpose as accessible books of devotion engaging with the need for new insights and readership in a post-Reformation England, the defenders of the old faith were also producing their texts of conviction. Bishop Bonner’s *Profitable and*
Necessary Doctrine, combined with The Thirteen Homilies, formed the basic manual of parish catechesis during this time. As such it was required to be in possession and in use by every parish. Again, they are strongly representative of traditional Catholicism, with the addition of some creatively used elements from the two previous reigns which were deemed positive. The writing and publication of polemical, propagandist, preaching manuals and primers, and catechetical texts, not only reflected the positive appreciation of their positive and propadeutic value but also their combative element in countering opposition literature. The view that they constituted “a rich and sophisticatedly contemporary spirituality, well adapted to its pastoral purpose”, is justified. 1085 The Marian record on propaganda emphasising discontinuity and disorder religious also deserves to be better known. 1086 The researches of Lucy Wooding also recognise positively the new genre of writings which are scripturally and patristically based. She does contend however that the emphasis is more practical, moral and devotional and short on typical pre-Reformation hagiography, and with the notable exceptions of Pole and John Standish other writers are reticent about Papal Supremacy. 1087 Eamon Duffy is more inclined to argue in favour of adequate and even considerable recognition of Papal Primacy as a constant and central theme of the writings and preaching of the period. 1088 Likewise, William Wizeman, whose exhaustive study on Marian spirituality and theology has already been noted, concludes that all the major themes of the Catholic Counter-reformation were present in the Marian apologetic.

1085 Duffy, E., Fires of Faith, p. 70.
1086 Ibid. pp. 70-78.
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It is a fact that no major shrine to the Blessed Virgin Mary – all of which were destroyed from 1536 onwards - was set up again under Queen Mary. This has led to conclusions that this devotion was a casualty of the Reformation neglected in the Marian recovery and even a questionable aspect of Mary’s own personal devotion. Given the amount of craftsmanship and expense necessary to restore roods and patronal images required to be set up again in every parish church throughout the country, there must have been a considerable logistical problem about the completion of such a large-scale project as a shrine, in the traditional style and ornament. Resources were concentrated on essentials. Overt hostility may also have acted as a deterrent. There was also the ever-present danger of desecration which only required one successful attempt. The rood may have supplied at least one aspect and topical focus of devotion. Statues of the Virgin Mary, as one of the two supporting figures of the rood, were widely replaced. Her aspect in the story of Christ’s Passion had been central to it in devotional terms for many centuries. Perhaps that image expressed appropriately for many the desolation of the times of iconoclasm. In literary circumstances, the prayerful devotion of the cult of the Virgin in her own right – so to speak – was not ignored. William Wizemann notes it in the primers published during the reign and in Bishop Bonner’s *A Profitable Doctrine*. Frequently, elements of Marian piety took the form of attribution to Queen Mary as protector and earthly patron of renewed Catholicism. Catholic writers such as Miles Hogarde and Leonard Stopes produced works that drew parallels between the role of the Virgin Mary in the story of salvation and that of the Queen in being chosen to save England from heresy.

---

The propaganda war waged from the Protestant side has been noted as one of the chief weapons used to de-stabilise the Marian regime.\footnote{Loades, D., \textit{The Reign of Mary Tudor}, pp. 162.} Eamon Duffy’s defence of the Marian Church affirms its priorities of refuting the arguments of opponents and providing positive and sound sources to contest them.\footnote{Fires of Faith, pp. 59-72.} There were always sufficient writers in the Catholic tradition who successfully countered opposition polemic, particularly in the presentation of the social and other evils attributed to the new religion.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 72-5.} The earlier output of the reign compared to later diminution is fairly attributable to the adverse and unpredictable conditions of war, disease food shortages.\footnote{Ibid, p. 60-61.} Controlling and restricting the availability of Protestant literature remained a constant and effective exercise.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 57-8.} The printing presses were also occupied positively in the provision of works in demand. Thousands of Altar Missals were in production throughout the reign. Queen Mary’s and Cardinal Pole’s authorisation of a new edition of the Sarum Missal – which went to several editions – and a similar mandate to Carranza to produce a catechism, guaranteed work for authorised printers.\footnote{Mayer, T.F., \textit{Reginald Pole}, pp. 242 & 281.} Who was actually winning this battle of words? At times, it seems that the verdict of history has gone against the Marian authorities.\footnote{Loades, D., \textit{The Reign of Mary Tudor}, pp. 279-88.} However, on one level it is questionable whether the polemical writings of the gospellers, though numerous, had a wider circulation much beyond their own communities. At the same time, the pressure from the traditional side was unrelenting for most of the reign. In 1557, William Rastell’s complete edition of the works of Sir Thomas More was published. He also wrote in manuscript form a life of More – now lost – of which
only a fragment remains in the British Library. In the same year, Roper’s *Life of Sir Thomas More* also appeared highlighting the example of the most important layman to oppose the religious revolution from the very start. The significance of this in propaganda terms has been recently fully appreciated.\footnote{Duffy, E., *Fires of Faith*, pp. 178-81.} There is convincing evidence refuting the claim that the Marian authorities were negligent in regard to understanding the potential of the printed word.\footnote{Duffy, E., *The Fires of Faith*, pp. 57-78.} The apologetic and catechetical works of Bishop Bonner, Miles Hogarde, Bishop Thomas Watson, Robert Parkyn, Robert Edgeworth, John and Nicholas Harpsfield, John Proctor and John Christopherson, John Standish, and the printing works of John Wayland, all provide examples of effective and accessible writings from the Catholic side. The case for the Catholicism is cogently argued and doctrinal explanations clearly set out. The early years of the reign were the most productive and it was almost inevitable that the hard times in the later years meant less energy and resources available for such activities.\footnote{Ibid., p. 61.}

The initial difficulty of matching available resources to requisite expenditure on recovering something like an adequate parochial presence represented a real challenge for Cardinal Pole.\footnote{Pogson, R.H. ‘Revival and Reform in Mary Tudor’s Church: A Question of Money’, in Haigh, C., ed., *The English Reformation Revised*, pp. 139-156.} However, it was one to which he rose with distinction. He had begun the involvement of the bishops in his quest to procure details of the state of their diocesan finances and necessities at the earliest opportunity after his arrival in England.\footnote{CSPSp, vol. XII, p. 112. CSPV, vol. VI, pt. 1, no. 270.} Mary involved the Council in his investigations, setting up weekly meetings with him from early in 1555 to explore the problems and
find solutions.\footnote{1104 CSPD, no. 140. B. L. Cotton MS. Titus B n. fol. 16.} Mary’s consent to the drafting of a statute to return first-fruits, tenths and spiritual income from impropriated benefices in the possession of the Crown represents her contribution to at least exemplify what she and Pole had been asking of all who had benefited from the former confiscations.\footnote{1105 Statutes of the Realm, vol. IV, 2/3 Philip & Mary, c. 4. Wriothesley’s Chronicle, vol. II, p. 130.} As described in earlier chapters, the reconciliation to Catholicism practically depended on the guarantee of property rights. But there must always have been the hope that eventually some amends might be made once traditional religion and its values had properly taken root again.

In the early stages the fact that most of the bishops were already in debt to the Crown and had lost the greater part of their church revenues and plate was a major handicap.\footnote{1106 CSPD, no. 2.} In some cases the trail of enquiry into diverted and unaccounted sources and revenues went cold fairly quickly. Examples of enquiries into lost or unaccountable items from confiscations which should have come to the Crown appear in the public records.\footnote{1107 CSPD, nos. 118, 124, 146, 888.} As it was, considerable time and effort was needed to unravel the knot of confusion and misappropriation and restore order and proper accountability. Mary had already begun her own investigation into alienated church goods, where petitions for the same had been addressed to her.\footnote{1108 APC, vol. IV, pp. 344, 360, 371, 376; vol. V, pp. 105, 112.} Although it took time, there were notable successes in returned and re-directed properties. In April 1555 the city of Exeter benefited from the return to its eight parishes of nearly 1,400 ounces of silver plate.\footnote{1109 APC, vol, V, p. 201.} The archdeaconries of Taunton and Wells retrieved as much as 4,545 ounces and parishes within the diocese of Norwich received back...
quantities of their plate. Even as late as February 1558, parishes in the East Riding of
Yorkshire were receiving back plate previously confiscated in Edward’s reign. In regard to income and lands formerly confiscated to the use of the Crown, Mary had to establish original ownership in many cases before any form of restitution could be made. Restitution also involved compensation still being made to displaced religious. That obligation passed from the Queen to the bishops with the transfer of the revenues deriving from former monasteries or convents. The level of painstaking enquiry and paperwork involved should not be underestimated.

Despite the time and effort required in tracking down the appropriate data, a degree of success has to be acknowledged. Order was beginning to be imposed on a creaking and outdated system and this was in no small measure due to the painstaking attention to detail of Pole and his staff. An investigation of the meticulous efforts of the Cardinal and his team, aided by Queen Mary’s officials in the Court of Augmentations, forms an important contribution to both understanding and appreciating the Cardinal’s aims and successes. Hindsight may condemn these efforts as too late and insufficient, but the reality is that it represented genuine and much-needed advance towards sufficiency and good housekeeping. The records reveal long-term planning leading to greater efficiency. The brevity of the experiment may easily give rise to the notion of futility but that is to judge it unfairly on the basis of unforeseen circumstances.

An area of Pole’s administration previously undervalued and diminished due to its suspension by Pope Paul IV was his role as residential Legate. Thomas F. Mayer

1110 APC, VI, p. 267.
has revealed much more clearly the level of success it enjoyed, even in the short period of its duration. The legatine register preserved in Douai and the records of the contemporary ecclesiastical courts are the basis of the evidence in its favour.\textsuperscript{1112} Indications are that a considerably greater number of cases on religious matters relating to his competence as legate and archbishop were referred to his judgement than previously thought. Though fragmentary and incomplete, the records provide sufficient samples to demonstrate a successful and well-conducted operation of legal adjudication. The consistency and quality of justice dispensed is also of a very high and efficient standard. Instead of the previously proposed number of only 43 lay cases, a much more likely figure is 315.\textsuperscript{1113} Greater clarity of evidence appears in the consideration of clerical appeals for dispensation. Here the number is eight hundred and thirty four, who sought dispensations or absolution for various impediments. Those for pluralism number 232. As Mayer points out this was one of the most abiding and intractable problems in this age.\textsuperscript{1114} Pole dealt with it by using the shortage of clergy to advantage, filling every benefice. He also laid down ground rules which led to a changing attitude, in evidence by the end of his legation. This must rank as a signal achievement favouring the correction of an abuse. The credit for this success has been hitherto denied him due to the rapid disintegration of his administration after 1558.

