



Routledge Research in Early Modern History

EDWIN SANDYS AND THE REFORM OF ENGLISH RELIGION

Sarah L. Bastow



Edwin Sandys and the Reform of English Religion

This book examines the complexities of reformed religion in early-modern England, through an examination of the experiences of Edwin Sandys, a prominent member of the Elizabethan Church hierarchy. Sandys was an ardent evangelical in the Edwardian era forced into exile under Mary I, but on his return to England he became a leader of the Elizabethan Church. He was Bishop of Worcester and London and finally Archbishop of York. His transformation from Edwardian radical to a defender of the Elizabethan status quo illustrated the changing role of the Protestant hierarchy. His fight against Catholicism dominated much of his actions, but his irascible personality also saw him embroiled in numerous conflicts and left him needing to defend his own status.

Sarah L. Bastow is Head of History at the University of Huddersfield.

Routledge Research in Early Modern History

Firsting in the Early-Modern Atlantic World

Edited by Lauren Beck

Early Modern English Noblewomen and Self-Starvation

The Skull Beneath the Skin

Sasha Garwood

Maurits of Nassau and the Survival of the Dutch Revolt

Comparative Insurgences

Nick Ridley

The Economic Causes of the English Civil War

Freedom of Trade and the English Revolution

George Yerby

Edwin Sandys and the Reform of English Religion

Sarah L. Bastow

Murder, Justice, and Harmony in an Eighteenth-Century French Village

Nancy Locklin

The Dirty Secret of Early Modern Capitalism

The Global Reach of the Dutch Arms Trade, Warfare and Mercenaries
in the Seventeenth Century

Kees Boterbloem

Languages of Reform in the Eighteenth Century

When Europe Lost Its Fear of Change

Edited by Susan Richter, Thomas Maissen, and Manuela Albertone

For more information about this series, please visit: <https://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Research-in-Early-Modern-History/book-series/RREMH>

Edwin Sandys and the Reform of English Religion

Sarah L. Bastow

First published 2020
by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 Taylor & Francis

The right of Sarah L. Bastow to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-367-35315-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-33064-3 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

To Mum and Dad for constant support.
To Ryan, Lily and Anna for welcome distraction.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	ix
Introduction: The Reform of English Religion	1
1 Tales of Exile and Narratives of Reform	10
2 Settling Religion and Fox Hunting in the North, 1558–9	41
3 Establishing Reformed Religion in the Diocese of Worcester: An Enemy Is Bourne	70
4 Religion in London: ‘The End of All Things Is At Hand: Be Ye Therefore Sober’	101
5 A Reformer in a Conservative County: ‘That Being Delivered Out of the Hands of Our Enemies We May Serve Him’	145
Conclusion: Death and Legacy	185
<i>Appendix: Key Dates in the Life of Edwin Sandys</i>	190
<i>Bibliography</i>	192
<i>Index</i>	210

Acknowledgements

My thanks to the University of Huddersfield for providing time to complete this manuscript. In particular, my thanks to Katherine Lewis for reading chapters of this book in advance of publication. This publication contains short sections from my previously published works including *Defending the Faith* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018) and ‘“Stiff-Necked, Wilful and Obstinate”: Conflict in the Elizabethan Church’, *Northern History*, 50 (2013). I would like to thank both the publishers for their permission to reproduce this material.

Abbreviations

Annals	John Strype, <i>Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together With an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, and Letters</i> , Vols 1–4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824).
BL	British Library, London.
CCEd	The Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540–1835, www.theclergydatabase.org.uk .
CSPD	Calendar State Papers, Domestic.
CSPD, <i>Add</i>	Mary Anne Everett Green, ed. <i>Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566–1579</i> , Vol. 25 (London: HMSO, 1871).
EEBO	Early English Books Online.
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online edition, www.oxforddnb.com .
<i>Salisbury</i>	S.R. Scargill-Bird, <i>Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire</i> , Vol. 2: 1572–82 (London: HMSO, 1888).
SP	State Papers.
TAMO	John Foxe, <i>The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online</i> (1586 edition) (Sheffield: HRI Online Publications, 2011).
TNA	The National Archives, Kew, London.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

The Reform of English Religion

‘Our vineyard hath flourished;’ behold the mere grace and favour of God towards his church: ‘Little foxes devour it;’ behold the ingratitude of the people, resisting the grace of God, and abusing his mercy:¹

So proclaimed Archbishop Edwin Sandys in a sermon given in York concerning the state of religion. The sermon identified the threat posed by those he characterised as ‘little foxes’ who challenged the reformed religious settlement of the Elizabethan era. The ‘little foxes’ Sandys referred to were those who failed to conform to the Elizabethan Church. Sandys (born c.1519) had experienced the full gambit of religious change brought by successive Tudor monarchs. He commenced his religious education in the reign of Henry VIII, but convinced of the need for religious reform was a strong evangelical voice by the time Edward VI was on the throne. He fully embraced the reforms of the Edwardian era, rose to become Vice Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and by 1554 his evangelical credentials were so notable that the Duke of Northumberland requested him to preach a sermon in favour of Lady Jane Grey’s claim to the throne. This sermon, which implied his support for treason, combined with his evangelical religious beliefs, forced his exile in the reign of Mary I. He returned to England to hold prominent clerical roles in the reign of Elizabeth I and rose through the ecclesiastical hierarchy to become Bishop of Worcester (1559–70), then Bishop of London (1570–6), ending his career as Archbishop of York (1576–88). He was a man committed to religious reform, beset by the need to challenge those he saw as threatening the reformed Protestantism he believed in, and often his own worst enemy in seeking out a battle if one failed to present itself.

Taking Sandys as the central character in a story of religious change and upheaval in early modern England, this book illustrates the struggles facing those of the Protestant faith as they strove to convert the nation. They may have, in theory, triumphed over papistry but they were still facing opposition from Catholics within England and from those who felt the settlement did not go far enough. Alec Ryrie has argued that

2 Introduction

Protestantism was born in crisis and conflict and that it was through this experience that Protestants defined themselves.² This book challenges the traditional categorisations of ‘Puritan’ as a catch-all term for reforming clerics. It argues that Sandys, like many of his contemporaries, was not ‘Puritan’ but his stance was far more nuanced and changed over time. In the Elizabethan era their confessional identity was still being shaped, and ‘the Church of England was a Church but “half-reformed”’ in the eyes of many clerics, but the debate on religion had gone quite far enough for the monarch.³ Sandys found himself defending the religious settlement against both the forces of papists and ‘Puritans’. He was a preacher who advocated taking up the fight in both word and deed. He was often controversial and by no means the easiest man to get along with. Patrick Collinson’s analysis of his character led him to describe Sandys as ‘irascible’.⁴ Certainly Sandys’ correspondences tend to suggest that he was both easily offended and quick to anger. Sandys was in constant conflict, his disputes with Catholics may have been expected as the obvious enemies of a Protestant regime, but he also set himself in opposition to would-be allies. In short all those who Sandys felt were threatening the stability of the Elizabethan religious settlement were targets for his ire.

This book seeks to move on from the assumption that Elizabethan Bishops were uniform in their understanding of religion and challenges the notion that those that were in favour of further change must automatically be categorised as Puritan. Alec Ryrie has argued that ‘early modern Protestantism was a *broad-based* religious culture’ and that although ‘some individuals held puritan views on particular issues, that does not mean they *were* “puritans”’.⁵ This is true of Sandys: he was not a Puritan in the way that has been advocated in much of Reformation historiography. A clear-cut assumption of fixed religious belief in the context of Sandys’ era does not work. People held differing views on differing issues. Hence, this book argues that those of reformed faith often shaped their identity in terms of what they were not: namely as individuals who had rejected the Roman Catholic faith and were not papists.

The narratives produced by Sandys in his sermons and letters echo those of other evangelicals; they fashioned a dichotomy between those who had seen the true faith and those who could not see as they were blinded by false doctrine. Predominantly this cast the papist as the main foe. Sandys challenged, fought and attempted to convert those Catholics with whom he came into contact. His sermonising as well as his actions in Worcester, London and York all illustrated that he felt them to be a genuine threat to the true faith. Yet his battles were not confined to those whom he considered to be fundamentally misled in their desire to remain with a corrupt Romanist religion, but were also with some fellow Protestants. Many of these were engaged in the same task as him, namely, creating a godly community in England. Yet when examined in context, these quarrels often sprang from a desire to safeguard the Church’s

reputation and property, obey the monarch in enforcing her settlement of religion and prevent further religious instability. Sandys objected to any who were acting to stop him fulfilling what he saw as his duty, to educate the unenlightened and defend the faith. Equally personal animosities shaped his quarrels and triumphs. Conflicts involving Sandys illustrated that there was genuine intra- and well as inter-confessional conflict in the early modern era.

This book therefore examines the religious shifts of post-Reformation England in terms of the religious conflicts and the difficult decisions facing the clerics of Elizabeth's church. Edwin Sandys' experience is at the centre of this study; his life provides a view into a rapidly changing religious world. He participated in the religious debates of the Edwardian and Elizabethan eras and was troubled by the theological dilemmas and the practical challenges facing the early modern cleric. Sandys had his own peculiarities and as a leader of reform and then an advocate of the Elizabethan settlement he was never far from controversy. His words and the narrative of event he created through his letters, sermons and records, alongside external reports of him and his actions, throw light on religious discourse in Elizabethan England.

The nature of religious change has been widely debated with questions asked regarding the success and nature of reform. How should reform be categorised and assessed? Just how reformed was England by the end of Elizabeth's reign? How far are Protestant, Anglican, Calvinist or Puritan useful terms in assessing this change? An etymological study is not the aim here, but inevitably terminologies in relation to confessional identities will be used. Whilst the legislative reform programme of Henry VIII's reign changed the main source of authority in the English Church there is now a much wider acceptance of the stance that the transformation of the country from 'Catholic' to 'Protestant' was a long-term process and not easily achieved by the reformers.⁶ Much of the current debate on the nature of reform is now centred on the intricacies of what it meant to be a Protestant at a time when religious norms were still being established.⁷ The English nation did not reject good works in favour of a justification through faith without question, and whilst some were persuaded others rejected the theology shift. It will be argued that the English people did not easily replace, without question or trauma, the importance of 'action' with the magnitude of 'the word' in their attempts to seek salvation. Recent historiography has sought to delineate and nuance the categorisation of Protestant. The term Anglican has largely been dismissed as unhelpful in the sixteenth century where norms in religious practice were still being established. The notion of an Elizabethan '*via media*' which settled into a 'Calvinist consensus' in England has also been challenged.⁸ Sixteenth century evangelicals struggled to settle on what should be the norm in religious practice. Historians have debated the extent to which all English Protestants were Calvinist in nature and in turn the extent to

4 *Introduction*

which Calvinist meant Puritan.⁹ Whilst Sandys was at the forefront of radical reformed ideas in the 1550s by the 1580s he was rejecting more radical demands as dangerous and divisive. Sandys termed these 'Puritan', but modern historiography would more likely classify them as Presbyterian. The divisions within the reformed community had emerged in exile between those that adhered to and defended the Edwardian Prayer Book and those that favoured Genevan religious reform. These divisions did not entirely disperse with the return of the exiles to England and were to periodically emerge as points of dispute throughout the reign of Elizabeth I. By the end of Elizabeth's reign a generational shift had occurred, what had been new and radical was now stayed and part of the establishment.¹⁰ Walsham's work on generation change, alongside a discussion of divergent confessional identities under the broad umbrella of Protestantism, is therefore crucial to interpreting Sandys' actions and the conflicts of his later life.

Peter Marshall considers that historians should see reformers not as early Protestants but as late medieval Christians, continuing pre-existing trends for reform.¹¹ Sandys was one of this first generation, undertaking his religious education and training in a post-Reformation world. The shift from Catholic priest to godly minister embraced the new religious ideas which swept through Europe. Walsham has argued that 'Protestants acknowledged that these were extraordinary times in which youth might indeed teach or facilitate the conversion of their elders.'¹² Sandys was an early evangelical, committed to reform; though what he viewed as the right level of reform could quickly look like an outdated stayed defence of the status quo when seen through the eye of a generation who had only known Protestantism. By the time of his death Sandys was lamenting both the recalcitrant attitudes of Catholics who failed to release their hold of the old faith, blinded as they were by popish doctrine, and a newer generation of reformers who were advocating for reforms which threatened established hierarchies.¹³ Chapter one shows how Sandys was at the forefront of this new world; firstly at Cambridge in an era where the universities were the centres of reformed thinking; and then in exile, where Sandys was part of the Strasbourg circle centred around Peter Martyr Vermigli, the reformed theologian who had fled from Italy.¹⁴ The experience of exile reshaped the vision of many of those who returned to England in 1558/9, but not into one single theological model or ideal church. The reformers were themselves divided regarding what shape the new English Church should take. Moreover, they faced shaping this church under the control of a new monarch and within a political landscape which did not always prioritise reform. They also faced congregations of parishioners who had a clear idea of precedent and practice. Local traditions and long-held dogmas were often at odds with ideas of radical change, whether this was in regards to theology, the built environment or local power structures. The mundane structures of

societal life were intertwined so closely with religious belief that it was easy to see how evangelical clerics were frustrated by the mingling of religious practice with superstitious rituals.¹⁵

Reconstructing the life of Edwin Sandys in this earlier phase of reform also cast light on the problematic nature of some of the source material. The main source of information on Sandys' activities and actions in the Edwardian reformation comes from his entry in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*;¹⁶ yet this account was written in the Elizabethan era and constructed as part of the rehabilitation of Sandys' reputation following scandals that beset his life in the early 1580s. The approach of chapter one is to examine the experience of Edwardian Protestantism and exile, but also to consider methodological approaches in studying how this era was constructed and reconstructed by the Elizabethans to create a suitable Protestant narrative. Sandys needed to secure his own legacy, which also suggests that the role of the individual in presenting and colouring a narrative requires consideration. Thus, it is possible to see how early evangelicals created their own legacy and how this became part of a creation of a national narrative. It was both advantageous and necessary to construct a wider narrative of heroic sacrifice to justify the sacrifices of early Protestants, but also to tie this into the narratives of the early church.

Chapters two and three examine the extent to which Sandys' experience was common to all reformers. Were his difficulties ones shared by other clerics and to what extent was religion truly reformed under the new Elizabethan regime? Michael Questier advocates that 'One of the central contentions advanced by the architects of the Elizabethan religious settlement was that the statutory conformity that it required was relatively minimal.'¹⁷ Alec Ryrie suggests that the 'new regime, and Elizabeth in particular, found the views and the style of some of the Protestant exiles distasteful and inexpedient.'¹⁸ This meant that returned exiles were to find that things were not quite as they hoped. Many of them, including Sandys, were to be involved in formulating the new settlement, putting reformed theology into practice and implementing the practicalities of transforming a church and people. They viewed the settlement as the first stage in what they assumed would be a longer period of transformation, but were to be disappointed to find that for their Queen this was to be the end not the beginning of religious reform.

The book explores religious change both at the centre of national life and in the provinces, illustrating regional variation, but also the constant battle for the hearts and minds of the English people. The settlement of religion in England was no easy task. By 1559 the people of England had experienced at least three different religious settlements in the preceding thirty years. The early Elizabethan clerics who were leading and directing reformed religion faced a difficult task in trying to shape a religion on which they were all agreed, only to find the monarch had her own

6 *Introduction*

ideas of what her settlement should look and sound like. Secondly they faced the equally formidable task of implementing the settlement upon a nation that to a large extent had conformed to the Marian restoration of Catholicism. Sandys' career not only spanned a period of considerable religious upheaval but he also experienced this in key locales. His life and career prior to his exile was at Cambridge University at a time when religious change was in its formative stages, but his first major ecclesiastical appointment was as Bishop in Worcester in 1559. The Diocese of Worcester had seen rapid change under Edward, and yet had embraced a Marian counter reformation, leaving Sandys with what he viewed as a struggle to reclaim the region for true religion. Chapter three therefore focuses on the extent to which the bishops were able to further reform their dioceses and what challenges faced Sandys and the other early Elizabethan clerics.

Alec Ryrie notes that both Mary and Elizabeth were notable in their attempts to restore previous settlements.¹⁹ Whilst diametrically opposed in nature it is true that both the Marian and Elizabethan settlements were attempts to reverse the religion of the preceding regime and restore the religious landscape to an earlier point in time. The implementation and reaction to Elizabeth's restoration was not uniform throughout the country. Experiences differed depending both on geographical locale and the nature of the individuals overseeing the implementation of the settlement; person and place were key to explaining the success, or lack of it, in reforming the nation. Worcester and the surrounding area had pockets of strong Catholic resistance and this combined with Sandys' uncompromising personality created the perfect storm. Sandys' nemesis in Worcestershire was to be Sir John Bourne and the conflict, whilst in part driven by personal animosities, reflected widespread battles between the Catholic and reformed population. The question of how to challenge long-held local precedents and traditions faced many of the new bishops. Were the local personnel suitable to the needs of the new church? How did bishops begin to introduce godly married clergy to their parishes and how were these clergymen to provide for wives and families? Did the churches and cathedrals look like Protestants' spaces of worship or were further iconoclasms required? Alongside the formation and implementation of the new settlement a dearth of educated men to fill positions and a drive to remove corruption were challenges facing Sandys and other bishops. An examination of these themes in relation to Worcester paints a picture of how the religious landscape was shaped in England in the early years of Elizabeth's reign.

Following his time in Worcester Sandys was translated to Bishop of London putting him in charge of the diverse capital. So how had things changed by 1570? What sort of reformer was Sandys now? Were his ideas already dated after only ten years in office or was he still at the forefront of religious reform? Chapters four and five explore the contrasts

between reformed religion at the centre and in the provinces through an examination of London and Yorkshire. The office of Bishop of London saw Sandys where he wanted to be, at the centre of the political nation with easy access to the court and the Cross.²⁰ Given his enthusiasm for preaching it is unsurprising that he paid particular attention to St Paul's and to sermons at the Cross, where he became entangled with controversial reformers.²¹ His pursuit of Catholics in London had wider ramifications and saw him involved in international controversies as he raided the Portuguese embassy to stop Catholic Mass.²² His time in London was significant in shaping his belief that further religious reform, particularly that which challenged established hierarchies, was both unnecessary and dangerous. In 1576 he lamented leaving London even if it was to be promoted to position of second prelate in the land. His promotion reflected the need to have a man who would oppose Catholicism, but also defend the settlement, in a prominent position. In moving to the North he compared himself to St Paul sent to preach to the troublesome and unconverted. It was in Yorkshire he was to face some of his biggest challenges and fierce opposition. Once ensconced in the North Sandys set about identifying the enemy and suppressing resistance to the settlement. He found 'enemies' to be in plentiful supply and his expectation of finding the unconverted was fulfilled. Sandys' self-portrayal shows him as a man who felt he should be at the centre of government and politics, but one whose trials came when he was in the wilderness of the peripheries. The view presented by his letters reflected his rather binary view of the world; you were either for him, or against him. Catholics who openly opposed him and set out to belittle and humiliate him were to be expected, but in the North he found these men and women to be everywhere and often in positions of power. He also identified other reformers, including Henry Hastings, the Lord President of the Council of the North, and a future Archbishop of York, Matthew Hutton, as opponents. His time at Worcester and York saw him facing the challenges that he claimed he longed for, yet clearly he was more at home in London where he felt his talents were more appreciated.

The interaction between Catholics and Protestants and the mediums through which these conflicts were played out has been discussed in recent studies.²³ For Sandys toleration was unthinkable and he did not see a lack of open conflict as the norm. Sandys never lost the fervent belief that the unreformed and unrepentant Catholic was the enemy of the godly evangelical.²⁴ A discussion of conflict in chapters four and five will not just focus upon the relationships between the reformed and the unreformed, but also look at the relationships between Protestants. In addition there were other areas of conflict, including between the Elizabethan political regime and the Church hierarchy.

Despite becoming Archbishop of York the power of his position did not bring Sandys the ability to enact his vision of a reformed church.

8 Introduction

This casts further light on the nature of the settlement and position of the clergy under Elizabeth. Accusations of avarice and questionable financial dealings plagued Sandys throughout his career. He was a married man with eight surviving children to provide for, in a Church which made little provision for the new status of married clerics. He was operating alongside an Elizabethan regime that was willing to exploit the Church for the benefit of the crown. Whilst not condemning married clergy who were fathers, the rhetoric and reality of the period rejected the idea of a cleric who engaged with patronage and advancement for his offspring.

What can we therefore observe from using Sandys as a channel for examining religious change? Sandys held key roles in the church, but was also an individual with a complex and irascible personality. It is clear that Sandys, a proponent of what was undeniably radical evangelical ideology at the beginning of his career, had moved to become a defender of the moderate Elizabethan settlement by the time of his death. This reflected the progress, or lack thereof, to furthering reform in the Elizabethan era. Sandys reflected the necessities of compromise and thus raises questions about just how reformed the church was in the sixteenth century. Whilst his attitude to pushing for further reform moderated with the changing political and religious climate, his view of the papist as the enemy remained constant. His battles reflected the difficulties faced by the early modern cleric demonstrating that leadership was no easy matter in an era where the norms of religious, social and political behaviour were being reshaped. Moreover, Sandys' struggles against those he termed his enemies, were numerous, and these enemies were to be found throughout the country. These 'enemies' were sometimes overtly Catholic but not always. Fellow Protestants too were often deemed enemies, either for failing to commit enthusiastically enough to pursuing papists or for pushing for further reform which Sandys deemed to be damaging to his notion of a Protestant church. The complexities of Elizabethan politics and religion created an apparent paradox where the enemy was to be found everywhere.

Notes

- 1 Edwin Sandys, *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1842; reprint 2006), p. 56 (afterwards Sandys, *Sermons*).
- 2 Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation England* (Oxford: University Press, 2013), p. 419.
- 3 Peter Marshall, *Reformation England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), p. 130.
- 4 Patrick Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519–1588)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (afterwards ODNB, online edition).
- 5 Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, p. 6.
- 6 Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

- 7 Amongst others see Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation England*; Karl Gunther, *Reformation Unbound: Protestant Visions of Reform in England, 1525–1590* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Marshall, *Reformation England*.
- 8 For discussion see Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1988); Haigh, *English Reformations*; Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodoxy', and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001); Marshall, *Reformation England* especially chapter 5; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- 9 Marshall, *Reformation England*, pp. 133–4 for a discussion of 'godly', Puritan and Presbyterian.
- 10 Generational change is discussed in Alexandra Walsham, 'The Reformation of the Generations: Youth, Age and Religious Change in England, c. 1500–1700', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (2011), 93–121.
- 11 Marshall, *Reformation England*, see preface.
- 12 Walsham, 'The Reformation of the Generations'.
- 13 Walsham, 'The Reformation of the Generations', p. 115.
- 14 For the impact of exiles and non-exiles on the formation of the Elizabethan church see Christina H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1938); Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996).
- 15 Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Penguin, 1971), pp. 58–60.
- 16 Acts and Monuments, various editions but primarily making use of the online editions found at 'The Acts and Monuments Online', www.johnfoxe.org
- 17 Michael Questier, 'Sermons, Separatists, and Succession Politics in Late Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (2013), 290–316.
- 18 Alec Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realms, 1485–1603* (Harlow: Pearson, 2009), p. 197.
- 19 Alec Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realms 1485–1603* (London: Routledge, 2013) p. 177.
- 20 S. Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 2.
- 21 T. Cartwright, *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: Agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer, Touching the Churche Discipline* (1575).
- 22 A.J. Crosby, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth*, Vol. 10 (London: HMSO, 1874, 1966), p. 73.
- 23 Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
- 24 Sandys, *Sermons*. Sandys illustrates his views throughout his sermons and in the preface.

1 Tales of Exile and Narratives of Reform

Introduction

The written narratives of religious change produced in the sixteenth century are important in understanding how reformers both viewed and represented their religion. Conversion narratives, accounts of suffering and persecution but also histories of the era were created to give a sense of precedent to reformed ideas and to claim a longevity and history for Protestantism.¹ Alongside theological and polemical texts were contemporary histories of the successive Tudor monarchs which also held underlying religious narratives. Rosemary O'Day argued that:

in examining the way in which history was used by the reformers it is important to distinguish between the attitudes of the 'religious' reformers (those who saw the Reformation as the fulfilment of the church's need for renewal) and the 'official' reformers (those who saw the Reformation as serving the needs of the monarchy, or at least, the English body politic).²

Yet whilst these groups may have started as separate and distinct, by the 1580s and 1590s it is arguable that the majority of individuals who composed these opposing factions were now one and the same. The evangelicals of Edward's reign had taken up important church offices and become part of the establishment. They may have lamented the slow progress of reform in the 1560s but were also defenders of the body politic and a magisterial Protestantism, centred on the authority of their monarch. They had played important roles in directing and sometimes writing the 'new' histories of their church. They had been instrumental in shaping the direction of reformed religion in the reign of Edward VI and now gave validity to a new settlement through the authoring or sponsoring of texts which historicised the evangelical. For Protestantism, as a language of the word, the creation of a new literature was vital to the godly cause. Whilst preaching and oral traditions of reading aloud provided a reinforcement of the faith, it was contemporary texts that were to create

a lasting memorial and record a 'new history' of faith. Alex Ryrie has asserted that for early modern Protestants, alongside psalms, borrowing from the past was essential to the way in which they shaped a sense of self identity.³ Moreover, the mental landscape of suffering and the language, if not the reality of, martyrdom was attractive to the Protestant psyche. Representations of struggle, suffering and trial were all part of the godly persona and represented a key concern for the faithful as they traversed their own trials and tribulations in everyday life.

By the 1580s Edwin Sandys had already played a key role in shaping and enforcing doctrine. He was keenly aware of the importance of presenting the godly image of the Church through the written word. He was also acutely aware of the importance of reputation and was keen to ensure that the image of his evangelical credentials and his godly life was recorded for posterity in a suitable manner. The main account of Sandys' early life in the church is provided in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Yet this account was not recorded contemporaneously in the 1540s and 1550s when the events occurred, but in the 1580s, several years after the fact. This account was highly influenced by, if not actually written by, Sandys himself, composed as the Archbishop came to the end of his career and was in ill health. Created with the benefit of hindsight it was stylised in the form of the day, to fit a narrative of persecution and providence. It is therefore to the writing of reformed history that we first turn to view the Edwardian reforms in the context of the era, but created with an Elizabethan audience in mind. Equally the harrowing accounts of Marian suffering are coloured by these influences and require the same need for care on reading them as a 'true' account of the events; yet it tells us much about how Sandys and other reformers wanted their story to be told to later generations. It was shaped for a godly audience but also to refute accusations made against Sandys towards the end of his life. In this chapter we will look to these accounts, to view how he, and others, recorded the initial period of evangelical reform in England. They tell us much about the importance of suffering, constancy and providence to the godly psyche and illustrate the importance of narratives in creating an emotive experience for the reader.

Narratives of Reformation

John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, more popularly known as the Book of Martyrs, was an important and popular text for early modern Protestants. It became a seminal text for the reformers, reappropriating stories of the early martyrs to present a Protestant heritage based on the ideas of a true church before it was corrupted by Roman Catholicism. The preface dedicated the book to Queen Elizabeth, but also emphasises its objective to educate the reader, in particular 'those who know and love the truth'.⁴ The significance of Foxe's work has been emphasised by the

12 *Tales of Exile and Narratives of Reform*

John Foxe Project and has done a great deal to rehabilitate Foxe and his writing.⁵ Alongside a retelling of an early universal church uncorrupted by Catholic vices were more recent martyrs, those who had died for their faith within living memory. The popularity of the volume even within the Elizabethan era is clear to see, with four editions produced between 1563 and 1583. With each new edition changes were made, some of a subtle nature and others more obvious such as the addition of woodcut images and the adjustments made to the Tyndale section.⁶ Within *Acts and Monuments* the ‘memories of past troubles’ were kept ‘fresh and bleeding’.⁷ Patrick Collinson argued that ‘Foxe wanted to be known as a “story teller”, which is to say, an historian.’⁸ He also argues that:

By its very nature, Foxe’s ‘Book of Martyrs’ was an extremely controversial work. Martyrdoms are divisive; extreme acts of violence and of resistance in a confessional cause are inevitably bound to provoke sectarian passions. And a martyrology will arouse powerful emotions, particularly when many of the martyrs it describes were executed within recent memory.⁹

The framing and telling of stories concerning those who died for their faith within the living memory of the reader was deliberate. These tales also made a point which went beyond accounts of martyrdom; suffering, refusing to recant and a moral if not physical victory were part of the tale. Yet not all of those featured as protagonists in Foxe’s book were martyred; those aiding and abetting the martyrs often still survived as did those who had been the persecutors of said martyrs. There was frequently a judgement still to be made on the latter and for the determined opponents of the true faith a reckoning with God, which may come in the form of a punishment in this life, but certainly confirmed their lack of salvation in the next. Alongside the tales of martyrs sat tales of those who survived the trials and hardships of the Protestant time of persecution, primarily under the rule of Mary I. The inclusion of these stories reflected ‘Foxe’s unwavering interest in stories that showed divine providence at work’.¹⁰ It is only in the last edition (1583) that the story of Edwin Sandys appears under the auspices of ‘Those Providentially Saved in Mary’s Reign’. The accounts of contemporaries who survived were in some ways more problematic than the accounts of those martyred. Various accounts required editing in each subsequent volume to reflect current concerns. For example Foxe did not want to list Freewillers and Anabaptists in the 1563 edition when their names were best forgotten, and deleted Robert Cole’s providential rescue from the 1570 edition ‘because of Foxe’s anger at Cole’s prominent support of Archbishop Parker’s vestments policy’.¹¹

Foxe was a politically aware editor, who knew what elements it was wise to include and to exclude. Equally he exercised an editor’s privilege of allowing his own views to shape his choices. Alexandra Walsham

made the point that some of Foxe's sources were dubious, coming from 'anonymous individuals who relied upon such untrustworthy sources as childhood memory, local folklore and alehouse gossip'.¹² The work of Thomas S. Freeman has shown that whilst alehouse gossip was indeed where some of Foxe's tales originated, others were 'compiled, moulded, and disseminated by a network of godly laity and clerics' which included leading ecclesiastical figures of the day.¹³ Freeman has shown that some of the stories had no oral tradition and were 'designed from the outset to be circulated in print'. Whilst Freeman is referring specifically to the story of Eagles in reference to this quotation, the fact that 'there was nothing casual or disinterested in the way these stories were conveyed' is worth noting.¹⁴ Freeman argues that Foxe had ultimate control over what went into the volume and how these stories were presented:

Yet while Foxe's informants could determine which stories reached him and the content of those that did reach him, they could not shape the final version of these stories when they were printed in *Acts and Monuments*, nor were they able to decide if their stories would be printed in Foxe's book at all. Only Foxe had this power.¹⁵

Was this the case with all accounts or could prominent and influential individuals play a role in shaping their own tale? Freeman indicated that the changes in each version of the *Acts and Monuments* reflected the changing scope of the text from 'being a work of confessional propaganda to a work of pastoral guidance'.¹⁶ By 1583 the volume was also politically important to the Protestant nation in telling a story that both the hierarchy and the wider public wanted to hear. The *Acts and Monuments* represented a clear narrative on suffering and the dangers faced by true believers. It both reshaped and created new role models for a Protestant nation, which reflected the popularity of martyr narratives, but also allowed living examples to be included. Sandys was clearly not a martyr but his tale did have other essential and appealing elements within it, including accounts of suffering and the importance of providence.

Sandys' story features a recounting of his involvement in the attempt to supplant Mary I with Lady Jane Grey, his imprisonment in the Tower and then the Marshalsea, and finally his escape to the continent. These events are headed 'A briefe discourse concerning the troubles and happy deliuerance of the Reuerend Father in God, Doct. Sandes, first Bish. of Worcester, next of London, and now Archb. of Yorke.'¹⁷ Sandys' tale only featured in the 1583 edition of *Acts and Monuments* and appeared in the volume directly following the account of preacher Thomas Rose. The notes accompanying the 1583 online edition of the *Acts and Monuments* determine that Sandys' account was one of three 'written by their protagonists and sent to Foxe for purposes of self-justification and self-exculpation'.¹⁸ Whether Sandys wrote this account himself and sent it to

Foxe or whether it was penned by Foxe on his behalf is difficult to assess. Foxe and Sandys were already friends and colleagues and therefore it is likely Foxe would have been willing to give a favourable account of Sandys' story. Yet it is equally as feasible that Sandys could have written the story himself and sent it to Foxe. Many of the nuances and underlying points made via this account show the elements of a godly life that Sandys wanted to emphasise in the 1580s and this would support that he had considerable input into the work. As with many of the accounts in the *Acts and Monuments*, whether this was the literal truth becomes less significant than the thematic strands and providential occurrences that are woven through it.

In addition to compiling the *Acts and Monuments* Foxe had been involved in translating several of Martin Luther's works for an English audience. Sandys had been involved in some of these ventures in the 1570s, alongside Foxe, and wrote the foreword to a translation of Luther's *A Commentarie . . . upon the epistle . . . to the Galathians*.¹⁹ Whilst the translator of this text and the author of the long introduction to the piece remained officially anonymous it is conjectured by Evenden and Freeman that Foxe was the author of the introduction and that John Field was the translator.²⁰ In the preface/foreword to Luther's *A Commentarie . . .* Sandys declared that on seeing the translation he had allowed it to be printed as 'certain godly learned men' had translated the text from the Latin 'to the great benefit of all such, who with humble hearts' who would read it. He also emphasised that the translators wished to remain anonymous, 'seeking neither their own gain nor glory; but thinking it their happiness, if, by any means, they may relieve afflicted mindes'.²¹ If, as is postulated, Foxe and Field were the translators then the three men had already collaborated in print and Sandys' praise of their work suggested they had his admiration.

Foxe had also praised Sandys, albeit indirectly, in all the three previous editions of the *Acts and Monuments* via comments he made on John Bland. Foxe wrote that Bland was a schoolmaster of merit and that amongst his pupils was Doctor Sandys, 'a man of singuler learning & worthines, as may well beseeme a scholer meet for such a scholemaister, whom I here gladly name, for his singuler gifts of vertue and erudition'.²² Sandys and Foxe had been in contact since at least their time in exile and Foxe's comments on Sandys indicated a respect of his scholarly abilities.²³

The fourth edition of *Acts and Monuments* appeared at a most fortuitous time for Sandys. By the 1580s Sandys had risen through the ranks to reach the second highest ecclesial office in the land, yet all was not well. Sandys was suffering a damaged reputation, arising from an incident in a Doncaster inn where he was accused of adultery and the subsequent lengthy dispute with Robert Stapleton.²⁴ The court cases ensuing from this incident ended in Star Chamber and although Stapleton was found as the guilty party, the case besmirched Sandys' reputation. Sandys was

also facing questions regarding his commitment to the reformed faith in regards to his early career and he was involved in a series of disputes in York with both Matthew Hutton and the President of the Council of the North (Henry Hastings, third Earl of Huntingdon). Sandys was therefore keen to secure his reforming credentials and have a public eulogising of the sufferings he had undergone for his faith. In 1585 an authorised book of Sandys' sermons was published, with the cover page including a quotation from Daniel 12:3: 'They that be wise shall shine as the brightest of the firmament: and they that turne many to righteousnesse, as the stares for ever and ever.'²⁵ The appearance of a book of sermons belonging to a living cleric was unusual and alongside the account of his exile in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* this can be seen as part of a clear plan to rehabilitate his damaged standing. Sandys clearly saw the events of the 1580s as a further example of the testing that he was to undergo for his faith. They were part of the trials and suffering that exemplified a man of true faith every bit as much as the period of imprisonment and exile recounted in the *Acts and Monuments*. Yet equally, he was aware of the need to prove to himself and to others the assuredness of his salvation, and to secure his posthumous reputation. The importance of a heroic narrative to Sandys' life was clear in the 1580s. Because of his desire to assure all of the steadfastness he had to his faith he wanted to emphasise that there had never been any evidence of backsliding or recanting. The importance of his reputation as an influential preacher who could turn all to the true faith was foremost in his thoughts in the 1580s. Thus, it is unsurprising that these themes were also ones emphasised in the story of his life.

If the account of his life in the 1583 version of the *Acts and Monuments* was indeed written by Sandys, then via the content of the account, he has a specific point to make which he did very effectively. Unlike preacher Thomas Rose's story (preceding that of Sandys in the volume) which frequently drifts into the first person, Sandys' narrative is told entirely in the third person. This gives both a sense of impartiality and emphasised the idea that Sandys' fate was predetermined and providential, that he was following God's plan and did not have active agency in all the events. In the narrative Sandy is portrayed as in control of himself and his beliefs (albeit occasionally advised by others); he remained true to his faith and honest in all things throughout the tale, even to the extent of refusing to leave prison through an open door lest it look like he was admitting guilt.²⁶ The account in *Acts and Monuments* shows Sandys as an honest theologian torn from his world of academia and thrust into the limelight by the Duke of Northumberland's invitation to preach the accession of Lady Jane Grey. He is beset throughout the narrative by papist enemies, yet is shown to be an effective and persuasive preacher, able to convert all those who were willing to open their minds to see the truth.

The narrative begins with Edward VI's death and a supper with the Duke of Northumberland that was attended by Edwin Sandys, Matthew

Parker, William Bill and Thomas Lever. This was exalted, theologically sound company and places the story from the start at the centre of high politics and matters of national import. The story recalls that Northumberland said: 'Maisters, pray for vs that we speede well, if not, you shall be made Bishops, and we Deacons.' The word deacon here was used in a Greek derivation to mean either servant of the church or messenger. This led to the providential nature of this statement being commented on by the narrator of the tale. 'And euen so it came to passe, D. Parker, and D. Sandes were made Bishops, and he [Northumberland] and Sir Iohn Gates, who was then at the Table, were made Deacons ere it was long after, on the Tower hill.'

Foxe's account tells us that as Vice Chancellor Sandys was required to preach the day after the supper in Cambridge. The element of compulsion here is significant as in the 1580s Sandys was keen to emphasise his obedience to authority and in particular the crown, which was only second to doing God's will in all things. This point is therefore laboured in the narrative; Sandys gave the sermon as it was God's will, but also due to his unswerving obedience. In order to select a suitable theme for his sermon in 1553 Sandys 'shut his eyes, and holding his Bible before hym, earnestly prayed to God that it might fall open where a most fit text should be for hym to intreat of'. Providential intervention in the selection of an appropriate passage for the sermon was important in emphasising Sandys as a conduit for God's will. The Bible happily fell open at Joshua 1:16 'And they answered Joshua, saying, All that thou commandest biddest us, we will doe, and whither soever thou sendest us, we will goe.'²⁷ A providential selection of a text on the theme of obedience in all things was advantageous as the account made it clear that Sandys' actions were as a compliant servant, but also a defender of the true faith. In recounting the conversations that took place between Sandys and the Duke of Northumberland this is further emphasised. Northumberland, it is told, eventually proclaimed allegiance to Mary, albeit with a sad heart. Sandys however made no such affirmation and so never betrayed his principles, but equally the account is clear that he committed no treasonous acts:

The Duke that night retyred to Cambridge, and sent for Doct. Sandes to go with hym to the Market place to proclaim Queene Mary. The Duke cast vp his cap with others, and so laughted, that the teares ranne downe hys cheekes for grieffe. He told D. Sandes that Queene Mary was a mercifull woman, and that he doubted not thereof: declaryng, that he had sent vnto her to know her pleasure, and looked for a generall pardon. Doctor Sandes answered, my life is not deare vnto me, neither haue I done or sayd any thyng that urgeth my conscience. For that which I spake of the state, I haue instructions warranted by the subscription of xvj. Counsailors. Neither can speach bee treason, neither yet haue I spoken further then the worde

of God, and lawes of this Realm doth warrant me, come of me what God will. But be you assured, you shall neuer escape death: for if she would saue you, those that nowe shall rule, will kill you.²⁸

The story recounts how Sandys tried to retake his place at the university, but that university officials who were in opposition to him organised the taking of the statute book, keys and various things from Sandys' lodgings and he was arrested. The sin of backsliding is illustrated as a fault of Sandys' enemies in this section of the tale. He was betrayed by one of his colleagues, Dr Mouse (Mowse), who 'beyng an earnest Protestant the day before, and one whom Doct. Sandes had done much for, now was he become a Papist, and his great enemy.'²⁹ Dr Mouse was Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge in 1554. He was deprived of his office on the accession of Mary in favour of Stephen Gardiner and only restored after Gardiner's death, and following his reconversion to Catholicism. Sandys' story indicated Mouse's lack of commitment to his faith, but truncated Mouse's reconversion to Catholicism to the few days prior to Sandys' arrest rather than reflecting the true time scale. The rapidity of abandoning the reformed faith by some of his fellow academics, described within Sandys' account, emphasised the lack of true belief. It also provided dramatic contrast with Sandys' unwavering commitment to his own faith.³⁰

Reformed Religion

The nature of reformed religion in the Edwardian era has received less attention than might be expected, given the instrumental role that the theologians of this era were to play in shaping the nature of English religion.³¹ The early Edwardian Church had its roots in the schizophrenic religious policy that dominated the latter years of Henry VIII's reign. The early 1540s were a time when Henry himself appeared to be attempting to rewind certain aspects of religious reform, particularly those that had the potential to be a threat to his magisterial dominance, such as a freely accessible bible in the vernacular. Historians have often seen these years in terms of factional battles between conservative and evangelical groupings and the five and a half years of Edward's reign as no less riven by faction, but combined with a 'controversial and destructive Protestant Reformation.'³² Whilst the national policies of Henry's Church such as the 1539 'Act of Six Articles' and the 1543 'Act for the advancement of true religion' were decidedly conservative in nature, Henry's son and heir was educated and cared for by committed reformers. Ryrie described this grouping as not just 'doctrinaire Protestants', but as 'evangelically inclined'.³³ It was not just Edward's circle that was occupied with religious reformers, but Henry's household was filled with, perhaps even dominated by, these men. The evangelicals at court or with access to court circles included Thomas Cranmer, John Cheke (1514–57), Hugh

Latimer (c.1485–1555) and Richard Cox (c.1500–81). Aysha Pollnitz has argued that we should be unsurprised at Henry VIII's choices, as the men he chose to educate his son came from a Humanist and Erasmian tradition. Henry had always favoured Humanist learning and saw these men as embodying an outlook that he admired. In presenting this as their confessional identity they were part of, not enemies to, Henry's concept of majesty and kingship. Henry knew that in appointing these men to oversee the early years of Edward's life they would give Edward a 'liberal education that would enable him to govern a church as well as a state.'³⁴ The fact that the conclusion of this education resulted in the overturning of the 'Henrician religious settlement and set a more militant Protestant version of kingship' was something that Henry did not live to see.³⁵ This grouping of evangelicals was to have a dramatic effect on the religious changes of Edward's reign and the policies that Elizabeth I subsequently adopted and repackaged as her own.

Thomas Cranmer's influence in particular had lasting effects on the shape and nature of the English Church. Cranmer had outlived the coup that removed Thomas Cromwell first from power and then from this world. Cranmer's qualities as a reformer have been overshadowed by criticism of his religious compromises. For David Loades Cranmer 'was a reformer, but only within the parameters which the king laid down' and moreover was reliant on Cromwell for the religious impetus of policy. Furthermore he was ultimately orthodox on key issues such as the doctrine of the Mass, which became a preoccupation for his monarch in the latter years of the reign.³⁶ Yet it was Cranmer who was to provide the means for the reformation in England to move forward, taking on the theological controversies playing out on the continent, but in a uniquely English way. He invited to England a number of continental European reformers who had played key roles in shaping the debate on the theology of 'Protestantism' throughout Europe. These included Martin Bucer, Peter 'Martyr' Vermigli and Bernadino Ochino. He oversaw their appointment to positions at Cambridge, Oxford and Canterbury respectively. The men who had formed circles of evangelical thought in England could now draw on their ideas and engage further in the debates regarding the form godly religion would take in England. The *Act of Forty-Two Articles*, the 1549 and 1552 Books of Common Prayer were amongst the achievements of the Edwardian theologians. These were decidedly more Protestant and reformed than anything drafted in the Henrician period and reflected the influence of men such as Bucer, who had played a role in taking forward the continental reformation.³⁷ Elizabeth was also to use this material as defining and limiting her settlement, making the Edwardian reforms the most radical of the English reformation.

Diarmaid MacCulloch has argued that the Edwardian reformation was problematic in Anglian historiography, as it did not fit the rhetoric of the nineteenth and twentieth century church of moderation. MacCulloch

makes a strong and convincing case that it was because the 'Edwardian adventure' was a 'religious revolution' which demolished the traditional in order to rebuild something new and different.³⁸ Ryrie too believed that the Edwardian period has too often been overlooked.³⁹ The attempts to accelerate religious change under Edward were explicit, and in comparison to the later years of Henry's reign the changes proposed were radical. This period should be seen not in terms of a mid-Tudor crisis but as a period of intensified change in a long reformation.⁴⁰ In terms of the progress of reformed thinking and theology the period saw a rapid shift of emphasis away from the old and towards the new; it saw the formulation of policy and doctrine that would simply be reasserted under Elizabeth and it saw the men who would later be the key players in establishing reformed religion at their most radical.

Diarmaid MacCulloch has argued that 'Prominent Edwardians could afford to take a generously wide view of what reformed identity might mean.'⁴¹ Peter White has suggested that early reformers 'were content with a relatively unsophisticated Protestantism which countered the merit theology and "mass mongering" of Rome on the one hand, and guarded itself against Anabaptists excess on the other'.⁴² So how did Sandys fit into the picture of Edwardian reformation and evangelical thinking? From his later writings we can see that he was influenced by the nature of reforms in these formative years of evangelical reasoning. He had first come to Cambridge in the 1530s (1532/3) and graduated with a BA in 1538/9, an MA in 1541 and as a doctor of divinity in 1549.⁴³ In the early 1550s it is clear that the primary concern was to counter the corruption of the Roman Church, but the primary theological considerations coming from the continent were centred on the nature of the Mass and discussion of the 'real' presence of Christ. This in itself had already caused a split within reforming circles due to the lack of agreement on this precise matter. A consensus centred on Calvinist orthodoxy, advocated by Lake to describe the early Stuart Church, was many years away.⁴⁴ The Edwardian Church was perhaps influenced more directly by Bucer, who after all was actually in England, rather than Luther, Calvin or Zwingli.⁴⁵ Continental reformers in exile were debating ideas alongside English evangelicals and were still forming both ideas and policy which was someway off becoming the norm in English religious thinking. Throughout all of this Bucer was seen as a unifying presence between the differing groupings.⁴⁶ Bucer's ideas were underpinned by ideas on providence. He believed that God allowed those to fall who He could not prevent from falling; alongside this was a belief that preaching was vital. He also published works on the nature of marriage, and by association divorce, which was a theme Sandys too was to take up.⁴⁷ Parker gave a sermon at Bucer's funeral in 1551 which complimented Bucer as a man keen to care for the 'politique and Christian order of the hole Township in the respect of the civyll society and commonly order therof.'⁴⁸ English Protestantism has

become linked in the historiography of religious reform to the upholding of obedience to civil authority. Stephen Alford advocated that the universities and their scholarly communities were flagships of reformation and through them the Edwardian regime tried to 'blur the boundaries between learning, kingly authority, and godly religion.'⁴⁹ The nature of Bucer's and Martyr's thinking implied that order was vital to their beliefs and that reformed religion could accommodate monarchical authority. Throughout Sandys' writings, sermons and actions we can observe this desire for order and authority, we can see his belief in the authority of monarchy and most obviously the desire to combat Catholicism and follow the path laid out for him by God.

It is hardly surprising that there is nothing in the account of Sandys' early career, found in Foxe's work, which commented on his beliefs regarding any of the more complex theological debates that had preoccupied Bucer or Martyr. The nature of the Mass, the role of justification, the elect, predestination and marriage were topics for elsewhere. It is clear to see Bucer and Martyr's influence in Sandys' own theology and outlook, but the purpose of the narrative in Foxe's work was to give a clear message of commitment to reform not to discuss complex theology. Nor does the story actually tell us the sort of evangelical Sandys was in the 1550s, but it does tell us how he wanted and needed to be shown by the 1580s. The Edwin Sandys portrayed in the 1550s, via *Acts and Monuments*, was actually the Sandys of the 1580s; it showed both how Foxe wanted him to appear and how Sandys himself wanted to be remembered. He appeared as a staunch unwavering Protestant, yet one who was respectful of authority.

The account presented a binary dynamic, the faithful are committed and constant in all they do; meanwhile the adherents to the Roman Catholic faith are inconstant, traitorous and plotters. Thus, Sandys' account of his last days at Cambridge and his arrest showed a university torn apart by factional dispute, echoing the divisors in the country. On one side he portrayed the godly evangelicals who supported him and attempted to keep him safe and on the other both supporters of Mary and turn-coats from the true faith. It is those in the latter category for whom he expressed most contempt, as they lacked consistency and commitment to their beliefs. He condemned those who abandoned godly religion to support Mary as purveyors of falsehood in word and deed. Sandys' defenders included Sir John Gates, a courtier and ally of Northumberland who had been staying with Sandys and who advised him to walk into the fields around the town to avoid arrest, and Doctors Bill and Blithe, who persuaded him that he should suffer the wrongs done to him rather than resort to violence.⁵⁰ The narrative presented him drawing his dagger as Mr Mitch plus a 'rabble of vnlearned Papists' prevented him from delivering his oration and defence of his sermon as they 'conspired together

to pull hym out of his chaire, and to vse violence vnto hym'.⁵¹ Sandys verbally berated them 'chargyng them with great ingratitude, declaring that hee had sayd nothing in his sermon, but that he was ready to iustifie, and that their case was all one with his: For they had not onely concealed, but consented to that whiche hee had spoken.'⁵² Along with Mr Mitch another traitorous individual was Mr Mildmay who according to Sandys 'came downe in payment agaynst Queene Mary, and armed in þe field, and now he returneth in payment for Queene Mary'. Sandys judged him to be inconsistent as he was 'before a traitor [to Mary], and now a great friend. I cannot with one mouth blow whote and cold after this sort.'⁵³ Consistency and loyalty were qualities that were emphasised, but perhaps most importantly for the purposes of a tale defending Sandys in the 1580s, a clear emphasis was placed on his loyalty to justice and good order. Barrett L. Beer writes that 'It was not enough for an early Protestant leader to be learned and devoted to reformist doctrines, because the successful propagation of the Gospel required bold and energetic men who would actively engage the enemy.'⁵⁴ Sandys had spent much of his life engaging with the enemy yet the account in Foxe's book tells how he was a man of upright conscience but never engaged in treasonous or unlawful behaviour. Thus, it is recounted that:

When Wyat with his armie came into Southwarke, he sent two Gentlemen into þe Marshalsea to D. Sandes: Saying, that maister Wyat would be glad of his companie and aduice, and that the gates should be sette open for all the prisonners. He aunswared: Tell maister Wyat, if this his rising be of God it will take place: If not, it will fall. For my part I was committed hether by order, I wil be discharged by like order, or I will neuer depart hence. So answeared maister Sanders, and the rest of the preachers being there prisonners.⁵⁵

Sandys was therefore adamant that he had no desire to be involved in treason or rebellion against Queen Mary and that he was utterly reliant on God for his salvation. Protestant responses to finding themselves under a Catholic Queen were varied. Gerry Bowler has argued that many automatically turn to violence, but in the initial months of the new regime it was not the case.⁵⁶ Having turned down any aid that could have been provided by Wyatt and his rebels Sandys remained fast to the teaching of the supremacy of civil authority. Even within the context of a volume that told of the suffering of the godly at the hands of a backward and corrupt Catholic regime Sandys and Foxe both advocated the need for obedience to the forces of monarchical authority. Again all was to be determined by God's will and the failure of Wyatt and his rising showed that he was not just in his cause. Most importantly Sandys was treading a fine line to avoid any accusations of treason in the retelling of events.

Imprisonment and the Escape Narrative

The power of Sandys as minister and preacher is also emphasised throughout the text in Foxe's account. Adherence to the true faith, without expressing doubt, even when imprisoned and in fear of losing your life was also a prominent trope in the narratives of evangelical religion. This story has none of the self-doubt or insecurity seen in some tales of suffering; at no point did Sandys waver, doubt his cause, or lack for the support of his God. By the 1580s Sandys was keen to emphasise the longevity of his reformed ideals, mitigating the accusations made that his ordination was under Catholic rites and emphasising that recanting his reformed faith was never a possibility. Sandys' tale lacks the more direct elements of extreme physical suffering and martyrdom present in many of the other accounts in *Acts and Monuments*, but his journey to prison had echoes of Christ's journey to Calvary, designed to emphasise the suffering that he did experience. Thus, he was forced to travel from Cambridge to London firstly on 'a lame horse that halted to the ground' and then on a borrowed 'nagge'. His departure from the city of Cambridge was overseen by 'Papists [who had] resorted thither to giere at hym' and his arrival in London was met by further jeering, this time by 'a milk wife'. This woman hurled a stone at him which hit him, but he turned the other cheek and said 'Woman, God forgeue it thee'.⁵⁷ Thus, his public humiliation and suffering was emphasised alongside his humility in the face of persecution.

Sandys is shown as a strong, well-respected and honest man. Both his gaolers, John Bowler (Nun's Bower, the Tower of London) and Thomas Way (keeper of the Marshalsea), were impressed by his faith. We are told little of Sandys' initial prison experience, except that he was kept in poor conditions, but after being in the Tower for three weeks he was moved to a better prison, the Nun's Bower, where he joined John Bradford (c.1510–55). The inclusion in the story of this change of location draws attention to why the Bower was suddenly available for occupation, as it had been the prison of Lord Ambrose Dudley and Lord Henry Guildford prior to their executions, and thus made connections for the reader with previous martyrs.⁵⁸ For the purposes of Sandys' story it reunited him with Bradford who had been at St Catherine's College, Cambridge, was a noted preacher and a close acquaintance with Bucer.⁵⁹ Unlike Sandys, Bradford was eventually martyred for his faith, but the story emphasised the power both Sandys and Bradford held as persuasive advocates for their faith.

While D. Sands and M. Bradford were thus in close prison together 29. weekes, one Iohn Bowler was their Keeper, a very peruerse Papist, yet by often perswading of him, for he would geue eare, and by gentle vsing of him at the length he began to mislike Poperie and to

fauor the Gospell, and so perswaded in true religion, that on a son-day when they had Masse in the Chappell, he bringeth vp a Seruice booke, a manchet and a glasse of wine, and there D. Sandes ministred the Communion to Bradforde and to Bowler. Thus, Bowler was their sonne begotten in bondes.⁶⁰

After his stay in the Nun's Bower Sandys was removed to the Marshalsea whilst Bradford was imprisoned with Ridley and Cranmer. The new gaoler was Thomas Wray, who urged Sandys to give up his vanity in holding to a false faith, citing that so young a man as Sandys could not know better than 'so many worthy Prelates, auncient, learned, and graue menne as be in thys Realme'.⁶¹ Here Sandys is again humble, but firm in his commitment:

Doctour Sandes answered: I knowe my yeares young and my learning small, it is enoughe to knowe Christe crucified, and he hath learned nothing that seeth not the greate blasphemie that is in Poperie, I will yeelde vnto God and not vnto man, I haue reade in the Scriptures of manye godly and courteous Keepers, God may make you one. If not, I trust hee will geue me strengthe and patience to beare your hard dealing with me.⁶²

Thus, Sandys was able to win the confidence of his new keeper who then trusted him to meet with Bradford alone in the fields surrounding their prison, gave him a good chamber and allowed him to preach, administer communion, and as a result convert others.⁶³

Doctor Sands gaue such exhortation to the people, for at that time being young, he was thoughte verye eloquent, that hee mooued many teares and made the people abhorre the Masse, and defie all Poperie.⁶⁴

Nevertheless Sandys was still imprisoned, in danger and he had refused escape asserting that he would only leave his imprisonment if ordered to do so by the monarch. The emphasis on his adherence to the monarch was emphasised, noting for a 1580s audience the importance he placed on hierarchy and authority. Foxe's account asserted that initially Sandys' deliverance from the Marshalsea was planned to be secured via Sir Thomas Holcroft, who was a soldier, MP, courtier and had held a number of positions in local government.⁶⁵ Holcroft had been a supporter of Somerset, rather than Northumberland, and was thus able to find some favour with the new Marian regime. However the order for Sandys' release was granted from Queen Mary and signed by the Bishop of Winchester, on the understanding that Sandys was not to leave the country on the bond of two of his kinsmen. Sandys made it clear to Holcroft that he was going to leave and thus could not allow this bond to

take place. Holcroft eventually agreed that he would not take a bond and would agree to release Sandys without this security, on the agreement that Sandys did nothing to implicate him. Despite the vital role Holcroft played he is not shown as a heroic figure. Holcroft did not openly support Protestantism, even though he clearly acted to save and free those arrested, as a nicodemite he was a much more problematic figure in the tale. The issue of whether lying was acceptable, in word or deed, for the purposes of self-preservation was an issue in the 1580s just as much as it was in the 1550s.

Sandys' last act before leaving England had the ring of a medieval miracle to it. The miraculous and the providential were often difficult to tell apart and as Walsham has argued the disparity between the two may have escaped the indiscriminating.⁶⁶

The 6. of May beyng Sunday, the wynd serued. Hee tooke his leau of his Hoste and Hostesse, & went towards the ship, in taking leau of his Hostesse who was barren, and had bene married viij. yeares. Hee gaue her a fine handkerchiefe and an old royall of gold in it, thanking her much, and sayd: Be of good comfort, or that an whole yere be past, God shall geue you a childe, a boy. And it came to passe, for that day tweluemonth lacking one day, God gaue her a faire sonne.⁶⁷

This aspect of Sandys' departure into exile also illustrated one of the problematic aspects of creating a martyrology for an early modern audience, especially when the martyrs were not from the early church, but memorialised more recent sacrifices and suffering.⁶⁸ 'The claims that a person who died for his or her beliefs was demonstrably a martyr because those beliefs were true' required the reader to already be a committed believer, but if the aim of the book was to convert or to stop backsliding then some proof of the 'trueness' of the cause was required.⁶⁹ 'Traditionally miracles had supplied this verification' and as Freeman's work has illustrated authors, both Catholic and Protestant, continued to supply their audiences with the wonders performed by their martyrs. Foxe was disparaging of the traditional Catholic hagiographies, due to their flights of fancy and their false miracle tales, yet he still included signs and wonders in his work. Susannah Brietz Monta has argued that Foxe's work showed the Protestant caution to and distrust of miracles alongside a 'lingering fascination' with them.⁷⁰ Walsham's study of providence has shown that Protestant theologians did not go as far as suggesting that God never 'interrupted or overrode the laws of nature' and that there were 'special providences' rather than spontaneous miracles to be found in their world.⁷¹ In Sandys' case perhaps the need for an account showing a providential miracle was even stronger, for after all he was not actually a martyr but a former exile, and one whose godly reputation was by the 1580s in doubt.

The Reality of Exile

In analysing how exile was viewed in the early modern mindset Jonathan Wright asked the question 'Were exiles on a par with martyrs in the competition to serve Christ, were they comparable to hirelings who deserted their flocks, or were they something in between?'⁷² In his 2001 article he concluded that: 'In spite of such criticism, significant as it was, exile emerged from the Marian experience to be regarded as a legitimate, often glorious, response to persecution'.⁷³ What exile meant was reinforced through religious, political and literary sources. Exile was seen in the scriptures, with Adam and Eve's expulsion from the Garden of Eden imposed as a punishment from God on a sinful humanity, through to the exile of Moses and Jason which were much the more suitable exemplars cited by sixteenth century exiles.⁷⁴ Exile as both a physical and allegorical separation from the familiar was taken up as a common theme in plays and poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Shakespeare amongst others illustrates early modern understandings of exile. His plays see exile used as a punishment (both threatened and imposed) by figures of authority, but also as a self-imposed banishment from country or friends, necessitated by a need for moral or spiritual wellbeing.⁷⁵ The experience of religious exile was to be something that impacted upon both Protestant and Catholic communities in the early modern era and was not unique to the English experience of religious change but was common to many who felt in danger from religious persecution through the European world. As we have seen in the account of Sandys' exile in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* the recounting of these tales were not necessarily intended to provide the early modern audience with an accurate representation of the events, but to provide them with role models and examples of admirable behaviour. The importance of providence underpinned many of these stories and as we have seen with Sandys' story could also illustrate ideas that were expedient to the current political climate of the reader. For Sandys it was important to remind everyone of his reforming credentials, but also to illustrate his loyalty and the real hardships that he had undergone in the Marian era.

It has previously been shown that Sandys had already had contact with continental reformers who were themselves in exile in England before any of the troubles of the Marian era. Sandys was at Cambridge throughout the 1530s and 1540s becoming master of St Catherine's in 1547 and Vice Chancellor by 1552 during the reign of Edward VI.⁷⁶ Archbishop Cranmer's desire to attract the brightest and best men from the continent had led to him extending invitations to many of the key evangelical reformers of the era.⁷⁷ Martin Bucer and Peter 'Martyr' Vermigli had accepted the invitations and Cranmer had hoped that Philip Melancthon would leave Wittenberg and replace Bucer at Cambridge, though this was not to be.⁷⁸ These men brought with them knowledge of the upheavals of religious

reform and the real dangers that conflicts between state and church could entail. In 1549 Martin Bucer left Strasbourg for exile in England.⁷⁹ Strasbourg had seen a period of challenges to religious orthodoxy in the 1530s replaced by a period of consolidation with Charles V's Interim Settlement imposed in 1548. The compromises that this settlement had imposed had forced Bucer to flee. In Strasbourg Bucer's ideas had already begun to challenge Lutheran ideologies and in taking up the role of Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge he was able to influence the English reformation.⁸⁰ Bucer had distinct views on the role of the church in which secular rulers had a role to play but which left the church responsible for the control of ecclesiastical personnel and discipline.⁸¹ Bucer's notion of 'a historical precedent that allowed for a dominant monarchical role vis-à-vis the Church and state supremacy over the Church' was one that was to be important to the Elizabethan church settlement.⁸² Bucer's influence on the development of the English Church, and in particular on Matthew Parker, has been discussed elsewhere, but his connections with Cambridge clearly had an influence on many of the evangelicals who would be key to the Elizabethan Church.⁸³ When fleeing via Antwerp Sandys headed first for Strasbourg which had been Bucer's former home and which was to house a number of English exiles for at least part of their time in continental Europe.

Sandys was not to remain in Strasbourg for the whole period of his exile and here the influence of another continental exile becomes important, that of Pietro Martire Vermigli, also one of the leading lights of the Reformation. Vermigli, more commonly referred to as Peter Martyr in the English reformation tradition, was a former Augustinian monk. He had been influenced by Luther's ideas which resulted in him fleeing to Zurich in 1542, and then Strasbourg where he was supported by Bucer in becoming a professor of theology. Along with Bucer he left Strasbourg after the implementation of 'the compromise' to come to England.⁸⁴ Marvin Anderson described Martyr as Bucer's 'alter ego' as he held the parallel position to Bucer of Regius Professor of Divinity, but at Oxford (1549–53).⁸⁵ The desire for 'ecumenical reconciliation' was initially held by both Bucer and Martyr even if they were not in agreement on all points of reform.⁸⁶

Bucer and Martyr realised that the 'Interim' settlement in Strasbourg was not going to bring about the reforms they desired, but the movement of both men to England allowed them to conceptualise their ideas on reform. It was during their exile in England that they were most clearly able to formulate and articulate the extent to which they differed from both Roman Catholic doctrine and Lutheran ideas. Martyr was permitted by Mary I to leave England when she came to the throne and he headed for Strasbourg, where he was joined by Sandys following his escape from prison in 1553. By the time Sandys came to reside in Strasbourg it had undergone further change becoming less independent and

more Lutheran. The account in Foxe's book is remarkably brief regarding Sandys' period in exile, especially given the much longer narrative of his time at Cambridge and imprisoned whilst still in England. The account provided in the Foxe narrative is dominated by the discussion of Sandys' actions in reference to his incarceration and departure from England which further supports the premise that Sandys was involved in formulating the piece. Proving the legality of his departure from England had been his main concern during his incumbency in Worcester and proving his constancy to reformed religion and his honesty were his priorities in the 1580s. In addition by the 1580s continental European connections were of much less significance than they would have been in any account written in the early 1560s.

The account in Foxe's book does tell us something of the connections that Sandys relied upon and who were therefore instrumental in ensuring his safety. He first travelled to Antwerp with the son of a Mr Issac and it was the same Mr Issac who was also praised for supporting Sandys once he was resident in Strasbourg. On arrival in Antwerp Sandys was welcomed by a Mr Lock and invited to dine with him, but this peace was to be short-lived. George Gilpin, who was to be a key player in English activities in the Low Countries, came to inform Sandys that he needed to flee as searches were being made for him. Sandys left Antwerp and eventually made his way to Strasbourg. Here he was separated from his family for a year before his wife and child joined him. Even then Sandys' trials were not over as the whole family was struck down with an illness:

He fell sore sicke of a flixie, which kept hym nine monthes, and brought him to deathes dore. He had a child which fell sicke of the plage and died. His wyfe at length fell sicke of a consumption and dyed in his armes, no man had a more godly woman to his wyfe.⁸⁷

Thus, his trials and suffering were emphasised in the account and his time in exile marked by loss. Sandys remained in Strasbourg until 1556, when along with Martyr he left for Zurich.⁸⁸ In Zurich the religious reforms had been dominated by the ideas of Ulrich Zwingli whose teaching and ideas differed from those of Luther. Zwingli progressed ideas on the sacraments and iconoclasm in particular, which were expressed in his Sixty-Seven Articles of 1523.⁸⁹ The split with the reformed tradition was already becoming visible by the 1520s and when Zwingli died in 1531 his place had been taken by another reformer, Henrich Bullinger, who was to play a significant role in the lives of many English exiles including that of Edwin Sandys.⁹⁰ Bullinger's hospitality to exiles from around Europe, in particular from England, was vital to the community's survival. Bullinger's ideas can also be seen in the stance of the English exile community who settled in Zurich and who would later form the lynchpins of the Elizabethan Church. Bullinger for example 'saw no basic distinction

between the Christian State and the Christian Church' as established in Old Testament theology and

from this covenant theology it followed that the jurisdiction of the civil authority extended to ecclesiastical matters, and, though predestination was still of prime importance, God's election was binding only so far as men and women kept the conditions of the covenant.⁹¹

Alongside the ideas already formulated in England in the Edwardian era these premises formed the foundations for ideas of church and state underpinning the Elizabethan Church; that the civil magistrate and the church preacher should have the same goals; the creation of a godly state and church was the duty of both civil and ecclesiastical authorities. The connections Bullinger established in this period of exile ensured that he was to remain influential in later developments in English theology, as he maintained correspondence with several of the former exiles after their return to England.⁹² This is not to go as far as Torrance Kirby has done in asserting that an English religious settlement was in fact a Bullinger-Martyr formulated settlement, but does acknowledge that the English settlement was not as MacCulloch would argue a uniquely home-grown cuckoo in the European Reformation's nest.⁹³

Disunity in Exile?

The period 1553–8 saw numerous Englishmen leave for refuges on the continent. The cities of Strasbourg, Zurich, Frankfurt and later Geneva all hosted English migrants with these itinerants moving between cities as circumstances dictated. Initially Strasbourg was home to Sandys and many of his compatriots. John Jewel and Peter Martyr joined the community there in 1554 when forced to flee England. The new arrivals were not in residence there for long as in March 1554 a number of the English divines who had been based in Strasbourg journeyed to Frankfurt where disputation had occurred over the face of the English Church. The disagreements lay principally over the extent to which the service followed by the English congregation should diverge from that laid out by the 1552 Prayer Book. Christina Garnet, Patrick Collinson and Diarmaid MacCulloch have all viewed this as a significant conflict, beginning the disagreements that would be visible in the Elizabethan Church between differing groupings.⁹⁴ This has been disputed by Karl Gunther who has argued that the episode at Frankfurt is best seen as 'presaging the widespread commitment of the returning exiles to purge the Elizabethan Church of the "remnants of popery."⁹⁵

The episode in Frankfurt would certainly be best viewed in the context of the circumstances of 1554, rather than reflected through later conflicts, but again we are faced with a retrospective account of the events.

The main account of the events in Frankfurt, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfurt*, was first published in 1575 at the height of an Elizabethan controversy primarily over vestments, but also reflected the increasing divergence between groups desiring further change and those advocating conformity for the sake of unity. The publication of *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfurt* has proved a source of controversy for historians. Firstly the text's authorship is officially anonymous, but the editorship has been attributed variously to William Whittingham, Thomas Wood, John Field and perhaps even to a wider group of authors who were favourable to the Genevan rites.⁹⁶

Again Sandys has a role to play in these events in signing the letters returned to Frankfurt from Strasbourg, participating in the meeting at Frankfurt in 1554 and also in terms of the later narratives surrounding the publication of the *A Brief Discourse*. In particular he took action against those he considered to be advocating for further reform at the expense of unity in the later 1570s. All of this came in the aftermath of the publication of *A Brief Discourse* and other texts advocating the need for further reform coming out of the Heidelberg presses. Sandys believed that the main author of works supporting the cause for the rites of Geneva and advocating for further reform was Thomas Cartwright. His letter to Gualter in 1574 referred to Cartwright's authorship of 'A Full and Plain Declaration' but made no reference to either the authorship of 'A Brief Discourse' (published 1575) or to William Whittingham, despite subsequent texts citing this as the first indication of Sandys' enmity towards Whittingham.⁹⁷ As with Foxe's work, the publication of the account of events at Frankfurt at a later date tells us much, if not more, about the events at the time of its publication as it does about the events it described. The events at Frankfurt do however connect to the beliefs held by Sandys in the 1570s and in part explain the enmity against those who posed a potential threat to the unity of the reformed church in England. The later editing of *A Brief Discourse* by Edward Arbor at the beginning of the twentieth century attributed its authorship to Whittingham. The volume included, along with the account of the events at Frankfurt, a biographical account of Whittingham's life produced at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This anonymous biograph of Whittingham, 'Written by a Student of the Temple, about 1603', eulogised Whittingham and was clear in suggesting that he had been ill used and criticised for his links with Geneva. Listed as chief villain in this persecution was Edwin Sandys, who acted against Whittingham using his authority as Archbishop of York. In recounting Sandys' action whilst Archbishop of York the anonymous author concluded that Sandys had acted with malice and pursued Whittingham 'til death'.⁹⁸ The intricacies of the case will be discussed in regards to Sandys' exercise of authority in York (in chapter five), but via Arbor's editing and interpretation the link between Sandys and Whittingham

was thus established, beginning with the troubles at Frankfurt and ending with Whittingham's death in 1579.

Collinson's and Gunther's work has emphasised that what lay behind the disputes at Frankfurt was a complex set of concerns that went beyond the mere order of the service. The men at Strasbourg were eminent theologians who had formed the 'rump of the Edwardian establishment'.⁹⁹ This is an important factor in assessing how the events of 1554 would have a longer impact on Sandys' ideas regarding church discipline and later on his view on those seeking further reform. As part of the Strasbourg party Sandys was amongst men who had played a role in shaping Edwardian religion, formulating the ideas and beliefs that underpinned the revised 1552 Prayer Book. Thus, criticism of that prayer book, however imperfect Sandys and his compatriots may have thought it to be in 1552, was criticism of the work and beliefs established in England and now being dismantled by the papist foe. The men in the Strasbourg group were from the circles that surrounded Martyr and Bucer, it was their divine guidance that they had followed in England and which had led them back to Strasbourg in time of crisis. Criticism of the settlement they had worked on was an implication that perhaps they had followed an imperfect path and that God had looked elsewhere to find a true centre of evangelical influence. The letter sent from the congregation at Frankfurt implied that in terms of geographical loci, God had in fact chosen Frankfurt rather than Strasbourg or Zurich, and it was the Christian duty of all English evangelicals to relocate to rediscover his divine presence in this new English Church.¹⁰⁰ Sandys and his compatriots believed in divine providence and as Gunther argues the claim from Frankfurt that they, not others, had 'received special providential favour likely touched a sensitive nerve'.¹⁰¹

All of these factors ensured that the invitation letter from Frankfurt (dated 2 August 1554) to the English refugees from around Europe was viewed as presumptuous. The assertion that the congregation at Frankfurt were to form a definitive English Church and expected others to join them was not universally welcomed: 'Wherefore, Brethren, seeing you have endured the pain of Persecution with us, we thought it likewise our duties to make you partakers of our consolation';¹⁰² The congregation at Frankfurt saw it as their duty to provide a definitive English reformed church and that God had set them on this path. The problem of course was that all the exiles believed in providence, all believed that they were acting at God's direction and that the righteousness of their case would be shown through their ultimate triumph. Sandys' own words show us that he certainly believed that the English congregation at Strasbourg were preceded by the 'Lord himself' who had gone before to prepare the way for them and thus 'having nothing, we are in possession of all things'.¹⁰³ In a sermon delivered at Strasbourg Sandys recommended that

they celebrate their persecution, and that they give thanks that God's providence and favour had led them to the appointed place:

Could we wish for more at the hands of God than, being banished and constrained to forsake all the profits and comforts which we enjoyed at home in our native country, here amongst aliens and strangers to find a city so safe to dwell in, maintenance so competent for our needful and reasonable sustentation, such grace in the eyes of the godly magistrates under whom we live, such favour and respect to our hard estate, such free liberty to come together, to call upon God in our common prayers, to hear his word sincerely and truly preached in our own natural tongue, to the great and unsearchable comfort of our souls; finally, all things so strangely and almost miraculously ministered and brought unto our hands, as doubtless we could never have found here, if the Lord himself had not gone before, as it were, to make ready and to provide for us?¹⁰⁴

This undated sermon took Corinthians VI as the theme which questioned the nature of disputes, the following has been modernised: 'Dare any of you that hath a cause agens another, be deemed at wicked men, and not at holy men?'¹⁰⁵ The pitting of brother against brother was the theme of this passage 'I say to make you ashamed. So there is not any wise man, that may deme betwixt a brother and his brother; but brother with brother striveth in dom[ination], and that among unfaithful men.'¹⁰⁶ Whether this sermon came before or after the Strasbourg congregation was contacted by Frankfurt is unknown, but it did illustrate the fears of division amongst the faithful when they were in such uncertain times.

The English congregation at Frankfurt asserted that there was a need to go further in terms of reform, and thus implied that the Edwardian rites were still ridden with popish traits: 'You remember that, before, we have reasoned together in hope to obtain a Church; and shall we now draw back? as mindful of GOD s Providence, which hath procured us one free from all dregs of superstitious Ceremonies?'¹⁰⁷ There was also an element of pragmatism to their moves as they had been granted shared use, along with an established congregation of French exiles, of the Church of White Ladies. In order to secure their right to use the church an agreement on their service with the French exiles was necessary. The French grouping used an order of service derived from Calvin and the suggested revisions to the English service echoed this.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, the changes that the Frankfurt congregation implemented, such as omission of the surplice and a revised litany, were issues that had been discussed and debated in England. It is feasible that they saw these omissions as necessary to secure their new church and that the inclusion of new prayers, confession and metrical psalms as simply continuing on the path started for them by the Edwardian divines.

The men at both Zurich and Strasbourg wrote back to Frankfurt, but neither grouping was particularly enthusiastic about the suggestions made by the congregation at Frankfurt, nor with the prospect of the Frankfurt grouping setting the agenda for the English Church.¹⁰⁹ In December 1554 the Strasbourg clerics replied to Frankfurt saying that ‘we cannot at this presente condescende upon any generall meatinge at anye certayne tyme, either tooe remaine with you or otherwise’, with Edwin Sandys being the first signatory to the letter.¹¹⁰ The Strasbourg contingent did eventually respond with the intention to send representatives to Frankfurt, which did not satisfy the requests regarding the formation of a new and unified English Church, but did signify that they were unwilling to let Frankfurt set the agenda. Eventually the divines at Strasbourg agreed to come to Frankfurt ‘to set in order and establish that Church accordingly’ and agree the substance of the book.¹¹¹ *A Brief Discourse* recorded the tensions in the Frankfurt congregation: ‘Yea, contention grew at length so hot, and the one party, which sought Sincerity, was so sore charged with Newfangledness and Singularity and to be the stirrers of contention’.¹¹² The account however also makes it clear that this initial dispute was settled in the early months of 1555 with John Knox, William Whittingham, Thomas Parry and Thomas Lever agreeing an order of service that held until March that year, when Richard Cox arrived. On the arrival at Frankfurt of both Cox and the group from Strasbourg the parties divided into what has commonly become referred to as the ‘Coxians’ who defended the prayer book and the ‘Knoxians’ who advocated for the revised service. Lever defected to the Coxian grouping who triumphed, and Knox and Whittingham left Frankfurt. The events described in *A Brief Discourse* present Knox and Whittingham as the wronged parties forced to flee. They create a sense of exile within exile, as they were forced out of Frankfurt.

A lack of unity amongst the English exiles spread across Europe was perhaps to be expected. In Edwardian England such disagreements could have safely taken place within the universities and reformed networks and it is likely any discord would have ultimately been quieted by royal decree. Amongst an exiled population the debate was instead magnified and seized upon by Catholic commentators as a sign of instability in reformed ideas.¹¹³ To pin all the future discord in the Elizabethan Church onto this one event in Frankfurt is, as Gunther has argued, going too far. Although neither should this division be dismissed as easily forgotten once the Protestant congregation was again in the ascendancy, these divisions did not instantly disperse in 1558–9 and were to resurface over time. Other potential divisions also existed, for example between those who had fled and those who remained behind in England. Foxe’s tales of martyrs reflected the later anxieties felt about backsliders and nicodemites during the Elizabethan era. Andrew Pettegree has argued that the number of Marian Protestants who outwardly conformed was significant

and far outstripped the numbers who went into exile.¹¹⁴ Alexandra Walsham's work has also argued that nicodemism 'played an important role in shaping the nature of inter-confessional relations' in the later sixteenth century.¹¹⁵ The fate of martyrs was frightful but they at least had the consolation that they had met their deaths as honest men and women who had stayed loyal to the true faith. The fate of others was less certain, they may have retained their mortal lives but the impact of such pretence and official denial of their beliefs was still of concern to the exiles in the reign of Elizabeth.¹¹⁶ Protestants writing of their own history reflected this; Sandys, through both Foxe's account and his own sermons illustrated his wider concern with demonstrating the importance of constancy in religious belief.¹¹⁷ Sandys' sermon in Strasbourg also addressed this issue stating that there were two sorts of men to whom grace was offered, but in vain. The first was the 'dissolue and retchless' who failed to hear the word and the second are those

which receiveth the seed, and it taketh root for a time; but when the heat of the sun cometh, it withereth away. Many such there be, which have gladly heard the gospel, have frequented sermons with appearance of great devotion, and could freshly talk of the holy scriptures of God. But when the heat of the sun burst out, when persecution and fire followed the professors of it, O Lord, how many have shrunk, yea, and utterly fallen from it! How many persecutors now, which then were professors! Not one amongst forty hath tarried the beam and blaze of his burning and trying sun.¹¹⁸

The partisan nature of the *A Brief Discourse*, is clearly visible and whilst Gunther's work has sought to play down the overall significance of the troubles at Frankfurt it was clear that Sandys did not entirely forgive and forget on his return to England in 1559 as there were still disagreements in the 1570s. The account of Sandys' escape provided in Foxe tell us that he believed he had heard God's word and that he had suffered for his beliefs, having to flee his homeland and leave behind his wife and child. His later writing through the 1560s and 1570s are also underpinned by the same narrative, where the godly evangelical is victim to those who cannot or will not see the truth of God's word. In Sandys' case this was very much a single truth, formed through his experience of persecution and exile. This sense of persecution was no less painfully felt when the perceived persecutors were of a reformed rather than papist bent.

Conclusion

The change in the direction of English religion enacted via successive monarchs in the eleven years between 1547 and 1558 had an obvious correlating impact on English men and women. Sandys was at the heart

of the changes first at Cambridge, then in terms of his involvement with the attempt to secure Lady Jane Grey on the throne. The importance of the Edwardian era cannot be understated in forming the ideals of reformed religion that would dominate the English reformed experience. It was these ideas that evangelicals took with them in to exile and which would play a vital role in shaping the later Elizabethan settlement.

Sandys experienced the high point of Edwardian religious triumph in a position of power at Cambridge. He was the Vice Chancellor at a point when evangelical religion dominated the universities and these men debated openly regarding the shape and nature of reformed religion. Whilst conservative forces at Cambridge in the early 1550s did trouble him for the danger they posed to the ultimate victory of true religion, this was only in a minimal way in comparison to later years. Evangelical ideas were in the ascendancy and dominated religious policy at the centre of government. England was the safe haven for foreign exiles and reforms to the nature of the national church were discussed. It was an era where he was at the forefront of the change and in the first wave of reformers. At no other point in his life would he be in this position, and it is unsurprising that this is an era that he came back to over and over in his later life, as a golden age. In comparison to the prestige and relative comfort of the university his time in exile was troubled with hardships of a physical, personal and theological nature, yet this period too was to retain a rose-tinted glow in his later years as he looked back on it. Sandys was not alone in his troubles and it was in exile that he formed links with key members of the future church establishment. It was also in exile that his views consolidated, forming the theological beliefs that would change little over his later life.

Exile was not a permanent state and in returning to their native land the émigrés faced another set of challenges. What had been familiar before their exile could now seem alien, including the way in which they were perceived by those who had not undergone the same experience. Not all of the Marian exiles returned immediately on Elizabethan's accession to the throne, particularly those who had been at Geneva decided to bide their time and wait for a clearer view of what this new governing regime would implement in terms of religious policy. One such man was Thomas Sampson who did not return until 1560 despite being at Strasbourg in December 1558, along with Sandys and Cook, who were preparing to return to England.¹¹⁹ Sampson's anxieties about returning to England were clear from his letter to Martyr in December 1558 where he asked for advice on how he should react to the title 'supreme head of the church' bestowed on Elizabeth when only Christ could be head of a church and the more focused question on whether it would be right to accept any office in the new church, especially that of Bishop considering the 'degeneracy' of the office from the primitive church.¹²⁰ Peter Martyr wrote to Elizabeth in 1559 giving his advice on what approach

she should take to religious matters: 'By means of an appeal to a host of Old-Testament and early-Church examples of kingship he . . . advise[d] Elizabeth on her duty of religious reform in England.' He explained that in 'identifying England as an "elect nation"' it was 'Elizabeth's divinely appointed task to "redeem" England through the restoration and establishment of her "godly rule".'¹²¹ Sandys was to return to an England that was Protestant and to a settlement that was in all but name Edwardian in nature, yet it was not necessarily to be the godly nation dreamed of by the exiles.