Added to all of Pole’s domestic charge and responsibility were the demands made upon him by papal diplomacy between the constantly warring Hapsburg and French rulers, first commissioned by Julius III and then from May 1555, by the

\textsuperscript{1112} Mayer, T. F., ‘Cardinal Pole’s Final Legation’, in Duffy and Loades, eds., \textit{The Church of Mary Tudor}, pp. 149-75.
\textsuperscript{1113} Ibid., p. 158.
\textsuperscript{1114} Ibid., p. 164.
intransigent and suspicious Paul IV. The determination of the latter to recover what he considered the lost former dignity and power of the Papacy was almost superhuman. It included former English tribute paid to the Holy See, although for the time being he granted exemption on the grounds of insufficient resources. Pole obediently and affectively conducted a thorough investigation to satisfy the Pope’s commission.

Rex Pogson identified the largely neglected manuscript of the report of the taxable value of English dioceses drawn up by John Clerk, a leading notary employed by Pole. It is in his words “a large and elaborate record” which indicates both thoroughness and attention to detail. It may not have advanced the progress of conversion and consolidation in England, but it does illustrate the capacity for effective direction and government, within the very short interlude of Pole’s presidency. It is easy to accuse him of negligence of more direct pastoral necessities in the time given over to these exercises. But it could be argued that the possession of such information placed at this disposal for the future a description of the state of the dioceses more accurate than any previously available. Soon, however, events beyond his control on the European scene were to engage him and his Sovereigns in both financial and other priorities, depriving them of the opportunity but not the interest to pursue uninterruptedly that agenda which had engaged their attention since 1553. Illness would not be the least inconvenient circumstance to interfere with the project of recovery. The rising death toll resulting from an epidemic would reduce clerical manpower resources and ultimately claim the life of the Cardinal himself.


1115
By 1556, the situation for Catholic revival seems promising, at least to one admittedly involved and interested observer. Writing from London at the end of 1556 (15 December), Alvise Priuli expressed admiration for the perceptible improvement to his (and Pole’s) friend Ludovico Becadelli, Archbishop of Ragusa. The letter mentioned the restoration of Westminster Abbey, now housing 28 well-educated monks ("benissimo qualificate di dottrina"). Abbot John Feckenham and his monks also exercised a pastoral mission to those imprisoned in London for heresy. In this connection they made contact with a notable figure of resistance. Sir John Cheke, courtier and statesman, had been renowned for his classical erudition and Protestant conviction. His conversion to Catholicism is applauded in Priuli’s letter. How genuine was it? The facts of his high-level career as Protestant scholar and then tutor and mentor to Edward VI are indisputable. In Mary’s reign he went into exile in Germany. Later, he was kidnapped in Brussels and brought back to England to be imprisoned in the Tower. His subsequent public declaration of conversion to Catholicism was something of a propaganda coup for Pole. Perhaps it was but Strype’s biography of Cheke is doubtful of the veracity of the conversion. Cheke was among the most distinguished of the laymen at the court of Edward VI who genuinely embraced the new religion. Born in 1514, his linguistic skills and academic potential led to his becoming a King’s Scholar at St John’s Cambridge from where he went on to be the first Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge. He was chosen by Henry VIII in 1544 to be tutor to the future Edward VI. His total influence on that king’s formation and religious views cannot be doubted. He is described as having been “the central figure in (this) circle about Edward and his outlook shaped the king’s world view within the cloistered environment of the privy chamber.”
recorded that Cheke was “ever at his [Edward’s] elbow, both in his closet and in his chapel, and wherever else he went, to inform and teach him”. A close friend of John á Lasco, he was very much involved in the revision of the Prayer Book in 1552. He went on to be Secretary of State to Lady Jane Grey during her short reign as queen. He was socially well-connected within the Protestant circle, being a brother-in-law of William Cecil who married Cheke’s sister and through his marriage with a daughter of Richard Hill, a London wine-merchant, he became a son-in-law of Sir John Mason, who was ambassador to Brussels at this time. Like other prominent persons who through Mary’s clemency or political sagacity were pardoned for their part in Northumberland’s rebellion, he showed little gratitude. Soon afterward he applied for licence to go abroad and was among those influential Protestant exiles choosing to leave the country well before there was any penal threat to their religious status. While abroad, his intellectual gifts were put to use by the exiles. He supplied good copy for propaganda purposes and he was very likely one of the chief brains behind the overseas literary campaigns against Mary’s regime.

Somehow or other he was lured from Emden in Germany to Brussels, where, on 15 May 1556, in the company of Sir Peter Carew he found himself suddenly apprehended and taken by force to England and imprisoned in the Tower. His betrays are named as Sir Peter Carew, Lord Paget or Sir John Mason. Elizabeth Garrett suggested it was Carew who exchanged betrayal of Cheke for a pardon for himself, but as to why the government in England were willing to accept these terms for the capture of Cheke, she offers no conclusion. Perhaps his weakness of character may have made him susceptible to conformity, a trait which Strype contends

1120 Garrett, E., Marian Exiles, p. 114.
was evident in him. A decision was taken to seek his conversion rather than prosecute him. Reports claimed that he demanded a conference of theologians with whom he could dispute. At this point, so the account claims, Cardinal Pole took an interest in the case resulting in the conversion of the prisoner. Strype decided that it was Mary who actively involved Feckenham in the case. Within months he appeared to have abjured all his former Protestant beliefs and then composed a treatise in Latin based on the writings of St Hilary of Poitiers, St Cyril, St John Chrysostom and St Augustine, confirming the Catholic belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and sent this and a letter of submission to Queen Mary. He was brought to Whitehall to make his profession of faith before the Queen herself. Despite this clear gesture of recantation he was sent back to prison. Soon given his liberty he was restored to his estates. As a further emphasis on the value of his conversion Cardinal Pole appointed him to sit with Bishop Bonner as an examiner of prisoners brought in for religious dissent. Strype endorses the view of Foxe that Cheke was so downcast by his abandonment of his true beliefs that he died aged 43 in 1557 of a broken heart. He may have been a victim of the same virus that was responsible for so many other deaths during his time.

Priuli’s letter, mentioned earlier, praises Abbot Feckenham’s influence in the reconciliation of 28 obstinate young prisoners anticipating the death penalty. The Venetian ambassador believed Cheke also influenced the conversion. Clearly, the value to the Catholic propaganda cause of this high-profile conversion or conformity

1121 CSP, Ven., VI, pt. 1, no. 548.
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was current in diplomatic circles. From the reports mentioned we may infer that it was a useful propaganda coup during a critical period of the campaign against determined opposition.\footnote{Duffy, E., \textit{Fires of Faith}, p. 148.} As a close assistant, Priuli judged the conversions as a sign of progress and as evidence of Pole’s enterprise. But it should not be discounted on that basis. It conveys optimism at the continuing expansion of religion and perhaps reveals something of the appearance of change in London that helps to balance historical accounts that are less positive. Unlike Foxe and Strype later Priuli, reported in the immediate aftermath of the events and his tone is more likely that of an insider witnessing positive results in an area previously difficult to engage.
Chapter VI: Hostage to Fortune

1. “*Magno dolore affecti sumus*”\textsuperscript{1128}

The unfulfilled potential that surrounds the reality that Cardinal Pole could have succeeded to the Papacy in 1550 offers a fascinating possibility of speculation. At a certain point in the conclave that followed the death of Paul III, he needed just one vote in order to gain a further six from the French party that would have given him the necessary majority.\textsuperscript{1129} In the event the strategy of his supporters collapsed and Cardinal del Monte went on to become Pope Julius III. By the time of Julius’ death in 1555, Pole – although still not completely overlooked as a candidate by some – was already in England and refused to leave his post and travel to Rome for the conclave that assembled to elect a successor. Providence produced Pope Marcellus II (Cervini) who reigned for less than a month, an altogether different character than his supine predecessor, and after him Pope Paul IV, Caraffa (1555 - 1559).

The various personality traits and obsessions of Pope Paul IV are well documented.\textsuperscript{1130} He was reform minded but his character was rigid, suffocating and terrifying in its simple identification of evil and heresy with everything that he

\textsuperscript{1128} Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. III, pt. 2, p. 475. Philip & Mary to Pope Paul IV deploring the threatened revocation of Pole’s legatine status, a latere, and natus.
\textsuperscript{1129} Pastor, L. History of the Popes, vol. XIII, pp. 15-17.
personally disliked. Nobody dared gainsay him, though at times manifestly and dangerously wrong in his judgements and actions. Among the less than fortuitous traits of prejudice he exhibited was an animus against the Spaniards and in particular the Hapsburg rulers Charles V and Philip II. Their domination of the Pope’s homeland inspired in him a repugnance that was potentially explosive and easily aroused. His other abiding aversion was the taint of heresy anywhere he encountered or suspected it. Unfortunately, his notions of heresy frequently happened to coincide with anything or anyone with whom he did not agree and he frequently equated his own private and political views with the full magisterium of his Supreme Pontificate.

Much has been made of the extent to which the animosity of Paul IV and his suspicions about the orthodoxy of Cardinal Pole blighted the green shoots of Catholic revival in England. The origin and direction of his suspicions about Pole have been well examined in to studies already mentioned. Part of the protracted libel against Pole was carried on by Pier Paolo Vergerio, Nuncio in parts of Germany. Part of the case rested in Pole’s pre-Tridentine circle of friends and their search for a demanding level of spiritual awareness. Pole had also sought to find some middle way between Luther and Catholic theology, within an Augustinian framework, on the question of justification. The important element of his quest that should be borne in mind is that such speculation was legitimate before Trent’s definition. Pole completely and totally submitted to the latter and there was never any question that he withheld obedience on this point. Nevertheless, he was dogged by the relentless suspicions of Paul IV. That circumstance, coupled with the Pope’s provocation of
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hostilities with the Hapsburgs caused real hardship for Pole, as it did for Queen Mary. Their instincts of loyalty were severely tested in these final years. That said, it probably stalled rather than stifled the momentum of the recovery. What saved the situation was undoubtedly Pole’s continued obedience despite his public humiliation. Mary also kept her head and gave her full support to the Cardinal, defending him at all times from papal aggression. Much more damaging to internal efforts at reorganisation and reform – because it drained financial resources and diverted attention away from the priorities of peacetime – was King Philip’s war with France into which England was unavoidably drawn during the summer of 1557. A failed plot in 1556 by Thomas Stafford (a Plantagenet relative of the Queen) produced evidence of the direct complicity of Henry II of France, which the English government could not ignore. By this time too, there appears to have been widespread recognition among those chiefly concerned about the succession that Mary would bear no children and inevitably thoughts and interests turned more and more to Elizabeth as the next heir.1134 Her public acceptance of Catholicism both belied her true feelings and made her acceptable to Philip as Mary’s successor. The nearest alternative, Mary, Queen of Scots, a more certain Catholic, was already betrothed to the Dauphin, whom she would marry in April 1558. Her succession to the English throne would have inevitably drawn England into alliance with Philip’s enemy France. Meanwhile Philip naturally sought to exploit his royal position in England to gain support for his continental war effort. Away from England and now a ruler in his own right elsewhere, knowing the value and symbolism of the rite, he requested the assurance of a proper coronation, before agreeing to return.