Notes

- 1 Peter Mazur and Abigail Shinn, 'Conversion Narratives in the Early Modern World', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 17 (2013), 427–36.
- 2 Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London: Routledge, 1986).
- 3 Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 422.
- 4 Susan Felch, 'Shaping the Reader in the Acts and Monuments', in *John Foxe and the English Reformation*, ed. David Loades (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), p. 62.
- 5 *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: www.johnfoxe.org (afterwards John Foxe, TAMO).
- 6 The changes are outlined via the John Foxe Project and its online presentation of all four editions at John Foxe, TAMO; John N. King, '“The Light of Printing”: William Tyndale, John Foxe, John Day, and Early Modern Print Culture', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54, 1 (2001), 52–85.
- 7 Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, p. 425.
- 8 Patrick Collinson, 'John Foxe as Historian', TAMO.
- 9 Thomas Freeman, 'The Power of Polemic: Catholic Responses to the Calendar in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (2010), 475–95, especially p. 477.
- 10 Thomas Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction in Foxe's Book of Martyrs', *The Historical Journal*, 43, 3 (2000), 601–23.
- 11 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition) Editorial commentary and additional information [Accessed 10 January 2017].
- 12 Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 102.
- 13 Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction', p. 614.
- 14 Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction', p. 614.
- 15 Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction', p. 614.
- 16 Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction', p. 615.
- 17 John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments of Matters Most Speciall and Memorable, Happenyng in the Church, with an Vniuersall History of the Same: Wherein Is Set Forth at Large the Whole Race and Course of the Church, from the Primitive Age to These Latter Tymes of Ours . . . Especially in This Realme of England and Scotland* (London, 1583), p. 11.
- 18 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition). Editorial commentary and additional information. This refers to the stories of Rose, Kemp and Sandys.
- 19 J. Foxe, ed., *A Commentarie of M. Doctor Martin Luther vpon the Epistle of S. Paule to the Galathians* (London, 1575); Martin Luther, *Luther on*

36 *Tales of Exile and Narratives of Reform*

- Justification, Extracted from His Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians with an Address Prefixed to the First Edition of the English Translation of the Above Work, by Dr. Edwyn Sandys* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1820), tract 86.
- 20 Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 249–52.
- 21 Luther, *Luther on Justification, Tract 86*; Evenden and Freeman, *Religion and the Book*, p. 252.
- 22 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 11, p. 1689 [1665].
- 23 Evenden and Freeman, *Religion and the Book*, pp. 304–5.
- 24 Sarah Bastow, ‘“Edwin Sandys, Archbishop of York 1577–88, Stiff-Necked, Wilful and Obstinate”: Conflict in the Elizabethan Church’, *Northern History*, 50 (2013), 239–56.
- 25 Sandys, *Sermons*, cover page.
- 26 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book: 12: Section 10/13: Part 99.
- 27 William Tyndale (transl.), *Tyndale's Old Testament: Being the Pentateuch of 1530, Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537 and David Daniell Jonah*, ed. (London: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 310.
- 28 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087].
- 29 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087].
- 30 Thomas Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge from the Conquest to the Year 1634* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1840), p. 258; Alain Wijffels, ‘Mowse, William (d. 1588)’, ODNB, online edition.
- 31 Catharine Davies, *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- 32 Stephen Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 1.
- 33 Ryrice, *The Age of Reformation*, p. 147.
- 34 Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 140.
- 35 Pollnitz, *Princely Education*, p. 140.
- 36 David Loades, *Cranmer and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 6.
- 37 Bucer was positive about the 1549 Prayer Book but recommended further changes for the 1552 edition; N. Scott Amos, ‘Martin Bucer and the Revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer: Reform of Ceremonies and the Didactic Use of Ritual’, *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, 2 (1999), 107–26.
- 38 D. MacCulloch, *The Boy King Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), p. 158.
- 39 Ryrice, *The Age of Reformation*, p. 147.
- 40 Christopher Haigh, ‘The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation’, *Historical Journal*, XXV (1982), 995–1007; David Loades, *The Mid Tudor Crisis, 1545–1565* (London: Palgrave, 1992); J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1984), especially p. 137.
- 41 D. MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999), p. 174.
- 42 Peter White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 44.
- 43 Patrick Collinson, ‘Sandys, Edwin (1519–1588)’, ODNB, online edition.
- 44 Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

- 45 Constantin Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012), p. 10.
- 46 White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, p. 44.
- 47 Martin Bucer, *Scripta Anglicana* (Basel, 1577).
- 48 Scott Amos, ‘“It Is Fallow Ground Here”: Martin Bucer as Critic of the English Reformation’, *Westminster Theological Journal*, 61, 1 (1999), 41–52.
- 49 Alford, *Kingship and Politics*, p. 125.
- 50 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087]; C.S. Knighton, ‘Bill, William (d. 1561), dean of Westminster’, *ODNB*, online edition.
- 51 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087].
- 52 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087].
- 53 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087]. It is not clear if this was Sir Thomas Mildmay, father of Walter Mildmay. Thomas is recorded as dying in 1550 and his son, also Sir Thomas, is not recorded as having been at Cambridge.
- 54 Barrett L. Beer, ‘Episcopacy and Reform in Mid-Tudor England’, *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 23, 2 (1991), 231–52, especially p. 234.
- 55 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2112 [2088].
- 56 Gerry Bowler, ‘Marian Protestants and the Idea of Violent Resistance to Tyranny’, in *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England*, ed. Peter Lake and Maria Dowling (London: Routledge Kegan & Paul, 1987), pp. 124–43.
- 57 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087].
- 58 Walter Thornbury, ‘The Tower: (part 1 of 2)’, Walter Thornbury, *Old and New London: A Narratives of Its History, Its People and Its Places*, Vol. 2 (London: Cassel, Petter, Galpin & Co, 1878).
- 59 D. Andrew Penny, ‘Bradford, John (c. 1510–1555), Evangelical Preacher and Martyr’, *ODNB*, online edition.
- 60 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2111 [2087].
- 61 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2112 [2088].
- 62 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2112 [2088].
- 63 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2112 [2088].
- 64 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2112 [2088].
- 65 R.J.W. Swales, ‘HOLCROFT, Sir Thomas (1505/6–58), of Vale Royal, Cheshire’, published in *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509–1558*, ed. S.T. Bindoff (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1982) online [Accessed 13 February 2017].
- 66 Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, p. 232.
- 67 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2113 [2089].
- 68 Philip M. Soergel, *Miracles and the Protestant Imagination: The Evangelical Wonder Book in Reformation Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 103. Germany writer Ludwig Rabus did not include contemporaries in his work *Histories of the Chosen Saints, Witnesses, Confessors, and Martyrs of God* (1552) but Casper Goltwurm’s *Church Calendar* (1559) included fifty contemporary martyrs.
- 69 Thomas S. Freeman, ‘The Politicisation of Martyrdom’, in *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England c.1400–1700*, ed. Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), p. 36.
- 70 Susannah Brietz Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 54.
- 71 Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, p. 229.
- 72 Jonathan Wright, ‘Marian Exiles and the Legitimacy of Flight from Persecution’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52, 2 (2001), 220–43. Especially 220.

38 *Tales of Exile and Narratives of Reform*

- 73 Wright, 'Marian Exiles', 243.
- 74 H. Hamlin, 'Strangers in Strange Lands: Biblical Models of Exile in Early Modern England', *Reformation*, 15 (2010), 63–81.
- 75 Jane Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- 76 Patrick Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519–1588), Archbishop of York', ODNB, online edition.
- 77 Mark E. VanderSchaaf, 'Archbishop Parker's Efforts Toward a Bucerian Discipline in the Church of England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 8, 1 (1977), 85–103.
- 78 MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p. 170.
- 79 Kenneth F. Thibodeau, 'Science and the Reformation: The Case of Strasbourg', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 7, 1 (1976), 35–50.
- 80 Eamon Duffy, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490–1700* (London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 179–89.
- 81 Cornelis Augustijn, 'Bucer's Ecclesiology in the Colloquies with the Catholics, 1540–41', in *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community*, ed. D.F. Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 107–21.
- 82 Thomas Dandeleit, 'Creating a Protestant Constantine: Martin Bucer's De Regno Christi and the Foundations of English Imperial Political Theology', in *Politics and Reformations: Communities, Politics, Nations, and Empires, Essays in Honor of Thomas A. Brady, Jr.*, ed. C. Ocker, M. Printy, P. Starenko (Boston, MA: Brill, 2007), p. 541.
- 83 VanderSchaaf, 'Archbishop Parker's Efforts', 85–103; Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin', ODNB, online edition.
- 84 Marvin Anderson, 'Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19, 3 (1988), 451–69.
- 85 Peter Martyr and Marvin W. Anderson, 'Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542–1562): His Letters to Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 4, 1 (1973), 41–64.
- 86 M.A. Overell, 'Peter Martyr in England 1547–1553: An Alternative View', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15, 1 (1984), 87–104; VanderSchaaf, 'Archbishop Parker's Efforts', p. 85; Duffy, *Reformation*, p. 272.
- 87 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), Book 12, p. 2113 [2089].
- 88 Norman Birnbaum, 'The Zwinglian Reformation in Zurich', *Past & Present*, 15 (1959), 27–47; Duffy, *Reformation*, p. 273.
- 89 Cater Lindberg, *The European Reformations: Sourcebook* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 112–14; Andrew Pettegree, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), p. 104.
- 90 Carlos Eire, *Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450–1650* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), pp. 219–20. The extent to which Zwingli was advocating an independent reform movement independent of Luther has been widely debated.
- 91 'Bullinger, Heinrich' in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. E.A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- 92 Hastings Robinson, *The Zurich Letters: Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842).
- 93 Torrance Kirby, *Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 1–9; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (London: Palgrave, 2000), p. 29.

- 94 Christina H. Garnet, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1938), p. 59; Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 33, 72, 153; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation*, pp. 70–1.
- 95 Karl Gunther, *Reformation Unbound: Protestant Visions of Reform in England, 1525–1590* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 160.
- 96 William Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfurt, 1554–1558 A.D.*, ed. Edward Arbor (London: Elliot Stock, 1908); Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 153; Patrick Collinson, 'Field [Feilde], John (1544/5?–1588), Church of England Clergyman', ODNB, online edition.
- 97 'A Full and Plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline Out of the Word of God, and of the Declining of the Church of England from the Same' (1574); 'Sandys to Gualter, 1574' in Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 124.
- 98 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, p. 16.
- 99 Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal, 1519–1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1980), pp. 73–4; Gunther, *Reformation Unbound*, pp. 164–7.
- 100 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*.
- 101 Gunther, *Reformation Unbound*, pp. 164–7.
- 102 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, p. 26.
- 103 Edwin Sandys, 'A sermon preached ay Strausborough in the time of Queen Mary's reign' in Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 296.
- 104 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 296.
- 105 1 Corinthians 6:1, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, ed. Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden, Vol. IV (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850), p. 346.
- 106 1 Corinthians 6:5 *The Holy Bible*, p. 347.
- 107 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, p. 27.
- 108 Jane Dawson, *John Knox* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 91.
- 109 The names of those who signed the response from Zurich were Robert Horne, Richard Chambers, Thomas Lever, Nicholas Karvile, John Mullings, Thomas Spencer, Thomas Bentham, William Cole, John Parkhurst, Roger Kelbe, Robert Beamont, Laurence Humphrey, Henry Cockcraft and John Pretio.
- 110 'Strasbourg Exiles to Frankfurt Congregation' (13 December 1554), Denbighshire Record Office, Plas Power MSS, DD/PP/839 p. 42; Online: *Letters from Exile: Documents of the Marian Exile*, Edinburgh University. Available from: www.marianexile.div.ed.ac.uk/documents/documents.shtml
- 111 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, pp. 38–9. Those signing the letter from Strasbourg dated 23 November 1554 were James Haddon, John Pedder, Christopher Goodman, Edwin Sandys, Thomas Eaten, Humphrey Alcockson, Edmund Grindal, Michael Reymuger, Thomas Lakin, John Huntingdon, Augustine Bradbridge, Thomas Crafton, Guido Eaten, Abthur Saul, John Geoffrey and Thomas Steward.
- 112 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, p. 52.
- 113 Gunther, *Reformation Unbound*, pp. 189–217.
- 114 Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), p. 89.

40 *Tales of Exile and Narratives of Reform*

- 115 Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (London: Routledge, 2016), p. 87.
- 116 Gunther, *Reformation Unbound*, pp. 99–100.
- 117 Edwin Sandys, ‘A sermon preached ay Strausborough in the time of Queen Mary’s reign’ in Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 293.
- 118 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 300.
- 119 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. 1–5.
- 120 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 2.
- 121 Kirby, *Zurich Connection*, p. 181.

2 Settling Religion and Fox Hunting in the North, 1558–9

Introduction

On 20 December 1558 Sandys wrote from Strasbourg to Henrich Bullinger in Zurich stating that yesterday the English exiles had received a letter from London confirming the news that Mary was dead and that Elizabeth was the new Queen. This was not Edwin Sandys' first knowledge of the changed circumstances in England, as he had travelled from Zurich to Strasbourg with the news at the beginning of the month.¹ His letter continues with a certain amount of macabre humour regarding Cardinal Pole, Mary's Archbishop of Canterbury:

That good cardinal, that he might not raise any disturbance, or impede the progress of the gospel, departed this life the day after his friend Mary. Such was the love and harmony between them, that not even death itself could separate them. We have nothing to fear from Pole, for dead men do not bite.²

Sandys certainly believed that Pole had demonstrated exceptionally suitable timing, dying before the new regime was put into place and leaving the way clear for godly religion. Indeed Elizabeth's succession could be seen as providential, not simply in terms of the accession of a new godly monarchy for the country, but also in creating the opportunity for the establishment of a truly Protestant and reformed nation. This story of Elizabethan religious change has traditionally centred on a lack of opposition to the new Elizabethan broom sweeping away both Marian papistry and the inefficiency of her regime.³ The portrayal of the Elizabethan era as inevitably instituting reformed religion, unopposed by the majority, has created a sense of inevitability to the triumph of an anglicised Protestantism. In the early months of Elizabeth's reign there would seem to have been some debate about how the tricky issue of religion should be approached.⁴ Yet as Collinson has argued one of the significant elements of the English Church was that it 'retained a superior order of clerics and invested them with the title of bishop'.⁵ Eight ecclesiastical sees became

vacant through the death of their bishops in 1559 and an additional five of the Marian Bishops, including Cuthbert Tunstall at Durham, had died by the end of 1560. In terms of implementing a new religious settlement the apparent ill health of many of the senior Catholic clergy in England suggested that there was a clear path for the establishment of a Protestant settlement. In Sandys' rose-tinted vision, coming in the afterglow of Mary's death and before his return to England, he too advocated that a new religious settlement would be welcomed rather than resisted. Many of the evangelicals of Edward's reign also seemed to believe that there was ample space to allow for their career progression if they chose to return to England. They were in fact in demand, as the shortage of suitable candidates for the bishoprics and other high offices of the Church guaranteed these men a place of relative power within the newly established church.⁶ The context of Sandys' letter and the nature of the man himself were all important here. Sandys was in Strasbourg, still separated from the realities of home. He was writing whilst packing up his life on the continent, as he hastened to return home with relatively little thought for the realities of the situation. Moreover, this was a letter to Bullinger, his friend, reflecting the hope he felt for a brave new world where true religion would triumph. This is not to say that Sandys was politically naïve in his writing, even to a trusted friend, but rather that this letter lacked some of the more astute positioning of his later correspondences.

Whilst the correspondence from Sandys in late 1558 and early 1559 would appear to support the story in which there was little opposition in terms of evangelical episcopal appointments in an inevitable Protestant settlement his optimism soon waned and his tone became less certain of the idealised religious utopia he had initially envisaged. By the later twentieth century this story of unopposed religious change was to sit alongside another more dominant narrative in the writing of English history, that of the story of English Puritanism. Thus, the origins of English Puritanism were traced back to radicalisation in exile.⁷ In this interpretation clear binary positions were portrayed: on one side the returned exiles dissatisfied with the Elizabethan *via media* as a religious settlement which was never radical enough for them and on the other side sat a Queen forced into a settlement always too radical for her liking.⁸ Elizabeth as English Deborah became an emblem of the middle way overseeing a *via media* which was ambiguous enough to take the majority along with it whilst really satisfying none. In conjunction with this Mary was portrayed as a poor leader, who had overseen a bloody era of failures, in contrast to the religiously moderate and participatory monarchical republic of Elizabeth.⁹ This story of Elizabethan triumph and moderation echoed again and again in traditional historical examinations of the country as a whole. They appeared to show that at a national level the minimal opposition was soon quashed and at a parish level the clergy did not have to be removed as they were largely compliant. Henry Gee's estimation

that there were only 200–300 deprivations of parish clergy was for a long time the accepted and quoted figure to show minimal resistance to the new regime.¹⁰ Alongside this the study of the Elizabethan settlement has focused on the nature of Elizabeth's own religious convictions and the manoeuvrings in court and Parliament.¹¹ These interpretations have since been challenged, with more recent assessments suggesting that firstly the Marian regime was broadly popular, secondly that the movement towards Protestantism was not fully accepted or welcomed and thirdly that the settlement implemented by Elizabeth was always the one she had intended.¹²

The chapter will examine the impact that the period of exile had in developing the ecclesiastical vision of the men who returned to England in 1559 to take up office in the Elizabethan Church. Exile did not give the men their faith, for they took that with them, and it was Edwardian in shape and context. Yet the networks established prior to and throughout the period of separation from England would remain important to Sandys and his fellow English exiles for many years. Sandys was not alone in Strasbourg in December 1558 when he received the news of Mary's death. English exiles Anthony Cook and Thomas Sampson were also there and clearly in contact with Sandys.¹³ He had never been in isolation since he left England at the start of Mary's reign. The English exiles formed communities; thus, whilst in exile Sandys interacted with men whose fortunes had been on the rise in Edward's reign and who were later to form the mainstay of the early Elizabethan Church. The networks, established in exile, were crucial in shaping the largely reactive nature of Elizabethan Protestantism. It was in exile that the first signs of discord were to be seen between those who wanted to retain the nature of Edwardian reform and those who would begin to push for greater changes. It was in exile that the men who would become the hierarchy of the Elizabethan Church formed their ideas influenced by their hosts and shaped by their Edwardian roots.

In terms of the sources that are available for the early years of the Elizabethan era it is the letters from the former exiles to their previous hosts that provide insight into the thinking, concerns and ideas of the new regime's future bishops. Compiled in *The Zurich Letters* the correspondence sent to Peter Martyr and Heinrich Bullinger (amongst others), and their responses, provide us with the views of the English evangelicals in the early months and years of Elizabeth's reign.¹⁴ Alongside these letters this chapter will also examine the records of the Royal Visitation which occurred in 1559–60. The focus will be on the Northern Province, as that was where Sandys was sent, to assess how the returned exiles viewed the England they returned to. It will also begin to assess the responses to the new regime at grassroots level, though this will be developed further in the next chapter in assessing the reaction to Sandys' arrival as a reforming Bishop in Worcester. Sandys was one of the men who tried to set the

agenda and influence the nature of the settlement, appearing at the disputations and being sent north as part of the 1559 Visitation. He also saw that his new life was not going to be free of trials and frustrations. It is clear that the evangelicals gave consideration to the nature of the Church they wanted to see and attempted to formalise this vision via various disputations. Documents such as 'the device' and 'the declaration' show the evangelicals working through complex issues to decide on the best way forward.¹⁵

Sandys' return to England also saw personal changes impacting on his life. He remarried in February 1559, almost immediately following his homecoming. He and his wife proceeded to start a family, despite the lack of clarity regarding the status and legality of clerical marriage. Sandys' second wife was Cecily Wilford, daughter of Thomas Wilford of Kent (d.1553). Cecily was from a family committed to reformed religion, her father having been an ally of Northumberland.¹⁶ The Wilford family had also gone into exile, with at least two of her brothers, Thomas Wilford (c.1530–1610) and Francis Wilford, forming part of the exiled community in Frankfurt.¹⁷ It is likely that Sandys had formed connections with the family whilst in exile and perhaps had even met Cecily before his return to England, though there is no official record of Cecily as having been in Frankfurt with her siblings. This new marriage and the need to provide for a wife, and subsequently a family, was clearly a motivating factor for Sandys' desire to find a suitable role in Elizabethan society. It also magnified his disappointment when things did not move as swiftly as he would have liked. His need to progress reform was tempered with the need to obtain the financial security and social standing he clearly craved. Life on return to England was not quite what many, including Sandys, had envisaged. The time in exile had been difficult, but seemed to demonstrate the righteousness of the evangelical cause. As a persecuted minority they were clear of their place; they were the faithful, steadfast through times of trouble; they were a group tyrannised for their beliefs by the forces of the antichrist. Once returned to their homeland they had to reshape their faith as the religion of the victors. They were now part of the establishment and the returned exiles were to learn that victory required an element of compromise. This is not to imply that what was implemented in terms of religious settlement was a *via media* but rather that there needed to be compromise with the monarch over what their role in the new regime would be. Elizabeth and her ministers wanted a new ecclesiastical hierarchy but did not necessarily want to hand over to them the power to set the agenda for the Church, nor lose the wealth of the Church. Victory needed to be consolidated, which required hard work on the part of the men appointed to church offices, but did not necessarily come with the freedoms or the patronage that had been open to the exiles whilst on the continent. Their role models and mentors were now many miles away and although guidance could be sought via letter,

the replies could take weeks if not months to reach them. The initial months of the new regime were times of uncertainty and struggle, with disappointments marring what initially had seemed like the ultimate triumph of reformed religion.

Religion in Elizabethan England: 'I will not change it, provided only it can be proved by the word of God'

Edwin Sandys' letter to Bullinger of 20 December 1558 appeared to be very hopeful that Elizabeth would not favour papists. His letter gives an account of her responses when questioned on religion. The words he attributed to Elizabeth animated the Queen as a defender of the faith. He wrote that Elizabeth responded to Mary's request that 'she would make no alteration in religion' stating that: 'As to religion, I promise thus much, that I will not change it, provided only it can be proved by the word of God, which shall be the only foundation and rule of my religion.'¹⁸ He also gave an account of Elizabeth's change of counsellors who were now 'good Christians' and he wrote that 'there is great hope of her promoting the gospel, and advancing the kingdom of Christ to the utmost of her power.'¹⁹ Sandys implied no criticism of Elizabeth even over what were apparently ambiguous statements. There has been much debate over Elizabeth's own religious beliefs, with Christopher Haigh stating that the tradition has been for many historians to conclude that she cared little for religion.²⁰ In his own view Haigh's analysis concluded that she did have some personal commitment to religion and that this religion was undoubtedly Protestant, but that she was also a political realist.²¹ Political realism was some distance from evangelical fervour. It was clear from November 1558 that the Catholicism of her sister's reign was not to continue, yet the nature of what precisely what sort of reformed religion would replace it was less clear. Christophe d'Assonleville, writing to Philip of Spain on 25 November 1558, assured him that as yet little change had been made with the Queen still attending Mass and Vespers but that he had heard 'that it is her intention to settle religion as it was eight years before the death of King Henry' which would exclude the Pope but allow for 'the forms of the ancient religion' to be followed.²² Even in early 1559 Count Helffenstein was writing to Emperor Ferdinand that 'there is nothing special to report' on the question of religion as 'Throughout England the form of the Catholic religion is preserved and nothing so far has been altered.'²³ These partisan and somewhat optimistic interpretations of the situation were no doubt for political reasons, but did indicate that the precise nature of the nature of reformed religion was not made immediately explicit in the first weeks and even months of the reign. The arrest of John Christopherson, Bishop of Chichester, for preaching a sermon against religious change at St Paul's Cross on 27 November 1558 indicated that the old regime was no longer supreme

and was encouraging to the evangelicals to push for change.²⁴ Elizabeth's criticism of John White, the Bishop of Winchester, who preached the funeral sermon for Mary in December 1558, also signified that Elizabeth would require complete obedience from her clergy.²⁵ Obedience was to be one of the defining elements of a settlement determined by the monarch, yet a preference for evangelical rather than Catholic religion seemed obvious by the year's end.

Questions abounded amongst the evangelicals in the early months of the regime and it is these questions that have since provided fodder for historical debate. Was the new religion of England to be the hybrid Anglo-Catholicism that Elizabeth's father had advocated, or the more developed evangelical Protestantism of her brother's reign? Since 1554 religious debates had moved on still further; differences in opinion were obvious both amongst the theologians on the continent and amongst the English exiles currently residing there. Significantly for the returning exiles it was the evangelical clergy who had remained in England who initially surrounded the Queen and who were in a position to give more immediate advice and direction to the new regime. This must have raised a series of questions in the minds of those newly returned. Was the new settlement to be dominated by men who may have been compromised into recanting their faith? Were returned exiles to be seen as harbours of imported radicalism? Would the ideas of Edwardian settlement dominate or would Zurich, Strasbourg or Geneva have the upper hand? English Protestants in exile had already been split by divergent beliefs so would these create further divisions now they had returned home? Or were all quarrels forgotten in the promise of the deliverance of a reformed nation?

In December 1558 the Queen issued a proclamation 'for the quiet governance of all manner her subjects' which commanded

all manner of her subjects, as well those that be called to ministry in the Church as all others, that they do forbear to preach, or teach, or to give audience to any manner of doctrine or preaching other than to the Gospels and Epistles . . . the Ten Commandments . . . without exposition or addition of any manner, sense, or meaning to be applied and added.²⁶

In Elizabeth's first Parliament in January 1559 Nicholas Bacon, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, made an opening speech advocating that the task was to unite 'the people of this realm into a uniform order of religion'.²⁷ This is an accurate description of the main directive regarding religion; the emphasis was on obedience and uniformity. It was at the first Parliament in 1559 that the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity formalised the changes to be made to the religion of the nation. The Act of Supremacy reversed Marian legislation, revoked allegiance to papal authority and revived the supremacy of the crown albeit with Elizabeth

as Supreme Governor not Supreme Head of the Church. This has generally been perceived to be more a concession to Elizabeth's gender, rather than a concession to religion. An oath of loyalty was also required from all clergy to ensure the better 'observation and maintenance' of the Act. This reinforced the rejection of papal authority and advocated royal supremacy in all matters. The Act of Uniformity re-established the rites set out in the second Edwardian Prayer Book of 1552 albeit with some amendments. It was these amendments that altered the look of Protestant religion, for example, kneeling was permitted and vestments and ornamentation were more elaborate than many evangelicals would have liked. Furthermore, the spirit of this new reformed religion left room for manoeuvre about the nature of communion. It was left to the individual to decide if Christ himself, rather than just the bread and wine, was present. In addition to the supremacy and uniformity of the Church, there was also discussion over the more tangible elements of reform, namely the ownership of property, lands and revenues. The link between the parliamentary acts and the prayer book has long been established in accounts of the era. Neale correctly noted that the records of the era are less detailed than would be ideal for the period between Parliament meeting (25 January 1559) and the passing of the Uniformity Bill (29 April) which have left much open to interpretation.²⁸

In particular who drove this settlement and determined its nature has been an area of debate amongst historians for a number of years. Neale's assertion was that the Queen was forced to accept a more radical settlement than she would have liked due to the forceful presence of the 'Puritan Choir' in the Commons.²⁹ This view centred the debate on a battle between the House of Commons and the House of Lords, with Neale asserting the presence of a radical, Puritan grouping who tried to dominate policy from the very start of her reign. Alternatively, Christopher Haigh's description of a church 'rather more Catholic than had been planned' suggests a regime forced into moderation, alongside an assertion that Elizabeth was undoubtedly Protestant.³⁰ More recently the role of various courtiers and councillors has been asserted, presenting them as a powerful force in determining church policy, with emphasis on William Cecil's role in shaping and implementing the settlement.³¹ Attributing the nature and content of the settlement jointly to Elizabeth and William Cecil, as though they were a single entity, has illustrated flaws in historical interpretation. Brett Usher has stated that 'William Cecil spent much of his official life under Elizabeth trying to do his best for the episcopal bench [and] almost invariably got his way with the queen'.³² The idea of Cecil as both the driving force and often the victor would suggest that the settlement was more Cecilian than Elizabethan. John Guy, amongst others, has also challenged the assumption that the Queen and Cecil were of one mind acting always in unity over the cause of religion. Guy has asserted that the bills for supremacy and uniformity were managed

by Cecil and thus more Protestant than the Queen envisaged;³³ whilst Elizabeth's input was often contradictory moderating the settlement into a more conservative religion which allowed for communion hosts, was ambivalent about married clergy and saw little need for sermon centred services.³⁴ For Rosemary O'Day Elizabeth had 'envisaged a politique settlement which, although Protestant, was not Reformed'.³⁵ If the idea of a settlement composed by Cecil and challenged by Elizabeth is to be believed then the final product is what both Marshall and MacCulloch have described as an 'idiosyncratic settlement', that did not move far towards a fully reformed church and left the English bishops not as fore-runners of change, but defenders of a 'status quo in which many of them did not believe'.³⁶ It is not the intention here to debate at length the nature of Elizabethan government, but it will be acknowledged through Sandys' later dealings with both Cecil and the Queen that he did not always find them of one mind in terms of religion, and that disagreements can be seen over the nature and the implementation of the new settlement.³⁷ More recently Cyndia Clegg has made a convincing case that it was always Elizabeth's intention to restore the 'state of the Church as it had existed at the end of Edward's reign'; that the 1559 Prayer Book was the product of a 'collaborative effort of Church and State, of learned divines and fit noblemen, of privy council and queen—and ultimately parliament'.³⁸ In essence Clegg puts forward an argument advocating that with the exception of vestments, the settlement imposed via the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity and enacted via the Prayer Book was exactly what Elizabeth had always intended it to be—Edwardian Protestantism restored.

Complaints about the lack of alacrity in establishing and implementing religious change can be seen throughout the early correspondence of the exiles, things simply were not moving with the speed they had hoped for regarding what they saw as the most crucial and necessary changes to be made. The differing views of what was of most import are unsurprising. Numerous voices were clamouring for their version of religion. Elizabeth was by no means secure on her newly inherited throne in 1558 and she and her Council realised that there was a fine line to tread for the new Queen. Marshall's interpretation described an idiosyncratic settlement and this was what Sandys described too; a settlement that he believed was Protestant, directed the Queen, which was not as yet fully reformed on all issues.³⁹ The anonymous and often quoted 'Device for Alteration of Religion' outlined some of the key issues that faced the nation and the Queen, whilst also advocating for a Protestant settlement. Papal excommunication and the reaction of foreign powers were amongst the first concerns stated.⁴⁰ Mary's widower was a powerful man and his relations spanned much of Catholic Europe. Elizabeth needed to ensure the security of her throne and to emphasis England as a new Protestant power was not perhaps the wisest thing to do. A more moderated approach, which played on the uncertainties that many had about the new regime was much

more advantageous. A lack of clarity meant that it was more difficult for international responses to immediately pit themselves in opposition. After all it was by no means clear what English religious policy would be. International correspondence to other Protestant monarchs, coming from the English court in 1558–9, suggested that Elizabeth favoured the Confession of Augsburg. Though again how much this was a reflection of Elizabeth's true beliefs and how much was politic manoeuvring on the parts of both Cecil and the various ambassadors is debatable.⁴¹ All of this uncertainty did little to reassure the returned exiles that things would indeed turn out as they had hoped. Alongside the uncertainties regarding the nature of reformed religion was the potential threat posed by the incumbent clergy in England, once any change was clarified. The often cited 'device for alteration of religion' suggested that:

Bishops and all the clergy wil se their own ruine. In confession and preaching, and all other ways they can, they wil perswade the people from it. They wil conspire with whomsoever that wil attempt, and pretend to do God a sacrifice, in letting the alteration, tho' it be with murther of Christen men, or treason.⁴²

The use of 'The device for alteration of religion' as evidence of official policy is of course problematic, as we have nothing that suggests this was an official document used or followed by those at the centre of government. The importance attached to 'the device' is largely based on the conjecture and assertions of generations of historians that this document was of import, yet it does outline the concerns and issues of late 1558 and early 1559, regardless of whether this was an official stance.⁴³

The restrictions on preaching implemented in 1558 suggested that Elizabeth and her counsellors had acted quickly to stop the wrong message spreading amongst the people. This restriction had concerned John Jewel in January 1559 in his letter to Peter Martyr, but he recognised that dangers lay from both the papists and from discord within the reformers.⁴⁴ As has been indicated previously the lack of immediate religious opposition from the Catholic leadership can be attributed to the specific circumstances of 1559–60, rather than to any intervention on the part of the new regime. Some of the returning exiles seemed of a mind that the Roman Catholic bishops would renounce their occupations and go without a fight. Both Parkhurst and Grindal's writing illustrate that they believed this to be the case, with the latter stating:

It is therefore commonly supposed that almost all the bishops . . . will renounce their bishoprics and their functions, as being ashamed, after so much tyranny and cruelty exercised under the banners of the Pope, and the obedience so lately sworn to him, to be again brought to a recantation, and convicted of a manifest perjury.⁴⁵

This demonstrated a considerable amount of confidence in their cause as the only true religion and also a distinct belief that the Marian clergy lacked the necessary backbone to really defend their corner. The bishops who were still in place in 1559 included Cuthbert Tunstall of Durham who was amongst those who refused to take the oath. However during the 1559 Parliament five more bishops were deprived of their office. This left the way clear for new men to be put into post. For Usher this allowed the creation of what he terms ‘a “Cecilian” hierarchy’.⁴⁶ John Foxe, in his celebration of the Elizabethan regime, recorded that eventually there was wholesale change:

Finally, the olde Byshops deposed, for that they refused the othe in renouncing the pope and not subscribing to the Queenes iust and lawfull title. In whose rowmes and places, first for Cardinall Poole, succeeded D. Mathew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury. In the place of Heth, succeeded D. Young. In steede of Boner, Edmund Grindall was Bishop of London. For Hopton, Thurlby Tonstall, Pates, Christoferson, Peto, Coates, Morgan, Feasy, White, Oglethorpe. &c. were placed Doctor Iohn Parkust in Norwich, D. Coxe in Ely, Iuell in Salisbury Pilkenton in Duresme, Doctor Sandes in Worcester Mayster Downam in Westchester, Bentam in Couentry and Lichfield, Daud in S. Dauies, Ally in Exceter, Horn in Winchester, Scory in Hereford, Best in Carlile, Bullingham in Lincoln Scamlar in Peterbury, Bartlet in Bath, Gest in Rochester, Barlo in Chi. &c.⁴⁷

The accepting of the proffered offices caused a moral dilemma for many of the returning exiles. Thomas Sampson for example wrote to Peter Martyr asking what his answer should be if he were offered a place in the new Church as he doubted the authority of any monarch to usurp Christ’s place. Furthermore he questioned if bishops would have either the freedom or power to act independently.⁴⁸ The ethics of whether any monarch could usurp the title ‘Head of the Church’ from God himself sat alongside another issue, the problem of the gender of the monarch. If it was hard enough to countenance a King as head of the Church for the early modern cleric, the leadership of a Queen raised even more doubts. Sandys recorded that the change to the Act of Supremacy which amended the title ‘Head of the Church’ to ‘Governor of the Church’ was a wise decision, and was a scruple put into the Queen’s head by Mr Lever.⁴⁹ The anxiety of the exiles to ensure that they were only supporting a truly reformed church was plain, but the path was not quite as clear as it had seemed whilst they were in Strasbourg and Zurich and therefore even more important was their need to gain both reassurance and counsel from their mentors on the continent.

Sandys' Return to England

At first Sandys' return to England was a moment of celebration, but neither he nor his fellow exiles were to find the Protestant paradise that had been hoped for. In the early months of 1559 many of the returning exiles found the religious settlement in England a disappointment. John Jewel, who had delayed his return to England until 1559, wrote to Martyr in March of that year to say that the hopeful tone of his last correspondence was misleading. He told Martyr that things in England were not as he had hoped, '[f]or the Roman pontiff was not yet cast out; no part of religion was yet restored; the country was still every where desecrated with the mass: the pomp and insolence of the bishops was unabated.' Yet he still held great expectations of improving circumstances as 'All these things, however, are at length beginning to shake, and almost to fall.'⁵⁰ Whilst initial correspondence by men such as Jewel and Sandys suggested that things were not progressing either as quickly or entirely in the direction they had hoped, many in reality, accepted the necessity of a more gradualist approach. The former exiles assumed that this was the first step on the road to reform rather than the end game.⁵¹ In addition it would seem that Sandys was clearly aware of the practicalities of the situation in England. Whilst he was firm on the need to push for further changes, equally he knew that insisting on instantaneous change was impractical. Not all of the Marian exiles had returned immediately on Elizabeth's accession to the throne, particularly those at Geneva decided to bide their time and wait for a clearer view of what this new governing regime would implement in terms of religious policy. The exiles may have had unrealistic expectations of their new monarch, but were coming to understand that nothing was going to happen with haste.

Once in England the exiles needed to find a place for themselves. They firmly believed in the need to push for religious change, but insisting that their principles were put above all else was not going to provide a living or put food on the table. Sandys wrote to Parker in 1559 complaining that he felt he had been brought lower on his return to England than he had ever been in exile, complaining that 'these times are given to taking, and not to giving; ye have stretched forth your hands further than all the rest.'⁵² Foxe's account of the first year of Elizabeth's reign tell us that Elizabeth was anxious to have concord 'hauyng heard of diuersitie of opinions in certaine matters of religion amongst sundry of her louyng subiects'.⁵³ A disputation between the forces of reform and the forces of conservatism was arranged for the end of March 1559. It was to see four of the remaining Marian Bishops pitted against the evangelicals in a debate over the merits of each group's beliefs. Each side was to have eight participants, four bishops and four doctors to speak. The Catholic forces consisted of John White (Bishop of Winchester), Thomas Watson (Bishop

of Lincoln), Ralph Baynes (Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry), Cuthbert Scott (Bishop of Chester), Owen Oglethorpe (Bishop of Carlisle) with Henry Cole, Nicholas Harpsfield, Alban Langdale and William Chedsey.⁵⁴ On the reforming platform were John Scory (Bishop of Chichester), Richard Cox, David (Thomas) Whitehead, Edmund Grindal, Robert Horne, Edwin Sandys, Edmund Gheast, John Aylmer and John Jewel.⁵⁵ The debate was to centre upon three questions: (1) 'It is agaynst the worde of God, and the custome of the auncient Church, to vse a tongue vnknown to the people, in common prayer, and the administration of the Sacraments;' (2) 'Euery Church hath authoritie to appointe, take away, and change ceremonies and Ecclesiasticall rites, so the same be to edification and lastly' (3) 'It cannot be prooued by the worde of God, that there is in the Masse offered up a sacrifice for the quicke and the dead.'⁵⁶

The two groupings were told that they had to submit their answers in writing prior to the debates as the Queen was keen to prevent too much heated disputation. Conflict was however inevitable and the account of the meetings in Parliament recorded by Foxe showed the Catholic grouping as failing to adhere to the rules set down. This interpretation is supported by contemporary letters, including that written by John Jewel to Peter Martyr complaining that

[t]he bishops, (such was their good faith,) produced not a single line either in writing or print; alleging that they had not had sufficient time for the consideration of matters of such importance; notwithstanding that they had been allowed ten days, more or less.⁵⁷

The presentations started on Friday 31 March with the initial point, regarding common prayer in English, covered by the Catholic party who were to speak first. Dr Cole was nominated as the Catholic group's representative and dominated Friday's session. The evangelicals reported that Cole was hostile with Jewel stating that he 'assailed us most unworthily with all manner of contumely and invective, and stigmatized us as the authors and firebrands of every kind of sedition'.⁵⁸ Jewel was also unimpressed by the dramatics of Cole's performance; he described Cole as 'having turned himself towards all quarters, and into every possible attitude, stamping with his feet, throwing about his arms, bending his sides, snapping his fingers, alternately elevating and depressing his eye-brows.' Jewel attributed this melodramatic performance to Cole having to fall back on 1300 years of Catholic precedence for rejecting prayer in the English tongue.⁵⁹

The meeting reconvened on the following Monday; however rather than moving onto the second point of dispute the Catholic bishops argued that they had not had a chance to speak on the first issue having not had sufficient preparation time for the meeting on 31 March. Strype's report of the meeting certainly saw this as unsportsmanlike conduct on

the Catholic clergy's part. Ralph Baynes, Bishop of Lichfield, played on the divisions within the Protestant grouping implying that they had no consistent theological position. Baynes

minding to run from the matter, began to question with the protestants, what church they were of? saying, that they must needs try that first: for there were many churches in Germany; and he demanded of Horn, which of those churches he was of?⁶⁰

Horne took the chance here to assert the legitimacy of the Protestant cause as representative of a true church replying 'that he was of Christ's catholic church.'⁶¹ The Protestant group's written response to the first question indicated that they had turned to the gospels to assert their points. In his letter to Martyr Jewel concluded that:

Thus you have the account of an useless conference, and one which indeed can hardly be considered as such. I have, however, described it more copiously than there was any occasion for, that you might better understand the whole proceeding.⁶²

The preceding at Westminster were not considered edifying or constructive to the establishment of a new church, but the reformers can hardly have been surprised that the Catholic bishops were unwilling to debate the issues in this way. After all the reforming party had a clear advantage and the debate was shaped around their agenda.