These years were a time of severe social and economic downturn. Epidemics caused widespread illness and death; bad harvests led to severe food and other shortages. Borrowing was very high and interest rates equally so. The harvests of 1555-1557 were generally bad, leading to scarcities of all kinds. The years 1557 to 1558 saw the most serious outbreak of “the sweating sickness”, an influenza that caused many deaths – significantly among the clergy – and was very likely what caused the death of Cardinal Pole himself. These natural disasters as well as the Dudley conspiracy in the latter half of the reign are often projected as confirmation of failure on every level and as indications of the terminal illness of the regime itself and its policies. Misfortune seemed to outweigh success. The legendary loss of Calais in early 1558 seemed to confirm this general trend. It has become a useful signpost pointing to descent into futility. The circumstances of the loss may be much more prosaic: persistent government failure to address the known weakness of the fortifications and the possibility of the truth of rumours that internal treachery had also been a factor. Henry Machyn records the fact of the rumours. Bishop Gardiner had previously, in 1555, been alarmed at the extent of Protestant influence in the territory. The Protestant intelligentsia in exile were acutely aware that should Mary’s health fail their hopes rested on her half-sister. Having married with the hope of continuing a Catholic line, the disappointment for Mary of remaining childless must have been particularly painful. But she still nurtured hopes of becoming pregnant again.

1136 *CSPV*, vol. VI, pt 2, nos. 258, 883, 884.  
Her court and parliamentarians may have been more sceptical. Perhaps the suspicion of Mary’s infertility stalled plans to have Philip ceremonially crowned. In the event of Mary’s death he might wish to become sole ruler. Her efforts to procure his coronation led to tensions between her and parliament. She may have wanted her husband to be crowned at first but was later persuaded to abandon the idea.\footnote{CSPV, vol. VI, pt. 1, no. 257. Richards, J., \textit{Mary Tudor}, p. 211.} Hostility to enhancing his status seems to have arisen more from his foreign origins than from his religion. This was a much more difficult obstacle for Mary to overcome. Her refusal to force the issue gives rise to the view that for all the accusations of either insensitivity or arbitrary rule made against her, she was after all rather more wise and temperate in government. She understood well the limits set by the need for parliamentary consent and did not push it to breaking point. There was no coronation for Philip because parliament opposed it. On a religious level too, Mary’s skill in dealing with uncooperative pressure from Rome was also tested. Relations cooled considerably and almost threatened to break down, presenting her with an ironic dilemma. Her obedience to the Holy See and loyalty to the notion of the essential unity of the Church it represented, conflicted with the immediate domestic loyalties to her husband and her Archbishop. Played out in diplomatic rather than canonical sanctions, the impact of this quarrel upon parochial and pastoral religion was likely to have been minimal. Throughout this period of accelerating involvement in foreign wars, of tension with papal politics and intermittent natural disasters, the religious recovery in Catholic practice and doctrine continued and undoubtedly had its effect where it was most needed on those growing up in Catholic environment.
King Philip’s departure to Brussels on 29 August 1555, as much as her emergence from the confinement of pregnancy, raised Mary’s profile in government. Their arrival in London from Hampton Court was enthusiastically reported on by Michiel, the Venetian ambassador who noted not only the huge crowds that came out to see them but their evident popularity. He seemed to believe also that with Philip’s departure Mary would take little part in Council business but would rely on the presence of Cardinal Pole. Philip had proposed that she confide in the Cardinal and advised him to support her. Faithful to his conviction that churchmen should concentrate their efforts on spiritual matters and as far as possible eschew political office he took no direct part in government business. He retained a pastoral concern for Mary’s political agenda, while living at Whitehall to be near her, during part of this time. Some view this as circumstantial evidence of her total dependence upon him. His accommodation there may have been for the practical reason of structural improvements to Lambeth Palace, initiated by him, as for any reason of state. Michiel was convinced that in the absence of Philip the Queen was disconsolate. It has been suggested that this may be overstating the case. Observers at this time noted that her sense of duty remained undiminished as well as her composure in public. Privately she occupied herself with own pious and charitable interests, which more than anything else had defined her character since her childhood. The habits of many years of solitude and the realisation of the inescapable absences relating to a dynastic alliance with a monarch ruling territories elsewhere must have had some bearing on her ability to cope. Diplomatically at least, there was no lack of
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1143 Mayer, T.F., Reginald Pole, pp. 320-330, provides details of major works that were undertaken at Lambeth Palace between 1556 and 1557, during Pole’s tenure of the See of Canterbury.
1144 Richards, J., Mary Tudor, pp. 182-184.
1146 Richards, J., Mary Tudor, pp. 142-6
communication between husband and wife, “as demonstrated by the frequency of messengers and couriers who pass to and fro when anything occurs”. 1147

The contentious issue of ownership was re-ignited by the bull of Pope Paul IV, issued in September 1555, condemning the alienation of church property. A copy arrived in England, allegedly – according to Michiel – to provoke trouble for Pole and create the notion that former concessions would be revoked. 1148 Fears were quelled by Bishop Gardiner’s reading in parliament and at Paul’s Cross of an exemption for England. 1149 The parliament that began on 25 October 1555 was the last to be managed by him. It was also to prove a less than smooth operation. 1150 There can be little doubt that in the matter of political guidance the Chancellor’s death on 12 November 1555 was a great loss, as Michiel reported. 1151 Machyn gives a sympathetic account of his funeral obsequies. 1152 Mary’s determination to part with her inherited stake in confiscated Church property, and simultaneously to ask for subsidies was resented by a sizeable proportion of the members. Answering the proposition that hostile reaction to repressive religious policies formed the background to this debate, Jennifer Loach comes to a different conclusion. 1153 Opposition to Mary’s wishes was not really connected with any presumed dislike of the burnings then occurring. The class of those who sat in this assembly, the gentry and nobility - as Michiel noted – were not sympathetic to the dissidents. Their interests were economic and social more than religious. For Mary, the issue was one of conscience rather than policy.
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She summoned between fifty or sixty members to explain that her conscience would not allow her to continue to enjoy first fruits and tenths that rightfully belonged to the Church, at the same time requesting subsidies for normal government expenditure. Unfortunately, the secession of available funds to the Church with the economic outlook so unfavourable provoked censure. The poor harvests continued to bite into resources and were notable in spiritual provisions of general dispensations from the usual Lenten abstinence being granted by Cardinal Pole in 1557. Even the Princess Elizabeth was granted a dispensation at her own request to take milk and meat because it appeared from her petition “… you do not wish to do so without papal approval”.

The simmering hostility of Pope Paul IV to the Hapsburg dynasty – and to Spaniards in general – erupted into open warfare in the summer of 1556. Aided and abetted by the French King, Henry II, the Pope provoked a situation by which Philip II had no choice but to defend his ancestral territories in the south of Italy. Unfortunately for Philip, the octogenarian Pontiff was old enough to have lived through wars and campaigns in Italy of both Ferdinand of Aragon and Charles V – great-grandfather and father of Philip – including the total sack of Rome in May 1527. The Pope was also incensed that Charles V agreed to the Peace of Augsburg with the German Lutheran rulers in 1555, accepting the religious status quo and the formula *cuius regio eius religio*. Effectively it drew the territorial boundaries of religious division in German lands for the time being. By 1556 the papal fury against the Hapsburgs was ready to risk all to punish them as he saw fit. Bernardo Navagero, Venetian ambassador to the Holy See, was witness to this and reported to the Doge
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and Senate the violent and intemperate language of the Pope, as he gave vent to his anger against them:

... the Pope would not allow him [the Portuguese ambassador] to proceed further, and drawing up his sleeve and rochet half way up his arm, and shaking it, as usual with him when in a rage, he said, “Lord ambassador let there be no more talk of peace, but of war. Woe is me (ohimé) are you not aware of the impiety and acts of treachery of these rogues, heretics and scelerats (sceletrati)[i.e. rogues]. We will give them as much war as they shall desire. Charles has always been schismatic, and Philip rapacious; both one and the other unworthy of the so many favours received by them from the goodness of God ... we will deprive them of their realms and dignity and do our worst by them.1156

Behind the Pope’s audacious confidence to deal with and defeat the Hapsburgs was his alliance with Henry II of France, his “good son, and in truth the first-born of this Apostolic See”.1157 Aided and abetted by this same ruler, conspiracies and plots against Mary’s government ultimately intended to undermine the Catholic revival in England, were being constantly fomented.1158 None of this seems to have altered the Pope’s judgement in favour of the French, even if he was aware of their machinations. The impact of papal displeasure had little impact upon the increasing normality of public ritual and ceremonial. Mary typified this phenomenon carrying out all the duties expected of her and taking part in the great seasonal rites of the Church. Congregations all over the country were doing the same. In the Lent of 1556, she celebrated the rituals of Maundy Thursday in the traditional manner of English royalty.

Her Majesty, knelt down on both her knees before the first poor woman, and taking in the left hand the woman’s right foot, she washed it with her own right hand, drying it very thoroughly with the towel which hung at her neck, and having signed it with the cross, she kissed the foot so fervently, that it seemed as if she were embracing something precious. She did the like by all and each of the other women, one by one, each of the ladies, her attendants, giving her in turn their basin and ewer and towel; and I vow to you, that in all
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her movements and gestures, and by her manner, she seemed to act thus not merely out of ceremony but from great feeling and devotion. Amongst these demonstrations, there was this one remarkable, that in washing the feet, she went the whole length of that long hall, from one end to the other on her knees.\footnote{CSPV, vol. VI, pt. 1, no. 681.}

The following day Mary celebrated Good Friday with ceremonies which included the blessing of cramp rings and touching for the “king’s evil” a scrofulous disease of the skin.

After the Passion, the Queen came down from her oratory for the adoration of the Cross, accompanied by my lord the right reverend Legate, and kneeling a short distance from the cross, moved towards it on her knees, praying before it thrice, and then she drew nigh and kissed it, performing this act with such devotion, as greatly to edify all those who were present. Her Majesty next gave her benediction to the rings … this being terminated, her Majesty went to bless the scrofulous, but she chose to perform this act privately in a gallery, where there were not above twenty persons … \footnote{Ibid.}

A manuscript known to have been used at this ceremony has survived. Bearing the quartered arms of both Philip and Mary – and therefore dating sometime between 1555 and 1558 – it is titled “\textit{Certayn prayers to be sed by the quene’s highness in the consecration of the cramp ryng}”.\footnote{Westminster Cathedral Treasury MS. No. 7. This manuscript is currently on loan to Westminster Abbey from the library of Westminster Cathedral. Its fly-leaf contains the inscription, \textit{Queen Mary’s Manual for blessing cramp rings and touching for the evil}, Bound 1850. That binding has not survived with the rest of the MS.} An illustration of Mary in the action of blessing rings and the full text of the rite is given. This is followed by the heading “\textit{The Ceremonye for ye heling of them that be diseased with the kyng’s evil}.” On the page opposite the Queen is illustrated with her Clerk of the Closet by her side. He holds an open book of the Gospel readings. Kneeling in front of her to receive the royal touch is the sick person aided by a clerical sponsor. This singular document survives as but one illustration of Mary as the pious Catholic monarch performing her religious duties solemnly. Others close to Mary during those years later bore witness
to her piety and charity. One of her maids, Jane Dormer, afterwards married the
Spanish Count (later Duke) of Feria. In her later memoirs, written in Spain, she
recalled the summer of 1556, while she was at Croydon, one of the Archbishop of
Canterbury’s country residences, when the Queen made informal and incognito visits
to the poor round about listening to them and doing whatever she could to help their
situation. That summer saw the beginnings of severe epidemics of illness that
were to continue intermittently until the end of the reign, causing many deaths, among
both rich and poor alike, noted by chroniclers and foreign diplomats.

The Pope’s war with Philip provided him with another opportunity to vent his
anger upon the Cardinal. He was but one of a number of key members of the
Sacred College whom the Pontiff distrusted. Paul IV was not a man to be cautious in
acting upon his opinions. Cardinal Morone, one of Pole’s closest friends and for a
time his correspondent from Rome, soon became the subject of investigation though
later proved innocent. Pole had tried diplomacy between Philip and the Pope, but
this counted for little with the latter whose coldness and discourtesy towards him was
becoming an embarrassment. The public withdrawal of official status obliged the
Cardinal to act. On 7 December 1556, the Venetian Ambassador Michiel reported to
the Doge and Senate that Pole had decided to send his own representative to Rome.

The Legate is this day dispatching to Rome in haste his privy chamberlain
Monsignor Henry Penning … He told me … that the sole cause of this mission
is his having been many months without ever receiving any reply of any sort
from the Pope or his ministers to any letters and offices performed by him; the
Cardinal thinking this strange, being of the opinion that such constant and
prolonged taciturnity was derogatory to the post of Apostolic Legate; and

furthermore seeing that letters produce no effect whatever, he determined to
send a person express to give account of the affairs of this kingdom, and
especially of the prosperous progress of the religion.\textsuperscript{1166}

By 1556, a state of war existed between the Papal dominions and Spanish
territories in the south of Italy, brought on by the intrigues of the Pope’s nephew
Cardinal Carrafa. He had worked on his uncle’s fears and prejudices against his old
Hapsburg enemies.\textsuperscript{1167} By the end of that year peace had been restored between the
belligerents but a potentially more dangerous and closer conflict between Philip II and
Henry II of France was looming. French intrigues against Mary and Philip in England
eventually provoked them into military intervention. With Calais and other coastal
territories under English sovereignty vulnerable, the threat from France could not be
ignored. Meanwhile, Paul IV abandoned warfare to concentrate once again on the
spiritual conflict against schism and heresy and the unfinished reforms and agenda left
over from the suspension of the Council of Trent, six years previously, which he
hoped soon to reconvene.\textsuperscript{1168} He also began to take an interest in English affairs in
connection with traditional Papal revenues. Though soured against Pole he did not
ignore what he regarded as England’s obligations to the Holy See as the brief to the
Cardinal of Sept 1556 on taxing the diocese of Chichester shows.\textsuperscript{1169}

By 28 November, Pole’s friend Cardinal Morone wrote to him suggesting that
he should abandon his post in England because of Philip II and come to Rome.\textsuperscript{1170} A
further letter followed on 12 December, threatening the excommunication of the King
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and the deprivation of all his kingdoms.\textsuperscript{1171} Paul IV very much believed he not only possessed the power to effect this but also the inalienable prerogative to do so. Pole had actually foreseen that nothing of any advantage would be gained in the continuing dispute between the Pope and Philip, either to them or to the Catholic Church in England, and had written in such terms to the Pope.\textsuperscript{1172} Pole suffered for having done his best to broker peace between the two potential foes. Increasingly the actions of the Pope were placing a strain on his relationship with England and placing Pole in an impossible position of loyalty to his Sovereigns and obedience to the Pope. Mary was also being put in an equally ambivalent position dealing with the Pope’s demands that she offer no aid whatsoever to her husband while at the same time anxious to support Philip within the limitations of her marriage treaty. Pole wrote to Morone utterly refuting the Pope’s angry claim that Mary had aided her husband financially against him. He describes the report as “\textit{falsissimo}”, and affirms that Mary disapproved of the war and had desired only peace between Philip and the Pope.\textsuperscript{1173}

With King Philip now absent for over a year and the likelihood of Mary’s ever having a child seeming less likely, Elizabeth’s presence in London in December caused a stir.\textsuperscript{1174} Mary was said to be relying more on Cardinal Pole with whom, it was reported by Michiel, she spent several hours each day.\textsuperscript{1175} Philip’s absence extended as the increasing territories over which he ruled directly increased from Milan and Naples, to the Netherlands (October 1555). Spain and its vast possessions came under his rule (January 1556) with the abdication of his father Charles V. From
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this time on Philip could devote only partial interest to English affairs though his royal status in Spain and Naples may have led him to demand confirmation of it in England, by a coronation.¹¹⁷⁶

Mary’s absence from the celebrations on St Andrew’s day 1556, in the newly restored Westminster Abbey, to commemorate the well attended anniversary of the reconciliation of England with the Holy See was noted by Michiel. A week later he attributed her continuing indisposition to “distressing herself about her husband’s troubles”.¹¹⁷⁷ She would not reject her Council’s advice and accepted their advice in January 1557 that peace between England and France should continue despite the tensions between both kingdoms. The marriage treaty with Philip was designed to avoid England getting involved in his dynastic wars and they saw no reason why this should lapse.¹¹⁷⁸ Realistically, the possibility of war still existed. Machyn reports a muster in Greenwich Park of several hundred of the Queen’s pensioners and bodyguards in her presence with around ten thousand spectators.¹¹⁷⁹ He records that the Queen was in good spirits and “laughed heartily” at the antics of a tumbler. If she was distressed at this time it did not show on that occasion. On 18 March King Philip landed at Dover and five days later rode with Mary through London to Whitehall Palace.¹¹⁸⁰ His presence was to coincide with a season of religious events whose pomp and publicity seem to mark a turning point in the confidence of everyone concerned that there was visible and certifiable progress where it most mattered – the participation of large numbers of Londoners in liturgical ceremonies.

¹¹⁷⁸ CSPD, no. 538.
The reinstatement of the shrine of St Edward the Confessor was initiated on 20 March with great solemnity. Perhaps this was to have been the first of several such places of veneration. London, at any rate, was being gradually won over to popular traditional religion. A succession of sermons preached in London during that Lent and Easter identify not only the stepping up of the strategy of Catholic catechesis to the masses but also the increasing success in reaching more and more citizens. Henry Machyn noted these events and the crowds that they drew.\footnote{Machyn, \textit{Diary}, p. 131.} On 3 April, Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, preached at All Hallows the Great where there was “a great audience of people”. On the same day, Dr William Peryn, the Master of Blackfriars, preached at St Bartholomew’s, Smithfield, and another sermon (the preacher’s name is absent from Machyn’s record) was delivered at St Mary le Bow. The same year saw the publication of a spiritual treatise by him.\footnote{Peryn, W., \textit{Spiritual exercyses and goostly meditacions} (London, 1557), RSTC 17629.} The following (Passion) Sunday, Abbot Feckenham preached at Westminster and “made [a goodly] sermon as has been heard in our time”. On Good Friday Henry Morren (Morwen), one of Bishop Bonner’s chaplains, preached at Paul’s Cross and “there was a great audience”. On Easter Monday a great showpiece sermon took place at St Mary Spittal:

The 19\textsuperscript{th} day of April did preach a[t] St Mary Spittal doctor Pendleton, and made a goodly sermon; there was my lord mayor and 23 aldermen beside my lord mayor, and 3 judges, and all the masters of the hospital with green staffs in their hands and all the children of the hospital in blue garments … that be kept with certain lands and the charity of the noble city of London, and above 20,000 people of old and young, to hear the sermon of old custom ….”\footnote{Machyn, \textit{Diary}, p. 131.}
In a city with a population estimated at around 120,000+, this would represent a good average at any time.\textsuperscript{1184} By comparison a sermon preached by Bishop Gardiner three years earlier, in the autumn of 1554 had been reckoned by two witnesses to have drawn a crowd of 10,000.\textsuperscript{1185} Of necessity, both figures for such a large concourse are visual estimates. But the impression conveyed is of huge numbers. The apparently larger audience for 1557 has to be seen as an indication of greater interest if not yet full commitment. The preacher was himself a convert. Henry Pendleton (not to be confused with his nephew Edward, afterwards Vicar of Eccles) had largely conformed or remained silent under Edward but had been quick to return to Catholicism with Mary’s accession. He soon became a major contributor and convincing Catholic controversialist, a fact that makes any notion that he merely conformed at least questionable. He had no need to contend once again with the challenge of an official change of religion that might have tested his conviction, since he died in September 1557. On 20 April, Dr John Young preached at St Mary’s Spittal and this time Machyn records that all but one of city’s alderman was present, as well as the Lord Mayor and other noble gentlemen “with the whole city both old and young, both men and women”\textsuperscript{1186}.

The return of King Philip added to the renewed splendour of the Garter Procession on St George’s Day, who attended both sung Mass and Evensong with the Duke of Muscovy also present in the chapel for the evening service.\textsuperscript{1187} Machyn was so impressed with the whole event that he adds a second description of the festivities, coming several days later than the first (or else the original pages of the Manuscript
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These public religious ceremonies continued throughout the summer months. On 2 May, Dr William Chedsey preached at Paul’s Cross. Several burials of important Londoners recorded by Machyn may be the result of the unhappy effects of the flu epidemic then raging through the country. His entries for these months demonstrate the solemnity and public grandeur of the funerals, emphasising the return to general custom of these cherished religious traditions to the City of London. Typical of the time was the burial of haberdasher Tadley at St Magnus church on 12 May, with “12 staff torches and 4 great tapers and 16 poor men bare them”. On Ascension Day (26 May) the King and Queen rode to Westminster and attended a Procession and Mass with the whole court. The month of May ended with the traditional May games in Fenchurch Street, which represented another aspect of revival of quasi-religious community activity discontinued in the reign of Edward VI.