The Settlement

The debate at Westminster did give the reformers an opportunity to begin to set their beliefs and the justification for them down in writing. It has also been conjectured that by the end of April 1559 a small group of reformers had already met to review the Book of Common Prayer.⁶³ This belief is again founded on the statement in the device which advocated that:

This consultation is to be referred to such learned men as be meet to shew their minds herein; and to bring a plat or book hereof ready drawn to her highness. Which being approved of her majesty, may be so put into the parliament house, to the which for the time it is thought that these are apt men; Dr. Bill, Dr. Parker, Dr. May, Dr. Cox, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Grindal, Mr. Pilkington. And sir Thomas Smith do call them together, and to be amongst them. And after the consultation with these, to draw in other men of learning and gravity, and apt men for that purpose and credit, to have their assents.⁶⁴

Again given that there is little to suggest that ‘the device’ was followed in any way, so we cannot know that this meeting ever took place. We do know that Matthew Parker was not in London and therefore would not have been able to participate.⁶⁵ Strype also asserted that Sandys was part of the above group: ‘In this business the divines, Dr. Sandys, Dr. Bill, and the rest above mentioned, were diligently employed at sir Thomas Smith’s house in Westminster.’⁶⁶ The lack of clarity regarding if a meeting actually occurred and who the personnel involved were illustrates the problems with the extant sources for the early months of Elizabeth’s reign. Sandys was concerned by the content of the legislation and the extent to which the evangelical would need to follow it to the letter. A letter from Sandys to Parker at the end of April indicated that Sandys was in London and monitoring the progress of the acts and the prayer book through parliamentary procedure as he recorded: ‘The book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take order for them.’⁶⁷

The 1559 Book of Articles, or ‘declaration’ as it was known, was composed in May 1559 and set out the confession of faith of the clergy of the newly reformed church.⁶⁸ Wenig suggests that whilst the authorship of this document is unknown, the preface stated that the authors had recently preached before the Queen; thus, the author is thought to have been one or more of the former exiles. This makes it likely that Sandys was amongst those who authored the document (alongside John Jewel and Richard Cox) and he certainly mentions the declaration in a letter to Parker in April 1559.⁶⁹ The letter was primarily to justify their conduct and statements during the dispute at Westminster, but amongst the statements was an article defending predestination, that was presumably considered necessary because of a fear that others were denying it.⁷⁰ The article stated that: ‘Predestinacon to lyfe is the everlasting purpose of god, whereby before the foundacons of the world were laied’. Moreover, the godly consideration of predestination was of unspeakable comfort to godly persons, who feel themselves working in the spirit of Christ who drew their minds to ‘high and heavenly thinges’.⁷¹ This may suggest that the authors had a broadly Calvinistic outlook, although the document does not elaborate on the precise nature of predestination, but rather extolled what it brought to ‘godly personnes’ in place of good works. A basic Calvinistic outlook was something that Sandys along with a number of other former exiles shared with their hosts Martyr and Bullinger, yet Sandys was largely silent on the theme of predestination in his published sermons.

The nature of what the returned exiles wanted from the new settlement can be gleaned from this 1559 document.⁷² The tone is both defensive and optimistic. It defends the nature of the returned evangelicals’ religious views, making it clear both what they believe but also what they

did not. The expectation is clear in this gathering of former exiles, they set out what they hoped the new religion of England to be and believed that their views would be listened to. Their defence is made both against the 'Idolatrii and sup[er]sition' of the previous regime and also against those who untruly charge them and falsely slander them.⁷³ In terms of doctrine they asserted that they took on the name 'Christian catholik'; emphasised that they were going back to the original church for the origins of true religion; and that the scriptures contained all that was necessary for salvation.⁷⁴ Along with predestination they also addressed many other issues, such as the nature of sin, the authority of the Church, purgatory, the sacraments and the issue of married clergy. Given the number of married clerics amongst the former exiles their conclusion on the right of clergy to marry is perhaps unsurprising. They conceded that 'Although the state of single lyfe and true virginity' was 'a singular gift of god highlie com[m]ended' and ultimately to be preferred before matrimony, they concluded that:

Yet there is no state charged by goddes worde to lyve a sole lyfe. For the same Paule saithe that he hath no comandement of the lorde towching virgins that everie one hath his prop[er] gift of god, one this waie and an other that waie: and that he meaneth not to entangle any man. . . . But rather he willith and commandeth Suche to marrie w[hi]ch have not the gift of virginitie. And therefore Bisshoppes, priests and deacons are not commanded to abstene from matrimony.⁷⁵

McMillan argues that there was no conflict between the Zurich reformers and the new English Church as they all wanted the same moderate Protestantism.⁷⁶ This is supported by the statements made which were familiar evangelical ideas, echoing those of the Edwardian reformers. They were against idolatry and advocated that they, not the Roman Church, represented a true Christianity. The statements were predicated with the idea that there would still be a religious hierarchy for authority was still to rest within a traditional structure and bishops were to expect obedience from both church personnel and the wider community.

The Visitation

The new Queen, or perhaps more accurately Cecil, sought to secure religious obedience in a fairly traditional way namely via a Royal Visitation. This was planned and Injunctions were drawn up in June 1559.⁷⁷ This manner of securing religious uniformity had been used by successive Tudor monarchs since Henry VIII.⁷⁸ The religious changes of Edward VI's reign were enforced by a visitation in 1547, which divided the country into circuits. This process was mimicked (probably quite deliberately) in 1559 and the country was divided into six circuits, five circuits covering

the Province of Canterbury and one circuit covering the Northern Province. These visitations were to take the newly written Injunctions to the country as a whole. The 1559 injunctions were based on the Edwardian Injunctions of 1547.⁷⁹ They placed emphasis on loyalty to the crown and emphasised the need for licensed preaching and access to the scriptures. In addition they emphasised a rejection of all those things that could be viewed as part of Catholic practice, such as superstition and idolatry. In line with the idea of reform they rejected abuses such as simony and corruption (both financial and moral).⁸⁰ Haugaard points out that the appointment of a former exile was common to each commission with Becon, Horne, Bentham, Jewel and Davies appearing on each of the five southern circuits. Edwin Sandys was selected as one of the commission that was to visit the Northern Province.⁸¹ In addition Haugaard suggests that these choices were perhaps in part practical as after all these men were in June 1559 currently unemployed and therefore had the time to undertake this lengthy visitation process.⁸²

Gee, in his examination of the Elizabethan clergy suggested that the commissioners were not chosen for their religious beliefs.⁸³ Bayne in his analysis of the Visitation of Canterbury disagrees stating that aside from the Lord Lieutenants 'they were for the most part adherents of the new order'.⁸⁴ The choice of ecclesiastical personnel certainly seemed to reflect a religiously reformed agenda to the process, even if some of the secular participants were not known as reformers. The commission was to assess the state of religion in the country and enforce the new settlement. Given this it was not necessary for all members of the commission to be evangelical, because the assertion of authority and obedience to the new regime was what mattered. Each commission was to include the Lord Lieutenant of each county, a number of ecclesiastical personnel at least one of whom was to be a preacher, lawyers and a selection of the local gentry—though not all were expected to serve equally.⁸⁵ For the Northern Commission orders were sent to Francis Talbot, fifth Earl of Shrewsbury (the President of the Council of the North) to form the commission.⁸⁶ Appointed to it were the Lord Lieutenants of each county, a range of evangelicals and representatives of civic and state authority. The appointees also had allocated deputies. The official list of commissioners for the northern circuit consisted of Edwin Sandys, Henry Harvey, Sir Thomas Gargrave, Sir Henry Gates, Christopher Estofte, Lord Evers, Sir Henry Percy and George Browne, with Bernard Gilpin, Edmund Scambler, William Harrison, Sir John Foster, Sir Edward Fyton, William Morton and Thomas Percy as deputies.⁸⁷ Not all of these men were evangelical; in fact some were not at all in favour of reformed religion, remaining conservative in their religious outlook throughout the Elizabethan period. Francis Talbot, fifth Earl of Shrewsbury and President of the Council of the North, was a man who had served the crown since Henry VIII's reign. His political skill was illustrated by his ability to survive the regime changes of

the Protectorate governments of Edward's reign, remain in power under Mary and still be seen by Elizabeth as suitable until his death in 1560. He was pragmatically loyal to the crown regardless on whose head this sat. George Bernard concluded that 'Perhaps he was fortunate that he was never compelled to decide irrevocably between loyalty to monarch and to religious principle'.⁸⁸ His religious beliefs appear to be conservative, yet he had not been willing to go as far as openly rebelling against Northumberland in his efforts to subvert the line of succession in 1553 and was described by Stephen Gardiner as a 'heretic peer' during Mary's reign.⁸⁹ In contrast Sir Thomas Gargrave, vice-president of the Council of the North, did favour reformed religion, but more importantly shared the beliefs of his superior that obedience to the crown and the good order of the North were desirable above all else. By the 1570s he had taken the stance that the only way this could be achieved was through 'stricter law for Religyon & agaynst papysts'.⁹⁰ Sir Henry Gates had been an Edwardian Protestant and supporter of Northumberland but had been pardoned under Mary, taking a key role in the defence of the North during the Anglo-French wars. He was also to go on to play an important role in the Council of North, making the maintenance of law and order in the county a priority.⁹¹ It would seem the local nobility and gentry who were listed as members of the commission were present in name only and Gee surmises that they were named as members in case of potential unrest. The choice of men who prioritised the efficient, quiet and orderly running of the North was more important than having evangelical laity on the commission.

Certainly not all those involved in the Northern Visitation had reforming credentials, yet no Marian clergy were chosen. The settlement was a Protestant one and moreover the intention was that it would be adhered to, necessitating the selection of some active reformers. The choice of these men may also have been partially pragmatic in that many of those chosen did not as yet have another office to fulfil. It also gave the Queen and those around her a good chance to see the former exiles in action and to assess how far they would stick to the parameters set by the crown. Many of the men selected had already been engaged in delivering sermons at St Paul's Cross, so their intellectual, preaching and academic abilities had already been noted; therefore this allowed the new regime to assess their usefulness to the new Protestant ecclesiastical hierarchy. Would these men follow what was to become a 'party line'?

In practice the burden of the work of the Visitation of the North fell on Edwin Sandys and Henry Harvey who were present at virtually all the sessions and headed the Visitation.⁹² Harvey was another Cambridge man, but had remained in England during the reign of Mary unlike his counterpart Sandys. Harvey also appeared to have a distinctly conservative outlook in religious terms judging by his later appointments to Trinity College.⁹³ Writing in 1975 C.J. Kitching expressed the view that Harvey

was 'an ideal companion' for Sandys as he was a 'skilled ecclesiastical lawyer who held important offices under both Edward and Mary.'⁹⁴ Yet given what we know of Sandys' religious views and his enthusiasm for ensuring a reformed nation it would seem unlikely that Harvey would have been his first choice. If the aim of this Visitation was to take a hard-line Protestant stance and to ensure the reform of the North then the choice of personnel was a little surprising. However if we accept that the settlement was a moderate one and intended to be enforced as such then the choice of personnel is entirely logical. To what extent Sandys would have seen a religious pragmatist such as Harvey as ideal may have been debatable, but he was going to have to compromise to fit into the new regime. This may have made working with a man for whom compromise and moderation seem to be 'by-words' a necessary evil.

The visitation also had an official preacher appointed. C.J. Kitching's research suggested that Thomas Lever was initially suggested as the preacher, but Edmund Scambler was the man who took up the role.⁹⁵ Thomas Lever was a fellow exile of Sandys and had been with Sandys when he was asked to preach in favour of Lady Jane Grey's accession to the throne. It was Lever who had been appointed to take Sandys' sermon to London once it had been read at Cambridge, he too was at Frankfurt at the time of the troubles and led a congregation at Wesel and then Aarau.⁹⁶ Lever's willingness to comply with the new regime had already been brought into question as he had raised doubts about Elizabeth assuming the title 'supreme head of the church'.⁹⁷ Edmund Scambler's religious pedigree also indicated him to be a reformer, but perhaps one more likely to fall in with the new settlement than Lever. Scambler had remained in England during Mary's reign and had been in contact with Parker, to whom he was appointed chaplain. He had a solid 'English' Protestant background and was an ally of Parker, which contrasted with the continental Protestant influences of Lever and Sandys.⁹⁸ This again suggests that a concerted effect was being made with the choice of personnel for this Northern Visitation to achieve a balance of ideas, personalities and influences. The commission was to effectively root out any potential troublemakers, yet also to present a moderated and English version of Protestantism, but this was still a Protestantism that had substance.

There was also a list of surrogates who could act in the commissioners' stead, again reflecting a mixture of ecclesiastical personnel, forces of secular authority and local dignitaries.⁹⁹ The session of the commission ran between Tuesday 22 August in Nottingham and Monday 18 December in Newcastle visiting Pontefract, Halifax, York, Hull, Richmond, Durham, Carlisle, Kendal, Manchester and Chester amongst other places.¹⁰⁰ At each of different locations of the sessions a sermon was preached, the commission was read aloud as were the names of those cited to appear. Henry Gee summarises the duties of the commission as firstly to act as spiritual

judges and secondly to enforce the settlement of religion.¹⁰¹ Despite the fact that Edmund Scambler was the official preacher for the visitation Sandys seems to have delivered many of the sermons himself. Sandys was listed as the preacher at Nottingham (St Mary's), York (Chapter House), Hull, Durham (Chapter House), Newcastle (St Nicholas), Carlisle (Chapter House), Kendal and Manchester (parish church). This meant that he preached at the majority of the key locations only missing Northwich, Tarvin and Chester which came at the end of October, at a point where all the visitors were anxious to be leaving for home or to take up new offices. Given the importance Sandys placed on sermonising and his later self-portrayals as a great preacher it is unsurprising that he did not want to leave the conversion of the North to Scambler.

Preaching the Settlement

Arnold Hunt has argued that '[h]istorians of the Elizabethan church have not always found it easy to come to terms with the idea that the settlement might have been brought into being as much by speech acts as by written texts.'¹⁰² Preaching was to play an important role in reconverting the nation and Sandys certainly saw preaching as a necessary and important aspect of spreading the message of his religion. Sandys had written to Henrich Bullinger celebrating Elizabeth's affirmation of godly religion immediately on her accession: 'the Queen caused the gospel to be preached at that renowned place, Paul's Cross, which duly occurred to the great delight of the people'.¹⁰³ Sandys had also been one of the preachers allowed to preach a Lenten sermon at court in February 1559 even though public preaching at St Paul's Cross was still prohibited.¹⁰⁴ The importance of sermons cannot be underestimated and the visitation was the first opportunity for reformed preachers to preach to the clergy and a wider audience across the country.

We do not have the text of any of the sermons preached by Sandys at this visitation, but his published volume of sermons gives a sense of his style and technique which fitted the formulas for Protestant sermon giving. His sermons always focus on a verse/s from the Bible with a specific theme which he expanded upon, with both instruction and exhortation forming key elements in his sermonising.¹⁰⁵ John Strype incorrectly identified one of two sermons given in York from the published volume of Sandys' sermons as being delivered in celebration of Elizabeth acceding to the throne in 1559. This error has since been repeated by many based on Strype's dating of the sermon. Whilst these sermons (listed as third and fourth in the printed volume) 'Take us the little foxes which destroy the vines' and 'I exhort therefore before all things' are given in celebration of an accession day it is clear they were in fact delivered at a later date than 1559. The text of the first of these sermons indicated that Sandys was exhorting his audience to celebrate at twenty years since God delivered

them ‘from the state of miserable servitude, and gave us our gracious sovereign, his own elect, Elizabeth by his grace our prince and governor, the restorer of our religion and liberty’.¹⁰⁶ Combined with the fact that we know Sandys delivered the sermons at York this seems to support the suggestion that this was indeed intended as a celebration of Elizabeth’s accession, but that the sermon was delivered in 1578/9 when Sandys was Archbishop of York. Roy Strong’s work has illustrated the importance of the Accession Day celebrations in Elizabeth’s reign.¹⁰⁷ These celebrations were designed to mark Elizabeth’s accession as a key event in the English calendar and the memorialisation of that day was celebrated yearly with tilts and other festivities.¹⁰⁸ Celebrating the day in York can thus be seen as an attempt to replace traditional Catholic celebrations with a nationalistic Protestant agenda; it played to Elizabeth’s desire to be feted as sacred to her subjects and the text of Sandys’ sermon certainly hit all the right notes. In his sermon he states that no nation of people ever had such good cause to gather and give God thanks than they did at this time.¹⁰⁹ It had all the expected trappings of a celebratory piece and Sandys describes Elizabeth as a ‘skilful overseer’. He also praises her learning and wisdom describing her as ‘not far inferior to Mithridates for diversity of languages, but far surmounting all former English princes in learning, knowledge and understanding’.¹¹⁰ He also extols her commitment to the ‘true religion’ summarising that: ‘Thus hath God blessed this vineyard his church with a learned, wise, religious, just, uncorrupt, mild, merciful, peaceful, and zealous prince to govern it. A great blessing: the Lord continue it, and make us thankful for it.’¹¹¹ His sermon then continued onto more familiar territory, it highlights the dangers to the realm that came from enemies of reformed religion, moving away from the flattery and exaltations of the Queen.

Sandys’ sermons often rely on an identification of an enemy and the third sermon in his published works, ‘Take us the little foxes which destroy the vines’, highlighted previously, is slightly atypical in its more joyous tone. Sandys often highlighted dangers and threats in his sermons warning against slipping from the true path. Indeed it would seem Sandys’ preaching in the 1559 Visitation was considered too radical for some. His sermon delivered at Newcastle (Ackland) is recorded by Strype in his *Annals of Reformation* as having caused a crisis of faith for Bernard Gilpin.¹¹² It was recorded that the visitors sent for Bernard Gilpin and required him to preach a sermon at Durham against the primacy of the Pope. They allocated him this topic as ‘the oath of supremacy being to be required of all the clergy, they might be the better prepared to take it.’¹¹³ Gilpin’s biographer, David Marcombe, concluded that Sandys’ invitation to preach at the visitation had given Gilpin a sleepless night.¹¹⁴ Strype’s account indicated that it was in fact the combination of hearing Sandys’ sermon the previous day, on the nature of the Eucharist ‘against the real presence in the sacrament’ and the fact that he was told to preach

denying the primacy that was what caused the sleeplessness. Strype postulated that Sandys' sermon 'seemed to deny utterly any real presence' and 'offended Gilpin, and many others, no doubt (who were used to the contrary doctrine)'.¹¹⁵ Strype further tells that following Gilpin's sermon he was required to prescribe to the new settlement, which he did:

because it gave glory to God, and authority to the word of God, for rooting out of superstition and human doctrine: and his heart only doubting in certain points of smaller consequence, which God, he hoped, in time would reveal unto him. He considered further, that if he should refuse, he should be a means to make many others refuse; and so consequently hinder the course of the word of God. Therefore on these Christian and prudential rules he came to a resolution, and subscribed.¹¹⁶

Yet he still had a particular issue with 'two points that troubled him' and so 'sent to Dr. Sandys his protestation touching those two points that troubled him; and the doctor being nothing offended, took his protestation very courteously. And then his curate also, who had made some stop too, subscribed.'¹¹⁷ Thus, despite his initial unease Strype records that Gilpin soon found himself more at ease with the new religion thanks to Sandys' skill in persuading and preaching. This provided a nice example for the reformers to quote which seemingly saw a previously Catholic priest converted to the true faith once it had been revealed to him. Yet in reality Gilpin had not been that convinced a Catholic; he had already doubted some Catholic teachings and as Marcombe stated had previously been considered a 'closet Protestant'.¹¹⁸ In some ways this example is very much illustrative of the nature of the Royal Visitation of 1559, the conversion was not (as yet at least) to be forced on the North but rather it was hoped that the populace would see that the new settlement was in fact the right way forward and would support it. The preaching that took place as a fundamental part of the visitation was designed to persuade and convert. Elizabeth's succession was recent and these were still uneasy times; as yet the regime was not in a position to purge the North of all Catholic sentiments and practice.

Compliance

The bulk of the presentments amongst the laity in 1559 reflect the trend in other visitations, being dominated by improprieties other than compliance with the new religious settlement. Fornication, adultery and illegitimate children were by far the majority of the business dealt with by the visitors. Only four presentations in total were made from the laity for refusal to attend services in the York diocese, with two other presentments from this diocese for holding up the service either through noise

or 'troubling the curate'.¹¹⁹ No further details are given as to why these individuals absented themselves or caused disruption. At Aekesey it was recorded that 'George Wyntworthe and Edwarde Aykelande doo wilfully absent themselves from the church and from the dyvnye Service to the yvill example of all parishes'.¹²⁰ Certain branches of the Wentworth family were later to be recusants, so may reflect some early resistance from the family to a move towards reformed religion. Given that the services were likely to still be of a Catholic nature it is as likely that some of these presentments could have been Protestants objecting to a Catholic service, or merely expressions of local discontentment.

The presence of non-cooperative clergy was not the only sign of rather conservative attitudes in the county as the physical symbols of Catholicism were visible in many churches having survived early purges. Eamon Duffy suggested that the commissioners enforced the injunctions to the letter in terms of hunting out images.¹²¹ At Doncaster the images in the vestry were reported as being undefaced, having survived the early Edwardian iconoclastic purge, as had the images of the Virgin at Beynton and the Rood at Rowle.¹²² Yet evidence from later records (1570-1590s) suggested that this was most definitely not all that remained of Catholic images and the presentations to the royal visitors were actually quite minimal. The visitors were entirely reliant on the wardens and parishioners exposing the presence of Catholic iconography or practice and were not making visits to all locations to hunt these images out. At Doncaster the presence of retained images in the vestry was highlighted to them by the wardens and parishioners alongside complaints about the need for 'certain glasse wyndowes in the church to be amended'.¹²³ Sandys advocated in his later sermons that those of the reformed faith could share little common ground with papists as they 'disagree in the very foundation. They lay one ground and we another'.¹²⁴ He was opposed to the corruptions and superstitions of the Catholic faith that included imagery in churches, yet was limited in the actions he could take in this Royal Visitation. Indeed he reported to Peter Martyr that his objections to the retention of the crucifix by the Queen and her assertion that statues of the Virgin Mary were permissible had put him in a precarious position.¹²⁵

The limited impact of the visitation in terms of removing any Catholic elements from the North of England can also be seen via the very small number of deprivations. The 1559 Visitation saw only five clergy deprived of their posts.¹²⁶ Those who were ordered to appear and did not, resulting in their deprivation, were important individuals who had the potential to provide leadership to any disobedience. The five clergy who were eventually deprived were George Palmes, archdeacon of York, and Roger Marshall, sub-deacon of York, who both refused to subscribe.¹²⁷ The same was true of Anthony Salvyn, vicar general of the Durham diocese, William Carter, archdeacon of Northumberland, and Thomas Sedgewick. Whilst low rates of deprivations have been used to

paint a picture of a largely compliant nation, it should also be remembered that the visitation in 1559 was a relatively swift affair, with the visitors remaining in each location for a minimal amount of time. Thus, it was only the ardent opponent that was able to be identified. Action was taken against those who were obstinate and open in their opposition, but the real picture the visitation seemed to show was an urgent need for more personnel and a shortage of books. Access to the gospels was vital but at Edingley, Otley, Steynton and Elwick the Bible was not available and books had been burnt.¹²⁸ Many parishes reported that there was no curate or that they had had no access to services. Reforming and educating the clergy was to be a key preoccupation for Sandys in subsequent years and to be reflected in the visitations he made as a Bishop and then Archbishop.

By December 1559 many of the men involved in the visitation had been officially appointed to their new roles. Edwin Sandys was to take up office as Bishop of Worcester, having previously refused the diocese of Carlisle prior to going on the Northern Visitation. The refusal of high office was to some extent a trope of the reformers, the expression of a traditional humility topos demonstrated their commitment to focusing on the spreading of the word of God via reluctance to take up positions of power. A lack of overt ambition was considered admirable and some reformers did experience a genuine crisis of conscience when presented with the offer of a bishopric. Men such as Sampson had written to their advisers on the continent to seek their counsel about what to do if such an offer came their way.¹²⁹ Sandys was keen not to look too ambitious, but noted that he dare not refuse another office for fear of angering the Queen.¹³⁰ His refusal of Carlisle was couched in terms of humility, but alongside this we could conjecture that he did not want to be sent to Carlisle. He knew how problematic the diocese was and whilst a connection with his home county would later be expressed via the founding of a school at Hawkshead, Cumbria, he clearly had no desire to be back in the north on a permanent basis at this point in his career. His later affiliation to the diocese of London, where he expressed a desire to be closer to the centre of religious discussion and to the machinations of government rather than confined to the provinces, suggested that Carlisle would not have suited him at all. Sandys returned to London to be consecrated as Bishop of Worcester at Lambeth Palace on 21 December 1559.¹³¹

Conclusion

This early period of establishing a reformed regime in England is therefore revealing. It shows the uncertainties that abounded in the first year of Elizabeth's reign. It is clear that there were aspirations that the new Queen and her country would be in favour of reformed religion, but that these were not certainties. It also illustrated that even when it became

clear that Elizabeth would not favour Catholics, it was not clear what sort of reformed religion would come into place. Sandys was amongst the important voices arguing for evangelical religion, making a case that theologians, and not privy councillors or even monarchs, should specify religious doctrine and practice. Equally it is clear that they had taken a risk coming back to England, leaving behind the lives they had made for themselves. Nor did they receive the hero's welcome they were perhaps expecting; they found themselves on uncertain and rapidly shifting ground once back in England. Without income, position and role they were reliant on the Queen and Cecil to safeguard both their spiritual and their material futures. Sandys was clear about what he felt was important—preaching and education in the true uncorrupted word of God would bring salvation to the nation. He was an evangelical and Calvinist, but an Edwardian Calvinist with ideas found in the theology of Martyr and Bullinger. He was certain that the nation was in need of enlightenment and equally sure he and his new wife were in need of position and income. Spiritual and material needs were to play an important role in fashioning Sandys' identity as he took on a new role as a Bishop. His sense of self was already visible in 1559. He wanted to preach and was mistrustful that others would be able to deliver the message as effectively as he would; he was active and hardworking as his dedication to the visitation showed; he was determined but equally was quick to realise that in order to safeguard a future for himself and for evangelical religion, compromise would be necessary. He had already begun to see that a lack of unity amongst the reformers was divisive in constructing a new religious nation. He could not have imagined in 1560 that this would result in a nation that was rent with division and thus unstable.

Notes

- 1 'Antony Cook to Bullinger', in *The Zurich Letters*, ed. Hastings Robinson, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1845), p. 1. This letter dated 8 December 1558 was the response to another correspondence from Bullinger congratulating England on its redemption and noted Sandys was the conveyer of the letter to Cook in Strasbourg.
- 2 'Sandys to Bullinger', in *The Zurich Letters*, ed. Hasting Robinson, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1842), pp. 3–6.
- 3 The concepts of Elizabeth as the English Deborah and the cult of Elizabeth are advocated in Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987); Frances Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999). The myth is challenged in Alexandra Walsham, 'A Very Deborah? The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2003), pp. 143–68.
- 4 John Neale, 'The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity', *The English Historical Review*, 65 (1950), 304–32.
- 5 Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 21.

- 6 'Sampson to Martyr' (17 December 1558) in Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 2. Sampson asked what to do if offered an ecclesiastical office and in 'Jewel to Martyr', 26 January 1559, pp. 6–7 Jewel suggested that bishoprics would be 'very cheap' given the number of vacancies.
- 7 J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1958), p. 58.
- 8 B. Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559–1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 4.
- 9 Patrick Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', in *Elizabethan Essays* (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), pp. 31–58.
- 10 Henry Percy Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898).
- 11 J.E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I* (Chicago: Review Press, 2014).
- 12 Peter Marshall and John Morgan, 'Clerical Conformity and the Elizabethan Settlement Revisited', *The Historical Journal*, 59, 1 (2016), 1–22; Cyndia Susan Clegg, 'The 1559 Books of Common Prayer and the Elizabethan Reformation', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 67, 1 (2016), 94–121.
- 13 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 3.
- 14 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, multiple examples throughout the various edited volumes of letters.
- 15 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 'Synodalia' (afterwards CCCC MS 121). The full title is given as 'A declaration of doctrine offered and exhibited by the protestantes to the Quene. . .'; Anon, 'The Device for Alteration of Religion, in the First Year of Queen Elizabeth I' in John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together with an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, and Letters*, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), appendix 4 (afterwards Strype, *Annals*).
- 16 J.D. Alsop, 'Wilford, Sir James (b. in or before 1517, d. 1550)', ODNB, online edition; M.A. Stevens, 'Wilford, Sir Thomas (c.1530–1610)', ODNB, online edition.
- 17 Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles 1553–1559: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938, 1966), pp. 332–3. Francis was living in Frankfurt with his wife and children and several other exiles. Her uncle John Wilford also had a house in Frankfurt.
- 18 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. 3–4.
- 19 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 6.
- 20 C. Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), pp. 27–8.
- 21 Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, p. 28.
- 22 Henry Norbert Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement: A Study of Contemporary Documents* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1907), p. 4.
- 23 'Report of the Count Helffenstein to the Emperor Ferdinand', 26 February 1559 in *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners: Being a Series of Hitherto Unpublished Letters from the Archives of the Hapsburg Family*, ed. Victor Von Klarwell, trans. T.H. Nash (London: John Lane, 1928), p. 38.
- 24 Jonathan Wright, 'Christopherson, John (d. 1558)', ODNB, online edition.
- 25 The inclusion of two verses from Ecclesiastes were the main issue of contention: 'I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive . . . for a living dog is better than a dead lion.'
- 26 'Queen Elizabeth's Proclamation to Forbid Preaching' (27 December 1558) in *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, ed. Henry Gee, and William John Hardy (New York: Macmillan, 1896), pp. 416–17.
- 27 Rosemary Sgroi, *The History of Parliament 1558–1603*. Available from: www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/parliament/1559-0.

66 *Settling Religion and Fox Hunting*

- 28 Neale, 'The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity', 304–32.
- 29 Neale, 'The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity', 304–32; Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559–1581* (London: Cape, 1953).
- 30 Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 241; Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, p. 28.
- 31 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559–1577*, pp. 1–7.
- 32 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559–1577*, xii.
- 33 John Guy, *Elizabeth: The Forgotten Years* (London: Penguin, 2016), p. 13.
- 34 Mary Hill-Cole, 'Religious Conformity and the Progresses of Elizabeth I', in *Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003), p. 64.
- 35 Rosemary O'Day, *The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558–1642* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979), p. 33.
- 36 Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490–1700* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 382.
- 37 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, xii.
- 38 Clegg, 'The 1559 Books of Common Prayer and the Elizabethan Reformation', 94–121 especially p. 121.
- 39 Peter Marshall, *Reformation England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), p. 129.
- 40 Anon, 'The Device for Alteration of Religion, in the First Year of Queen Elizabeth I' in Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, appendix 4.
- 41 Simon Adams and David Scott Gehring, 'Elizabeth I's Former Tutor Reports on the Parliament of 1559: Johannes Spithovius to the Chancellor of Denmark, 27 February 1559', *English Historical Review*, 128, 530 (2013), 35–54.
- 42 Anon, 'The Device for Alteration of Religion, in the First Year of Queen Elizabeth I', in *A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690* ed. Edward Carwell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1840), pp. 43–8.
- 43 Strype, *Annals*, 1, p. 74; Henry Gee, *The Elizabethan Prayer-book & Ornaments, with an Appendix of Documents* (London: Macmillan, 1902), pp. 3–4, 5–31.
- 44 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. 16–17.
- 45 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 2, pp. 19.
- 46 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, p. 17.
- 47 John Foxe, TAMO, 1583 edition.
- 48 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1., p. 2.
- 49 'Dr Edmund Sandys to Dr Matthew Parker, 30 April 1559' in *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. J. Bruce and T.T. Pernow (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2005) p. 65.
- 50 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 10.
- 51 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, pp. 166, 194.
- 52 'Dr Edmund Sandys to Dr Matthew Parker', *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 65; Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 194.
- 53 Bodleian Library, Oxford, 'The declaracyon of the procedynge of a conference, begon at Westminster the last of Marche, 1559' (London, 1650); John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), 2142 [2119].
- 54 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), 2142 [2119].
- 55 John Foxe, TAMO (1583 edition), 2142 [2119].
- 56 'The Declaracyon of the Procedynge of a Conference, Begon at Westminster the Last of Marche, 1559' (London, 1650).

- 57 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, 'John Jewel to Peter Martyr, Dated at London, 6 April 1559', pp. 13–4.
- 58 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. 13–14.
- 59 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. 13–14.
- 60 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 132.
- 61 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 132.
- 62 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. 13–14.
- 63 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 13.
- 64 Anon, 'The Device for Alteration of Religion', p. 47.
- 65 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 120. Speculation that Edward Guest replaced him at this meeting has again occupied historians again based on Strype's assertion that a letter by Guest found amongst the Parker manuscripts indicated his pivotal role in the process.
- 66 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 119.
- 67 'Dr Edmund Sandys to Dr Matthew Parker', 30 April 1559 in *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 65.
- 68 CCCC MS 121.
- 69 S. Wenig, 'The Ecclesiastical Vision of the Reformed Bishops under Elizabeth I 1559–1570', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 70 (2001), 270–301.
- 70 T. Freeman, 'Dissenters from a Dissenting Church: The Challenge of the Freewillers, 1550–1558', in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, ed. Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 145 making reference to CCCC MS 121, 139.
- 71 CCCC MS, 121, 146.
- 72 CCCC, MS 121 141–61.
- 73 CCCC, MS 121, 143.
- 74 CCCC, MS 121, 144–5.
- 75 CCCC MS 121, 156.
- 76 K. McMillan, 'Zurich Reform and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 68 (1999), 285–311.
- 77 'Injunctions of 1559', in Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, pp. 417–42, also available from: <http://history.hanover.edu/texts/engref/er78.html>.
- 78 F. Donald Logan, 'Thomas Cromwell and the Vicegerency in Spirituals: A Revisitation', *The English Historical Review*, 103, 408 (1988), 658–67; D. Logan, 'The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities, 1535', *The English Historical Review*, 106, 421 (1991), 861–88. In 1535 Thomas Cromwell was initially appointed vicegerent by Henry VIII for the purposes of carrying out the first royal visitation of the church, designed to emphasise the newly instituted royal supremacy, although this visited mainly cathedrals and was superseded in significance by Layton and Leigh's monastic visitation of 1536. Mary I did not implement a Royal Visitation.
- 79 Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, pp. 417–42.
- 80 Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, pp. 417–42.
- 81 TNA, SP 12/4 f.198.
- 82 William P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: The Struggle for a Stable Settlement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 136.
- 83 Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy*, p. 95.
- 84 C.G. Bayne, 'The Visitation of the Province of Canterbury, 1559', *The English Historical Review*, 28, 112 (1913), 636–77 with reference to p. 637.

68 *Settling Religion and Fox Hunting*

- 85 C.J. Kitching, ed., *The Royal Visitation of 1559: Act Book for the Northern Province*, Vol. 187 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1975), xvii.
- 86 TNA, SP 12/4 f.198, 'Commission from the Queen to the Earl of Shrewsbury'.
- 87 TNA, SP 12/4 f.198. The commission included Francis Earl of Shrewsbury who was President of the Council of the North, Edward Earl of Derby who was Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire, Thomas Earl of Northumberland, Lord Warden of the East and Middle Marches. H. Gee also names James Croftes, Richard Bowes and Richard Kingsmill.
- 88 G.W. Bernard, 'Talbot, Francis, Fifth Earl of Shrewsbury (1500–1560)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 89 Bernard, 'Talbot, Francis, Fifth Earl of Shrewsbury', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 90 J.J. Cartwright, *Chapters in the History of Yorkshire: Being a Collection of Original Letters, Papers, and Public Documents, Illustrating the State of the County in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I* (Wakefield: B.W. Allen, 1872), p. 46; Ian W. Archer, 'Gargrave, Sir Thomas (1494/5–1579)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 91 Narasingha P. Sil, 'Gates, Sir John (1504–1553)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 92 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, xxxiii.
- 93 John F. Jackson, 'Harvey, Henry (d. 1585)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 94 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, xviii.
- 95 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, xvii; Ben Lowe, 'Thomas Lever (1521–1577)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 96 Lowe, 'Lever, Thomas (1521–1577)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 97 Lowe, 'Lever, Thomas (1521–1577)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 98 William Joseph Sheils, 'Scambler, Edmund (c.1520–1594)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 99 The surrogates were Bernard Gilpin, Edmund Scambler, William Harrison, Sir John Foster, Sir Edward Fyton, William Morton and Thomas Percy.
- 100 Kitching, *The Royal Visitation of 1559*, xxxiii; In addition the commission held sessions at Southwell, Blyth, Otley, Beverley, Malton, Northallerton, Aukland, Alnwick, Penrith, Lancaster, Wigan, Northwich, Tarvin and Doncaster.
- 101 Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy*, p. 73.
- 102 Arnold Hunt, 'Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Hugh Adlington, Peter McCullough, and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 366–86.
- 103 Robinson, Vol. 1, *The Zurich Letters*, pp. 3–6.
- 104 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, p. 60.
- 105 Greg Kneidel, 'Ars Praedicandi: Theories and Practice', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. P. McCullough, H. Adlington, E. Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 13.
- 106 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 56.
- 107 Roy C. Strong, 'The Popular Celebration of the Accession Day of Queen Elizabeth I', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21, 1/2 (1958), 86–103.
- 108 Strong, 'The Popular Celebration of the Accession Day of Queen Elizabeth I', 86–103; Frances A. Yates, 'Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 20, 1/2 (1957), 4–25.
- 109 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 56.
- 110 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 57. Mithridates was supposed to have been able to speak all twenty-two languages of the countries he governed and to have a prodigious memory.

- 111 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 58.
- 112 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, pp. 245–6.
- 113 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part. 1, p. 246.
- 114 David Marcombe, ‘Gilpin, Bernard (1516–1584)’, ODNB, online edition.
- 115 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part. 1, p. 246.
- 116 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part. 1, pp. 246–7.
- 117 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 1, pp. 245–6.
- 118 David Marcombe, ‘Gilpin, Bernard (1516–1584)’, ODNB, online edition.
- 119 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, xxxiv. The report from the parish of Orston noted that ‘the parishioners kepe no scilence in the chuche’, which suggested that this was a community fault rather than the actions of one individual (p. 62).
- 120 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, p. 66.
- 121 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (London: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 569.
- 122 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, pp. 67, 69, 73, 85.
- 123 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, p. 67 (f.97v).
- 124 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 13. ‘O Every One that Thirstesth’.
- 125 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, p. 74.
- 126 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, xxxiv.
- 127 Claire Cross, *York Clergy Wills 1520–1600: I Minster Clergy*, Vol. 1 (York: Borthwick Papers, 1984), p. 95; Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, pp. 106–7.
- 128 Kitching, *Royal Visitation of 1559*, pp. 63, 67, 70, 72.
- 129 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol.1, p. 1.
- 130 Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, p. 73.
- 131 Sandys, *Sermons*, xviii.

3 Establishing Reformed Religion in the Diocese of Worcester

An Enemy Is Bourne

Introduction

The Royal Visitation of 1559 had provided the opportunity for the men who were to form the mainstay of the Elizabethan ecclesiastical hierarchy to assess the state of religion in the parishes and the regime to see them in action as preachers and magistrates. David Loades argues that the visitation did not tolerate '[o]pen defiance or nonconformity', but that otherwise 'a great deal of evasion and finger crossing clearly went on' and that this set the tone for the first ten years of the reign.¹ Coming straight from his role on the Northern Visitation Sandys arrived in his new diocese of Worcester with a clear intention to promote the gospel and further the reform of the nation. Immediately he moved to conduct another visitation under the commission of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker. This new visitation was to impose a 'more searching conformity'.² The keenness to impose conformity and thus ensure a fully reformed diocese was an indication of Sandys' approach and perhaps also an early indicator that he was not about to find his time in Worcester peaceful. The diocese had been the site of early evangelical fervour but this did not mean it was an area full of enthusiastic reformers. Sandys was to face challenges as he found himself an evangelical in what was still a conservatively religious world. His role in the shaping of religion on both on a national and local level was to be questioned, and it is in Worcester that we first begin to see his frustrations at his lack of agency and authority despite his high ecclesiastical office. Those traits, which would later be seen by Collinson as evidence of Sandys' irascible personality and accusative nature, began to show themselves in his role as Bishop of Worcester.³ Between 1560 and 1570 we can see many of the key religious and secular debates of the era directly impacting on Sandys' life, including the struggle to gain a settlement that was suitably and fully reformed, yet solid enough to withstand threats from both internal and external pressures. It is in this period we can see Sandys' keenness to defend married clergy, his emphasis on family and his desire to stand against Catholicism and its advocates. Seven of Sandys' nine children

were born during his tenure in Worcester and thus it is unsurprising that the material needs of a large family were pressing and had a role to play in dictating his concerns during the 1560s and 1570s.

The first ten years of Elizabeth's reign were to establish England as a Protestant nation, but were also to see continued wrangling over the nature of the religious settlement. International politics were to play a role in shaping the stance taken on religion by the Queen and her ministers. Even in Worcestershire Sandys was not entirely isolated from international debates. He continued to correspond with his former hosts on the continent writing to Peter Martyr, though with less frequency than some of the other returned exiles. Alongside issues of religious reform Parliament persistently questioned when the new Queen would marry. They received no definite answer to their question and the issue of marriage was also to trouble the clerics of the new regime as they also received no confirmation of their legitimacy as married men. This was to particularly trouble Sandys who was newly married to Cecily Wilford and who became a father again in 1560. His second marriage was to be fecund and alongside his concerns as a reformer, he faced the problems of heading a large family. He and his wife had seven children during the years 1560–70 during their residency in Worcestershire. Providing a secure future for them was Sandys' duty as a father and he devoted a great deal of effort to the task.

In terms of developing the national evangelical agenda Sandys had a role to play, even distanced as he was from the centre of political life in his Worcester base. He was to find himself in demand at court to give sermons and was involved in translating significant religious texts such as the Bishop's Bible. He was a well-regarded preacher and a man of significance in the new Church. In contrast, in Worcestershire he was embroiled in conflict. Sandys once again had to fight for the supremacy of his Protestant faith. The key protagonists in this new conflict were Catholics and in particular one local Worcester gentleman, an ardent Catholic named Sir John Bourne. This man was to prove a vocal adversary and Sandys' beliefs combined with his personality ensured that he could not tolerate any dissent from his religious truth or questioning of his authority. Sandys remained essentially an Edwardian Protestant, though coloured with the eyes of one who had spent time in Strasbourg and Zurich. This did not always sit easily in the early Elizabethan period for as well as facing opposition from those still loyal to the Catholic faith he was also to begin to see the seeds of opposition from within the reformed confession. There were a variety of interpretations within the evangelical groupings and they all vied for supremacy.

The sources that shed light on Sandys' time in Worcester are predominantly letters and local administrative records from the diocese and county. Letters between Sandys and his religious mentors on the continent continued, but Martyr's death in 1562 removed one important

guiding force from Sandys' life. He continued to correspond with Heinrich Bullinger and Rudolph Gualter, discussing his concerns about the nature of the church and his anxiety about the financial fortunes of the English clergy. Increasingly letters going to and received from William Cecil, Lord Burghley, dominate the extant materials. The focus of the correspondence, as would be expected, is on national religious issues and local diocesan concerns, which are also reflected in surviving court proceedings. Surviving material from the Diocese of Worcester is limited, but other local records combined with the personal correspondence of Sandys allow us to see some of the tensions in the first decade of the Elizabethan settlement. Alec Ryrie has argued that 'Elizabeth had apparently hoped for an inclusive religious settlement, stretching from the more pragmatic Protestant exiles to genuine traditionalists'.⁴ This policy was intended to provide a means of compromise which could incorporate a significant portion of the population, but equally it ensured that the returned exiles were to face a number of battles during the first years of the settlement. Sandys was still an enthused reformer, willing to take up battle against the forces of the antichrist, push forward on the principles of implementing a reformed and educated ministry and as yet still unwilling to see his only role as defending the settlement.

Worcester: Religion, Authority and the City

Sandys was not the first reformer to be sent to Worcestershire and in order to assess how he was received it is important to gain a sense of the area and the religious convictions of its inhabitants. The Diocese of Worcester in the West Midlands formed part of the Province of Canterbury and had traditionally held wealth and prominence. In the early Tudor era a succession of absentee Italian appointees had held the bishopric of Worcester, making it a reward for services rendered, rather than a key diocese in terms of promoting English clerics. Wabuda has argued this said something about 'the special character of the bishopric of Worcester' as it indicated that there was a precedent for placing important men in the office of bishop there, albeit in the later fifteenth century men who rarely visited.⁵ Several livings within the diocese were also held by other absentees and pluralists suggesting a tradition of weak religious authority on a local level.⁶ The county's position close to Herefordshire, Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire gave it a range of trading options and made it strategically important in periods of national conflict. It was close enough to the Welsh borders to find that in the early modern period the Council of the Marches showed some interest in the county, but was not close enough that its history became entwined in border conflicts. The county was largely rural, with the cloth trade and agriculture dominating industry in the county.

From 1535 onwards Worcester was no longer a county where the ecclesiastical leadership was distant and disinterested. The appointment

of Hugh Latimer as Bishop of Worcester made it a focus for evangelical reform. Latimer made significant progress in removing images, crucifixes and other elements objected to by reformers and ejecting at least one non-resident holder of benefices.⁷ He opposed any suggestion that the former Prior of Worcester should have any office in the 'new' church, telling Thomas Cromwell that whilst he rejoiced 'that the King is moved to have pity of that simple man', equally 'there are divers degrees of pity'. Latimer objected to giving the prior 'a competent living and one to wait on him' and instead he suggested '[w]hether, at his great age, to burden him with his office be to pity or trouble him'.⁸ This hard line and lack of compromise was to be reflected by Sandys in his approach to purging papal influence from the county. Both men also targeted images as a way to purge Catholic influence from the diocese, or at least the cathedral. Latimer's process of reform included the stripping of the shrine of Virgin Mary of adornments. This was not iconoclasm in the direct sense of a direct attack upon the Catholic imagery, but rather an attempt to stop the depositing of gifts and offerings to the shrine. It was this act which provoked a less than favourable response from a local man, Thomas Emans, who indicated a continuing loyalty to the statue and the importance of the virgin's image. Latimer wrote to Cromwell dismissing the cult of Our Lady of Worcester as little more than a tourist attraction and as reflective of many of the countrywide cults that needed to be pulled down.⁹ Latimer's radicalism was to lead him into trouble when he preached against the Six Articles in the House of Lords and the result was a forced resignation of his bishopric and the loss of the reforming imperative in the county.¹⁰ Latimer was replaced by John Bell (1539–43) who had worked closely with Latimer's Italian predecessor (Geronimo de' Ghinucci) and who actively disliked Latimer and his appointees.¹¹ Bell was involved in negotiating for Henry's divorce and composing key works such as *The Institution of a Christian Man* (Bishop's Book) but was in Wabuda's assessment a conservative Humanist, rather than an evangelical reformer.¹² Following Bell's resignation Nicholas Heath (1543–51) was appointed to Worcester; Heath was to return again to the office for a short period 1554–5. Under Heath little religious conflict seems to have taken place within the diocese. Heath was religiously conservative and it would seem that any disputes with the city centred on his tendency to be over generous to his own family, which is a complaint that was also later to be levelled against Sandys.¹³ The process of reform was begun again in earnest in the later years of the reign of Edward VI, when John Hooper became Bishop of Worcester in 1552. Hooper too had initially fallen foul of the Six Articles, fleeing to the continent in 1539 and only returning in 1547. On his return he came into dispute with Cranmer and others for his more radical approach to the wearing of clerical dress, with him rejecting the required vestments. The fact that he was of the reformed faith was not pleasing to everyone in Worcester. One of the

bailiffs of the city noted in rather disparaging terms: ‘This year 21 Junii bisshope Hooper came to Worcester with his wiffe and daughter. He had a long beard, and in all his time were noe children confirmed.’¹⁴ Hooper had married Anna de Tscerlas, a Belgium woman, and had two children. The arrival of this bearded married minister was clearly a shock to some as he seemed to contradict all that was expected from a cleric.¹⁵ At the time of taking up the office of Bishop of Worcester Hooper was already bishop of the neighbouring diocese of Gloucester, which was dissolved and made an archdeaconry within the Diocese of Worcester.¹⁶ Hooper brought with him both administrative and clerical reform. His 1551 visitation of Gloucester noted both absenteeism and the tendency of some ‘who shopped around to find the Prayer Book performed in a traditionalist fashion.’¹⁷ Newcombe records that

Hooper brought with him fifty articles of religion, thirty-one injunctions, twenty-seven interrogatories to be asked of the clergy, and sixty-one interrogatories to be asked of the laity. These articles and interrogatories served as the foundation for Hooper’s programme of reform within the diocese and went beyond anything seen before, anywhere in England.¹⁸

His radical stance on many key aspects of theology and practice including rejecting vestments and Lutheran notions of the Eucharist must have come as a shock to many both in Gloucester and Worcester. Examples of resistance from his more conservative clergy and parishioners can be found, but equally there were those committed to godly religion in the diocese that were more than willing to bring old practices to the Bishop’s attention.¹⁹ Hooper’s refusal to recant his beliefs when Mary I took the throne ensured that he became one of the Marian martyrs; his burning took place at in Gloucester in 1555.²⁰ He was succeeded by a restored Nicholas Heath who went on to be elevated to the Archiepiscopal See of York. Richard Pate (1555–9) succeeded as bishop in Worcester but was deprived of the See on Elizabeth’s accession.²¹ Worcester had experienced the full gambit of the changes in religion and thus in 1560 Sandys found a diocese where there were committed Protestants, but equally where the presence of ardent supporters of the old religion were still to be found. Amongst those of the old order were some prominent members of local society including the Yowles and Rowlands/Steynors, who were bailiffs for the city, and also Sir John Bourne who had been one of Queen Mary’s secretaries of state and a supporter of her reign both at court and in his home county.²² It was Sir John Bourne who was to be Sandys’ main adversary in the first few years in Worcester. It is through their disagreements that we can see some of the main religious tensions in the early years of Elizabeth’s reign, but also how these were often played out through a wider range of disputed issues.

The men taking up episcopal office in 1558–9 were to face various challenges, amongst which were their status as married clergy expected to provide for both their families and flocks with more limited means than previous generations of church personnel. Sandys was to find that his attempts to engage with the local lay population were not always successful either. In particular the hostility of Sir John Bourne and his wider kin was to escalate beyond a battle of words into violent clashes between the old world of Catholicism and kin networks and the new Protestant ideology represented by Sandys, his family and the Protestant ministers who came with the new religious settlement.

Implementing Reformed Religion in the Diocese of Worcester²³

Upon his return to England Sandys had been adamant that the gospel would flourish and his attempts to ensure that Worcester was reformed in word and environment are clear. The new regime was to be more rigorous in its searching out of those who failed to comply and Worcester was to receive two visitations coming in close proximity. The first was carried out by the order of the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, who instructed Sandys to make a visitation on his new See. The second was done on Sandys' own wish and apparently 'gave the new archbishop some disgust.'²⁴ This incident also brought into clear view the anxieties that existed in the early years of Elizabeth's reign between groups with differing religious views and even between those, who on the surface, shared common theological beliefs. Records of the visitation are no longer extant which leaves the exact detail of Sandys' actions unclear, but the intent is evident. Sandys wanted to root out non-conformity through this visitation and other means.

Patrick Collinson argued that the English reformation saw a movement from iconoclasm to iconophobia, which progressed from physical attacks on images to a wider perception that images and the material objects of worship were to be feared as dangerous to the godly nation.²⁵ It has already been indicated that the tenure of Latimer and the introduction of evangelical religion, which rejected the material culture of medieval Catholicism, impacted on the physical environment in Worcester Cathedral. Further significant change to the physical fabric of the Cathedral Church in Worcester occurred under Bishop Hooper and the Dean, John Barlow. The annotated Bailiff's Lists recorded that on '12 August [1552] the high alter was taken downe to the grownd. Also all the Quire with the busshopes stall was taken downe to the stalles, and the great payr of organs were taken downe 30 August'.²⁶ These alterations pre-empted national changes indicating the enthusiasm of the Edwardian reformers in Worcester who went as far as removing the church organ. MacCulloch portrayed Worcester as a 'showcase for liturgical change'.²⁷ In

1554 Cardinal Pole brought a pardon for England from this purge and a process of restoration began in the Cathedral.²⁸ The ‘whole quire of the college was removed from the clocke howse unto the highe Altar with closure of carved bordes round about the quire’ and on the north side ‘a payre of organs’ was reinstated.²⁹ The anonymous chronicler also noted that ‘the chappell in the east parte of the colledgee was goodly prepared, first the Alter, with a picture of our lady with her sonne in her armes’. Thus, the Virgin Mary had been reinstated, but the same chronicler found this restoration short-lived noting that things had changed again when ‘Elizabeth succeeded Queen’. By 13 May 1559 priests were compelled to subscribe and the new bishop, Edwin Sandys, began his visitation. The dismantling of church decoration and trappings of Catholicism were central to Sandys’ beliefs. By 17 May it was recorded that ‘the crosse and the image of our Ladie were burnt in the churchyard after none.’³⁰ Whether this was, as Diarmaid MacCulloch speculated, the image of Mary from the rood screen or an image of Our Lady of Worcester who had played an important role in the religious life of medieval Worcester is unknown. Certainly the shrine had previously been the focus of Latimer’s attempt to remove the cult’s significance in Worcester.³¹ In either case it signalled the stance of Sandys in regards to reforming the diocese; he was determined to replace the old ways with the new and turn the attention of his flock away from the trappings of Catholicism and towards the word of the gospels.

The Clergy in Worcester

Sandys targeted both clergy and laity in his programme of reform. In April 1563 Sandys testified to the Privy Council that a local member of the nobility, Sir John Bourne, was the patron of obstinate papists in the county especially two men named Arden and Northfolke [Northforth].³² These were two men that Sandys had deprived of their office for failing to acknowledge the Queen as governor of the Church and their refusal to use the Book of Common Prayer.³³ Sandys’ motivation in depriving these two men of office had been questioned by Sir John Bourne and Sandys wrote to Archbishop Parker, defending his actions, in response to this.

In Northfolk and Arden’s deprivation, truth is, I neither followed affection, nor sought my private gain. I was right sorry that they compelled me to do as they deserved I should do, and their displacing can no way profit me. Only I sought therein the vantage of Christ’s church. They have bragged, but I never thought they should find so much favour at your hands. I know your nature in shewing of humanity, which I never misliked.³⁴

Thomas Arden had held a prebendary at Worcester Cathedral where he was third canon and he was also rector of Hartlebury.³⁵ Sandys settled

at Hartlebury Castle, which was the main residence of the Bishop of Worcester, and which ensured that the parish of Hartlebury was of interest to him. Arden was deprived of both offices as well as his prebendary at Hereford Cathedral in 1560 following Sandys' visitation. William Northfolke was deprived of the office of rector at Hanbury.³⁶ The church of St Mary the Virgin at Hanbury was later to be a centre of reformed ministry as it became the parish church of the Vernon family, which established itself with the arrival of the reformed minister Reverend Richard Vernon in 1580. In 1559 the manor of Hanbury, the advowson and right to appoint were transferred from the Bishop to the crown and thus the changes to the parish represented a shift in both local ownership and authority. In 1560 William Tomlynson was appointed rector and Richard Lyngenis was listed as his patron, with Thomas Woodcocke appointed as curate to the same church in 1561.³⁷ In 1590 the manor was granted to Sir Thomas and Lady Elizabeth Leighton, who were related to the Queen, which saw a transfer of further power and influence away from the church. Arden and Northfolke may have been the deprivations that attracted most attention, but they were not the only clergy deprived of office in 1560, as a total of seven men were removed from nine positions in the diocese. Between 1560 and 1570 twenty men were deprived of their position as vicar or rector and a further eleven resigned.³⁸ Three of those deprived in 1560 were from prebendaries at Worcester Cathedral, the aforementioned Arden but also Thomas Ardrey and Robert Shaw. The Patent Rolls show that Thomas Norley, sub-almoner, was appointed to the sixth prebend in Worcester Cathedral which had been made void by the deprivation of Robert Shawe.³⁹ Norley had played an important role in representing Worcester in the lower house in Parliament as proctor in the reign of Mary I and was educated to MA level whereas Shaw only held a Bachelor's degree.⁴⁰ The change in personnel in Worcester was not wholesale but did see an attempt to replace men whose loyalty was to the old regime with more suitable candidates. Sandys deprived Robert Shelmerdyn in 1560 of the rectory at Morton Bagot and then the rectory of Spennall in 1562. The Shelmerdys were a local family and Robert had been a chantry priest at the chantry of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Aston, Birmingham until 1544 and then at the chantry at St Alphege in the parish of Solihull until 1547.⁴¹ Robert Shelmerdyn therefore represented the old religion, via a connection with both chantries and the Blessed Virgin in a very real sense. Shelmerdyn was replaced at Spennall by Thomas Penford, whose patron was Bishop Sandys. Thus, Sandys was able to put his own men into positions in the county.

The changes in personnel were only one aspect of the new arrangements at parish level in the 1560s. These new men often brought with them wives or married upon taking office. The reception of priests' wives in local communities has often been overlooked but recent work by Anne Thompson and Marjorie Plummer has begun to place

these women back into our picture of the communities of early modern Europe.⁴² The accusation of 'whoredom' was one frequently levied against those women who married priests in Edward VI's reign. These women found themselves in a very difficult position when Mary took the throne, often without a place in society for themselves or their children.⁴³ Yet this was not a phenomenon limited to Edward's reign, there were recorded slanders throughout England in the Elizabethan era, focused upon the married clergyman and even more so his wife. In 1571 a Robert Long of Salcott declared 'that ministers' wives were whores and their children bastards'; in 1592 John Mous 'in the presence of many persons of good credit', declared 'that all priests' wives are whores and their children bastards, and that it is no fame to abuse their bodies for that they are whores'.⁴⁴ This behaviour could be seen as being closely linked to religious proclivities and perhaps therefore it is easy to suppose that this reflected only the views of the minority who still clung to the old religion. Yet married clergy represented a change not just to religion, but to the norms of local society. It was clear that the sight of a clergyman and his wife was an adjustment that many communities struggled with.

In Worcestershire the wives of the clergy received a hostile reception from some quarters. The next incident centres on the response by the Bourne family, who were Catholic, to married clergymen in their dioceses. Edwin Sandys recorded that there was an attack on two ministers' wives in 1563 who were 'honest and sober' and one of whom was a gentlewoman (Mrs Wilson).⁴⁵ The ministers' wives were crossing the River Severn in their own boat when they met with a party from the Bourne household. The Bourne contingent entered the boat and proceeded to verbally and physically attack the women. In the party was Anthony Bourne, the eldest son of Sir John Bourne, who was 'blaspheming and swearing' and who told the women 'nowe you are amongst papistes'.⁴⁶ He insulted the ministry of the women's husbands and the women themselves, calling one a shrew and telling 'Mrs Wilson your husband is a good fellowe ye can want no help if ye doo sende for me'. Sandys attributed Anthony Bourne's behaviour as originating from his father's attitudes towards married clergy, noting that Sir John 'somie use suche talke for he hym self termeth the mynysters wives whores'.⁴⁷ The incident then escalated into physical violence when one of the servants from the Bourne party hit one of the other minister's wives, a Mistress Lyvys, with his buckler. This resulted in the tearing of her coat and a piercing of her skin and as Sandys wrote he 'hurt her and putt them both in great fear'.⁴⁸ Thomas Wilson was vicar of St Peter's and St Paul's at Blockley (1561) and became archdeacon at Worcester Cathedral (1566–1623) and the rector at Hampton (1586). It is likely that the Mrs Wilson in question was his wife as he was a new appointee, and her cousin was one of Sandys' servants, thus indicating a connection and ensuring that knowledge of the incident was

conveyed to him in detail.⁴⁹ This was indirectly an attack on Sandys as the Wilsons were connected to his household.

The ambiguous nature of clerical marriage was a personal concern for Sandys on his return to England in 1559 and this topic was to remain a preoccupation throughout the 1560s. Clerical marriage was permitted under the new settlement, but it did not necessarily appear to have been encouraged by either Elizabeth I, or by some within her government. Ryrie has correctly indicated that she had little choice to permit married clergy, despite her distaste for the practice.⁵⁰ The phrasing of the 1559 Elizabethan injunctions permitting marriage for the English clergy suggested that it had been acceded to somewhat reluctantly; 'although there be no prohibition by the word of God, nor any example of the primitive Church, but that the priests and ministers of the Church may lawfully, for the avoiding of fornication, have an honest and sober wife'.⁵¹ Yet the injunctions also set the proviso that the judgement of the individual priest or deacon in choosing a wife was not enough, and the marriage would not be allowed 'without the advice and allowance first had upon good examination by the bishop of the same diocese, and two justices of the peace of the same shire'.⁵² This vetting of potential brides was also applied to the higher clergy: 'And for the manner of marriages of any bishops, the same shall be allowed and approved by the metropolitan of the province, and also by such commissioners as the queen's majesty shall thereunto appoint'.⁵³ Thus, even bishops had to have their partners approved, with the ultimate decision resting with the monarch. Helen Parish has acknowledged that 'the married minister might prove to be as much of a spur to anticlerical sentiment as the incontinent priest'.⁵⁴ According to Carlson's work on clerical marriage in England neither the English clergy themselves, nor the monarchs determining policy had any enthusiasm for marriage amongst clergymen.⁵⁵ A significant number of the Elizabethan clerical hierarchy were married men, including Matthew Parker, Toby Matthew and Edwin Sandys.⁵⁶ Nancy Bjorklund has shown that the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, was a defender of clerical marriage and supported it as a happily married man.⁵⁷ Sandys had married his second wife, Cicely Wilford, in February 1559, a few months after his return to England. He had expressed concerns as to his status as a married clergyman, and more particularly that of the potential offspring of his marriage, soon after his return to England. He wrote to Parker in late April 1559 complaining about the Queen's refusal to officially approve marriage for the new ecclesiastical personnel. His comments that 'The Queen's Majesty will wink at it but not stablish it by law, which is nothing else but to bastard our children' reflected the anxieties felt by many of the married clergy. This ambiguity regarding their status as married men placed the legitimacy of their wives and families in doubt.⁵⁸ He even preached before the Queen that '[m]arriage is honourable in the sight of all men; but fornication and adultery the Lord

doth abhor, and the offenders therein the Lord shall judge.⁵⁹ Sandys was keen to defend his status, both as a godly man and a married man, and extended this defence to those within his diocese. Sandys believed marriage was a valuable institution for church and state. He saw God as ‘the author of marriage’, and advocated this stance in a sermon delivered in Strasbourg, which was selected as one of his published sermons in 1585.⁶⁰ The sermon took as its starting point Hebrew 13: 6 advocating that ‘Marriage is honourable in all’.⁶¹ Sandys’ sermon took up many recognisable themes, drawing upon biblical texts that advocated marriage as providing ‘mutual society, help and comfort’, legitimising procreation and as a remedy for uncleanness and fornication.⁶² Sandys was keen to use the sermon as a tool to reinforce both social and religious values, advocating traditional hierarchies within marriage, with a wife obeying her husband ‘because a man is head of the wife, as Christ is head of the Church’.⁶³ Within his published sermons he mentioned marriage, and in particular the importance of marriage for the clergy several times. He outlined the debate on married clergy, in terms of whether marriage could and should be regulated by law and whether by secular or ecclesiastical rule.

Again, there were that approved wedlock, yea, though it were iterated; but if priests did marry, they held them no better than unclean persons. Finally, there are they that say, marriage is, if not honourable, yet tolerable, and that in priests; but so, if they enter into the priesthood being once married, not into marriage being once priested. Against these, howsoever in their sole and single life they pretend great purity and perfection, as it were of angels (although their glory most commonly hath been whoredom and), it sufficeth us that St Paul doth term their lessons ‘the doctrine of devils;’

He condemned popery for forbidding clergy to marry ‘under colour of severing them from the world, but indeed to ease them of such cares and troubles as are necessarily joined with that honourable estate which God commendeth’ arguing that it resulted in congress ‘both secretly with concubines, and openly in stews, permitting them fornication’.⁶⁴ Marjorie Plummer’s work on clerical marriage has shown that

[a]mbiguous, vacillating, and contradictory official policies on the legal status of clerical marriage affected the actions of clergy and how married clergy and their families were treated, but so too did residual moral norms, individual religious belief, and social expectations.⁶⁵

Sandys felt that marriage and especially clerical marriage was an issue that required vocal public advocacy and the opportunity to sermonise on the topic arose as part of his purge of corruption from his diocese.

Strype recorded that Sandys had discovered five of six priests in the city keeping whores and this 'was so notoriously scandalous that the said Bishop in a sermon at the Cathedral a few days after spake of it. And also took occasion thence to shew how necessary it was to allow priest to marry.'⁶⁶ We do not have the text of this Worcester sermon, but amongst his published sermons is the assertion that '[t]he devil, that hath ever hated wedlock, and loveth whoredom, was the first author of this great disorder.'⁶⁷ The Worcester sermon appears to have acted as a trigger for further local disputes and saw Sandys and Bourne giving testimony to the Privy Council on the issue of clerical marriage as integral to the key points of dispute. Sandys stated that Bourne 'favoured not priestes mariages', that he 'mysliketh all priestes wives and dare call them howers' and that he regularly brought the topic of Sandys' wife into the conversations 'to speake ill of her if he coulde'.⁶⁸ Sandys' account to the Privy Council in April 1563 also indicated that it was indeed the sermon he had given in Worcester that had been the most recent source of tension; he stated that it was the fact that he had preached on the subject of marriage that had aggrieved Bourne.⁶⁹ The sermon, Sandys noted, elucidated on the evils of children marrying without their parents' consent which he argued Bourne should have no complaint about given that this point was supported by 'many of the scriptures and authorities.' Sandys' testimony also stated that Bourne had charged him with making the status of virginity equal to that of marriage in his sermon, which Sandys argued he never did.⁷⁰ Bourne's account to the Council went into much greater detail on the points of dispute between the two men. Bourne stated that Sandys' sermon asserted that: 'Betwixt matrimony and the virginall state, there was no impartie, but the virtue and dignitie of bothe was equall, and equally esteemed in the sight of god, Indede he praised both estates well' and further that

yf I wold beleve hym, I could not finde three good virgins since Chrites tyme, leving the matter with out exerctaton to all men to marry, marry/And for proof that single ^ living ^ men that is to saie unmarried men, and special unmarried priests.⁷¹

Thus, although Bourne's objections were at first about the theological points regarding the comparative status of marriage versus virginity, they soon related back to Sandys' enthusiasm for promoting the marriage of the clergy. Although this stance was shared by other members of the laity, it also reflected the fact that Bourne and Sandys stood on opposite sides of the confessional divide. Bourne shared many views with his former mistress, Mary I, whose royal articles stated that a married priest was polluted and 'his sacraments consequently also polluted, although not necessarily invalid'.⁷² Whilst both of Sandys' sermons on marriage (Strasbourg and Worcester) drew upon quite traditional defences of the

married state they also tied in reformed ideas which advocated that the prevention of clerical marriage was in itself an evil act. ‘The association of clerical celibacy with the doctrine of devils combined in evangelical literature to create an image of the papal antichrist, feigning holiness but corrupting the church’.⁷³ Thus, Sandys wanted to evidence Bourne’s rejection of both of the social and religious opinions put forward in this sermon. Bourne’s objections to Sandys’s assertion that it was important for children to marry only with the permission of their parents was surprising coming from a member of the English gentry. Combined with a rejection of clerical marriage this merely acted as further evidence to illustrate that Bourne was maintaining not just the practices of old Catholicism and thus defending corrupting papal ideas, but also that he was rejecting the importance of an ordered regulated society. Just as a family needed parental, and especially patriarchal, authority if it were to avoid chaos and degeneration, so too did society need godly regulation and guidance from the religious fathers of the Church. In Sandys’ eyes both the head of the family and the head of the Church in Worcester should be appropriately married men, whose authority should be noted and respected. It would appear that Bourne fitted the stereotype of an intransigent Catholic to perfection, a man who was a threat to the good order of the realm and to the souls of the nation.

Conflict with Papists

Alexandra Walsham has argued that the ideas of toleration and intolerance were closely interwoven in early modern society and that attempts to eradicate minority religions were ‘moderated and alleviated by the deep-seated instinct for peace and control that shaped the texture of life in the multiple local communities’ of the nation.⁷⁴ Edwin Sandys showed some of these subtleties in that he feigned friendly overtures towards Sir John Bourne, yet the conflict that arose between the two men was to be expected, for they held little in common in terms of confessional identity. The complaints Sandys made to the Privy Council against Sir John Bourne were often not directly in relation to his religion, but it was their religious differences that underpinned all of their conflicts. On his first visitation of Worcester Sandys had ordered a physical purge of the material elements of the old religion, which included orders for the removal of an altar stone from Bourne’s parish church. Sir John’s men had removed the stone but not broken it up as ordered by Sandys to ensure it could not be later restored. Sandys argued that they had taken the stone to Sir John’s house and the church wardens were willing to affirm this. Sir John countered saying that they had complied with the orders and removed the stone but had not broken it as it needed to be reused as pavement.⁷⁵ Sandys’ hard-line stance on decorative elements of the Church alongside his attacks on physical symbols of Catholic practice such as an altar stone

reflected the views of many of the returned exiles who wished to purge the Church of corrupting popery. Fincham and Tyacke acknowledge that 'in the post-Marian context of mid-1559 Elizabeth apparently intended originally that the restored altars should remain.'⁷⁶ For Sandys the conversion of his diocese was predicated by a need to remove any hindrances to that process and Sir John's status in the county meant that his failure to conform was of particular significance. For 'In reasoning against true religion & in scolding of the ministers in the notable hindrance to the gospel for the simple have some opinion of his learning & hange more upon him.'⁷⁷ The resistance to religious reform that was to be found amongst some gentry families was of great significance in maintaining Catholicism throughout the Elizabethan era. Sandys realised that reforming the diocese meant it was necessary to either convert or remove the Catholic ringleaders.

The tense relationship between Sandys and Bourne was intensified by their points of interaction, which were often instigated by the Bishop. Sandys himself recorded that his motivation in inviting Bourne to his house and entertaining him so fondly was 'to wynne his favour and confirme me his oppynyon in Religion.'⁷⁸ Given the two men were clearly not friends Sandys' choice to do this appears to have been motivated by a desire to entrap Bourne into an open confession of opposition, combined with the opportunity to persuade Bourne as to the error of his devotion to Catholicism. Underpinning this was a compelling need to offer hospitality and win over the local leadership of the county. A surface reading of the accounts provided by Sandys implied that he had set about an attempt to convert Bourne through means of conversation and persuasion. Both men testified that Bourne had frequently been invited to dine with Sandys. Bourne claimed that circumstances had prevented him coming to Sandys' home 'oftener'. It was through this extension of invitations to dine that the very act of offering hospitality became a point of dispute, but more significantly it reflected Sandys' approach. Whether Sandys truly held hope of converting Bourne is debatable, although they do seem to have discussed a range of theological points, with Sandys noting that they had discussed transubstantiation and Martyr's book.⁷⁹ Sandys indicated that Bourne had said he intended to convert, but without any real indication that this was his true intent. The engagement with Bourne in this way allowed Sandys to prove both Bourne's religious disobedience and his lack of civil behaviour.

In offering hospitality to Bourne Sandys was fulfilling the duty of a cleric of his stature by engaging in 'a Christian practice sanctioned and enjoined by the Scriptures on all godly men.'⁸⁰ It also afforded Sandys the opportunity for conversation with Bourne, where he could employ his skills as a theologian and convert his guest to godly religion. Equally, if we accept the idea that there were, what Heal has termed, 'laws of hospitality' where acts of benefice accrued honour, whilst acts of avarice

were shameful, then persistently refusing offered hospitality also conveyed a distinct social message.⁸¹ To reject hospitality once offered could either imply that the offerings or company was below the standards of the invitees; that this was unwelcome charity; or that the host was simply not a source of good entertainment.⁸² Bourne's refusal to attend one these invitations led Sandys to further complain that he had been insulted. Sandys had invited Bourne at Christmas, but Bourne had refused the invitation and had instead 'made his abode' with his own brother-in-law, who was reported to spend more on the Christmas festivities. Sandys asserted that 'I trust my house keeping wilbe better reported then his'.⁸³ Keeping a good table was important to Sandys and he wanted to assure the Privy Council (and perhaps his patrons on it) that he could not be accused of poor housekeeping or a lack of hospitality. As Heal points out, '[c]lerics in general, and bishops in particular, now had to justify their wealth by the quality of their pastoral care and by a standard of behaviour far higher than that of their predecessors.'⁸⁴ Sandys was later to give a sermon at St Paul's Cross that again advocated that it was the duty of a Christian to 'be habourous to one another without grudging' for the 'fruit of love is hospitality.'⁸⁵ Sandys had been the recipient of much hospitality as an exile and thus he advocated that hospitality to strangers was especially to be recommended especially those who are 'of the household of faith' and 'driven out of their country.'⁸⁶

Bourne did not decline all of Sandys' invitations, but his attendance at Sandys' house caused no less offence than the refusals. Sir John may have felt uncomfortable, but also took the opportunity to further enrage his host. Sandys noted that whilst dining with him Bourne had raised a glass in toast to Sandys' wife Cecily. This provided further insult as Sandys noted that Bourne had called her 'lady', which he argued 'is not her name and nether ever was so called before or synce and he did it to mock her.'⁸⁷ On the surface the extension of this title to Cecily could be seen as an exaggerated courtesy, but in choosing a form of address that was too polite Sandys interpreted it as a form of irony, implying that both he and his wife were of lesser status than Bourne.⁸⁸ In response Bourne claimed to be mystified by Sandys' reaction. His defence, put before the Council, included the admission that the truth was he

frequented his table, to win his favour and good reporte, myndyng to behave towards hyme and his, as becamed me, frendly and honestly/my coming was ofner then twice to his table, and should have ben oftener, but that he seemed to mislike me for drinking to his wife.⁸⁹

Forms of address were of great significance in the sixteenth century and the social position of a bishop's wife may well have constituted unknown social ground in terms of appropriate terms of address and

social etiquette.⁹⁰ Bourne's defence, that this was an entirely appropriate form of address, may well have held had it not been for other comments that he made about Sandys' wife. He continued that Cecily was 'faier well nurtured, sober and demure, so farr as I have sene.'⁹¹ The wives of the Edwardian and Elizabethan clergy were often insulted via the use of sexual language which implied their wantonness.⁹² Bourne made two comments that had this implication; firstly in relation to his belief that Sandys' was misusing church property to provide a nursery for his children, 'His wife being thus fruitful' and secondly again in relation to Sandys' provision for his children as Bourne again noted that 'his [Sandys] wiyfe beinge of good fecundytye and a very fruitful woman.'⁹³ Bourne's support of Catholic clerics and holding Mass in his house was in direct contrast with Sandys' status as a reformed cleric, who was a married man and a father. Ingram, Gowing and Foyster have all emphasised that both women and their husbands were keen to safeguard their reputations against anything that would make them a target for gossip and damage their sexual reputation.⁹⁴ Cecily's views are entirely absent here, but if the 'neo-monastic burgher ideal' of a pastor's wife is accepted then her complete absence from view should not be surprising, as she was in her proper place of 'retirement into the household' and in submission to her husband's views.⁹⁵ It was her husband who felt insulted and felt compelled to defend his wife's reputation and honour, but perhaps even more importantly to correct the slur on him implied by the insult to his wife.⁹⁶ The stance of the married clergy in respect to sexual reputation and honour was still something of a grey area but Sandys' reported statements regarding the position of virginity in comparison to the status of marriage was clearly attempting to readjust the listener's mindset so that the 'true Christian' could be both pious and sexually active and so the marital bed could become 'the new locus of chastity'.⁹⁷

The response of the Council to these complaints went to the heart of what they saw as the key issue, Bourne's attitude towards Sandys' wife. Unsurprisingly it was not the implied insult to any one individual that concerned them but rather that

he bring the question and disputeth against the marriage of mynisters which is a thinge allowed both by godes laws and the Quenes, he contennynge both dare before so honourable a counsel, if dinge it in so highe a place, he may escape unpunished, bothe he and others will take courage thereby to disquiet all married mynisters abrode in the Realme.⁹⁸

Thus, it was a questioning of hierarchy and authority that was at the centre of the dispute. In allowing one person to dispute the marriage of priests and ministers this could open the floodgate to others questioning both the practice of clerical marriage and the Queen's toleration of it.

The issue of authority was also raised through this dispute in other ways as Bourne questioned not just Sandys' marriage, but his authority and standing in terms of his birth and his departure from England in Mary's reign. Christopher Haigh makes the point that 'Many slights and attacks arose from the ambiguity of the minister's position, and the difficulty of fitting him and his family into the hierarchy of parish and county.'⁹⁹ As bishop Sandys may have expected his position to be more firmly entrenched in the social hierarchy, but this ambiguity also left the way open for Bourne to raise this as another issue and he accused Sandys of taking up a coat of arms that was not rightfully his to use.¹⁰⁰ Sandys informed the Privy Council that Bourne had reported that he was 'neither gentleman nor honest man'.¹⁰¹ This insult to Sandys' standing was another attack on his position in the county and Sandys asserted that he had only the coat of arms which the herald had sent him, which he noted was included so the Council could see his descent.¹⁰² This showed him to be descended from the Sandes of Saint Bees, Cumberland. In the notes of the Privy Council on the slanders made by Sir John Bourne they concluded that 'It is a great fault in a bishoppe to be presumptuous, proude and vayne (Touchinge him therwith it being untrue) it is a great slander.'¹⁰³ Thus, Bourne's crime was all the greater for falsely accusing Sandys, in his office as a bishop, of such misplaced pride, yet this was surely also a warning to bishops about what would and would not be tolerated.

Sandys also defended himself against the accusation made by Bourne that he was never imprisoned in the Tower of London, but rather was held in the Marshalsea for treason and further that he unlawfully left England in Mary's reign.¹⁰⁴ Sandys was very keen to make it clear to the Council that he had been detained 'for the matter objected against me . . . for words uttered in my sermon at Cambridge', which were not covered by any law of treason. Moreover, he emphasised that this was an example of his obedience as he was acting on the orders of the Duke of Northumberland and the masters of the Colleges. He attested to the names of his gaolers in the Tower and the Marshalsea and cited the names of those who signed his release including Queen Mary, the Bishop of Winchester and the Earl of Pembroke.¹⁰⁵ Sandys was keen to show his loyalty to Elizabeth attesting that he prayed for her as was his duty; that he was not guilty of treason against any monarch but equally that he had remained true to his faith and never recanted or received a pardon. Opposing authority was dangerous in any context, but opposing papist religion was necessary for a godly man and thus defending his actions in the Marian era involved treading a fine line. Equally the Privy Council was wary of accusations such as those made by Bourne. Opposition to royal authority could not be tolerated but equally many of those who had opposed Mary's regime were now in power. Bourne and those of his ilk were a spent force, their opposition was lacking in power and was focused on petty matters, but yet it still needed to be quashed.