Just as significant as the preaching, the solemn celebration of the annual Church festivals, and the return of extended funeral rites was the re-invigoration of the religious life of the City craft and livery companies. The Fishmongers came out in style on 7 June with a Mass in St Peter’s, Cornhill, and “three crosses borne and 100 priests in copes… and then the craft of Fishmongers; my lord mayor and the aldermen, and all the officers with white rods in their hands, and so to Paul’s and there offered at the high altar, and after to dinner at the Fishmonger’s hall …”

The next day it was the turn of St Clement’s parish without Temple Bar, with another Mass and “goodly procession” with scores of priests and banners. On 27 June, the King and Queen celebrated Corpus Christi at Whitehall. On the 21, 24 and 30 June respectively, the companies of Sextons, Merchant Strangers and Merchant Tailors,
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1188 Ibid., p. 134.
each celebrated days of festival, with processions of hundreds of priests in copes and “many worshipful gentlemen and women”.

There was nothing essentially new in these liturgies, except perhaps a sense of renascent participation after a time of prohibition. Similar entries in the record of Henry Machyn seem to indicate London residents largely and happily rediscovering the rituals and festivals of their traditional faith. His observations offer a counterpoint to Foxe’s one-sided account favouring the persecuted. The notion of broadly based hostility to Catholicism is difficult to maintain when viewed through the prism of popular participation such as that described by Machyn. At least in some respects, people were again investing in religion as they once did. This increasing accommodation with restored traditional religion was taking place against the background of the harshest period of public burnings of convicted heretics, which peaked in the year 1557. Machyn records them with his customary sang-froid, in contrast to Foxe’s polemical style. The argument suggested by Eamon Duffy that the increasing positive response of the population to the revived Catholic rituals acted as a stimulus to the desperation and determination of the martyrs of the new religion looks to gain more credibility if Machyn was reflecting the return of normality.

A negative feature of 1557 and the year that followed was the number of deaths due to what we would now describe as influenza. The funerals in the City provided Machyn with sombre but straightforward examples of repossessed religious rites. For whatever reason, the imposing funerals with which he was involved interested him vastly more than the burnings, around which Foxe built his narrative.
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Only one of the victims burnt in 1557 (Richard Gibson, related to a prominent City of London family) was a person of note. Otherwise, the civic mourning and obsequies form a constant cavalcade of Catholic religious life now daily coursing through the capital. From January to November, the deaths of no less than thirty prominent people feature in Machyn’s account. Each of these funerals provides another public display of the traditional Catholic rites at their most elaborate and expensive. For Machyn, the record of the death is almost incidental to the opportunity to describe the formalities of the funeral. Little of note remains unrecorded, from the number of tapers, torches, banners, escutcheons, mourners to the generous use of black hangings. This can only be read with hindsight as the last hurrah of a doomed national religion. Much more likely is it that it is a testimonial to the last period in English history when a whole society could still freely and uninhibitedly express with extravagance its Catholic identity.

Returning to the narrative focused on Pole’s agenda, even while still gathering information on diocesan and other finances without which he could not proceed in the way that he wished with its business, and because of inability of clergy to attend due to “dearth”, meaning the effects of economic stringency, Pole prorogued the Legatine Synod for the third time, in February 1556. He wrote to his friend Cardinal Morone in Rome explaining his reasons and setting out his intentions and asking for papal confirmation of his agenda. This letter provides an excellent summary of Pole’s objectives and initiatives and is surely an indispensable reference in understanding his line of thought. The emphasis on the doctrinal, financial, legal, pastoral and liturgical priorities set forth in the decrees of the synod is clearly
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delineated and Pole’s precise solutions unmistakably presented. Meanwhile the practical application of the synod’s decrees proceeded apace. With Queen Mary’s support, providing lands and income, and nominating priest rectors and wardens, Pole either founded or re-founded several schools, notably in Manchester, York, Basingstoke and Northampton. Future wardens were to be elected by majority vote, a clear indication of withdrawal by the Crown of any further direction in these newly restored institutions. Pole next oversaw the revival of the Clerkenwell Priory of the Knights of St John. It received its canonical restoration in advance of the future grant of properties and revenues at the Crown’s disposal and the setting up of its commanderies in May 1557. The Cardinal himself preached on the occasion which, according to the historian Canon Roger Dixon, was “Pole’s best performance”. The actual grant of properties from the Crown and the installation of Sir Thomas Tresham as Grand Prior took place in December of that year. Though considered of little significance to later commentaries on the return of religious life to England, the reappearance of the Knights of St John should not be regarded as an unimportant footnote to Marian revivals. They constituted an English branch of the pan–European military fraternity of entirely noble extraction who took vows similar to monks and who, within their various established communities, followed a religious discipline. They had two main religious aims, which had constituted their raison d’etre since the end of the eleventh century: care of the sick and needy (obsequium pauperum) and military defence of the Catholic faith (tuitio fidei). Their main focus of military and maritime interest was the threat to the Mediterranean coast and beyond from the Ottoman Empire, now centred in the ancient city of Constantinople.

military expansion of that empire was a constant preoccupation with the Christian powers of Europe throughout this period and would continue to be so for much of the remainder of the sixteenth century and beyond. The renewal of the Order’s English connection was a major engagement with the wider Church and its diplomatic, religious and security concerns. The official ceremony was no small behind-the-scenes affair. The day chosen was St Andrew’s Day, and the whole Court and the hierarchy was present for a Mass and later processed from Whitehall Palace to Westminster Abbey.  

All of the positive and fruitful indications of the faith still gradually making a strong recovery sit strangely in some ways with the actions of the Pope in Rome. During Lent 1557 Cardinal Pole was in Canterbury, in order – it may be assumed – to avoid an official meeting with King Philip, which would displease the Pope. Nevertheless, he did visit Philip privately in an effort to persuade him to peace with France. He also wrote to him with a blessing commending the King for “the good state” in which the kingdom now found itself.  

Paul IV now commenced what looks like a campaign to ensnare Pole. As early as April 1557 the Pope revoked the Cardinal’s Legatine powers although his status as legatus natus as Archbishop of Canterbury was not yet affected. The Pope confided his reasons for doing this to the Venetian Ambassador in Rome, telling him that he (Pole) should “no longer interfere in any matter whatever in that kingdom [England] as minister of this See”  

News of this initially came to Mary from Sir Edward Carne, her ambassador in Rome, writing on 17 April that the Pope was still minded to allow Pole to continue as legate.
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if “her Majesty would address a gracious letter to his Holiness to request the continuance of the said legate”. Carne wrote again on 15\textsuperscript{th} of that month to say the Cardinals in Rome had been informed in consistory by Cardinal Morone of the Legate’s progress in promoting the Catholic faith in England which would be impeded if his legation were now to be revoked, with all of which they agreed. The report goes on to say that despite this he failed to alter the intentions of the Pope who declared that the revocation was irrevocable and was part of a wider initiative of his to revoke all papal nunciatures in the dominions of Philip II. However, the Pope would stay the effecting of the decree pending a letter from Queen Mary. In a conversation with Navigero reported by him to the Doge and Senate, the Pope referred to Sir Edward Carne’s visit de scribing him as “for a native of those regions … modest and very intelligent,” and went on to confirm his implacable hostility to Philip in contrast to “his love for the Queen, for her own sake”. Strype’s \textit{Ecclesiastical Memorials} includes the Latin texts of three letters addressed to the Pope at this time, from the King and Queen, from Parliament and from the Nobility of England. In the case of the latter two, they are likely to be drafts. That of the monarchs is dated 21 May, 1557. In it, they reiterated the great good done by the Cardinal since his coming and their being grieved (\textit{magno dolore effecti sumus}) at the reduction of his status; especially since the revocation included the ancient privilege of an Archbishop of Canterbury as \textit{legatus natus}.

By 20 June the Pope was in possession of these letters but was unmoved by either their august provenance or the emphatic urgency of their expressed concerns. In
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typical autocratic and impolitic fashion, he dismissed Pole and instead appointed Fr William Peto, an aged though distinguished Franciscan at Greenwich, as Legate a latere. Sir Edward Carne reported to Philip and Mary on 2 July that the Pope was still determined on Peto and was now demanding that Pole come to Rome, of which Carne writes “… he will be served as Cardinal Morone who is still confined in Castle St Angelo and has been four times examined and nothing found against him”. On 16 August, Bishop Pate of Worcester wrote to the Queen begging her not to let Pole depart for Rome under any circumstances, as no good would come of it. Although Pole did not use his legatine authority from this time, he continued to be so regarded. Right through until July 1557, appeals continued to him, 38 from York and 7 from London. This probably indicates that in ecclesiastical terms the revocation of legatine status was either ignored or not believed although Pole did not assume that he continued as legatus a latere after mid-1557. Queen Mary ensured that the formal letters of recall of Pole and the appointment of Peto did not reach the Cardinal by having all despatches opened and examined at Calais. In view of all that Mary had done in order to restore her realms to Roman obedience, there is a cruel irony in her being obliged to use this restrictive practice against the authority of the Papacy, owing to the arbitrary decrees of its latest occupant. The custom of the Regium placet or Exequatur was a diplomatic device used by heads of state for preventing papal legislation prejudicial to royal prerogatives being brought into their dominions. It had last been used in Catholic England during the time of the Great Western Schism (1378-1417) against the various anti-popes, for which it had originally been devised.
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Having been informed by Fr Peto, whose loyalty and strict orthodoxy was beyond reproach, that he was unwilling and unsuitable both by reason of age and health, the Pope continued to leave the situation unresolved, in which condition it remained until the end. Even by the time of Pole’s death, the Pope’s suspicions regarding him continued unabated.

The Cardinal became Chancellor of both the universities in 1556. On a request from Cambridge, he directed that the bodies of Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius, two continental reformers of considerable renown who had received fellowships there in Edward’s reign, should be posthumously condemned and their bodies exhumed as unworthy to lie in consecrated ground. In accordance with what was believed then to be appropriate, their remains along with their works were burnt in the market place. The body of the wife of Peter Martyr (Vermigli), another reformed scholar who had been regius professor of theology at Oxford was dug up and thrown on a dunghill in the city. This action, at once distasteful to modern sensibilities, has to be seen in context with contemporary notions of the time that viewed those who died obstinately in heresy as positively damned. It was regarded as sacrilege that their bodies be interred within sacred precincts.

As already mentioned, the return to Catholic practice of so many throughout the country coincided with a dramatic increase in the number of those prosecuted and burnt for heresy during 1557. Effectively there was no weakening of resolve on the
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part of the government. On 8 February 1557, a commission for proceeding against heretics was issued under royal letters patent, having a wide-ranging brief and indicating a stepping up of the process of investigating and punishing those deemed obstinate and recalcitrant. In the dioceses, the 16 executions in London, 13 in Norwich, 24 in Canterbury, 4 in Rochester and 10 in Chichester, during the months of January to September 1557 represent what may be described as a hard core of resistance. Even London was seeing a turning point and Machyn’s entries are the legible evidence of its visible impact. Significantly, for all its size and variety, London produced few victims in this year.