The complicity of the hierarchy of the county of Worcester in tolerating Catholic disorder and disobedience was also raised via a series of disputes between the Sandys and Bourne families. The first dispute featured one of Sandys' servants, who was a 'cosin' of the Mrs Wilson who was verbally attacked whilst crossing the River Severn, who met with one of Bourne's servants (Jones) and a fight ensued. Sandys' man called Jones 'a knave' who had 'used a gentlewoman and a friend of myne'.¹⁰⁶ At this point both men drew their swords and Sandys' unnamed servant 'smote [Jones'] sword out of his hande at the first blowe' but 'bade hym take it upp agayne' saying 'I might kill them if I woulde but fight'.¹⁰⁷ At this point Sandys' brother (presumably Myles Sandys although he was not named) entered the story and intervened to end the 'braye'.¹⁰⁸ A further encounter between John Bourne and Myles Sandys illustrated the continuing hostility. Bishop Sandys noted that Sir John Bourne was very keen to ensure that his status was properly recognised in public places by the visible signal of men removing their caps. Sandys admitted that his brother, upon meeting Sir John, 'forgot to putt of his capp, whereupon Sir John Bourne called him a knave'. Bourne then sent for his serving man who appeared behind Sandys' brother and told him he was 'in great danger of death'.¹⁰⁹ Sandys noted that he disapproved of his brother's behaviour and his 'uncomelie wourdes used to a knight'.¹¹⁰ These displays of male bravado continued and Anthony Bourne (Sir John's son) was noted as having 'sent his sworde to the rutlers to make it sharpe and came sone after hym selfe' with another three or four men to the gates of the bishop's palace and called out 'where be the Busshops boyes, tell them yt Anthony Bourne is come'.¹¹¹ Sandys' men then responded by coming out with weapons and it required the bailiff to break up the affray. Foyster has argued that honour was important to men in terms of power and status in the early modern period and moreover '[w]ithin a culture which associated manhood with physical strength, being able to defend one's honour with one's fists was important'.¹¹² In Bourne's answer to the Council it was clear that taunts, levelled at the Bishop's relations and servants, escalated the incident. Bourne added in the information that 'they challenged his [the bishop's] said brother and servants bidding them come for the yf they were men, as they were boies through with arrogant behaviour'.¹¹³

Sandys' account noted that he was away at his Consistory Court at the time of the incident. He only found out about the events on his return home when he had to question his porter regarding the absence of his men.¹¹⁴ The Bishop clearly wanted to emphasise to the Privy Council that he had no enmity towards the Bourne family, and was in fact trying to show his lack of rancour in all his actions. His story went to great lengths to try to illustrate his propensity to 'turn the other cheek, even though he had been provoked showing his self-imagined role as peacemaker. On discovering what had happened Sandys' account tells us that

he proceeded to the courthouse where all the parties were assembled. Sandys reported that he had asked the bailiff to punish his men most extremely if they had transgressed but that he should use his discretion with Mr Bourne. He also argued that he left it to the bailiff to determine what punishments were imposed.¹¹⁵ Given that he had no authority to determine punishments in matters of common affray his interference at all in the matter suggested he was not in fact content to let the law take its course unhindered. Whilst Sandys certainly viewed himself as having the role of arbiter and peacemaker as part of his office of bishop of the diocese it is in fact more likely that he was concerned about the willingness of the bailiffs in Worcester to take action at all against Bourne. Amongst the men who were bailiffs of the city were Robert Jowle and his son-in-law John Rowland, alias John Steynor, both of whom seem to have been conservative in religion.¹¹⁶ Jowle was bailiff in 1559 and was described as 'a joly Catholik' by John Davies, one of Worcester's early Protestants.¹¹⁷

Bourne's account of the event suggested that the matter had been dealt with within the city and that justice had therefore been done, but that Sandys had chosen to escalate the matter further by riding to Ludlow to inform the Council of the Marches of the events. Penry William's study of the Council of the Welsh Marches acknowledged that the 'Privy Council dealt with every judicial body in Wales' and thus in bringing the incident to the attention of the local council it was also bringing the conflict to the attention of the Privy Council.¹¹⁸ In Bourne's account this was transgressing the unwritten rules of the local society in dealing with misconduct and was driven by 'hear and malice'.¹¹⁹

Alerting the Council to the events also further illustrated who now held power in the region. The fact that Worcester fell under the jurisdictional authority of the Council in the Welsh Marches was not a new occurrence, as the Council had grown up under Edward IV and had been utilised by successive Tudor monarchs in an effort to control what was generally perceived as a lawless collection of gentry.¹²⁰ By the Elizabethan era it was part of the more centralised system of government instituted by Henry VIII and Cromwell and exercised 'conciliar jurisdiction' over the shire of Wales as well as Monmouth, Hereford, Worcester, Shropshire and Gloucester.¹²¹ Sir Henry Sidney had been appointed president of the Council in 1560, largely due to his connections with the Dudley family.¹²² Collinson believed that Sandys too owed his preferment to the bishopric of Worcester to the Earl of Leicester suggesting that the Dudley family had a keen interest in the area which they were willing to actively pursue and patronise. Robert Dudley was both a prominent patron at court and had wider concerns to build and maintain control of the areas around the Welsh border. The President of the Council 'was as much a political as a judicial figure. He had to deal with a clutch of regional magnates and greater gentry, whose preponderance in the localities echoed something of the traditions of a more unruly age.'¹²³ The concept of a

civil society was not necessarily accepted by all and certainly examples of more physical ways of resolving conflicts were to be found in early modern culture. The previous president had been Gilbert Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells and nephew of Sir John Bourne. Bishop Bourne had been appointed in 1558 to the presidency but was deprived of both this and his episcopal office following his refusal to take the oath of supremacy.¹²⁴ Sir John therefore had only recently lost his highly placed connections on the Council of the Marches, and seen his relative deprived for his religious beliefs. To find his son called before them must have been a clear illustration to him of just how far he, and his kin, had fallen under the new regime change. L.M. Hill attributed much of Bourne's behaviour to just this feeling of loss, in what is termed 'the experience of defeat'.¹²⁵ Whilst Bourne was reacting badly to the changes that were taking place, it should be remembered that in 1563 it was still not really clear that this was a defeat for Catholicism. If the precedent of the two previous reigns was to be followed then there must have been hope that this was just another short-lived change and that traditional order and hierarchies would soon be restored. It should also be noted that Bourne had withdrawn from court life in 1558, prior to Mary's death, and returned to his life as a country gentleman. Thus, he had already removed himself from the high politics of the reign, so much so that Hill admits he was of little consequence to the new regime.¹²⁶ Indeed whilst Sandys' episcopacy had impacted on his local position, again there was little to indicate in 1563 that this would not simply be a temporary inconvenience, rather than a step change in local society. The Sandys-Bourne dispute in Worcester is important in illustrating that the points of contention and struggles for power between the old and the new regimes were not simply played out in church. Whilst Bourne's acts could be dismissed as simply the desperate actions of a defeated Catholic, equally they illustrate a fight for control of the county. Sandys was brought into what appeared to be localised outbreaks of violence, but which were driven by the shifts in the religious power structures of the diocese and the nation.

Land and Property: The Acts of Exchange

If the new Elizabethan Church was to be set on strong foundations then the reality was that it needed financial as well as spiritual strength to support it. Yet Elizabeth was wary of giving any institution or individual undue influence, based upon economic strength or patronage, right from the start of her reign. The Act of Exchange was one of the more controversial pieces of legislation implemented at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. It permitted the crown to exchange lands from vacant episcopal sees. Heal suggests that Cecil had not envisaged that this act would bring about drastic change in terms of disbursing the wealth of the bishops, yet it posed a theoretical and sometimes very real threat to the finances

of the Church.¹²⁷ It is clear that the prospect of losing episcopal lands, enhanced by the understandable fears and anxieties of many Protestants in the early months of Elizabeth's reign, did create a situation of unease as the new Church was established. Letters to and from the returned English exiles to their colleagues still on the continent expressed the concerns regarding the new Church, though specific mentions of the financial underpinnings of clerical office are infrequent, with a focus on establishing sound theological foundations.¹²⁸ Brett Usher attributes the reluctance of some of the returned exiles to take up offices to this period of uncertainty, as they were unwilling to commit to a diocese whose wealth and income was unclear.¹²⁹ Financial security was to be at the heart of many of Sandys' actions as Bishop and then Archbishop. He was aware of what difficulties financial impoverishment could bring and was unwilling to spend any more time in hardship, which is unsurprising given that throughout his exile he had often been reliant on the goodwill and charity of his hosts. Brett Usher believed that Sandys' prime motivation in turning down his home diocese of Carlisle was 'no doubt' due to the 'question of episcopal finances.'¹³⁰ This may well have been a motivating factor, but its distance from London and problematic position along the Scots border were equally if not more compelling reasons to refuse Carlisle. In addition the Diocese of Worcester was added to the initial five sees targeted for exchange alongside Canterbury, Ely, London, Hereford and Chichester, so was financially no more secure than Carlisle. As it happened Worcester was only compelled to grant away five manors rather than the more extensive lands first proposed, so Sandys' new diocese was financially sound.¹³¹

According to Sir John Bourne the lands that Sandys received upon entering his See were generous. Bourne stated that the lands and tenements delivered to Sandys by Queen Elizabeth to maintain him and his successors were of the value of £1000 per year.¹³² This included the bishop's palace at Hartlebury Castle (eight miles from Worcester), the manors of Grimley [Grymley] and Halesowen [Hallsowen] (three miles from Worcester) and Northwyke (two miles from Worcester).¹³³ Bourne complained that Sandys was misusing these buildings, which were not in the personal ownership of the Bishop but rather in use by him via the privileges of the office. Sandys had made full use of them, changing and adapting some of the properties to suit his needs, which include housing his family. At Grimley, which was a relatively new build brick and timber structure put up in 1512, Sandys built a wash house. Bourne was clearly incredulous that this was deemed 'necessarye for his wyffes landerye', whereas the previous unmarried Bishop Heath had used it for his householders.¹³⁴ Bourne was equally incensed by Sandys' demolition of the half-timber house at Northwick which had only dated from Henry VII's reign, stating that Sandys had sold the building materials from the Hall there to his friend's profit. The intrusion of family life had also infected

the Bishop's palace where 'a pretye building he calleth his nursarie' had been established where a 'fayre longe vaulted chappell of stone' had been pulled down.¹³⁵ Thus, the complaints once again related to the changing needs of the married clergy, as Mrs Sandys had produced three children by 1563. The Bishop and Mrs Sandys were thus establishing family residences rather than the traditional episcopal lodgings.

How a married bishop was to incorporate his wife into his life was largely uncharted territory. John Bourne brought to the attention of the authorities the fact that Sandys and his wife were living together in the cathedral palace at Hartlebury and clearly expected that Sandys should receive some kind of censure. The Queen had declared in 1561, via a proclamation, that the cathedral churches and colleges of the realm had been built for 'learned men' and that therefore the presence of wives there was 'no small offence' to orderly professional study and learning.¹³⁶ Therefore she had ordered that no married clergy were to live with their wives within the colleges or Cathedral precincts. Strype recorded that William Cecil knew that Matthew Parker was greatly displeased by this but that he had warned that the Queen had come very close to forbidding married clergy altogether.¹³⁷ The bishop's palace was exempt from the proclamation, as they were not living within the college or Cathedral precincts and it was Bourne who was to be punished for his complaints and the actions taken against the Bishop.

In terms of personal property and finance Sandys had little to offer in 1559 and he complained that his property and goods from his time at Cambridge had been seized on his arrest and not returned.¹³⁸ Once established in Worcester Sandys also began a process of securing his family's future in a variety of ways, some of which were highlighted by Bourne as dubious. According to Bourne this included leasing a parsonage for his child, in his brother's name, which came with a benefice, mansion and demesne which was capable of providing 'great hospitality'.¹³⁹ Bourne noted the lease was for ninety-nine years which was a long time in a period where there was an increasing move towards shorter leases that were of greater profit to the landowner. Bourne also indicated that Sandys was trying to reissue leases to give more favourable terms to the Church. In Bourne's statements this meant that copyholders were being pressed against allowing their children or friends to take up their tenancies in favour of the townsmen of Worcester and other strangers who were granted the leases by Sandys instead.¹⁴⁰ This redistribution of landed power was favouring Sandys, his family and friends and was detrimental to those who adhered to older loyalties. Sandys had leased the parsonage of Wharton in Lancashire to his children which had been in the possession of the dean and chapter.¹⁴¹ The nepotism of these actions was clear as was the obviously impractical nature of these leases in terms of how the parishes in question would be served. Sandy's eldest child was only three in 1563 and therefore it was clear that they would be in

no position to take up these properties or oversee the happenings in any of the parishes for some time.¹⁴² This move was a financial investment in the child's future rather than an investment in the spiritual wellbeing of the local populace. The prospect that married clergy would pursue the interests of their wives and children and hoard wealth was one that William Cecil, amongst others, feared as a problem that could leave clergy 'despised rather than revered and beloved'.¹⁴³ In Sandys' case this was a real possibility as he was not willing to leave the financial security of his family to chance and ultimately this would damage his reputation and standing. Yet as a bishop he was expected to live a life comparable with a wealthy member of Elizabethan society and provide suitable largess and hospitality.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, as a father and husband he had a duty to provide for his family. How to deliver on all aspects and fulfil all expectations, presented a difficult balancing act.

The Writing of Protestant Theology: The Bishop's Bible

Anxieties about the reception of reformed religion came from both the secular and the ecclesiastical leadership. Within this lay the unease of clerics about how much control and influence they really had over the new Elizabethan Church. There was, if not open conflict, at least unease between differing groups within the reformed clergy themselves. This was represented by the sometimes uncomfortable correspondence between Archbishop Parker and Bishop Sandys which seem to reflect Parker's dismay at Sandys' bullish attitude and approach.¹⁴⁵ Yet many of the ecclesiastical hierarchy shared a common belief in the importance of access to the scriptures for the masses. Given this it is unsurprising that they recognised the need to have an accessible and correct version of the Bible which would convey the right interpretation of scriptural texts. Given that Elizabethan evangelicals were keen to bring their version of reformed religion to the fore Matthew Parker set about a project to establish an approved version of the Bible, which was envisaged would provide 'a fair and accurate English translation'.¹⁴⁶ The Great Bible of 1539 and the Genevan Bible were the versions that were dominant in England, with the latter text having too many associations with John Knox for it to be truly acceptable. The task of translating the new Bible, to be known as the Bishop's Bible, was allocated between the learned men of the nation.

Strype tells us these divines cheerfully undertook the task allocated to them by Archbishop Parker. Edwin Sandys was genuinely enthusiastic about the project, as he asserted that the current version was too close to that of Munster, 'who was very negligent, and mistook sometimes the Hebrew'.¹⁴⁷ The debate of who translated what section of the Bible appeared to have been in flux even as the project got underway with Parker's letter to Cecil indicating who had been allocated what task differing slightly from the allocation of initials appearing in the

printed volumes.¹⁴⁸ In addition to translating the text Parker instructed the men to

add some short marginal notes, for the illustration or correction of the text. And all these portions of the Bible being finished, and sent back to the Archbishop, he was to add the last hand to them, and so to take care for printing and publishing the whole.¹⁴⁹

Parker has been criticised by historians including Lewis for starting this mammoth project, but then failing to correctly oversee the editing, which left inconsistencies in the text.¹⁵⁰ Yet Parker was sufficiently committed to the project and aware of the nature of text he wanted to see produced to ensure that apposite sections were allocated to ministers whose language skills were appropriate to the task. The new version of the text was to build on Cranmer's publication, but the Elizabethan edition needed to provide the correct guidance to the reader for this new age. It was essential that the marginalia provided instruction that was reformed, but that was not seen as too radical in interpretation. John Stow praised Parker's work stating that, this Bible 'newly printed in the largest volume' provided 'for the furniture of many churches then wanting them'.¹⁵¹ Sandys was clearly keen to see the project progress and upon finishing his section he wrote to Parker, on 6 February 1565, informing him that:

My duty remembered; According to your Grace's letter of instruction, I have perused the book you sent me, and with good diligence: having also, in conference with some other, considered of the same, in such sort, I trust, as your Grace will not mislike of. I have sent up with it my Clerk, whose hand I used in writing forth the corrections and marginal notes. When it shall please your Grace to set over the Book to be viewed by some one of your Chaplains, my said Clerk shall attend a day or two, to make it plain unto him, how my notes are to be placed. In mine opinion, your Grace shall do well to make the whole Bible to be diligently surveyed by some well learned, before it be put to print; and also to have skilful and diligent correctors at the printing of it, that it may be done in such perfection, that the adversaries can have no occasion to quarrel with it. Which thing will require a time. *Sed sat cito, si sat bene.*¹⁵²

Sandys' letter reveals the care he had given to accuracy and that he desired precision in the placing of the marginalia which were to be one of the main additions to the new text. The Bible was eventually published in 1568, which reflected the allocation of the project to multiple hands and thus required the chivvying along of a variety of bishops to complete their allocated tasks. Not all prioritised the importance of this project in the way that Sandys had, and this led him to write to Parker again this

time to urge 'hastening forward the Bible which you have in hand' for the benefit of 'those that we have be not only false printed, but also give great offence to many, by reason of the depravity in reading.'¹⁵³

Sandys was allocated Kings 3 and 4 and Chronicles 1 and 2 to translate and annotate with marginal notes.¹⁵⁴ The two books of Kings were chronologically structured and covered from the death of King David to the release of Jehoiachin, King of Judah.¹⁵⁵ Chronicles I and II covered some of the same periodisation as the previous two books of Kings. These verses do not seem to have inspired him in the same way that other biblical texts did in forming a starting point for his sermons. None of these books or verses form part of Sandys' later published sermons, so whilst he was keen to see the Bishop's Bible in print and more importantly in use, there is little evidence that the allocation of text were due to his particular liking for the content. His language skills were however up to the task and his promptness in completing the allocated task suggested that he still saw himself very much as the learned scholar and academic despite his forays into politics and local disputes.

Conclusion

Edwin Sandys approached his first appointment as Bishop with all the fervour expected of an evangelical cleric. He was frustrated on a national level by the slow progress of projects such as the Bishops' Bible and the failure of the new regime to embrace wholeheartedly and without question all aspects of reformed religion. His words reflect the frustration he felt when his role in the shaping of religion on both on a national and local level was questioned. In particular the issue of married clergy was to be most prominent in his thoughts during his time in Worcester, evidently because this was the period when his family grew and where he was most clearly challenged on the topic. Yet the importance of marriage as an institution that epitomised reformed religion was to remain a point of discourse for him throughout his life, the theme appearing in his sermons and writings. It permeated his thoughts and remained for him a key signifier of the rejection of the corruption of Catholicism in favour of godly religion which recognised marriage as a holy estate sanctioned by God. Equally securing a future for his family was to remain vitally important to him. Whilst this may seem an obvious statement for Sandys it represented one of the challenges of his life, the balance between the duty of a godly minister and the duty of a father to provide for his children in a manner which suited their status.

In this first decade of his episcopacy Sandys was still pushing for a reformed agenda, but he was clearly preoccupied with local challenges, which were focused on combatting Catholicism in his diocese. The tests he faced in Worcester were to be repeated in London and York. In responding to these encounters, his frustrations at his lack of agency

and authority despite his high ecclesiastical office became clear. In addition he, along with many other evangelicals, were adjusting to their new positions. Protestantism had been the religion of a persecuted group but was now the national religion. In Worcester Sandys faced the difficulties of fighting for the supremacy of his Protestant faith just as he had done before his exile, yet his responses were often disproportionate to the offences, or perceived offences he suffered. Bourne, his local antagonist, was the epitome of the stereotypes of the old religion: stayed in its ways, vocal, violent and uncivilised. Sandys portrayed himself as the upright cleric, morally justified and intellectually superior. Yet he was also unable to tolerate any dissent from his religious truth or questioning of his authority. This could be said to be the mark of a true evangelical unwavering and uncompromising, but his tendency to take slight at minor offences resulted in some aspects of the disputes appearing petty and unnecessary. Yet he had not lost the favour of Elizabeth or Cecil and his next promotion to Bishop of London required the steel he had shown in Worcester to be applied even more rigidly. In London he was to face new challenges too, as he realised that those pushing for even greater religious reform may no longer be his allies. The reformers he was to meet in London were questioning the need for ecclesiastical authority and in the process rejecting traditional hierarchy. These men were to become a threat to the newly established religion.

Acknowledgements

Parts of this chapter originally appeared as Sarah Bastow, 'I think it my duty to exhort you . . . defend the faith of Christ even until blood and unto death' in *Defending the Faith: John Jewel and the Church of England*, eds. Ranson, A., Gazal, A. & Bastow, S. (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2018). Courtesy of Penn State University Press.

Notes

- 1 David Loades, *Elizabeth I* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), pp. 136–7.
- 2 Sandys, *Sermons*, xviii; Loades, *Elizabeth I*, p. 137; John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the First Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Under Whose Primacy and Influence the Reformation of Religion Was Happily Effected* (London, 1711), p. 78.
- 3 Patrick Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519? 1588)', ODNB, online edition.
- 4 Alec Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realms, 1485–1603* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 201.
- 5 Susan Wabuda, 'Bell, John (d. 1556)', ODNB, online edition.
- 6 P.D. Clarke, 'Canterbury as the New Rome: Dispensations and Henry VIII's Reformation', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 64, 1 (2013), 20–44.
- 7 C.D. Gilbert, *Catholics in Worcestershire 1535–1590* (Brentwood: Worcester Historical Association Publications no. 2, 2009), p. 2; Clarke, 'Canterbury as the New Rome', p. 35.

- 8 TNA, SP 1/101 f. 40, 'Hugh Bishop of Worcester to Cromwell' (8 January 1536); James Gairdner, ed., *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, Vol. 10 (London: HMSO, 1887), p. 19.
- 9 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 403–4.
- 10 G.W. Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (London: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 505; Susan Wabuda, 'Latimer, Hugh (c. 1485–1555), Bishop of Worcester, Preacher, and Protestant Martyr', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 11 Susan Wabuda, 'Bell, John (d. 1556)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 12 Susan Wabuda, 'Bell, John (d. 1556)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 13 David Loades, 'Heath, Nicholas (1501? 1578)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 14 D. MacCulloch and P. Hughes, 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle from Worcester', *The Antiquaries' Journal*, lxxv (1995), 235–53.
- 15 D.G. Newcombe, 'Hooper, John (1495x1500–1555)', *ODNB*, online edition; A. Peterkin, *One Thousand Beards: A Cultural History of Facial Hair* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2001), p. 31. Catholic clergy rejected beards in the sixteenth century and Protestant clergy were often noted as adopting them to denote their rejection of popish excesses.
- 16 D.G. Newcombe, 'Hooper, John (1495x1500–1555)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 17 D. MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999), p. 106.
- 18 D.G. Newcombe, 'Hooper, John (1495x1500–1555)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 19 C.D. Gilbert, 'The Protestant Ascendancy in Worcester: The Case of the Clerk of St Helen's', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 18 (2002), 211–16.
- 20 John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or TAMO (1563 edition) Book 5, p. 1118 (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: www.johnfoxe.org [Accessed 29 January 2013].
- 21 Eamon Duffy and David Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 45, 48, 52.
- 22 Angelo J. Louisa, 'Bourne, Gilbert (c.1510–1569)', *ODNB*, online edition; Gilbert, 'The Protestant Ascendancy in Worcester', 213.
- 23 A discussion of Edwin Sandys' episcopacy in Worcester can also be found in Sarah Bastow, 'Edwin Sandys and the Defence of English Religion', in *Defending the Faith: John Jewel and the Church of England*, ed. Angela Ranson, Andre Gazal, and Sarah Bastow (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2018), pp. 224–41.
- 24 Strype, John, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The First Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821), p. 78.
- 25 Patrick Collinson, *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: The Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation* (Reading: Reading University Press, 1986).
- 26 MacCulloch and Hughes, 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle', p. 247.
- 27 MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p. 82.
- 28 MacCulloch and Hughes, 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle', p. 248.
- 29 MacCulloch and Hughes, 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle', p. 248.
- 30 MacCulloch and Hughes, 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle', p. 249.
- 31 MacCulloch and Hughes, 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle', p. 249, n 88.
- 32 TNA, SP 12/28 f.152, 'Bishop of Worcester to the Council', April (?) 1563.
- 33 TNA, SP 12/28 f.152, 'Bishop of Worcester to the Council', April (?) 1563.

- 34 John Bruce and Thomas Thomason Perowne, eds., *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker: Letters Written by and to Him from AD 1535 to His Death AD 1575* (Parker Society, 1853; Wipf and Stock, Eugene, Oregon, 2005), p. 125.
- 35 'Thomas Arden' (CCed Person ID 8942), *The Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540–1835*. Available from: www.theclergydatabase.org.uk (afterwards CCed).
- 36 Worcester Record Office, b 716.093-BA.2648/9b(iv) (Episcopal Register); 'William Northfolke' CCed Record ID: 133211.
- 37 'Thomas Woodecocke (1561–1561)', CCed Person ID: 66623.
- 38 'CCed Ordinary Tenure ID: 610'.
- 39 *Calendar of the Patent Rolls: Preserved in the Public Record Office*, Part 12, Vol. 2 (London: HMSO, 1948), p. 303.
- 40 Thomas Abingdon, *The Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Worcester: To Which Are Added the Antiquities of the Cathedral Churches of Chichester and Lichfeld* (1723), p. 147.
- 41 'Shelmerdyn, Robert (1544–1562)' (CCed Person ID: 29399), CCed.
- 42 Anne Thompson and Marjorie Plummer, *From Priest's Whore to Pastor's Wife: Clerical Marriage and the Process of Reform in the Early German Reformation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).
- 43 A.G. Dickens, *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509–1558* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 184–93; A.G. Dickens, 'The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York, Part 1: The Clergy', Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 11 (1957), 5–6.
- 44 F.G. Emmison, *Elizabethan Life: Morals and the Church Courts* (Chelmsford: Essex County Council Record Office, 1973), pp. 214–15.
- 45 TNA, SP12/28 f.141. 'The Bishop of Worcester to the Council', April 1563.
- 46 TNA, SP12/28 f.141.
- 47 TNA, SP12/28 f.141.
- 48 TNA, SP12/28 f.141.
- 49 TNA, SP12/28 f.141. The vicar of Alderminster (1563–1578) was also a Mr Wilson, in this case Robert Wilson. It is likely that the Mrs Wilson in question was married to Thomas Wilson, archdeacon at the cathedral, as she is portrayed as a gentlewoman and of a higher status than Mrs Lyvys. Sandys noted that the 'vile talk' used to the gentlewoman was of great concern.
- 50 Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation*, p. 202.
- 51 H. Gee and W.H. Hardy, eds., 'The Injunctions of 1559', in *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (New York: Macmillan, 1896), pp. 417–42. Available from: <http://history.hanover.edu/texts/engref/er78.html>.
- 52 Gee and Hardy, 'The Injunctions of 1559'.
- 53 Gee and Hardy, 'The Injunctions of 1559'.
- 54 H. Parish, '“It Was Never Good World Sense Minister Must Have Wyves”: Clerical Celibacy, Clerical Marriage, and Anticlericalism in Reformation England', *Journal of Religious History*, 36, 1 (2012), 52–69.
- 55 Eric Josef Carlson, *Marriage and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 49–66; Eric Josef Carlson, 'Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation', *The Journal of British Studies*, 31, 1 (1992), 1–31.
- 56 P. Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982, 2003), p. 45ff.
- 57 Nancy Basler Bjorklund, '“A Godly Wyfe Is an Helper”: Matthew Parker and the Defence of Clerical Marriage', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 34, 2 (2003), 347–65.
- 58 Bruce and Perowne, *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 66.

- 59 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 127.
- 60 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 313–30. Ayre notes this as a sermon given in Strasbourg at a marriage, but it is undated as are all the sermons.
- 61 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 313–30.
- 62 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 313–17.
- 63 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 320; Susan C. Karant-Nunn, ‘The Emergence of the Pastoral Family in the German Reformation: The Parsonage as a Site of Socio-religious Change’, in *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe*, ed. C. Scott Dixon and L. Schorn-Schutte, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), p. 93.
- 64 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 28.
- 65 Thompson and Plummer, *From Priest’s Whore to Pastor’s Wife*, p. 246.
- 66 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 78.
- 67 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 50–1.
- 68 TNA, SP12 / 28 f.141.
- 69 TNA, SP12 / 28 f.141.
- 70 TNA, SP12 / 28 f.141; SP 12/28 f.135, ‘Declaration of the matters wherewith the Bishop of Worcester has charged Sir John Bourne’ April? 1563.
- 71 TNA, SP 12/28 f.135.
- 72 D. Loades, ‘The Personal Religion of Mary I’, in *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 19.
- 73 Parish, *Clerical Celibacy*, p. 165.
- 74 Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), p. 300.
- 75 TNA, SP12 / 28 f.141.
- 76 K. Fincham and N. Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 33.
- 77 TNA, SP 12/28 f.152, ‘Bishop of Worcester to the Council’, April (?) 1563.
- 78 TNA, SP12 / 28. 141.
- 79 TNA, SP12 / 28. 141.
- 80 Felicity Heal, ‘The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England’, *Past and Present*, 102 (1984), 66–93.
- 81 F. Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 389.
- 82 Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 286–7.
- 83 TNA, SP12 / 28 f.141.
- 84 Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 258.
- 85 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 400. Taken from the twentieth sermon ‘The end of all things is at hand. Be ye therefore sober’.
- 86 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 400.
- 87 TNA, SP12 / 28 f.141.
- 88 Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas H. Jucker, *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems* (Philadelphia: John Benjamin, 2003), p. 63.
- 89 TNA, SP 12/28 f.135, ‘Declaration of the matters wherewith the Bishop of Worcester has charged Sir John Bourne’ April? 1563.
- 90 R.A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450–1700* (London: Longman, 1984), pp. 100–1.
- 91 TNA, SP 12/28 f.135, ‘Declaration of the matters wherewith the Bishop of Worcester has charged Sir John Bourne’ April? 1563.
- 92 Christopher Haigh, ‘Anticlericalism and Clericalism, 1580–1640’, in *Anticlericalism in Britain c.1500–1914*, ed. N. Aston and M. Cragoe (Stroud: Sutton, 200), pp. 22–3.
- 93 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127, ‘Charges by Sir John Bourne against the Bishop of Worcester’, April 1563.

- 94 Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 302–4; Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); E.A. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), p. 162.
- 95 Karant-Nunn, ‘The Emergence of the Pastoral Family’, p. 89.
- 96 Elizabeth A. Foyster, ‘The Concept of Male honour in Seventeenth Century England’ (Durham thesis, Durham University, 1996). Available at Durham E-Theses Online. Available from: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1491/>.
- 97 Karant-Nunn, ‘The Emergence of the Pastoral Family’, pp. 97–8.
- 98 TNA, SP 12/28 f.151, ‘A note of some of the apparent slanders uttered by Sir John Bourne, Knt., against the Bishop or Worcester’ April (?) 1563.
- 99 Haigh, ‘Anticlericalism and Clericalism’, p. 23.
- 100 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 101 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 102 TNA, SP12/28, f.141; SP 15/12 f.226, ‘The arms and descent of Edwin Sandes’, 1565.
- 103 TNA, SP12/28, f.151, ‘A note of some of the apparent slanders’, April (?) 1563.
- 104 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 105 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 106 ‘knave, n.’. OED Online. December 2012. Oxford University Press. 31 January 2013. Available from: www.oed.com/view/Entry/103934?rskey=kmwYU9&result=1. ‘An unprincipled man, given to dishonourable and deceitful practices; a base and crafty rogue’.
- 107 M. James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 322. Whilst not quite fulfilling the criteria of a duel this did try to evoke the idea that this was honourable violence in defence of a woman’s honour.
- 108 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 109 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 110 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 111 TNA, SP 12/28, f.135. ‘Declaration of the matters wherewith the Bishop of Worcester has charged Sir John Bourne in the Bishop’s answer to the articles alleged against him by Bourne’, April (?) 1563; SP12/28, f.141.
- 112 Foyster, ‘The Concept of Male Honour in Seventeenth Century England’, p. 209.
- 113 TNA, SP 12/28 f.135.
- 114 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 115 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 116 MacCulloch and Hughes, ‘A Bailiffs’ List and Chronicle’, pp. 235–53.
- 117 MacCulloch and P. Hughes, ‘A Bailiffs’ List and Chronicle’, p. 237.
- 118 Penry Williams, *Council in the Marches of Wales Under Elizabeth I* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1958), p. 206.
- 119 TNA, SP 12/28, f.135; M. Keniston McIntosh, *Controlling Misbehaviour in England 1370–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 23–45. Discusses the regulation of misconduct at local levels.
- 120 G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), pp. 198–9.
- 121 Elton, *The Tudor Constitution*, p. 199; Cheshire too was subject to it until 1569 see T. Thornton, *Cheshire and the Tudor State 1480–1560* (Bury St Edmonds: Boydell, 2000), p. 86.
- 122 Sidney was to become lord deputy of Ireland from 1565 which necessitated prolonged absences from his position in Wales so his active presence in the role was relatively short-lived.

100 *Establishing Reformed Religion*

- 123 Wallace T. MacCaffrey, 'Sidney, Sir Henry (1529–1586)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 124 Angelo J. Louisa, 'Bourne, Gilbert (c.1510–1569)' *ODNB*, online edition; Wallace T. MacCaffrey, 'Sidney, Sir Henry (1529–1586)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 125 L.M. Hill, 'The Marian "Experience of Defeat": The Case of Sir John Bourne', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25, 3 (1994), 531–49.
- 126 Hill, 'The Marian "Experience of Defeat"', p. 540.
- 127 F. Heal, *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 206.
- 128 Hastings Robinson, *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), pp. 1–65. Many of the letters in 1559 discuss the nature of the church.
- 129 B. Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559–1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 33–5.
- 130 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, p. 33.
- 131 Heal, *Of Prelates and Princes*, p. 223.
- 132 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127, 'Charges by Sir John Bourne against the Bishop of Worcester (Edwin Sandys), for abuses in the administration of the affairs of that See' April (?) 1563.
- 133 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127.
- 134 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127.
- 135 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127.
- 136 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, Vol. 1, pp. 212–13.
- 137 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 214.
- 138 TNA, SP12/28, f.141.
- 139 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127.
- 140 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127; Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485–1714: A Narrative History*, 2nd ed. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p. 162.
- 141 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127.
- 142 TNA, SP 12/28 f.127.
- 143 Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 257.
- 144 Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', p. 68.
- 145 Bruce and Perowne, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 124; Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 78.
- 146 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 412.
- 147 Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 414.
- 148 Jack P. Lewis, *The Day After Domesday: The Making of the Bishops' Bible* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016), p. 21ff.
- 149 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 414.
- 150 Lewis, *The Day After Domesday*, p. 21ff.
- 151 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 244.
- 152 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 415.
- 153 Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 416.
- 154 Pollard, Alfred William, *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525–1611* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911), p. 30.
- 155 Michael David Coogan, Marc Brettler, Carol Newsom and PHEME PERKINS, eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 494.

4 Religion in London

‘The End of All Things Is At Hand: Be Ye Therefore Sober’

Introduction

In April 1570 Sandys was elevated to the office of Bishop of London. Appointees to the London diocese were indicated as significant members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy trusted with oversight of the religion of the country’s capital. This represented the desire of the Elizabethan regime to provide Sandys with further promotion and saw Sandys following in the footsteps of Edmund Grindal, his companion in exile, who was the previous holder of the office. In Worcester Sandys had attempted to reform the diocese by tearing down old symbols of Catholicism, instituting new godly clergy in the parishes and actively fighting against the local forces of Catholic authority. On a personal level he had established a family that had set down roots in the Midlands county of Worcester and were to continue there even without him. In London Sandys became embroiled in international diplomacy, as part of his personal crusade against the papist antichrist. Combatting the papist threat in the capital was very different from the disputes he faced in Worcester, as it now brought with it national and international challenges. Sandys was also to face a new dilemma provoked by groups who had begun to push for more extensive religious changes in relation to the reform of the Church. The new demands did not sit well with the monarch and appeared to challenge not just the religious settlement, but the whole nature of evangelical religion in England.

The decade of the 1570s was to bring a variety of challenges to the Elizabethan regime: Firstly external forces drove a change in national policy towards Catholics in England, strengthening the crusade against the papist threat. The consequences of the arrival of Mary Queen of Scots in England and the issuing of *Regnans in Excelsis* by Pope Pius V, combined with increased concerns about the threat posed by domestic Catholics following the 1569 rebellion, meant that the ecclesiastical hierarchy were now encouraged to take direct and punitive action against papist dissent. For Sandys this validated his actions in Worcester, he had already shown that Catholics could pose a danger to local and national stability if they were not actively pursued.

The Elizabethan Church was engaged in a policy of gradual conversion, a war of attrition, which relied on a gradual glacial shift of attitude in the nation. As Alec Ryrie has argued the ‘literary fireworks’ of the polemical debates, such as those of Jewel and Harding had not ‘been accompanied by much actual persecution of Catholics’.¹ It had been much to the evangelicals’ dismay that the nation did not immediately wake to the dramatic revelation that Protestantism was the religion to bring true salvation. Sandys, Jewel, Grindal and their fellow member of the episcopacy were clear that their papist opponents were in the wrong, but they knew it required a committed and active minister to take action against them, yet one who could also persuade the majority to the right path. Sandys was more than comfortable with taking on the challenge of confronting and combatting Catholicism, but in Worcester he had lacked the means to do so on solely religious grounds, which had led to his pursuit of John Bourne for other violations. He had more success with combatting the problem of unreformed clergy who could be actively pursued in ways likely to result in punishment. In London he was to find himself in conflict with Catholics who he believed both posed a local threat to the stability of London, but also threatened the nation.

Secondly, a division began to take hold in reformed circles. By the end of the 1570s the evangelicals of the Edwardian period were no longer at the cutting edge of the reform movement; the Elizabethan Church was in its second decade, many of the leaders had their roots in the Edwardian Protestantism of the 1550s and were thus defenders of the prayer book. The Protestant church, founded in reformed religious ideas, had become an edifice of the establishment not the religion of an exiled minority. Those pushing for further reform were to become more vocal and the first *Admonition to Parliament* in 1572 stated that ‘we in England are so fare of, from having a church rightly reformed, accordyng to the pre-script of Gods worde, that as yet we are not come to the outward face of the same.’² The new reformers represented those who had backed a Genevan interpretation of reformed religion, combined with a new generation coming out of the universities. Thomas Cartwright’s advocating of a Presbyterian church supported by radical ministers such as John Field and Thomas Wilcox indicated increasing polarisation of reformed views. These views were countered by John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College Cambridge. Yet as Peter Marshall has argued, this did not mean the middle ground had been ‘evacuated’, as many ‘“moderate Puritans” were appalled by the confrontational tone of the *Admonition*, and many of the bishops shared the view that numerous abuses in the Church awaited reformation.’³ Sandys was one of these bishops, standing on that ill-defined middle ground. He believed that further reform was needed, that education of the clergy and the nation was vital, but crucially his time in London was to convince him that neither the approach, nor the

reforms that Cartwright and his supporters were pushing forward was right for the country. His failure to commit to supporting this new group of reformers was the signal that he was now a defender of the status quo. Sandys was to struggle with his new place in evangelical society; he needed to reshape himself—he was still the scourge of Catholics, but was still uncertain of how best to deal with those of his own confessional faith who he felt were endangering the nation.

In his first sermon upon taking up the bishopric he preached that,

This office requireth a perfect man to teach, govern, and guide this learned and wise people: this great and large diocese doth wish for one furnished as Samuel, or rather as Solomon, with all graces and gifts of learning, policy, wisdom, and knowledge of things belonging both to God and men. This cumbrous charge hath made many a good and godly man to withdraw himself, to shrink back, utterly to refuse the like place and calling.⁴

At first Sandys had refused the promotion to London. Whilst this may have been because Sandys truly did not see himself as the right man for the job, or because he and his family were settled in Worcester, it was in reality a concession to convention. As with the earlier ecclesiastical appointments in 1558–9 evangelicals were keen not to look too overtly ambitious and the turning down of high ecclesiastical office on the grounds of unworthiness suited the reformed ideals. They were rejecting worldly gains but needed to acknowledge that it was their duty to be willing to fulfil God's and the Queen's calling. The deployment of this form of humility topos was however a risky strategy with a Queen who did not take rejection well. Sandys' refusal was not well received at court, as was evidenced by Sandys' letter to William Cecil in April 1570.⁵ In this letter he apologised profusely for any offence he may have caused by his rejection of the bishopric of London, which he claimed was motivated by his own insecurities as to whether he was capable in 'mynde and infirmities of body' of such a great task.⁶ The letter also stated that he had heard rumours that this rejection had reached the people of London who were also turning against him as a result. Sandys was keen to reassure the citizens of London, via his 'private frende' William Cecil, that he had implied no insult. Moreover, this letter indicated that he was aware that he was treading a fine line in dealing with the key players at Elizabeth's court. Sandys openly stated he was keen to avoid offending either Cecil or the Queen but also acknowledged the importance of his third patron, the Earl of Leicester. Sandys wrote that he knew the Earl was already annoyed that he had written privately to Cecil for help.⁷ Leicester held great influence in the Welsh borders and Worcester region, being one of the major landowners in the area. Thus, offending him was clearly a

concern. Even if Sandys had been called to London, members of his family remained in the Midlands. Thus, it is possible to argue that Leicester's patronage was needed to secure the long-term success of Sandys and his family in Worcestershire. Collinson has even gone so far as to conjecture that the nature of the extant manuscript sources may give a distorted history of the relationship between Sandys and his patrons.⁸ Numerous of Sandys' letters to Cecil survive, whereas there is nowhere near the same level of surviving correspondence with Leicester. Whilst conjecture regarding the nature of extant sources raises interesting questions, as it stands it is not possible to see a closer relationship between Sandys and Leicester. Nevertheless the desire to please the Queen combined with the belief that he may have already offended Leicester, who was one of the key national and regional power brokers, may in part explain Sandys' concession letter. He wrote that if the Queen and Privy Council 'be not otherwise resolved if you byd me come upp I will and take yt office upon me, what so ever become of me'.⁹ Sandys was keen to play the role of humble servant in the letter stating that 'if another may be already chosen I shal be most glad of yt so yt I may live here or whereoever with yr favour and wanted friendship'.¹⁰ No other had been chosen, for Sandys had been determined by the Queen, Cecil and Leicester as the right man for the job and Sandys left Worcester to take up the office of Bishop of London in 1570.

The role of Bishop of London may have seemed a poisoned chalice given the difficulties incumbent in the office. Archbishop Grindal stated that 'the bishop of London is always to be pitied' for the city was a complex place and in Collinson's view 'the bishop was stretched almost beyond endurance by the scale and complexity of his ecclesiastical and political functions'.¹¹ Indeed, Sandys was to find himself embroiled in conflicts with both Catholics and Protestants in London, asked to consult on national matters and challenged both by the circumstances of the office, but also in terms of his own beliefs. Yet when Sandys came to be elevated to Archbishop of York in 1576 it was the loss of this London office that pained him most, suggesting that any early reluctance to leave Worcester in 1570, was overcome by the prospect of again taking a role at the centre of events. His battle against the forces of the antichrist continued in London just as they had in Worcester, but the challenges from those who desired further reform were most disturbing to him. The presence of more radical groups of Protestant reformers, embodied by men such as Thomas Cartwright, saw disputes regarding the role of the Church hierarchy played out on a public stage. The hothouse of the capital's religious melee was to force Sandys into a difficult position, throughout the 1560s he had lamented that religious reform had not progressed as quickly as he had hoped, but now things had turned in a direction he could not support. He was forced to face the question, was he still a reformer?