Pole’s continued and resourceful vigilance is also evident in the Visitations of various dioceses carried out during 1557. Previously, Winchester, Exeter, Salisbury, Chichester, Peterborough, Hereford, Ely, Lincoln, Gloucester, Worcester, St Asaph and Durham had all received visitations. There were partial visitations conducted in certain parishes in the diocese of Canterbury in 1554, 1555 and 1556. The visitation conducted in midsummer 1557 – analysed in Chapter V – was the most complete. This official enquiry at the behest of the local Ordinary of the diocese was undertaken at a time when England was at war with France, resources were becoming scarce and relations with the Holy See were at a very low point. Its thoroughness and speed is therefore all the more indicative of the advance of Catholic reform. The perception that the regime’s aims were on target and successful to an extent not generally admitted is provided in diplomatic correspondence.

1216 CRP, vol. III, 1493, 1494, 1540 and 2190.
With no anticipation of the short time the regime still had to run, and fulfilling a normal routine of his diplomatic mission, the retiring Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Michiel, penned an extensive report for his political superiors on the state of England.\footnote{CSPV, vol. VI, pt. 2, no. 884.} It is a valuable communiqué, penned by a foreign observer, who, although undoubtedly Catholic in his sympathies, is nevertheless a candid and observant witness of the political and religious atmosphere. Though probably restricted in direct experience to London and the various locations of royal sojourn within the Home Counties, it is not without relevance to the more general situation.

It is indubitable that externally and in appearance the Catholic religion seems day by day to increase and take root, through the Queen’s authority and the assiduity of the Legate, for monasteries are being built, and within this short period (three years not having yet elapsed since the reducement \textit{(dopo la riduzione)} of the realm. When I left England seven were completed \textit{(eretti)}; persons are seen to enter them, the churches are frequented, the images replaced, and all the ancient Catholic rites and ceremonies performed as they used to be, the heretical being suppressed.

However, he is convinced that there is still some way to go in the completion of this revival. He contends that the most committed seem to be those over thirty-five years of age and that in his perception:

\[\ldots\] all the rest make this show of recantation, yet do not effectually resume the Catholic faith, and on the first opportunity would be more than ever ready and determined to return to the unrestrained life previously led by them, were it solely for the sake of being exempted from confession and fasting and to be allowed to intermarry with kinsfolk (even the clergy being permitted to marry) and in short to be free from all the external acts \textit{(opere)} enjoined to Catholics. As all these things indulging their senses for 20 consecutive years (during which the schism lasted), took such deep root, it is marvellous they are not more licentious and daring than is apparent after being so long habituated to other customs; and this taciturnity and quiet evinced by them, owing to so sudden and unexpected correction, is also by many persons considered yet
more suspicious. With regard however to religion in general, your Serenity may rest assured that the example of their Sovereign can do anything with them, and in that proportion as the English estimate their religion and are influenced by it, so do they discharge their duty as subjects towards their Prince, by living as he lives, believing what he believes, and in short doing whatever he commands, making use of it for external show to avoid incurring his displeasure rather than for any internal zeal; for they would do the like by the Mahometan or Jewish creed, were their King to evince belief in it and willed it thus, accommodating themselves to anything, but more willingly such doctrines as gave them hope, either of the greatest licence and liberty in their mode of life, or of some profit.1219

Could this describe a generation brought up with contempt for tradition and the rule of popes and cardinals? Most certainly it could. This judgement has the ring of truth about it. It would in all probability be true of any society whose youth were subjected systematically in the short term to such propaganda. A generation radicalised and rendered cynical could not so easily be won back. However, to predicate the proposal that it never could is presume too much in its favour. Speculation on the wider picture and evidence from provincial sources give grounds for a more positive result for Catholic revival. There, the traditionalism of most local magnates as well as folk generally would tend to favour preference for older ways of community cohesion as well as respect for the past. Overall, there can be little doubt that stability and order, coming in the wake of previous breakdown of order and continuity, delivered support for the present regime while it lasted.

By later summer 1557, Pole was desperately engaged in seeking an appeasement with Paul IV. In August, he sent his personal representative Nicholas Ormanetto to Rome, with a personally written apologia, which although almost certainly never actually submitted to the Pope gave a very clear indication of Pole’s frustration and anger over the Pontiff’s suspicions and their implications for Church-

State relations in England.\textsuperscript{1220} A lesser man than Pole might have caved in under this pressure, knowing that Cardinal Morone was equally under suspicion and in prison. On the political level, the urge of Paul IV to prosecute further his hostility to King Philip was tempered by the latter’s capture of the French town of St Quentin in mid-August. Between seven to eight thousand English soldiers under the Earl of Pembroke had assisted him in this victory. Church bells rang, and processions and bonfires in London celebrated it.\textsuperscript{1221} The Pope, in a moment of rational appreciation of the hopelessness of continuing hostilities, made peace with Philip in October. Pole’s situation benefitted to an extent with the restoration of the legatine status to the See of Canterbury but personal rapprochement was not on the agenda for Paul IV.

As suggested in Chapter V, support for religious life was never absent from Pole’s agenda. A small but significant opportunity for religious re-possession came in late 1557. Anne of Cleves, for a short time fourth wife of Henry VIII, died in August. She had become a Catholic – or at least conformed – and by command of Queen Mary, her funeral was a state occasion with all the ceremonial of a full Catholic royal obsequy at Westminster Abbey, with great numbers of the Court in attendance.\textsuperscript{1222} Upon her death, a part of her dower estate, a former nunnery at Dartford in Kent was returned to its original owners, the Dominican sisters.\textsuperscript{1223}
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King Philip, accompanied by his English troops, departed for war with France on 5 July, 1557. Neither the Queen nor his English subjects at home would see him again. The summer of 1557 had seen a return of a further epidemic of “strange” illnesses throughout the country. But this misfortune and the continuing prosecutions for heresy apart, the state of the country was described in pacific terms by the Emperor’s ambassador, Don Juan de Figueroa, in a letter to his master written from Richmond in August 1557.

The whole kingdom of England is at peace and very obedient. Affairs are going well where religion is concerned, thanks be to God! Many churches and monasteries are being repaired, and inmates placed in them. As far as outer appearances go, things are as in Spain.

The letter went on to update the Emperor with the latest complexities of the diplomatic row with the Pope and Mary’s refusal to allow Pole to be compelled to travel to Rome and face the Inquisition. Figueroa anticipated — wrongly as it turned out — that full concord would follow when the peace with France was concluded. Pole now found that his ecclesiastical position required him to raise funds to support the war with France. By March 1558 he was asking parishes with an income of more than £30 a year to contribute in the same way as laity in that situation. Given Pole’s pacific disposition and the delicacy of his hard-won progress towards religious hegemony the war and its demands must have been something of a bitter blow to him.

The loss of Calais in January was no doubt seized on by the regime’s enemies to point
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up its weakness and misfortune. Some of this mood of gloom is detectible in
diplomatic correspondence. Despite the positive outlook of Figueroa’s report in 1557,
Philip’s ambassador, the Count of Feria, sounded less optimistic. His oft-quoted
remark from a letter to King Philip, written on 2 February 1558, that he was told that
since the fall of Calais, fewer than a third of Englishmen go to Mass as before may
reflect reality but might also reflect his own rather jaundiced view the situation.1227
In March, he wrote again to Philip describing in critical tones most of the Council with
whom he had to deal and referred to Pole as “a dead man.”1228 Was this the result of
ill-health or inertia? The former looks more probable. He was never very robust. In
the months that followed into 1558 deaths among clergy rose as a consequence of
illness and included a number of the hierarchy, thus creating nine vacant sees at a time
when it was bound to be difficult to fill them in the climate of bad relations with the
Holy See. Count Feria subsequently criticised Pole for allowing them to remain
unfilled. It cannot have been the fault of the Cardinal that the authority he needed to
appoint bishops was held by a Pope who not only distrusted him but was actively
seeking to bring him to Rome for trial. Thus by the summer of 1558, Oxford (Robert
King, d. 4 Dec. 1557), Salisbury (John Salcot or Capon, d. 10 Oct. 1557), Hereford
(Robert Parfew or Wharton, d. 22 Sept. 1557), and Bangor (William Glynn, d. 21
May 1558) were all vacant sees. By the end of the year, there were five more vacant
sees (Bristol, Chichester, Gloucester, Norwich and of course Canterbury, with Pole’s
death in November). So many unfilled vacancies at this crucial moment for the
Church in England later led to the unjust and hardly defensible accusation that Pole
was to blame for this situation. In November 1557, Pole was actively proposing

1228 Ibid., p. 366.
agendas for further progress to the people of London in his sermon preached on 30 November.

The loss of Calais historically marked the end of a long period of ownership by England of a piece of French mainland territory. It did not mean the end of every trace of the old Duchy of Normandy. The Channel Isles remained. Calais was symbolic as well as constituting a useful trading post close to the Netherlands, and also as a defence bastion. At the time, treason was suspected as the cause of the loss.\textsuperscript{1229} It was certainly a bitter blow. The Spanish ambassador’s remark about falling Mass attendance may reflect court gossip at the time. It could indicate that the regular attendance at church before the loss of Calais must have been considerable for such a decline to be noteworthy. That opposition painted the loss of Calais then and later as a canvas of condign catastrophe. A tract appeared in the month of March 1558, entitled \textit{A warning to England to Repente, and to turn to god from idolatrie and poperie by the terrible example of Calece}.\textsuperscript{1230} Its author was Thomas Traheron, a former Franciscan friar, in exile in Wesel, in Germany.\textsuperscript{1231} Nevertheless, there are indications that the loss may not have been regarded as quite as serious as later legend has made it.\textsuperscript{1232}

In January 1558, Mary believed that she was again pregnant and wrote to Philip confidently saying she had delayed to tell him until she was sure of it. Cardinal Pole also wrote informing the King and declared her to be in good health. Pole was in

\textsuperscript{1230} Traheron, B., \textit{A warning to England to repent, and to tverne to god from idolatrie and poperie by the terrible example of Calece, giuen the 7. March. Anno 1558}. ESTC, S102452. Copies in the British Library and Lambeth Palace Library.
\textsuperscript{1231} Garrett, E., \textit{The Marian Exiles}, p. 308.
good heart and wrote to his friend and former close associate, Bartolomé Carranza, now Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, fully expressing his confidence that the Catholic faith was genuinely in recovery. Despite all the material and natural disasters of bad harvests, disease, shortage of money and war with France, Pole was certain in the summer of 1558 that England in religious terms had “turned a corner”. In November 1557, his lengthy sermon to the citizens of London was critical but also upbeat. The sermon may be taken as an accessible summary of Pole’s analysis of what had gone wrong for the past 20 years and what he believed were the roots of the decline and disorder that had arisen from schism that then declined further into heresy.

King Henry’s assumption of supremacy seemed inconsequential, still supposedly leaving the Sacramental system of the Church intact. This was mistaken. Because of the schism, the Sacraments did not avail because, “you had the use of the sacraments with you, but the grace and the profit of them you had not.” This is a core explanation to understanding the advance of heresy after Henry’s death, foreseen by Sir Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher. Unity with the See of Rome had been the sine qua non of veracity, validity and orthodoxy because, as More had discovered, it “holdeth all up.” The wisdom and prescience of the two martyrs had been ignored. They were two of the most learned and respected scholars in Europe, whose example few among the grandees in the kingdom or in the City had chosen to follow, to the ultimate peril of all concerned. In this respect, London, more than elsewhere, had exceptional and plentiful guidance. Witness and constancy in defending universally accepted truth, was what made them true martyrs, unlike those of recent persuasion.

---

who died for their own opinions. Aiding and supporting the latter, whose faith was evidently not that of the ancient Church and all the generations since, but of their own devising, he utterly condemned. Crucially, embracing the teaching of these heretics was cutting oneself off from every source of grace derived from faith and even to deny one’s own ancestors who lived and practised it for centuries. He reserved his sharpest criticism for the gospellers. As heretics, they were worse than murderers, because they undermined the commonwealth and opened the door to all kinds of vices. He appears to have considered London less accommodating to the new religion and exonerated it from excessive blame for the number of those burnt within it. The latter were “brambles and briars cast in the fire here among you”, but many were “grown in other places”.

In the earlier part of his sermon, the Cardinal was speaking of the past, giving a summary of how things had gone from bad to worse, but now “… what great and marvellous causes you have to rejoice this day, for your happy returning to the church.” It is here that his critique of the reformers reached its climax, as he contrasts the novelty of their never-ending search in the Scriptures for justification of their own opinions with the universality of the antiquity of the ceremonies and rites of the Church. Their repudiation of the latter means that they derive no benefit from the former, by which they may be understood and interpreted, but only organically, within the unity of the Church. This applies as much to the small details of worship and ceremony as to the more important. Just as the small detail of eating an apple against God’s command produced the effect that “the whole world smarted for it”, because it was an act of disobedience. The Scriptures exhorts obedience before all
else, which for Pole is clearly manifested in the observation of ceremonies, the very things “cast down” by the heretics.

But this I dare say, whereunto Scripture doth also agree, that the observation of ceremonies, for obedience sake, will give more light than all the reading of Scripture can do, if the reader have never so good a wit to understand what he readeth, and though he put as much diligence in reading as he can, with the contempt of the ceremonies: but the thing that giveth us very light is none of them both; but they are most apt to receive light, that are more obedient to follow ceremonies, then to read; for those be parvuli; [the simple] and such to whom the Scripture giveth light; as Scripture itself doth testify; where it is written, Declaratio sermonum tuorum intellectum dat parvulis; et testimonium Domini fidele sapientiam praestans parvulis. [The unfolding of your word gives understanding to the simple and the witness of the Lord faithfully provides wisdom to the simple]. Which name they cannot justly bear, that refuse ceremonies.1235

The light that the gospellers claim to seek cannot to be found exclusively in reading but must be accompanied by penance and works of mercy, which both open the way and pre-dispose to enlightenment. Here, Pole criticises his audience for the scant restoration they have made to atone for past sins. Instead, they indulge in “excess of meat and drink ... sumptuous apparel ... the churches remaining bare, robbed and spoiled.”1236 Rome, Bologna, Venice and Milan could all boast scores of monasteries and hospitals all founded from the voluntary alms of the citizens, whereas in London “…there are not 10 places, neither of hospitals nor monasteries in the city nor about the city.” This was not just an indication of Pole’s deep regret that their conversion is still in some ways superficial, but also that he believed profoundly in the necessity of the promotion of religious life as a barometer of the quality and sincerity of Catholic practice. It is a classic Catholic affirmation of faith as sterile without the good works that should accompany it. Any criticism of Pole and of Queen Mary that they were slow to revive religious life or maybe even hardly interested has

1236 Ibid., p. 507.
to be balanced with the evidence to the contrary contained in this sermon. His view was that it was the privilege and the prerogative of the laity (my emphasis) to set up opportunistically and fund such institutions, as in the past, involving themselves appropriately in the charitable works of the Church, prayer, almsgiving, hospitals and of course, suffrage for the deceased, all of which were keystones in the edifice of English Catholicism. It was the religious houses which had provided the most effective and indeed in some cases the only means of redress to welfare, indigence and ill-health. They were not just concerned with prayer and worship but had a social outreach, embracing many public services not otherwise provided. Such institutions continued to be effective and to increase in Europe and elsewhere before and throughout the post-Tridentine period. They embraced confraternities and sodalities in Italy, Spain and in the New World. Pole was here echoing the more general virtue of the absolute necessity of good works, cast down after the break with Rome, and which continued to be one of the principal signs overseas of the Counter-reformation.\textsuperscript{1237}

Although in the Marian restoration of Catholicism, so much importance was placed upon a return to the proper celebration of the Mass, the Cardinal referred only once and briefly to it in his sermon. Perhaps its necessity was already understood by his hearers. It certainly cannot be because Pole thought it less important.

On 14 December, Pole issued a summons for the southern convocation, incorporating Philip and Mary’s licence.\textsuperscript{1238} Events were to overtake his pastoral initiative in this respect. The declaration of war with France intervened in the spring of 1558 to render any such expensive gatherings inopportune. Outbreaks of illness may also have forestalled large assemblies. Convocation was prorogued in March


\textsuperscript{1238} \textit{CRP}, vol. III, 2147.
1558. The Cardinal’s public priorities as a churchman had changed to active support of the monarchs in their need of revenue, with the parliament of January 1558 being called to help raise the necessary funding for the war. Yet even in the midst of this national emergency, spiritual matters still commanded the attention of the members. The questions of the restriction of benefit of clergy in criminal cases and of sanctuary in Westminster Abbey were raised. Abbot Feckenham produced the original charter of King Edward the Confessor in support of the latter. The benefit of clergy bill passed. The legal status of the sanctuary bill failed. The time given to both debates was considerable. There was a lively interest in establishing some kind of status quo affecting customs related to the position of the Church in society as it had been before the breach with Rome. By 1558, customary ecclesiastical traditions enshrined in English law had again become the subject of normal parliamentary procedure.

The remaining months of the reign are generally dismissed as slow downward drift as the aftermath of the loss of Calais and the poor health of the Queen and the Cardinal diminished their energies. He seems to have ignored his weakness since he took the initiative of instituting commissioners to prosecute heretics in the diocese of Canterbury. On another vexed question, there was increasing success in matching ecclesiastical expenses with income. At last, the Cardinal was beginning to be able to get to grips with the financial deficits in some dioceses by using the surplus in others to supplement their incomes. Pole’s upbeat letter to Carranza, which was in response to one from his fellow Primate in Spain criticising his absence from his

Diocese of Canterbury, seeks to set out his reasons for remaining in London. It is there that he can do most good at this time, lending the support of his immediate presence to the Queen as the only way to provide stability and continuity, because together they have achieved a great deal more than is realised:

...mea presentia hic utilior sit Ecclesiae, an alibi; hunc oportere bene exploratum & perspectum habere hujus Regni statum in rebus tum civilibus, tum Ecclesiasticis, & superiorem proximorum annorum, quibus facies Religionis tota erat immutata, & presentem, quo jam pristinam formam recipere incipit; eundem etiam nosse oportere, qui sint omnium ordinum animi, & multa, quae ad Serenissmae Reginae pertinent.

(…my presence here is more useful to the Church than elsewhere; it is necessary to have investigated and to have regard to the condition of this Realm in matters both civil and Ecclesiastical, and of recent bygone years, in which the face of Religion was totally changed, and the present, in which it has begun already to receive its pristine form; it is necessary also to know similarly, all the spiritual efforts, and many favours for which the most Serene Queen has been responsible).

As a valedictory statement on their joint efforts it represents an optimistic evaluation when unknown to all concerned time was running out. However, intimations of mortality were increasing. The recurring liturgies for the dead recorded in Machyn’s manuscript were a constant reminder.\(^\text{1242}\) Entries for the year 1558 – with several pages missing that take out the months from April to July – are descriptions of funerals in the City churches. Once again, Machyn may be taken to represent the otherwise silent voice of his class and of the much longer tradition of the London folk, interrupted during Edward’s six-year reign.\(^\text{1243}\) The rituals of death for the older generation would almost certainly have been the most familiar and the most therapeutic at a time of increasing mortality.

\(^{1242}\) Machyn, *Diary*, pp. 169, 171, 172, 173 provide typical examples.

Pole’s reputation between those who have viewed him as a more liberal and less fanatic player or a hesitant and timorous player in the Marian period has been somewhat ambivalent as a consequence. His most recent biographer has intensified this discussion and even suggested another more controversial aspect to his character.\textsuperscript{1244} He suffered in his own time from the controversies of the period, but with only one exception, Paul IV, the other popes of his time seem to have regarded him well and used his talents. With Cardinals Morone and Cervini (Pope Marcellus II), he was a co-president and a third papal delegate at the first session of the Council of Trent. That had been an opening of the official and deliberative aspect of Catholic Counter-Reformation but, as proposed in earlier chapters, was neither its beginning and still had a long way to go to be fully effective in the life of the Church. Pole’s inspiration and vision was thoroughly irrigated by all the streams of spiritual and doctrinal renewal on the continent that eventually converged into the great delta of Trent. Through its dogmatic and pastoral definitions it also clarified which of the many reform spiritual movements already in existence were compatible with Catholicism. It debated and discussed and then submitted its decrees to the judgement and approval of the Holy See. Pole, as a major figure in Church affairs for two decades, played an important part in these deliberations.\textsuperscript{1245} His great friend Cardinal Morone has recently been acknowledged as the prelate most effective in drawing together all the great themes of reform at the later sessions of Trent from 1562 onwards.\textsuperscript{1246} This latest work both recognises the efforts of Pole and Morone to probe the potential for agreement of all sides on the question of justification but also concludes that both prelates were absolute in their obedience and their fidelity.

\textsuperscript{1244} Mayer, T.F., \textit{Reginald Pole}, chapter 9.
\textsuperscript{1246} Firpo, M., and Niccoli, O., \textit{Il cardinal Giovanni Morone e l’ultima fase del concilio di Trento} (Bologna, 2010).
Senza dubbio il card. Pole e Morone volevano ristabilito il regno dello spirito, Restabilito la purità del culto, soppresa ogni instituzione che non conferiva nemmeno al miglioramente dei costumi.
(without doubt cardinals Pole and Morone wished to the re-establishment of the kingdom of the sprit, of the purity of cult, and the suppression of every institution which did not in the least contribute to the improvement of customs.)