London in 1570

Despite all of the difficulties of the position, once appointed to the office of Bishop of London Sandys seemed content to be there. This office would bring him most directly into conflict with the new wave of reformers and see him having to challenge his own beliefs. Yet the position gave him access to the court and offered, in theory at least, the chance to make a real impact on the religious landscape of England. Susan Brigden stated 'in London the English Reformation began'.¹² Whilst the educational centres of Oxford, and more particularly Cambridge, may lay claim to the intellectual and theological origins of an English Protestantism it was London as the capital city where many of the preachers and laity took up these ideas. The city was often a centre for discontent, a breeding ground for new ideas and had been at the centre of the political and religious reformation of the 1520s and 1530s. Many of the early reformers had advocated their beliefs and put these into action in the capital. John Colet, Dean of St Paul's Cathedral, was advocating reform as early as the 1510s prior to the national political and legislative religious reforms.¹³ In addition at St Paul's was 'the Cross', a place where preachers could address the public audience and this too fell under the bishop of London's care as he could choose the preacher.¹⁴ The Cross was an important forum for reformers to preach evangelical ideas and thus who controlled it could set the tone and influence thinking. Sandys had the power to promote or restrain new viewpoints in the 1570s. St Paul's itself was in a state of disarray, following a fire in 1561 which had destroyed a significant part of the church. The failure to make much progress in repairing the church was to be laid at Sandys' door by many including the Lord Mayor of the city. Sandys' successor as Bishop of London, John Aylmer, noted it would have been an impossible task to pay for such significant damage to this national church building simply from the revenues of the See.¹⁵

London was the locus of many reforming groups and as Beer has highlighted had many advantages, with wealthy parishes attracting the best clergy. A large number of these parishes allowed the laity to choose the 'priest, service and sermons most suited to their own taste'.¹⁶ London's immense number of parishes (110 by the early seventeenth century) resulted in great diversity and each of these 'parishes handled local affairs and fostered [their own] sense of identity'.¹⁷ Moreover, as David Hickman has indicated, the 'perceived strength of the Reformed religion may make it untypical of the rest of the country'.¹⁸ The multitude of parishes and the sense of independence felt by many of them posed obvious problems for any bishop attempting to impose order on them and this diversity was to make Sandys' task challenging. In addition to the myriad of parishes were other layers of authority and organisation in the city. London had a well-established guild structure and civic government which included the Aldermen and Lord Mayor who were important in

terms of administering finance, justice and supporting or opposing religious changes in the city.¹⁹ By the time of Sandys' arrival in 1570 many leading Catholics had already left their roles amongst the governing elite of the city, meaning Sandys did not need to root them out.²⁰ John Stowe's *Survey of London*, first published in 1598, gives us a detailed account of London, but his comments on Sandys are much less enlightening. He commented only that 'Edwine Sands [sic], being translated from Worcester to the bishopricke of London, in the year 1570 was thence translated to Yorke in the year 1576 and died in the year 1588'.²¹ Merritt has questioned whether Stowe's zeal for antiquarian London was in fact 'the attitude of an essentially unreconstructed English Catholic' as his work lacked the anti-Catholic rhetoric of Camden, Shirley or Erdeswicke and may also account for his lack of enthusiasm about Sandys.²² What Stowe and other contemporary commentators illustrated was that London was unique in many ways concerning trade, politics and religion. London was also beset by problems in the early modern era, including overcrowding due to the rapid growth of the population, plus an increase in the number of poor and vagrants.²³ In 1570 the Lord Mayor had set forth proclamations for the 'regulation and good order' of the city, 'not only upon the queen's charge to him to preserve peace in that her chief city, but also because lately there had been great frays and fightings, and murders too, committed in and about the said city'.²⁴ Thus, religious debate was to be underwritten by heightened concerns about order. The need for a well-ordered society permeated Elizabethan England and was seen in microcosm in the city. The need for order was to be a vital concern for Sandys in his tenure as Bishop of London as he was appointed immediately after the 1569 rebellion when concern about Catholic opposition was heightened and due to the outbreaks of violence in France which seemed to bode ill for Protestants.

A narrative of religious reform has often accompanied the early modern story of the capital, with popular assertions that forward-thinking Protestantism was emblematic of city life. Yet we should not assume that simply because the capital came into contact with new ideas all who lived there automatically became filled with reforming zeal and accepted new ideas. Alec Ryrie summarised effectively in stating that 'the English did not see themselves as groaning under a papal yoke . . . [i]f English Protestantism had not existed, it would not have been necessary to invent it'.²⁵ Although Tudor London contained groups of reformers it also had groups of Catholics. Sandys was overseeing a complex city where radical reform and vestiges of the old religion both required his attention. Turning now to consider the specific circumstances facing Sandys as Bishop of London it is clear that he welcomed the life and energy of the city but equally faced dilemmas when reformers challenged him. He found himself repositioned, no longer on the forefront of radical religious change, but part of a Protestant mainstream. Whilst the 1559 settlement may

not have progressed as far as he would have liked, as one of the Church hierarchy this was a settled religious stance that he felt he must defend, to preserve the integrity of the reformed nation. The primary task of the new Elizabethan bishops, according to Brett Usher, was ‘to stamp out “popery” within their cathedral chapters and in their parishes, appoint sound, legally trained subordinates to the key administrative posts within their diocesan establishments and generally encourage an ungrudging acceptance of the settlement’.²⁶ Sandys had done just this in Worcester for ten years, making concerted efforts to stamp out popery and to enforce an acceptance of the settlement of godly religion as the norm. He was to find his task in London even more complex where popery had an international dimension that was distinctly absent in Worcester. More complex still was the enforcement of the settlement. Sandys faced opposition from both Catholics and fellow reformers. He was in conflict with both the laity and the clergy of London, but needed to keep on the side of the power brokers of Elizabethan England, William Cecil and Robert Dudley. Moreover, it was to see him tread a dangerous path where his initial support of one particular reforming preacher, Edward Dering, was to earn him the displeasure of Elizabeth herself.

International Dispute and the Catholic Threat

Sandys felt he should actively oppose Catholicism and this brought him in to conflict with not just English Catholics but also papists from other nations. The continuing presence of Catholics in English society and the threat they posed to the success of evangelical religion was something that Sandys was already more than familiar with, given his conflict with John Bourne in Worcester. The Catholic population of London was composed of both members of the local population and visitors from elsewhere in the world, including ambassadors of foreign nations. The ramifications of attacking men who had international standing were much greater than taking on members of the regional gentry. Sandys’ actions in London had the potential to create an international incident and feed into court politics. It is also important to consider the context of Sandys’ actions in relation to the changing outlook of the era. By the 1570s official attitudes towards Catholicism were beginning to shift, particularly amongst those at court. It is arguable that a harder line on religious disobedience had always been advocated but not necessarily implemented by men such as William Cecil. Many of those surrounding the Queen were no longer willing to allow ambivalence to result in a tacit policy of toleration.²⁷ The late 1560s and early 1570s saw a series of national and international events that meant Catholicism could be repositioned in much of the rhetoric, as not merely an unwelcome hang-over from earlier times, but a real and present threat to England and the Queen’s own person. Sandys was part of this repositioning; whilst he

had never been an advocate of tolerating papistry, a distinct shift can be seen in his attitude. Often he had framed his seeking out of Catholic dissidents as part of his efforts to convert them, but in his new office Catholicism had a more obvious and overt international context. Papists who posed a threat to Queen and country were to be removed. His lack of toleration and renewed zeal to seek out and eradicate the Catholic threat was couched in the language of high politics and thus exploring international developments further will be necessary to see Sandys' actions in context. A combination of internal and external factors had come together by 1570 to present a triple assault on Elizabeth and her Protestant kingdom. The arrival of Mary Queen of Scots on English soil presented a Catholic alternative to Elizabeth. Alongside this a domestic revolt occurred in the form of the 1569 Northern Rising and the Pope issued *Regnans in Excelsis*, a Papal Bull of Excommunication targeting Elizabeth and encouraging English Catholics to reject a Protestant monarch. The arrival of Elizabeth's Catholic cousin, Mary, in England in May 1568 provoked a flurry of discussion at court regarding what to do about the deposed Queen. Mary had fled Scotland where she had been held prisoner and led a failed rebellion.²⁸ If Mary's political naivety was as great as Jenny Wormald has suggested, and she did assume that sisterly solidarity would secure her future under Elizabeth's protection, then she was soon to be disillusioned.²⁹ Elizabeth may well have been reluctant to sanction any action against another anointed Queen, but this was not a sentiment shared by many of Elizabeth's councillors, nor was it reflected in the propaganda of Protestant Tudor England.³⁰ Mary was recast as adulteress and murderer, her reputation was in ruins and her future was as a nucleus for plots and conspiracies, 'with a culture which expressed itself in hidden meanings and ambiguities'.³¹ Fletcher and MacCulloch noted that Mary's arrival triggered a series of conspiracies and Cecil was the one to point out the 'problems presented by Mary's arrival in England'.³² The increased threat of uprising and rebellion seemed suddenly very real. Suspicions were aroused that Catholics would rebel, seeking aid from Spain, with the aim of replacing a Protestant Queen with a Catholic one. In November-December 1569 the North of England rose in revolt, making real the fears of Cecil and Walsingham that a papist threat could be found on English soil.³³ The rebellion saw large numbers in open revolt from North Yorkshire to Durham.³⁴ Whilst the northern families, the Percies and the Nevilles, had lost much of their power since the Tudor dynasty had come to power, they still represented an older feudal and Catholic heritage. Some interpretations have sought to portray the 1569 rebellion as simply an extension of the tensions at court and in a climate of fear it is possible to envisage it as accidental rebellion triggered by rumour and discontent, but it was hard to dismiss the ultimately Catholic undertone.³⁵ The participants upheld old

religious practices and tore down symbols of the new confession, therefore religion remained the underpinning and most significant dimension to the rebellion. Agitators in the rebellion were openly and fiercely Catholic such as the Norton and Markenfield families. The rebellion of 1569 showed that the loyalty of northern nobles was not secured and emphasised the potential danger of Catholics if the North were not brought to heel.³⁶ The 1569 rebellion may not have achieved a great deal, nor posed any real threat to Elizabeth's person, but this unrest inextricably linked Catholicism to rebellion. The rumoured plan for a marriage between the Scots Queen and the Duke of Norfolk further heightened tension.³⁷ The potential danger posed by Catholics was something Sandys was alert to in London.

The Pope chose this moment to speak out against Elizabeth in the form of a Papal Bull. Pope Pius V issued *Regnans in Excelsis*, on 25 February 1570, which declared Elizabeth a 'pretended' Queen of England. Moreover, it stated in an uncompromising way that she was a heretic and that 'her subjects are commanded not to obey her'.³⁸ As John Guy has stated, this created an 'inexorable logic . . . that Protestants were loyalists and Catholics traitors'.³⁹ Sandys saw the disruptive nature of the Papal Bull on London society at close quarters. On 25 May 1570 a copy of the Papal Bull was posted on the gates of Sandys' London palace adjacent to St Paul's Cathedral.⁴⁰ This demonstrated that Catholics felt emboldened, daring to post the Bull at the gates of a symbol of Protestant authority and significantly this was the first time it had been publicly posted.⁴¹ The reaction to this was equally as symbolic. John Felton, the man responsible for posting the Bull, had been apprehended and committed to the Tower where he was found guilty of treason and sentenced to be hung, drawn and quartered.⁴² His sentence was completed on 8 August at the same gate where he had posted the Bull.⁴³ Sandys was at Fulham when the hanging took place, so was not present to witness the activities outside his residence, but Felton's actions highlighted a challenge to royal and ecclesiastical authority and the dramatic response.⁴⁴

In London society both reformers and papists were demonstrative in showing their commitment to their respective religious causes and the written word had a clear role to play in these conflicts. The works of Aislinn Muller and Alexandra Walsham have shown how Catholics were engaging in translating and distributing materials from continental Europe to further their cause.⁴⁵ The transmission of the text of the Papal Bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, required agents from both within and outside the British Isles, with the text posted at Sandys' gate coming from the Spanish Ambassador Guerau de Specs via Roberto Ridolfi.⁴⁶ The reformers responded with a selection of popular ballads and broadsheets, reflecting an anti-Catholic response to *Regnans in Excelsis*, which were also posted at St Paul's. Again this directly impacted on Sandys, as Bishop

of London, who was required to oversee the religious behaviour of the diocese. The anti-Catholic ballad posted at St Paul's read:

A Pope was wont to be an odious name
 Within our land, and scapt out of our scrowles:
 And now the Pope is come so far past shame
 That he can walk with open face at Poules.
 Go home, mad Bull! To Rome, and Pardon soules,
 That pine away in Purgatoire payne.
 Go, triumph there, where credit most remains;
 Thy daie is out in England long ago,
 For Ridley gave the Bull so great a blow
 He never durst apeach this land till now,
 In bulling-time, he met with Harding's cow.⁴⁷

The ballad highlighted that the Papal Bull had no place in England and was a clear response to the posting of the Papal Bull at the palace gate, which had been seen as a bold act illustrating the papists' growing confidence. The reference to a previous Bishop of London, Nicholas Ridley, who 'gave the Bull so great a blow', could easily be perceived as a criticism of Sandys for not having the same ability to drive out the papal threat. Moreover, mention of Harding was a reference to the Jewel-Harding debate of more recent times.⁴⁸ Whilst Thomas Harding is generally perceived as the weaker of the two protagonists in this debate it did show that reformist clerics such as John Jewel were still receiving challenges. The very existence of the debate illustrated that there was still a Catholic presence in England. The discovery of the Ridolfi Plot in 1571 appeared to further validate the threat posed by domestic and foreign Catholics in England. Robert Ridolfi, a Catholic Florentine banker with connections to Mary Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk, embodied the fears of the court regarding an international conspiracy to remove Elizabeth which could be connected to domestic malcontents. Plots which presented Mary Queen of Scots as an alternative monarch were viewed as a real danger. It was unsurprising that Sandys was wary of the reaction of the city to these events given the proximity of the capital to the royal courts, Parliament and to the continent.⁴⁹ Two years after the issuing of the Papal Bull a massacre took place in Paris of a group of 3000 Huguenots on 23 August 1572 and violence then spread throughout provincial France.⁵⁰ News of the St Bartholomew's day massacre had an immediate impact on many in England and Sandys' letter to William Cecil of 5 September 1572 showed that the news of the massacre had provoked great fear. Sandys' letter begins without the usual courtesies and preamble, stating simply that 'These evill tymes trouble all good men's hedde, and make their heartes ake.'⁵¹ Sandys clearly felt that he should proffer some advice on how to deal with the threat posed by Catholicism and

in particular the arrival of the Scottish Queen in England. He offered nine suggestions as to how the Queen's safety could be secured and he headed the advice 'The saftie of our Queen and Realm yf god will'. His solution to what he saw as the primary threat to Elizabeth was typically blunt; advising firstly 'to cutte of the Scottish heade' and secondly 'To remove from our Q[ueen] papistes an such as by private persuasion, overthrowe good counsell'.⁵² Throughout this letter the necessity of surrounding the Queen only with those of trusted religion was emphasised. Sandys was clear that the safety of the Queen lay with ensuring the security of the city of London and also the Tower and he advised that 'no papiste of stengthe' should 'soiourne there this wynter'.⁵³ The security of London was an obvious concern to Sandys as he was bishop of the city and he indicated that he was very politically aware of the significant role religious instruction, and in particular preaching, could play in terms of securing and calming the inhabitants. He noted that: 'The citizens of London in these dangerous daies had need prudently to be dealt with-all' and he was concerned that preachers appointed to the Cross were 'young men, unskilful in matters politicall, yet so carried with zeale, that they will enter into then ad [sic] power further their opinions'.⁵⁴ He suggested that he and the Dean of St Paul's should give the first sermons at St Paul's Cross in order to set an example for others to follow. The Dean was Alexander Nowell who, as a leading preacher of the era, was often called upon.⁵⁵ Nowell was a reformed Protestant who shared some of Sandys' views, for example on Elizabeth's reluctance to marry and the need to secure further reform in the Church. Like Sandys, Nowell had also accepted compromises when necessary.⁵⁶ Sandys went as far as to offer to Cecil advice on foreign policy, advocating a league with the 'young Sottishe kinge', and with Protestant princes in Germany. He also took the chance to counsel on further ecclesiastical reform, noting that the gospel should be earnestly promoted and the church should be unburdened with unnecessary ceremonies.⁵⁷ He thus implied that only a further shift away from Catholicism to a truly reformed religion could ultimately safeguard the nation and the Queen's person. Cecil certainly felt that it may be prudent to take some precautions and moved back to London, but he was not willing to go as far as Sandys wanted and certainly he did not believe that drastic action needed to be taken against all foreign Catholics as will be discussed next in regards to the Portuguese ambassador Francisco Giraldi.

The Portuguese Embassy

Sandys was not just a man of words; he put his beliefs into action. He asserted that all Catholics were a threat, but especially potent was any potential association between English and foreign Catholics. Sandys showed himself particularly concerned about the behaviour of the

Portuguese ambassador Francisco Giraldi, who had been appointed in 1571.⁵⁸ Sandys wrote to both Cecil and Leicester about his concerns. Writing to Leicester, on 4 March 1572, Sandys noted that Giraldi had been at court complaining about him, but that these complaints were irrelevant as it was actually Sandys and the people of London who had suffered by the ambassador's presence. Most of the ambassadors' houses were in Hackney, just outside the city, and the Portuguese ambassador had a house on Hoxton Street with a private chapel.⁵⁹ Sandys felt that the proximity of this international Catholic presence was a threat to the city of London. What precise complaints Giraldi had made against Sandys were unclear but Sandys' response was vehement. There was nothing in the way of diplomatic language with Sandys stating: 'Yf this calf-worshipper had fallen into milde Moses hands: he should have tasted of his bloody sword. King Asa would not permit Idoltrie to be committed within this her Majestys Realme unpunished.'⁶⁰ Sandys cast himself as King Asa here who was noted for rooting out idolatry in his kingdom, which suggested he was continuing with the crusade against Catholic imagery that he had begun in Worcester. He also accused Giraldi of committing treason against the Queen and then using his status as an ambassador to protect himself. The overt hostility and suspicion that Sandys displayed towards Giraldi is perhaps unsurprising. Giraldi was a loyal Catholic and the ambassador of an international Catholic country and thus Sandys' enemy. In the early Elizabethan era 'belief in the Catholic "bogey" was a common assumption amongst Protestant "hotgospelers"' and belief in Catholic conspiracies was common even amongst the 'religious and political moderates' that surrounded the Queen.⁶¹ Sandys' concerns about the threat posed by Catholics in corrupting the nation appeared to have been made manifest by Giraldi's actions in facilitating popery in Sandys' diocese. Sandys' concerns were not simply generic, specifically he was unhappy that Giraldi had been hosting Mass in his house on Sundays and holy days for at least twelve months.⁶² For Sandys this was intolerable, but made even more so because Giraldi was opening his house to allow some of the citizens of London access to the Mass and his priest. Sandys noted that there had been at least twenty people there participating in 'This wicked blasphemie this vile Idolatrie'.⁶³ The Sheriff of London had apprehended a few of the participants but only the 'simple sort' and had 'suffered the Author of this evill to escape'.⁶⁴ The gathering of Catholics at the house of a foreign ambassador was against Sandys' beliefs but also appear to be permitting a forum for rebellious and treasonous activities to take place uninhibited. His letter to Cecil revealed that of those apprehended by the Sheriff, four were students at law and freshmen at the Inns of Court. The Inns were proving to be a safe haven for some Catholic families in the era.⁶⁵ He also noted that a great number of the others had hidden themselves. Thus, those detained were of little consequence when the real prize was the Portuguese ambassador

himself.⁶⁶ When the raid took place Giraldi was armed with a dagger and prepared to put up a fight, moreover it seemed that the Sheriff was wary of apprehending him despite Sandys' commission.⁶⁷

This conflict with the Portuguese ambassador came at a particularly tense time in terms of English diplomatic relations with the rest of Europe.⁶⁸ Religious differences were adding to the already tense problem of ever-changing political alliances. The Portuguese royal family were having their own difficulties in trying to create a secure succession in the sixteenth century. King Joao III (John) had married Catalin, the sister of Charles V, and produced numerous offspring, but only one son. His only surviving son, also named Joao, had married Joanna of Austria, but died whilst she was still pregnant. Prince Joao's unborn son, Sebastian, therefore inherited the throne from his grandfather, meaning a long minority and no secure succession.⁶⁹ England had been on friendly terms with Portugal since the fourteenth century and English-Portuguese relations were important both dynastically and for trade. Portugal provided a connection with the Hapsburg Empire that circumvented Philip of Spain. Whilst relations with the Hapsburgs were undeniably worse under Elizabeth than they had been under Mary, Pauline Croft has suggested that the assumption that war between Elizabeth and Philip was inevitable is a product of reading history backwards. King Sebastian was a useful link to the Hapsburg family, yet he was far enough devolved from the main power base to make Portugal a potential trading partner.⁷⁰ In terms of trade the Portuguese claimed Morocco and Guinea as part of their imperial preserve, but these were areas that were also significant to English merchants. The English had petitioned Cecil insisting that the Portuguese had no right to prohibit trade in these areas.⁷¹ These trade negotiations were being conducted by Giraldi and it seemed the Portuguese were willing to allow the English to trade in Morocco and Guinea in exchange for an acceptance by Elizabeth of Portuguese rights to prohibit trade if they so wished. The trade negotiations were at their height in 1572–3 and of particular interest to the London merchants and the Lord Mayor of London who wanted a voyage to the Barbary Coast.⁷² Sandys' attack on the house of the Portuguese diplomat therefore had the potential to impact on a number of delicate relationships and negotiations.

Giraldi was facing that problem of many early modern diplomats. They could find themselves 'living in a country that enforced conformity to a faith different from their own' which could result in a 'tenure that could be uncomfortable, unpleasant or downright dangerous'.⁷³ Sandys was uncompromising in the way he felt practising and influential Catholics should be dealt with. The correspondence on the Portuguese Embassy problem fell silent after Sandys' initial letters to Cecil and Leicester in March 1572. This suggested that they did not see Giraldi's religious activities as a threat in the same way as Sandys did, or perhaps that they were likely to overlook the small infringements of holding Mass for the

sake of a good trade deal. The trade negotiations continued throughout 1573 with neither side making any real concession. Sandys' issue with Giraldi was clearly not deemed significant enough to expel him from the country, especially as trade negotiations needed to press ahead. Court politics, international diplomacy and the defence of religion were not always happy bedfellows. Good international relations with Catholic powers meant that compromise was sometimes necessary. Negotiations came to a halt in July 1573 when Giraldi returned to Portugal for a brief time. On Giraldi's return to England in 1574 negotiations recommenced, indicating that Sandys had not won his campaign to permanently remove him; yet this did not mean that his campaign against papists was ended.

Catholics in the City

Seeking out other potential breeding grounds for Catholic activity in the city was a preoccupation of the Privy Council and they had identified the Inns of Court as a particular concern. Immediately after the Northern Rebellion in 1569 a visitation of the Inns had been ordered to ensure a 'reformation of the persons' not conforming.⁷⁴ At that point five barristers (Bawde, Atkinson, Waferer, Greenwood and Grey), plus two others from the Inner Temple who did not attend, had all been identified as suspicious in religion.⁷⁵ At the Middle Temple four members had been identified, though only one (Palmer) appeared. Five barristers from Lincoln's Inn and five from Gray's Inn were also identified as suspicious in religion.⁷⁶ In 1572 Sandys was ordered by the Council to ensure that the Inns were reformed in terms of religion before the end of term and to ensure proper 'obedience to the laws and observation of good orders'.⁷⁷ The Inns were a potential breeding ground for discontent and non-conformist ideas. Moreover, there were certainly Catholics active at the Inns of Court, and as we saw previously they harboured men who were able to practise their religion and make international connections. There was a clear sense that although the universities were hostile environments the Inns were a safer place for Catholic families to send their sons.⁷⁸ To some extent there was already a degree of crown control of religious activities at the Inns which had been re-established in 1559 with the Elizabethan Act of Settlement.⁷⁹ Attempts had already been made at the Temple and Gray's Inn to ensure that the preachers were of the right quality and outlook. At the Inner Temple the crown had the right to appoint the clergy and chose Richard Alvey who had 'an unblemished Protestant pedigree' and was noted for his ability to make a godly sermon.⁸⁰ In 1574 a survey was taken of the chambers and societies of all the Inns of Court in order to exclude the 'unworthy and unnecessary number and sort thereof'.⁸¹ It was 1577, after Sandys' tenure in the city, before further real action was taken against many of the men cited in 1569 as suspicious in religion. This indicated that Sandys had attempted to create a hostile environment

in London for Catholics, but had not made the necessary inroads into these sanctums.⁸² The Inns of Court were difficult to regulate and expulsion from them involved having to evidence repeated infractions, non-attendance at worship and failure to receive communion, which perhaps accounted for the lack of progress made by Sandys.

Sandys did however continue to take action against the papist threat in the city. In 1574 he wrote a list of texts that he had confiscated which included 367 copies of Richard Bristowe's 'Motives to the Catholic faith', 20 Treatises of Treason against Queen Elizabeth and the Crown of England, 28 copies of 'A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation' by Sir Thomas More (1572) and several hundred miscellaneous Catholic pamphlets.⁸³ This gathering and cataloguing of seditious materials was presumably in response to two 1573 proclamations, firstly one in June against 'objectionable books' and then another in September against 'seditious books'.⁸⁴ The arrival of seminary priests in England from the mid-1570s had provoked greater anxiety about the spread of Catholic propaganda. It is clear that Sandys was actively seeking out potentially seditious material, but his focus was not just on looking for Catholic texts. This confiscation of books was also intended to reveal the radical Protestant texts which were circulating in 1573–4. In particular Sandys reported to Cecil that 'although the date of the late proclamation for bringing in of the admonition to the P[ar]lament and other sedicious bokes is alreday expired' he was still seeking out the text though none had come to his hands.⁸⁵ This letter illustrated the dilemma Sandys faced in London; whilst he had successfully located Catholic texts he was also seeking out Protestant texts due to the 'boldness and disobedience this new writers have already wrought in the myndes of the people'.⁸⁶ He now felt he was facing enemies on two fronts, the old papist foe and the new dangers of those pushing for greater reforms which threatened to undermine the commonwealth and Sandys' religion.

Puritan and Presbyterian Voices

Sandys was clearly not just troubled by Catholics and their failure to conform but also by those of reformed religion who felt that the reform process had not gone far enough and who were willing to disturb the status quo to put forward their aims. By the mid-1570s, he was fervently against the sort of further reform that would lead to any implementation of Presbyterian ideas. Yet equally he did feel that there were some aspects of Elizabeth's policies that could be amended, which led him to support limited further reform provided it did not progress towards a Presbyterian religion. Central to this was the education and training of preachers and the importance of preaching in the godly cause. Often Sandys has been portrayed as a Puritan, yet the term itself is relatively undefined and has contested meaning.⁸⁷ What will be shown next is that Sandys was not

part of the reforming group who was advocating for wholesale change towards a Presbyterian church, but he was in favour of progressing certain aspects of evangelical reform centred around preaching, education and the removal of idolatrous images; this has previously been construed as Sandys holding 'Puritan' sympathies, yet it was clear he was not in favour of Genevan style reform, he rejected the idea of a Presbyterian church because of its rejection of both hierarchy and the role of the godly magistrate.⁸⁸

At the University of Cambridge religious debate was ongoing and heated. The writing of Thomas Cartwright was to form the nucleus of one movement around which other key preachers orbited.⁸⁹ Cartwright had first given a series of lectures on the *Acts of the Apostles* as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1569/70 which saw 'the hierarchical, episcopal Church of England . . . utterly condemned'.⁹⁰ Cartwright attracted a following at Cambridge, much to the displeasure of the university hierarchy, who acted to remove him using the university statutes, specifically via statute forty-five, which 'legislated against public criticism of the established religion'.⁹¹ This pitted Cartwright against both Matthew Parker and Edmund Grindal who perceived him as a dangerous and disruptive element and more directly against John Whitgift who was successful in having him removed from office.⁹² The rise in popularity of these new reforming ideas was to have a very real impact on London and these concepts took hold amongst some of the clergy there. Collinson has noted that the Church in London actually meant a group of 'unbeneficed stipendiary curates and preachers, some of them lecturers in the parish churches or Inns of Court'.⁹³ This more disparate arrangement allowed for greater freedoms, but also gave more opportunities for divergent opinions to occur, with separatist congregations developing who wanted a 'return to some sort of apostolic ideal'.⁹⁴ John Strype referred to this grouping as 'disciplinarians', who were 'friends indeed to reformed religion in this land, but very ill affected to some of the Constitutions and practices of it; these were also now creating trouble and disturbance here; labouring for a still further reformation'.⁹⁵ A.F. Scott Pearson listed the group of reformers who met in London in 1572 as incorporating Gilby, Sampson, Lever, Field and Wilcox, but not Cartwright.⁹⁶ It was the two London clergymen John Field and Thomas Wilcox who were accredited with writing the *Admonition to Parliament*. Strype recorded that this 'spread abroad still more the next year, shewed their discontents, and what they would have reformed, or rather what they would have quite cast away, and abandoned in this church'.⁹⁷ The *Admonition* advocated a commonly held godly belief in the reformed Church, that the Church of Rome had corrupted the primitive church and ultimately led the faithful away from the true path. Thus, the reformers' ultimate aim was to return to the true path, for '[n]othing in early Elizabethan religion was quite so sacred as the primitive church'.⁹⁸ Whilst the basic premise of a return

to the primitive church, uncorrupted by Rome, may have been held in common by all reformers this was not to say that there was agreement on just what this meant in practice. Whilst Queen Elizabeth and Sandys may have agreed that the papacy was corrupt and that the new English Church would return to a 'golden age' of Christian faith, this did not mean restoring a primate church without hierarchy and authority.⁹⁹ The *Admonition* set out an agenda which some have seen as 'the first open manifesto of the puritan party' marking 'the point at which puritanism began to be a hostile force, determined to do away with the existing system of polity and worship in the English Church'.¹⁰⁰ This view assumes a cohesion that did not necessarily occur amongst reformers, as certainly no distinct party existed. The *Admonition* is useful, however, as a tool to cast light on the differing interpretations of what a reformed church meant to different individuals and to illustrate just how fragmented the reformers really were in the Elizabethan era. It illustrated what Sandys was contending with in London which was a fight against radicals and conservatives.

Even though Cartwright was not directly involved with Field and Wilcox's *Admonition* he was brought back into the fray. He had left England for Geneva in December 1570 and only returned in 1572.¹⁰¹ His old adversary, John Whitgift, had published *An Answere to a Certain Libel Entitled an Admonition to the Parliament* (1572).¹⁰² With publication of the *Second Admonition to Parliament* he once again found himself in conflict with Whitgift, this time via a war of words with successive publications. Cartwright responded with *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: Agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer, Touching the Churche Discipline*.¹⁰³ Cartwright advocated that all aspects of the Church should be ordered according to scripture, whilst Whitgift responded arguing that scripture did not 'provide guidelines for the regulation of some aspects of the Church'.¹⁰⁴ These publications and the debates and controversies they provoked were to have a direct impact on Sandys who found himself struggling to balance the demands of the Council and Queen to suppress seditious activities, the need to maintain order and discipline in the diocese of London and his own reforming beliefs.

So what of Sandys' stance on the issue of further reform? The issues that were causing controversies in the Elizabethan era were many and varied and these will be explored in more detail next before moving on to Sandys' own stance. Their significance in terms of theology, practice and symbolism was also hotly debated and they were judged to be of differing importance by various groups. For example, the physical symbols of the ring in marriage formed one point of debate, whilst kneeling to receive communion another, these were listed amongst the abuses 'picked out of the popish dunghill, the mass book.'¹⁰⁵ Controversies raged about prophesying, vestments, the role of preaching and which individuals should be

allowed to preach. Those pushing for further reform felt that what was needed was drastic institutional reform of the Church itself, which took religion back to a purer and more primitive form, yet many fell somewhere in the spectrum between ardent conformist and ‘puritan’.¹⁰⁶

One of the focal points of debate which illustrated a varying range of views was that of clerical vestments, so these will be considered first. There was a significant amount of discussion regarding what priests and ministers wore and to what extent reformers, especially the returned exiles, should be prepared to compromise on this matter. Clothing may seem a trivial matter given the scope and impact of theological debate in the era, yet it was a very visible indicator of how much things had changed. This issue ran alongside debates on not just what the priest wore but how the church should look and what ornamentation should be permitted. Vestments were a cause of tension for John Jewel and he was not entirely at ease with the ruling of the settlement on this matter. Yet, as Jenkins argues he viewed a compromise on what ministers wore as a less significant issue than Elizabeth’s retention of her crucifix, which to Jewel at least appeared to be idolatry.¹⁰⁷

Vestments and Controversy

The practice of English separatism and presbyterianism alike started with a group of angry and frustrated pious laity in London in 1566. They were seeking Protestant church services where they would not be confronted by ministers wearing the rags of Antichrist, the legally mandated clerical surplices that had been inherited from the Catholic Church.¹⁰⁸

Thus, clerical vestments became a visible symbol of reformation of the clergy. The debate on vestments has often been framed in terms of ‘Archbishop versus exile’, with Matthew Parker himself admitting that his attempts to moderate the issue had ‘earned him “the foul reports of some protestants”’.¹⁰⁹ Collinson even implied that this included the opinion of Sandys himself as he had urged Parker not to ‘utterly condemn all Germanical natures’, although the context of Sandys’ plea undoubtedly referred to more than just a disagreement over vestments.¹¹⁰ Usher too condemns Parker for failing to take a ‘liberal interpretation on the provisions of the 1559 settlement’ and ‘his own natural conservatism’.¹¹¹ Yet Parker was in a difficult position trying to ensure that he retained favour with both the monarch and his bishops. The crisis over vestments came to a head in 1563 with Parker beginning to enforce the observance of the requirements laid down in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, but only as ‘interpreted (apparently with the queen’s tacit consent) by the bishops themselves’.¹¹² This essentially enforced only the wearing of the surplice and square cap rather than full vestments. Usher outlined the

complicated nature of trying to enforce this sort of legislation in the 'wide flung boundaries of the dioceses of London' with its multiple courts, confused jurisdictions and ancient liberties some of which formed 'virtually independent' outposts.¹¹³ Winship suggested that the enforcement of the regulations relating to the wearing of vestments was only implemented in the capital with the arrival of Grindal as Bishop of London in 1559 which would suggest the appointment of a returned exile equalled an enforcement of regulations. During a sermon to his congregation Grindal 'once apologized to his listeners for offending their godly consciences by wearing the hated vestments, but . . . wore them that he might sooner abolish them.'¹¹⁴ Grindal was concerned that the disputes over vestments were placing the future of the reformed church in England in jeopardy. He wrote to Bullinger in 1566 to express his concern that this 'controversy about things of no importance' had put many of the learned clergy on the brink of 'forsaking their ministry.'¹¹⁵ Thus, men such as Grindal and Sandys may have been accustomed to the godly requiring less pomp, but equally neither man was going to jeopardise the settlement for the sake of what were considered minor points.

Sandys had expressed concern over the retention of many vestiges of popery on his return to England, but equally assumed the right of interpretation rested with the ecclesiastical leadership. He wrote to Matthew Parker in April 1559 with the news on the ecclesiastical legislation passed by the new Parliament saying:

The last book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen.¹¹⁶

This held an optimistic view that there would be further change to come and that things were progressing slowly to allow either for the Queen's interpretation or to ensure that popish ornamentation would not be spirited away, losing opportunities for the crown. It was to become clear however that the Queen was not just concerned about the removal of ornamentation for purposes of profit, but rather that she wanted to retain certain aspects that she held to be important. In the introduction to *Puritan Manifestoes* the early twentieth century editors, Frere and Douglas, chose to interpret Sandys' words as a sign of his more reformists views:

The famous letter of Sandys of April 30, 1559, seemed to foreshadow a revolt against all the legal ornaments. It was only court pressure that brought the prelates up to the point of wearing copes: some of them would gladly have forgone even the surplice; while the contest

raged almost more fiercely about the walking dress of the clergy than about their ministerial dress.¹¹⁷

Indeed immediately on Sandys' return to England his views did seem to indicate he would be at the vanguard of the moment pushing for continual reform. Writing to Peter Martyr in 1560 Sandys noted that 'we have not long since a controversy respecting images'.¹¹⁸ By this he meant the dispute over the crucifix and the statues of Mary and John which Elizabeth wanted to retain and moreover to instruct clergy that they be placed in a prominent position in churches. Sandys was vehemently against this and had been involved in removing images during his visitation of the North. These actions and his failure to be supportive of or at least stay silent on the subject had meant that he was 'very near being deposed of' his office and earning the displeasure of the Queen.¹¹⁹ He also noted that 'Only the popish vestments remain in our Church, I mean copes; which, however, we hope will not last long'.¹²⁰ Dixon noted that 'their oracles', Peter Martyr and Bullinger, 'whilst believing that their scruples were right: . . . bade them yield them, rather than lose the office of preaching'.¹²¹ However, Sandys was remarkably quiet on the subject of vestments throughout 1565–6 which was at the height of the controversy over the wearing of the surplice and cap. Given Sandys' tendency to bring forth his views on other matters, including clerical marriage and the dangers of Catholic ornamentation in the 1560s, it seems strange that there is no comment on vestments if it was something he felt was the important issue of the day. It is also important to note that the often quoted evidence to support Sandys' supposed puritanical views was taken from 1559 not the mid-1570s. On his appointment to London in 1570 Sandys undertook a visitation where Strype noted that he enforced the regulations on conformity to the settlement and thirty-nine articles.

And January the 10th he held his visitation in London. Some Articles and Injunctions of the bishop then given the clergy, I learn from a journal of one of these London ministers. 'We are straitly charged, I. To keep strictly the Book of Common Prayer. II. No man to preach without a licence. III. To observe the appointed apparel: that is, to wear the square cap, the scholar's gown, &c. And in all divine service to wear the surplice. IV. None to receive strangers; that is, any of other parishes, to their communion. V. All clerks' tolerations to be called in.'¹²²

It would seem that in regards to vestments Sandys' 'radicalism' of 1559–60 had moderated by the mid-1560s and by 1570 he was an enforcer of the letter of the law. The wearing of limited vestments was then the lesser evil as access to the word and the role of preaching were determined by Martyr, Bullinger and ultimately Sandys to be the crucial element

in ensuring a godly Church in Elizabethan England. Compromise was necessary and Sandys, Jewel, Grindal and many others actively chose to adhere to the official line on the subject of the clergy's dress.¹²³

*Preaching: 'The house of public prayer should also be the house of public preaching'*¹²⁴

Preaching was crucial to Sandys' vision of a reformed church for it was through access to the scriptures and the preaching of the word that salvation was to be achieved. In his role as Bishop of London he had partial control of one of the key pulpits in the country; he held the right to appoint the preachers to St Paul's Cross.¹²⁵ The pulpit and preaching at St Paul's Cross has been the topic of studies by Millar McClure and most recently Mary Morrissey, whilst sermons and Elizabethan attempts at 'tuning the pulpits' have been examined by Peter McCullough, Susan Wabuda and Arnold Hunt amongst others.¹²⁶ Morrissey, in particular, has emphasised that St Paul's Cross was not easy to 'tune' as it 'operated, perhaps despite, a tussle between several authorities: the royal government, the dean of Paul's, but particularly the bishop, and the corporation of London.'¹²⁷ Morrissey argues that until the seventeenth century when Archbishop Laud and Charles I took control the pulpit at the Cross might be open to a wide range of opinions, as the controlling parties had conflicting interests. Whilst conflicting interests were in play, Sandys recognised the need to try and assert some kind of vetting procedure on those who were to speak there. Torrance Kirby's work on the nature of public sermons described a culture of persuasion that developed through the 1530s and which flourished in the controversies of the 1560s.¹²⁸ In light of the debates over Cartwright's ideas in London, control of the pulpit became increasingly important as a tool for communication. Sandys recognised the value of preaching as a tool for persuasion and control and thus how important regulation of who addressed the crowds there really was. The significance of what was said there had an influence on the city and in terms of the wider religious debates that were taking place in the country. Sandys' defensive letters to Robert Dudley and William Cecil in 1573/4 suggest he felt they were accusing him of losing control of the situation. Sandys himself complained of the seditious sermons that were being preached at the Cross and the rapidly changing opinions of men he had thought to be reliable in religious opinion.

These evill tymes force me to trouble your good LL [Lordships] do what I canne to promote little men to preache at the Crosse, but I cannot know their hartes, and these tymes have altered opinions. Suche as preached discretlie the last yeare now labour by raylinge to feede the fansties of the people, selfe liking has intoxicated them, and the flatterie of the fantasticall people hath bewitched them.¹²⁹

Collinson argues that after March 1566 there were few non-conformist clergy preaching at St Paul's Cross, thus excluding the 'militantly' Protestant and subscribers to the anti-vestiarian petition.¹³⁰ It is clear that there was a drive for conformity being undertaken by those in power including Sandys. In his role as Bishop of London in 1573 he suggested that even those men he initially thought would deliver a 'safe' sermon could no longer be relied upon. It also indicated that some of supporters of Cartwright and the *Admonition* were still making it through to preach at the Cross. Sandys cited the example of the chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich, a man named Cricke, who had been 'much commended unto me' in 'learning and sobrietie'. Yet Sandys stated that when called to the Cross, Cricke 'moste spitefully inveighed against the ecclesiasticall policie now by lawe established, confirming Mr Cartwrightes booke, as the true platform of the Syncer and Apostolicall Church'.¹³¹ Cricke was later to play a role in the East Anglican Presbyterian movement, indicating that he was by no means the conformist Sandys thought him to be.¹³² He also cited a Mr Arthur Wake of Christ Church, Oxford 'who this last yeare made a goode sermon at the Crosse'. Sandys had written to him to call on him to do the same again, but Wake did not reply to the letters and just arrived at St Paul's whilst Sandys was absent. When Doctor Walker and Sandys' Chancellor urged him 'to have consideration for thee troubled tymes' and to 'speake nothinge that should turn to sedition', he became evasive, only replying with 'well, well'.¹³³ It would seem, from Sandys' testimony, that this was taken as an acquiescence that Wake would deliver a conformist sermon, for they allowed him to preach. They were to be disappointed as his sermon too was 'confirmed in rayling against this present sake and affirming to be good whatsoever Mr Cartwright in writing hath set downe'.¹³⁴ Sandys asserted to the Council that 'I have dealt so carefully as I canne to keepe such fanaticall spirites from the crosse, but the deceitfull dwell enemye to religion' and he expressed the concern that many were 'so suddenlie changed these waveringe myndes that it is hard to tell where a man may truste'.¹³⁵ Sandys also warned that 'There is a conventicle or rather a conspiracie breedinge in London Contrare men of sundrie calling are as it were in commission together'.¹³⁶ He continued advocating that the leaders of this break-away reform movement were just as dangerous to godly religion as the papist threat.