These crucial aspects of reform are discernible in the agenda for restoration that Pole directed and went far to implementing in his short period of leadership in England. As already noted, from 1555 onward, he brought his considerable insights to bear on its ecclesiology and administration. Whenever and wherever he could, he commissioned capable clerics to assist him in this work. Dominican Friar Bartolomé Carranza, whose catechism of Catholic doctrine became the model for the future Tridentine edition, collaborated fully with the Cardinal in the English mission. Pole’s knowledge of reformed monastic life led him to seek support from the abbey of Monte Cassino to initiate a Benedictine revival at Westminster.¹²⁴⁷ The Theatine Bishop Thomas Goldwell of St Asaph, and friend of the Cardinal is another English representative of this continental coalition of reform. Authority, Eucharistic worship and celebration, and clarity of definition formed essential elements of their agenda for recovery of lost ground. The list of senior clergy, both diocesan and academics, chosen by Mary and Pole, to be appointed by papal mandate, and who resigned or were displaced quite soon in the Elizabethan settlement is an impressive testament to his perception both of character and of fidelity to his vision.¹²⁴⁸ All but one of the bishops still alive (Anthony Kitchen of Llandaff) refused to compromise with the established Church.

¹²⁴⁷ Mayer, T., Reginald Pole, p. 283.
The criticism that Mary and Pole failed to discover the Counter-Reformation is not really valid. On the contrary the liturgical and spiritual insights employed in rebuilding Catholic Europe and beyond were fully anticipated. The physical traces of the cultic and hagiographical revival were mostly destroyed and legally outlawed. Missals and works of devotion have survived here and there.\textsuperscript{1249} Within the heart of a national monument one significant but scarcely remembered symbol of restoration still stands. The upper superstructure of the shrine St Edward the Confessor is a rare surviving Marian construction. Its workmanship and design is of such a high quality that it was once thought to have been of older but is almost certainly work begun and completed during Mary’s reign.\textsuperscript{1250} At least one major place of worship still standing, the extended Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge – completed after Wyatt’s rebellion was defeated – dates from those years.\textsuperscript{1251} On Mary’s initiative the work of remodelling it commenced in 1556 and with it she increased the endowments of the College. These surviving structures are overlooked reminders of a period of English history commonly dismissed or despised. The internal disappearance of its spiritual legacy has been viewed as consequent upon the sterility of its aims and outcomes. It survived in part abroad, being free to do so, and long into the next reign.\textsuperscript{1252} Actually, it is arguable that the ultimate source of Mary’s failure to create an enduring Catholic polity was her personal infertility. The fruits of her Counter-Reformation were never allowed to ripen and the harvest was mostly lost. A political stratagem linked to a religion praised for its compromise replaced a former regime dependant upon more transparent politics and traditional attachment to religion. Perhaps her reign may be

\textsuperscript{1249} Duffy, E. \textit{The Stripping of the Altars}, pp. 524-6.
\textsuperscript{1252} Duffy, E., \textit{Fires of Faith}, pp. 188-207.
considered as the last of those periods in English history when an attempt was made to govern according to principles that owed more to Christian humanism than it did to the pagan morality of Machiavelli.¹²⁵³

The continuing residual survival at home of the spirit of Marian Catholicism is a topic beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, there are indications that the eventual demise of Catholicism was delayed considerably by the Counter-Reformation effect in England. Two written testimonies offer evidence from foreigners resident in London on the twilight situation between Mary’s death and legislation that eventually outlawed Catholicism. The first writer, known as Il Schifanoya, was in the service of Sir Thomas Tresham, Prior of the Order of St John in England. In a letter to Ottaviano Vivaldino, Mantuan Ambassador to King Philip at Brussels, he wrote from England on 6 February 1559:

The affairs of religion have undergone no change since my last account of them, save that in several churches in London they have commenced singing the litanies in English, as is done in the Chapel Royal. Mass is nevertheless said in all churches, the Host being elevated as usual in the presence of numerous congregations who show much devotion; so it is evident that the religion has not such a sorry footing or foundation as was supposed (non ha si tristo piede né fondamento come se pensava), for everybody is now at liberty to go or stay away. Persons in authority however do not fail to try the ford (di tentare il guado), as they did the other day by accusing two Doctors of Laws, the one a priest and the other a layman, of speaking evil (d’haver straparlato) of the affairs of religion; to which they bravely and prudently answered the Lords of the Council, and especially the layman, by name Master Stori who said, “You need not interrogate me about these matters, as I know better than any of you both the canon laws and those of this kingdom; let my accusers appear and prove what I have said, for I certainly said nothing at which you could reasonably take offence; but should her Majesty will otherwise, I do not refuse to die for the Church.” The other said the like, telling the Lords of the Council besides that her Majesty could not do them a greater favour. So, from what I hear all the clergy are united and confirmed in this holy and good opinion. Some of them will change their minds, but will be

esteemed for what they are. There are yet many frivolous and foolish people who daily invent plays in derision of the Catholic faith, of the Church, of the clergy, and of the religion, and, by placards posted at the corners of the streets (per gli cantoni), they invite people to the taverns, to see these representations, taking money from their audience. Others rob the churches by night, break the windows, and steal whatever they can, as they did two nights ago at the church of the Italian nation, where they stole the tabernacle of the sacrament, which they thought was of silver, but they found it to be of gilt copper, nor did it contain the sacrament, and a pall with other trifles, worth about two or three crowns; not having perhaps from fear of discovery dared to enter the sacristy, which contained sacerdotal ornaments, chalices, crosses, &c.; the thieves remaining unpunished.\textsuperscript{1254}

The second letter is one enclosed in another written again on 6 February 1559, by Paolo Tiepolo, Venetian Ambassador in London, where it is stated that:

The acts and decrees of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole have vanished into smoke (se ne vanno in fumo), but it is really very surprising to witness the very great fortitude of many persons, both bishops, lords, and plebeians, who have not bowed the knee before Baal, and who are prepared to suffer any extreme punishment, rather than return to their former state under King Henry.\textsuperscript{1255}

The impression given here is of a religion still embedded in popular culture but already under threat. These observations should be noted and stand as reminders that it still commanded more general support, and that Marian Catholicism achieved in a relatively short time a measure of renaissance that it would be unhistorical to deny. Comparing its strategy with that of the later Jesuit missions is invidious by reason of the necessary narrower scope and focus of the latter. The biography of John Gerard S.J., suggests that, of necessity, the mission was primarily restricted to residents of the houses of upper class, and only by accident to those beyond its walls.\textsuperscript{1256} This is not to criticise its methods or underestimate its value but to contrast it with the fully public and parochial mission under Mary. The primary thrust of post-

\textsuperscript{1254} CSPV, vol. VII, no 18.
\textsuperscript{1255} CSPV, vol. VII, no 19.
Reformation public ceremonial and pastoral engagement on a parochial basis, evident in the Marian experiment, was inevitably lacking in the Elizabethan mission. The full extent of continuing domestic lay fidelity of every class to the traditional faith is not computable. The limited available records of recusants are largely of those who were of some substance. The same would be true of the analysis of wills. This leaves the ultimate question of Mary’s success with the vast majority of the nation a matter of speculation. The clerical response to the change has usually been judged from the majority who accepted the Elizabethan compromise.\textsuperscript{1257} Less well known are those who were deprived or resigned immediately or soon after or continued to observe the rites secretly. Field’s research in the 1970’s from records accessible in episcopal registers, for the 24 dioceses of the Canterbury Province, reveals that 153 of the higher clergy (prebendaries and deans) were deprived or resigned, 551 parish clergy were deprived and 235 resigned. The highest numbers of deprivations were 82 (in Lincoln) and 78 (in London). Both dioceses had a further 44 resignations. The immediate loyalty of all but one living member of Mary’s hierarchy has been well-attested.\textsuperscript{1258}

As Mary rode into London in August 1553, it is recorded that the bells “so long disused,” rang out.\textsuperscript{1259} This is resonant of a note of relief as well as rejoicing. The bells were as much ringing in the return of the old religion as welcoming the new reign. The recently whitewashed, stripped-out shells of churches that had previously been centres of civic pride, public memorials to past generations and places of popular devotion, stood as testaments to a period of unparalleled and mostly unpopular destruction. The money of older established citizens and that of their ancestors had

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1259} Brigden, S., \textit{London and the Reformation}, p. 527.
\end{flushright}
subsidised Catholic rites because they wanted and believed in them. As in every revolution, the novelty and austerity of the change attracted some but repelled many. Its imposition helped to drive a wedge of misunderstanding between the young and older people educated in Catholic ways of belief. Applying the modern science of anthropology and sociology to conventions and traditions prevalent in pre-industrial age suggests that radical change without any obvious benefit would be unlikely to receive great support. Only if the old was unpopular and disrespected could it be easily overthrown. It is has been argued powerfully that this was absolutely not the case. Belief in the age-old guarantee of sacramental intimacy with the sacred through life, and benefits to those who had died, had occupied a huge amount of involvement and investment in local churches. The Prayer Book liturgy arbitrarily swept it all away. In fact, it took away the consoling and communitarian rituals controlled and organised at local levels and left only the certainty of government interference compounded by that of the minority religious enthusiasts. Mary inherited wrecked interiors, confused and bewildered congregations and initially demoralised clergy in what had been in her own lifetime a thriving Catholic nation. She had witnessed the result of political and religious turmoil and instability. Her aim was to repair by every legitimate means the shattered fabric of Catholic nationhood.

For the silver groat and half-groat of her coinage Mary chose the inscription *Veritas filia temporis*, truth is the daughter of time. The motto is suggestive of the necessity of a longer view, which she undoubtedly had but was existentially denied. The philosophy of life and of government that she and Cardinal Pole possessed was one nurtured in the religious certainties of a world that saw earthly realities as mere

---

reflections of eternal truths. The faith professed by her throughout her life traditionally saw the movement of time as imprecise and of small account in the greater perspective of eternity. The dictum *sub specie aeternitatis*, as a perspective of action and result, succinctly defines this philosophy. Upheavals, waves of change, patterns of disorder and chaos were inevitable and perhaps part of a pattern of human progress and pilgrimage. They were temporal and destined not to last but to be vanquished by the superior forces of goodness and virtue. To that extent the anticipation of quick success as much as the appearance of immediate failure are equally deceptive. In this polity constancy matters more than craft and diligence more than determination. It is arguable that the Marian experiment in Catholic restoration was inspired and nurtured by a vision beyond politics, even though it required legislation, political legitimacy, and in some cases the prosecution of dissident individuals to promote it. For the judgement of a failed and discredited interregnum of regression to yield to another recognising the positive and potentially achievable aims requires the application of fair and factual criteria and circumstantial as well as surviving evidence equally admitting of positive as of negative impact. This study has been an attempt to contribute to the continuing debate that research engenders.