The Citie will never be quiet until these authors of sedition who are now esteemed as goddess, as ffeilde, Wilcocke, Cartwright, and after be farre removed from the citie. The people resorte unto them as in poperie they were wante to runne on pilgrimage, yf these Idollers who are honoured for Saintes and greatlie enrishewd with giftes, were removed from hence their honour would fall into the dust, they would be taken for blacke as they be.¹³⁷

The publishing of Cartwright's *Reply* in April 1573, and a second reprinting in June of the same year, had clearly made an impact on many within the church as well as key members of the laity.¹³⁸ For Collinson it 'was in London that the episcopal repression of 1573 most closely resembled a persecution'.¹³⁹ Sandys was amongst those who now appeared to be suppressing further reform and defending the status quo. This represented a distinct shift for Sandys who had always seen himself at the vanguard of the reform movement. The sand had shifted around him; the crusade for reform had changed. Reform now meant going further than Bucer, Bullinger or Martyr; it outpaced the old guard of Edwardian Protestants and Sandys was not comfortable. He was now a defender of the prayer book, religious hierarchies and adherence to the Queen.

The Preaching of Mr Dering

The Bishop of London was clearly a key player in monitoring and regulating the religious activities of the citizens of the capital. Equally this placed him at the forefront of the exercise to control Puritan activities in the capital. Yet he also seemed willing to give men felt to be strong orators and who he felt could be reasoned with, an opportunity to preach. Even if Sandys held genuine sympathy towards those preachers who took a more radical stance, his writings and actions suggested this support was limited once his own position was under threat. In 1572 he had appointed the controversial preacher Edward Dering, reader of the divinity lecture in St Paul's Cathedral.¹⁴⁰ Dering was an unusual choice as he was out of favour with many having taken the side of Cartwright in the debates at Cambridge. Dering had also visited Field and Wilcox whilst in prison and expressed his controversial views to both William Cecil and Matthew Parker.¹⁴¹ Moreover, he had delivered a sermon before the Queen, on 25 February 1570, which had infuriated Elizabeth.¹⁴² His sermon, which was delivered as part of the Lenten series, took Psalm 78:70 as its theme.¹⁴³ It extolled the idea that princes are spiritual magistrates, and that it fell to them to reform religion. He opened with the phrase, 'A miserable Common-wealth it must needs be . . . that hath blind leaders.' Dering went further, addressing the Queen directly, saying that she should not 'pretende ignorance' of the short fallings of the English Church. Amongst these he listed the ignorance of the clergy, calling them 'dum dogs'.¹⁴⁴ McCullough implies that Dering went further still taking the Queen's hand as part of the dramatic performance of the sermon.¹⁴⁵ McGiffert has argued that this was a 'theopolitical' approach, advocating Puritan ideas based upon covenant principles.¹⁴⁶ The Queen was displeased and thus Dering was not an obvious candidate to appoint to a readership which gave access to a London audience and a key pulpit in Elizabethan England.

If Dering had reformed his ideas between 1569 and 1572 it was not immediately obvious. Matthew Parker clearly felt that Dering was not giving the 'right' answers when questioned on matters of controversial writings as he noted that his replies to *De visibili Monarchia Ecclesiae*, written by Catholic exile Nicholas Saunder, were childish.¹⁴⁷ Dering's stance on religion resulted in a Star Chamber case where he was accused of speaking against many elements of the Elizabethan Church including the Book of Service; against godfathers and godmothers; 'misliking of the Act of Parliament for the poor' and against church hierarchy; Dering is recorded as saying to a man named as Mr Blogg, 'Masters, hearken, I will prophecy, after Matthew Parker I trust there shall be no more Archbishops of Canterbury.'¹⁴⁸ Sandys was keen to defend his own actions in the Dering matter, stating he did not say much in the Star Chamber case as he had been called upon suddenly and did not know what would be propounded there, and at one point going further to state he did not know that Dering had been called.¹⁴⁹ The Queen was clearly unimpressed with Dering's response, or lack thereof, to this questioning. Moreover, Dering was still taking a controversial stance in the Cartwright problem. He wrote to Cecil in April 1573 to ask 'him to restore Mr Cartwright; and accused him somewhat rudely of his want of religion.'¹⁵⁰ Cecil's response to Dering indicated his displeasure, as he referred to his

biting letter, pretended (as by the beginning of a few of your lines appeareth) for Mr. Cartwright, whose name you reiterate, for that you will me not to be in heat at the memory of his name; I have been in doubt, whether I should, either for wasting of my time, or for nourishing of your humour, make you any answer by letter.¹⁵¹

Why then did Sandys choose Dering for the readership of St Paul's if he was considered a controversial and potentially disruptive preacher? If, as Lindsley contends, 'Dering's central concern was the preaching of sin and its remedy', with the greatest emphasis being placed upon the necessity of trained, preaching clergy, then Sandys and Dering had much in common.¹⁵² In addition Deering had gained some prominent patrons and was certainly more appealing to the elite than the commons. In June 1573 Sandys wrote to Burghley asking that Dering might be restored to his lectureship. Sandys acknowledged that Dering's words to the Council had perhaps 'cast himself into great danger', but felt that Dering was politically inept as he stated that 'a well advised man wold not have made suche an unadvised offer'.¹⁵³ Certainly Dering lacked the 'sensitive realism' that was necessary when speaking before men of great importance and particularly the Queen.¹⁵⁴ However Sandys continued that if Dering were restored he would 'rede his lecture so that he only teache sounde Doctrine' which extorted virtue and detracted from vice and that he would not meddle further in politics but would leave that task to the

magistrates.¹⁵⁵ Sandys reasoned that allowing Dering back into his lectureship would 'quiet many myndes now set on slaughter' for these were dangerous days. He also stressed that the restoration of Dering could be used successfully as a political tool, for 'I think that a soft plaister is better than a sharpe Coney to be applied to this sore, such are the tymes'.¹⁵⁶ Sandys later recorded that he had told Dering that he should read more soberly and deferentially that he had done or he would not be allowed to continue.¹⁵⁷ The Privy Council eventually ruled on 28 June 1573 that Dering could continue to lecture.¹⁵⁸ Sandys was a politically aware individual and his support of Dering at this point was intended as a way of providing a sop to the reformers, but in a way that he felt he could control. Sandys had envisaged that Dering would be a malleable tool for directing and placating these new religious movements, but ultimately he was wrong. By August 1573 Sandys was writing to Burghley again about Dering, this time defending himself against accusations made by Dering that it was Sandys who had put him out of the lectureship.¹⁵⁹ The relationship between the two men had clearly declined rapidly as now Sandys asserted that 'it be no rare things in Mr Dering to lye it is his common fault, commonly noted'.¹⁶⁰ Sandys noted in this letter, and in an additional letter enclosed in the correspondence, that discussions about Dering had previously taken place with key councillors (both Cecil and Dudley) and he had not proved to be the compliant preacher Sandys had hoped.

Sandys' support of Dering was at best fluctuating; he was willing to speak out for him up to a point, but he was not willing to fall with him. Sandys asserted that prior to August 1573 he had been unable to act. He enclosed a copy of a previous letter when he wrote to Cecil in August that reminding him that

if a Bishop of any church shall understand that any publique readers in his church doth oppigne the common order of the ministericon the churches established by law etc it is his duty upon good knowledge therof to remove him

but

yow have nothing wherin to charge him in his reading or otherwise with breach of the orders in the church, and that he is redy therto to answer, and offered to reade, and live wth owt breach of order, I cannot in conscience procede to hasten hir maties commandment untill I may heare more from your L. wherein he hath offended worthy to be removed.¹⁶¹

The fact that there had been no evidence and no firm word from either Cecil or Leicester had stayed Sandys' hand. Defying Queen Elizabeth was

not a policy that could be adhered to in the long term. Sandys, in his letter to Cecil in August 1573, was keen to state that he had already written of his belief that Dering, Wiverns and Johnson were followers of Cartwright's writing.¹⁶² Thus, when it became clear that Dering was not conforming nor was he to be redeemed in the eyes of Cecil, Leicester or the Queen then Sandys distanced himself from this potentially dangerous link. Whilst Sandys and Dering may have shared the broadly held belief that the Elizabethan religious reforms had not fulfilled their potential, they disagreed on how further reform should be achieved. Both were quarrelsome individuals but there was one great difference: Sandys was politically aware and knew when it was best to conform. Dering was a committed and effective preacher, but ultimately one who was dangerous to the status quo.

This man, by reason of his being a reader in St. Paul's, London, and a preacher of a ready utterance, and of great confidence, did also draw away many proselytes. It was therefore thought convenient to silence him from preaching his lecture any more. And so he was the next year, viz. 1573. This man was a great enemy to the order of bishops.¹⁶³

The Dering matter had muddied the waters and for Sandys there was now a need to make a public statement of his beliefs in regards to those pushing for further reform.

Stance Against a 'rebellious generation'

In 1573 Sandys gave a sermon at St Paul's Cross taking as its theme Matthew 8:23 and 24: 'And when he entered into the ship, his disciples followed him. And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, so that the ship was covered with waves: but he was asleep'.¹⁶⁴ Here he spoke out against the threat posed by those who were pushing for further and unnecessary reform. Sandys acknowledged that there would be difficulties in achieving the kingdom of God, and again he highlighted the anti-christ as a false source that could distract from the true Church, but went on to state that if 'our fathers, elders, guides, and teachers' 'be a rebellious generation, a generation that set not their hearts aright . . . then are they no precedent for us to follow'.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, he stated that the godly could and should be corrected, and would thus see the truth, whereas the wicked will be confused.¹⁶⁶ He also made the directly political point that a kingdom cannot stand if it is distracted and divided into factions and described those who were subscribing to these new radical ideas as 'silly weak ones', emphasising that it was the duty of the hierarchy, both magistrate and minister not to 'fall asleep'.¹⁶⁷ It advocated for the need for the faithful to be alert to dangers facing them and argued that 'he is

no servant, that refuseth to follow his master:' and that '[i]t is lamentable that the gospel of peace should bring forth schism'.¹⁶⁸ He further warned that Satan was ever looking for ways to destroy the true Church:

Sometimes he stirreth up cruel and bloody persecution. If that will not serve, he useth such winds as are somewhat more calm, but no whit less dangerous, the winds of division and contention, than which nothing doth sooner hazard the church of Christ. A kingdom being at unity in itself, though it be small, yet may be strong; but divided and distracted into factions, though it be mighty, how should it stand?¹⁶⁹

Delivering the sermon was not the only action Sandys took. In June 1573 Sandys wrote to Cecil stating that

I had sent you the assertions inclosed . . . but that I was desyrus first to have looked into Cartwright's boke and se what good stuff was to be found ther: but truth is as yet I could neuer com by that boke although it is currant amongst many. The absurdities and inconveniences are set down for the most part in their owne words.¹⁷⁰

Sandys' claim that he could not get hold of a copy of the text does seem somewhat dubious given the apparent prevalence of it in his diocese and the fact he had been tasked with confiscating any books which did not conform. The hunt for this prohibited text was not the only, or main, concern that Sandys had, but also what to do with the preachers who created the *Admonition* and had spoken out in favour of Cartwright's book. Sandys had been charged with reforming these men and then making the decision when they were suited to release. Given a lack of steer by the Privy Council he had opted to keep them under supervision in the city and thus they were lodged with Mr Mullens, archdeacon of St Paul's Cathedral, who was keen to be 'ridd of thyme'.¹⁷¹ The two preachers had written to Sandys to try to secure their liberty and Sandys also reported that he had received 'sondrie letters from noblemen in ther behalves'.¹⁷² Sandys was clearly uncomfortable with being charged with the decision of what to do with them telling Cecil that

the Counsell hath geven me authorite to set them at libertie or at the least to be in ther owne houses. I shal pray your L[ordship] that I may be releued in that behalf and disburdined. The whole blame is layde on me for ther Imprisonment.¹⁷³

The summer of 1573 was unpleasant for Sandys as there was a backlash against his perceived anti-Puritan stance. The campaign against him had begun in February 1573 and took the form of a libel which was

circulating in the city against him.¹⁷⁴ The libel was penned by Robert Johnson and addressed to Sandys as the ‘Superintendent of popish corruption in the diocese of London’, which clearly rankled. In this publication he refused to address Sandys as Bishop or Lord, accused Sandys of becoming a persecutor of the godly and of loving his palace and worldly things too much as to forget the true faith.¹⁷⁵ Sandys wrote to Cecil on 2 July 1573 to complain about this and the *Admonition*, asking for Cecil’s help in seeking out the author/s of all this material.¹⁷⁶ As noted previously Sandys was at pains to point out that he had not received any of the seditious books that the Queen had instructed be handed in, despite the fact that the deadline set had expired and he was sure that there were copies in the city.¹⁷⁷ The published libel clearly had a great impact on Sandys personally. Strype attributed this backlash to Sandys’ overly diligent response to the Queen’s instruction to search out radicals. He recorded that many ‘inventives were writ against him and particularly a book was now printed, which, as it made reflection upon the ecclesiastical state, so it laid foul aspersions upon him’.¹⁷⁸

Sandys’ urging for unity provoked a negative response from those pushing towards a Presbyterian style church. Their reaction further convinced Sandys that ‘Puritan’ religious reform was dangerous to the stability of the city and the nation. Writing to Bullinger in August of 1573 Sandys stated that:

New orators are rising up from amongst us, foolish young men, who while they despise authority, and admit no superior, are seeking the complete overthrow and rooting up of our whole ecclesiastical polity, so piously constituted and confirmed, and established by the complete overthrow of most excellent men.¹⁷⁹

Sandys clearly believed that this desire for further and more radical religious change was not motivated by true religious belief or fervour but rather that some desired change for the sake of it and that ‘the nobility [seek for] what is useful’.¹⁸⁰ His dislike of Puritan ideas that advocated against hierarchy could be seen as closely linked with his world view and also with his desire to ensure the preservation of land, titles and property. Certainly he was appalled at the idea that the Church’s hierarchy should be dissolved and that the ‘goods, possession, lands, revenues, titles, honours, authorities and all other things relating to either bishop of cathedrals, and which now of right belong to them, should be taken away forthwith and for ever’.¹⁸¹ He disapproved of this abandonment of order and advocated a clear view of patristic humanism, hierarchy and social order. He justified his disapproval stating that: ‘Take away authority, and the people will rush headlong into everything that is bad. Take away the patrimony of the church, and you will by the same means take away not only sound leaning, but religion itself.’¹⁸² Sandys also noted that this new

group were asserting that 'No one should be allowed to preach who is not a pastor of some congregation; and he ought to preach to his own flock exclusively, and nowhere else'.¹⁸³ Again this suggested that preachers should be limited to one place and one congregation which did not sit well with Sandys' view of the importance of preaching to spread the word. This parochial view of religion was at odds with Sandys' experience; after all he had travelled Europe, shared ideas with the great theological minds of the age and was a man who believed in the established order and hierarchy of clerics.

Anabaptists and the 'Stranger' Churches

It was not just Cartwright, Field and Wilcox who posed a threat to settled Elizabethan religion, other groups in London were to continue to cause problems for Sandys. Initially the 'Stranger' Churches had established a presence there, under Archbishop Cranmer. These groupings consisted of exiles from the continent, especially from France, Italy, the Low Countries and Spain.¹⁸⁴ Collinson and McGrath made links between the Calvinist ideas advocated by these churches as a 'permeable membrane between the emergent world of presbyterian Calvinism and the royally and episcopally ordered Church of England', whilst Springer has argued that 'foreigners' ceremonies . . . had little impact in England' after 1558.¹⁸⁵ Sandys was amongst many who was willing to support the approved and established foreign churches in London, such as the Dutch and French congregations, but who was not willing to tolerate the aberrant groups who had divergent views on key issues.¹⁸⁶

In 1570, immediately after Sandys took up office, the Italian churches were becoming aberrant. They were seen to be drifting from the principles initially intentioned and with concerns expressed that the young men attending were doing so to practise their Italian rather than hear the preached sermons and word of God. Thus, the young men had 'lost all the good and sober principles they carried out of England with them, and became negligent of religion, and little better than atheists'.¹⁸⁷ The problems engendered by those that were outside the direct control of the parish and bishop were to continue. In 1575 Sandys was involved with suppressing a group of Dutch Anabaptists.¹⁸⁸ Anabaptists had faced difficulties in England from the reign of Henry VIII, as they were divergent of Catholic doctrine and yet not acceptable to the reformed views of religion developing at court.¹⁸⁹ Sandys' reaction to the potential threat posed by Anabaptist groups to 'settled religion' is unsurprising given what has already been established of his character. The Anabaptist sects had been the centre of much trouble and anxieties in Strasbourg and the general climate of unease around non-conformity of this ilk in England was at a high point.¹⁹⁰ During Edmund Grindal's time as Bishop of London (1559–70) he had been asked to deliberate by members of these

foreign churches on various matters relating to the Strangers' Churches established in London. In each case he had set up a committee of men to deliberate on such matters, these panels incorporated ministers from the English, French and Dutch churches.¹⁹¹ Grindal had been forced to take action against men such as Justus Velsius whose radical views were at odd with many even in the reformed church.¹⁹² Sandys provides us with an account of his own actions via a letter sent to William Cecil, but we also have accounts of the incident given by the Anabaptists or 'friends' as they referred to themselves. The *Martyrs Mirror* compiled and published by Thieleman Van Braght in 1660 tells the stories of both the early Christian martyrs and European Anabaptists in a similar vein to Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.¹⁹³ Sandys simply recorded to Cecil that the group had been questioned on four key points of belief by both himself and the French and Dutch preachers who had accused them. On all of these points they failed to give satisfactory answers. Their denial of the Virgin birth, infant baptism, the legitimacy of the magistrate and swearing oaths to tell the truth resulted in their imprisonment in the Marshalsea. Sandys noted that their errors in religion were dangerous and to allow these views to spread would be a mistake. He advocated that those who failed to simply join the established Dutch church should 'be utterly expelled owte of this realme. And yf they returne to lose their lives for it.'¹⁹⁴ Sandys' toleration of non-conformity was certainly limited in regards to Anabaptists and he noted that attempts to expel them from the country in previous years had failed, as they had simply returned.¹⁹⁵ Sandys was keen to take actions swiftly to put an end to this aberrant group's ideas and classified Anabaptist ideas alongside Catholicism in terms of the dangers posed and responses required. This is illustrated by the fact that he went on to discuss an Irish priest who also required a certificate before he could deal with him, in the same letter.¹⁹⁶ The group of Dutch Anabaptists had been discovered in a house in Whitechapel without Aldgate in the east end of the city on Easter morning by William Friend.¹⁹⁷ These individuals had assembled for a meeting and Friend reported this to the constable John Osbourne (the rector of the parish), Richard Gardiner and two other officers and then went on to report the events to Sandys as Bishop of London.¹⁹⁸

The *Martyrs Mirror* recorded the story from multiple view points, all of which are taken from Anabaptists' accounts, some of whom were amongst the group detained on Easter Sunday. The title of the first section recorded that this was the tale of twenty 'persons at London' who were involved in this incident, however it later noted that twenty-five were initially conducted to prison only two of which escaped without violence.¹⁹⁹ The twenty-five consisted of fourteen women, a youth, five men who were imprisoned and five men who abjured. Sandys' role in proceedings is recorded in more detail in this account where he is referred to only as 'the bishop'. It was noted that there were twenty-five people

who were initially detained in the South Fort in the Mersey. This group was released on bail but with orders to appear at St Paul's to be questioned by 'the bishop and other eminent teachers and persons'.²⁰⁰ Gerrit Van Byler, one of the men imprisoned, noted that a Mr George, James King, John Wheelright, two aldermen and a French preacher were all present.²⁰¹ Both Sandys' account and the one given by the *Mirror* agree on the four key issues that came under question and that the group had denied them all. The *Mirror* noted that:

the bishop, and also the others, inveighed against them in a very brutal and furious manner, saying that the law should be applied to these people; if not, they would themselves lay hands on them. And because one of the prisoners spoke a little more than the rest, they said: 'This is their captain; you shall no longer scatter your evil seed in our country,' and they shut him up by himself. And the bishop showed them a large letter, saying very sternly: That the court has given orders, that all strangers should have to subscribe the above mentioned four questions, and he who would do this might remain in the country free and without molestation, but all that were found obstinate herein should be put to a terrible death. Let everyone consider this, subscribe and deliver himself from danger.²⁰²

In this account Sandys is portrayed as a threatening individual, a persecutor of the godly, which is in direct contrast to his portrayal in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* where he was the victim and the persecuted. Given this account is written by those who were punished it is unsurprising that their account casts Sandys as the persecutor. The *Mirror* continues that upon hearing Sandys' threat that they would be put to death if they did not subscribe five of the group recanted, but were not allowed to leave without further incident as instead were 'exposed . . . for a disgrace, in St. Paul's churchyard, with a fagot tied on their shoulders, as a token that they were worthy of burning, with which they stood there till the bishop had concluded his sermon'.²⁰³ Sandys was asking not that they conformed to the English Church, but rather that they subscribed to the teachings of the Dutch Church as the *Mirror* recorded that Sandys had given them a letter saying that 'these people were seduced' but they should have bail if they were to be united with their Dutch brethren. Sandys met with the group on another two occasions but with little success as they refused to conform to the Dutch Church and so were eventually passed from the hands of Sandys to that of the Mayor. The attempts to convert the group would seem to support Sandys' information that he had tried to persuade them and fits in with his belief that those of reformed religion at least stood some chance of being saved, unlike their Catholic counterparts. Yet his public humiliation of them also demonstrated that he was not willing to tolerate aberrant religious groups who he considered dangerous.

The fourteen women who refused to recant were also eventually released and put on board a ship for Gravesend along with the youth although the *Mirror* noted that he was first ‘tied to a cart and scourged out [of the city] with a whip’.²⁰⁴ Of the five prisoners that remained one died in prison and two were eventually released. The other two Hendrick Terwoort, a goldsmith, and Jan Pieterss, a cart maker, were condemned as heretics and burnt at Smithfield. Thus, Sandys’ advocated punishments were carried out, subscribers were permitted to stay under the direction of the Dutch church, but those who did not were exiled or executed. The execution of fellow members of the reformed community was a drastic step. No ‘protestants’ (the term is used very broadly here) had been burnt as heretics since Mary’s reign. Under Elizabeth Catholics were treated as felons, not heretics, and subject to hanging rather than burning. Thus, the decision to burn Terwoort and Pieterss was significant and illustrated just how far Sandys had changed his stance. He would not defend those who were too radical in the hopes they could be brought back to the true path of faith. They were as far removed from his theological position as the papists he had been fighting.

Prophesying: Learning How to Preach?

Another area of contention in Elizabethan England was how the clergy should be educated and trained in the skills needed by the reformed minister. Sandys had spoken on several occasions, as evidenced by letters and sermons, of the importance of education in furthering the godly cause. One method employed to educate the clergy was a practice that has come to be known as ‘prophesying’ in Elizabethan ecclesiastical history. This practice saw ministers engaged in exercises whereby they discussed key sections of the scriptures and debated their meaning and interpretation. Strype tells us that:

Prophesyings or exercises were much used now throughout most of the dioceses. Wherein the incumbents in livings and men in orders were employed in explaining certain passages of Holy Scripture in certain parish churches appointed by the bishop of the diocese for that purpose. Which were very acceptable to those of the people that favoured the Protestant religion; and had also their good use, both for the improving of the clergy in their studies of the Word of God, and for the instruction of the laity in the right knowledge of religion.²⁰⁵

The debate over prophesying reflected some of the inherent tension in the Elizabethan Church. This lay at the heart of just how truly reformed the Church was to be; for example how accessible scripture was and how to convey its meaning to the laity. The nature of ‘prophesying’ as

a practice is relatively obscure and, as Kaufman stated, '[w]e know relatively little about prophecies or "exercises" that early Elizabethan reformers devised as in-service training.'²⁰⁶ It would seem that prophesying was an activity that had been used in the continental cities of Zurich and Strasbourg as an educational practice and would thus have been familiar to the former exiles.²⁰⁷ To what extent these 'prophesyings' were controversial in their very nature is debatable, but Collinson believes that these were not particularly radical activities.²⁰⁸ They consisted of a voluntary gathering of interested laity, but predominantly of the clergy, to listen to sermons delivered by established preachers.²⁰⁹ The audience would consist of both clergy and laity but it was only the clergy that then withdrew to discuss the sermons. The reason why prophesying came to the attention of the monarch at all seems to be centred around the pre-occupation with the maintenance of order, rather than being due to any deep-seated theological dispute. The fallout from the controversy over the suppression of prophesying was however significant.

In relation to the feelings of the Queen's court Sandys found himself on the wrong side of the argument when it came to the issue of 'prophesying'. Not everyone saw the practice as a training method to be encouraged, though it could be argued that much of the dispute centred on how the exercises could be defined.²¹⁰ Elizabeth I was adamant that these prophesyings were not to be tolerated. The objections to the practice can be seen in Lord Bacon's judgement on the importance of preaching and the dangers of prophesying recorded by Strype.

Is there no mean to trade and nurse up ministers? (for the field of universities will not serve, though they were never so well governed;) to train them, I say, not to preach, (for that every man confidently adventureth to do,) but to preach soundly, and to handle the scriptures with wisdom and judgement? I know prophesying was subject to great abuse, and would be more abused now, because heat of contention is increased. But I say, the only reason is, the abuse was, because there was admitted to it a popular auditory; and it was not constrained within a private conference of ministers.²¹¹

Thus, the objections articulated by Bacon centred on the accessibility of this practice to the wider populace, which left it open to abuse. In particular the dangers this could present in terms of encouraging the people to question scripture, their ministers and authority more generally. Sandys however seemed unwilling to believe that Elizabeth had ordered the practice to cease when he was first told of the commandment from Parker in 1574. Sandys' view was reflective of the longstanding anxieties regarding the potential dangers of making scripture available to the laity without providing guidance. On being ordered to suppress the exercises in London he wrote to the Privy Council 'praying to know her Majesty's

pleasure herein by your Lordships'.²¹² He also made the point that there had been such exercises in his diocese since the beginning of Elizabeth's reign for the education of the ministers.²¹³ He emphasised that those participating were 'men of order, sober and discreet', that his diocese 'was quiet and orderly' and that suppressing such exercises would 'breed uniqueness'.²¹⁴ He was firmly of the view that some amongst the laity could be trusted with access to the scripture, but only if guided by a well-educated and well-trained clergy and the exercises were necessary to produce a correctly trained clergy. Elizabeth was not however satisfied with Matthew Parker's attempts to stop prophesying and instructed Grindal, his successor, to again suppress these exercises. Sandys supported Grindal in compiling a defence of the exercises, but was clear on the stipulation that the general populace was only to be permitted to hear the sermon and not to be allowed to participate in the debates.²¹⁵ Collinson's work on Archbishop Grindal asserts the controversy surrounding Elizabeth's desire to suppress the prophesying was what was at the heart of his fall from grace.²¹⁶ Sandys believed access to the scriptures was important, but equally that the laity needed appropriate guidance in reading them. A properly educated clergy was one solution to this, but it was the clergy not the laity that should be permitted to engage in the debate.

Thus, Sandys was enthusiastic about the education of the clergy, for it was through education that he felt the true godly religion would be best spread. The practice of hearing sermons and then allowing debate amongst the clergy as a teaching technique was one that clearly appealed to Sandys, and the controversy over prophesying was perhaps unexpected. In 1576 he responded to Edmund Grindal, the new Archbishop of Canterbury's enquiries about the practice of prophesying, by contacting his archdeacons with instructions that they were to answer every point concerning the 'learned exercises within my diocese.'²¹⁷ This would seem to be an indication that the exercises were still taking place in the diocese of London. The surviving responses were comprehensive and indicated that the exercises were still taking place within the archdeaconries of both St Albans and Essex. Moreover, these were regular occurrences that took place as often as once a fortnight in Essex and once a month in St Albans.²¹⁸ David Kemp, archdeacon of St Albans, noted that they were of great benefit to ministers, especially the younger ones and that they were moderated to ensure control was maintained, with an assurance that they 'dealt with no matters of controversy, as apparell'.²¹⁹ John Mullins, Sandys' archdeacon in London, provided a reply worthy of Sandys' himself in its obtuseness. He stated that in London 'there is but one kinde of exercise' which was held every six months for four or five days where the clergy who 'are no preachers' were allocated texts to study for discussion. He further advocated that, 'As for prophesying, there is none in the Archdeaconry of London.'²²⁰ For Sandys and his archdeacon prophesying and exercises were very different, what Mullins

was describing was 'a tradition of purely clerical exercises in London'.²²¹ The 'exercises' involved the education of the clergy, whereas the congregational 'prophesyings' could be said to describe the practises of some of the Stranger Churches, which needed to be controlled. Too much lay participation and debate could lead to dangerously radical ideas. In the exercises, as envisaged by Sandys, control was still paramount as this was a regulated process driven by respect for hierarchy. In May 1577 Elizabeth sent out letters to all the bishops ordering them to suppress these Puritan activities.²²² Collinson argues that Sandys' support of prophesying was an indication that whilst he was alarmed by Cartwright he remained 'a fully fledged evangelist'.²²³ Certainly Sandys was committed to godly religion, and his definition of godly practice incorporated an emphasis on the scriptures, preaching and education but also on the importance of ecclesiastical hierarchy, discipline and an ordered society. His religion was not that of Cartwright or even that of Dering and it was certainly not a religion that allowed the laity free rein to question and debate the scriptures with scant regard to an educated clergy. He was thus an evangelical, but not a Puritan in the sense of the word as it was used in the 1570s to denote someone advocating for the more radical forms of religious change advocated by Cartwright *et al.*

Conclusion

The Bishop of London therefore faced a near impossible task, as well as maintaining good order in a very diverse diocese he also held responsibilities for the control of foreign national churches and was expected to regulate preaching at one of the key venues in the country. Sandys tackled the task with his usual forcefulness and was clearly willing to seek out those who were flouting the Act of Uniformity. In London he was to find himself in conflict with both Catholics and those pushing for further reform, often labelled Puritan. His failure to commit to supporting the new groups of reformers was the signal that he was now one of the compliant clergy; he was holding the line against further unfettered and unwise reform. Over the course of his episcopacy in London Sandys' stance against those who were pushing for further, and to his mind unnecessary, reform began to harden. They were now posing a danger to established evangelical religion; they were challenging the tenets of faith he adhered to including clerical hierarchy. He was not alone in facing the dilemma regarding how to deal with the next swathe of reformers. The choice for men such as Sandys was to either support further reform and in doing so condemn their own evangelical confession as incomplete and insufficient or to oppose further reform and become defenders of the status quo. To do the former was to abandon their now well-established role in the English Church, but also required an acceptance of these new ideas. Those pushing for further reform were moving further away from

mere dispute over outward signs of worship and towards ideas, which would challenge the Queen and her religious settlement. In opposing them he also shifted further than Edmund Grindal in changing his stance and as we will see in the next chapter he and Grindal no longer seemed as close as they once were. In addition many who backed Cartwright's ideas lost, along the way, their status, power and influence. Sandys' zeal in Worcester and London had denoted him as suitable to combat Catholicism, but equally his sermons at court were wisely judged, his choice to defend the settlement and the status quo rather than support the more radical reformers suggested he was astute enough to know what would and would not be tolerated. He was now one of the trusted clerics who could be relied upon to enforce the Elizabethan settlement. His next appointment suggested just how much he was a man of the regime, as he rose to become Archbishop of York and moved north again to face the challenges there. It also suggested that Queen Elizabeth and William Cecil believed that he may prove a useful individual to have in one of the more troublesome regions of the realm.

Notes

- 1 Alec Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realms, 1485–1603* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 247.
- 2 T. Wilcox and J. Fields, 'Admonition to the Parliament', in *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt*, ed. W.H. Frere and C.E. Douglas. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907), p. 9.
- 3 Peter Marshall, *Reformation England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), p. 132.
- 4 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 331.
- 5 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 12 f.182. 'Edwyn, Bp. of Worcester, to Sir Wm. Cecil; his grief that his refusing the Bishoprick of London has displeased him', 26 April 1570.
- 6 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 12 f.182.
- 7 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 12 f.182.
- 8 Patrick Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519? 1588)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 9 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 12 f.182.
- 10 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 12 f.182.
- 11 Susan Brigden, 'Religion and Social Obligation in Early Sixteenth-Century London', *Past and Present*, 103, 1 (1984), 67–112, esp. p. 69; Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal, 1519–1583* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1979), p. 108.
- 12 Susan Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 2.
- 13 J.B. Trapp, 'Colet, John (1467–1519)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 14 Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, pp. 108–9; Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons 1558–1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 24.
- 15 John Aylmer, 'Letter from John (Aylmer) Bishop of London, to the Lord Mayor [12 October 1581]', in *Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia 1579–1664*, ed. W.H. Overall and H.C. Overall (London: E.J. Francis, 1878), pp. 322–9.

- 16 Barrett L. Beer, 'London Parish Clergy and the Protestant Reformation, 1547–1559', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 18, 3 (1986), 375–93.
- 17 Tai Liu, *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1986), p. 23. Liu calculated that 97 of the 110 parishes were within the city walls. Also, based on a count of the number of houses that were tithable, that of the 110 parishes 55 could be classified as small parishes. Also see Roy Porter, *London: A Social History* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 65.
- 18 David Hickman, 'Religious Belief and Pious Practice Amongst London's Elizabethan Elite', *The Historical Journal*, 42, 4 (1999), 941–60, 942.
- 19 Porter, *London*, pp. 64–5.
- 20 David Hickman, 'The Religious Allegiance of London's Ruling Elite 1520–1603' (Unpublished PhD thesis, University College London, 1995), p. 205.
- 21 John Stowe, 'Spiritually, or ecclesiastically government', in *A Survey of London, by John Stow: Reprinted from the Text of 1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), pp. 124–38; J.F. Merritt, ed., *Imaging Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stowe to Strype 1598–1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 1.
- 22 Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London*, p. 37; Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 176 on Protestant antiquarians.
- 23 A.L. Beir, 'Social Problems in Elizabethan London', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 9, 2 (1978), 203–21.
- 24 John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign*, Vol. II, part I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), pp. 28–9.
- 25 Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 98.
- 26 Brett Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559–1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 127.
- 27 C. Read, *Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1965), pp. 431–54; views on Cecil's desire for further reform can be seen throughout Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*.
- 28 Retha M. Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots* (Oxford: Routledge, 2006), p. 2.
- 29 Jenny Wormald, *Mary, Queen of Scots: Pride, Passion and a Kingdom Lost* (London: IB Tauris, 2001), p. 177.
- 30 Read, *Mr Secretary Cecil*, p. 397.
- 31 Kimberly Coles, "'Printed at London Anonymous": Was there Ever an Attempt to Publish the First Edition of the Defence of Mary Queen of Scots in England?' *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 49, 195 (1998), 273–81; Jean Wilson, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Urania', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 69 (2006), 151–73.
- 32 Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions* (London: Longman, 2008), p. 102.
- 33 Penny Williams, *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 392 notes the Elizabethan Council's business as full and thus sedition was dealt with by Star Chamber from 1570.
- 34 Fletcher and MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, pp. 102–15.
- 35 B.W. Beckingsale, 'The Characteristics of the Tudor North', *Northern History*, 4 (1969), 67–83; M.E. James, *Society, Politics, and Culture: Studies*

- in *Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 3, 10–11. Criticisms of James include: G.W. Bernard, ed., *The Tudor Nobility* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 1–47; R. Hoyle, ‘Henry Percy, Sixth Earl of Northumberland, and the fall of the House of Percy, 1527–37’, in *The Tudor Nobility* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 180–211; for noble influence R. Hoyle, ‘The First Earl of Cumberland: A Reputation Reassessed’, *Northern History*, 22 (1986), 63–94; W. Palmer, ‘High Officeholding, Foreign Policy, and the British Dimension in the Tudor Far North, 1525–1563’, *Albion*, 29, 4 (1998), 579–95.
- 36 M.E. James, ‘The Concept of Order and the Northern Rising 1569’, *Past and Present*, 60 (1973), 49–83; K.J. Kesselring, ‘A Cold Pye for the Papistes’: Constructing and Containing the Northern Rising of 1569’, *Journal of British Studies*, 42 (2004), 417–43; C. Sharp, *Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569* (London: J.B. Nichols, 1810), pp. 189–213.
- 37 G. Chalmers, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots: Drawn from the State Papers, Volume 2* (London: John Murray, 1818), pp. 389–90; David Loades, *Elizabeth I* (London: A&C Black, 2006), pp. 166–71.
- 38 P. McGrath, *Papists and Puritans Under Elizabeth I* (London: Blandford Press, 1967), pp. 68–70.
- 39 John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 277.
- 40 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 1, part 2, p. 354; *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 23; Henry Hart-Milman, *Annals of St Paul’s Cathedral* (London: John Murray, 1868), p. 291.
- 41 Aislinn Muller, ‘Transmitting and Translating the Excommunication of Elizabeth I’, *Studies in Church History*, 53 (2017), 210–22, 213.
- 42 W. Sparrow Simpson, ‘The Palaces or Town Houses of the Bishops of London’, *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society*, 1 (1905), 13–73, with reference to p. 45.
- 43 NA, SP 12/71 f.151, ‘The Queen to the Lord Keeper’, 28 July 1570.
- 44 Milman, *Annals of St Paul’s Cathedral*, p. 293.
- 45 Alexandra Walsham, ‘Translating Trent? English Catholicism and the Counter Reformation’, *Historical Research*, 78 (2005), 288–310; Muller, ‘Transmitting and Translating’, pp. 210–22.
- 46 Muller, ‘Transmitting and Translating’, p. 213.
- 47 Milman, *Annals of St Paul’s Cathedral*, p. 291; Paulo Lardi and Winifred Smith, ‘Anti-Catholic Propaganda in Elizabethan London’, *Modern Philology*, 28, 2 (1930), 208–12 on anti-Catholic propaganda in the 1580s.
- 48 Peter Milward, ‘The Jewel-Harding Controversy’, *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 6, 4 (1974), 320–41.
- 49 Cyril Hamshere, ‘The Ridolfi Plot, 1571’, *History Today*, 26, 1 (1976), 32–9.
- 50 Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 278; D. Maculloch, *Reformation: Europe’s House Divided 1490–1700* (London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 337–40.
- 51 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 15, f. 79. ‘Edwyn, Bp. of London to the Lord Treasurer’, 5 Sept. 1572.
- 52 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 15, f. 79.
- 53 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 15, f. 79.
- 54 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 15, f. 79.
- 55 Stanford Lehmborg, ‘Nowell, Alexander (c.1516/17–1602)’, *ODNB*, online edition.
- 56 Lehmborg, ‘Nowell, Alexander’ *ODNB*, online edition.
- 57 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 15, f. 79.
- 58 A.J. Crosby, *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth*, Vol. 10 (London: HMSO, 1966), p. 73. ‘Commission for Francisco Giraldi. Commission by Sebastian King of Portugal authorising Francisco

- Giraldi to treat in his name with the Queen of England, and to conclude and sign any contract that may be agreed upon' [Almiera, 7 April].
- 59 Hackney was outside the city, offering more in the way of fresh air and open spaces, but close enough to give ready access to Court. TNA and Hackney Archives Department, 'Tudor Hackney', [2003]. Available from: www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/tudorhackney/localhistory/lochsh.asp.
- 60 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 54, 'Edwyn, Bp of London, to the Earl of Leicester', [4 March 1573].
- 61 M.T. Thorp, 'Catholic Conspiracy in Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15, 4 (1984), 431–48.
- 62 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 54.
- 63 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 54.
- 64 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 54.
- 65 Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, *Elizabethan Popish Recusancy in the Inns of Court*, Special Supplement, No. 11 (London: Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 1976).
- 66 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 52 'Edwyn, Bp of London, to the Lord Treasurer' [2 March 1573].
- 67 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 52.
- 68 Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Baltimore, MD: Penguin, 1955), p. 170ff.
- 69 Andrew Pettegree, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), p. 330.
- 70 P. Croft, '“The State of the World Is Marvellously Changed”: England, Spain and Europe 1558–1604', in *Tudor England and its Neighbours*, ed. S. Doran and G. Richardson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 180.
- 71 T. Stuart Wilson, *Studies in Elizabethan Foreign Trade* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), p. 141.
- 72 Wilson, *Elizabethan Foreign Trade*, p. 142.
- 73 D. Fett, 'Spanish Diplomacy and English Recusancy in Early Elizabethan England', *Reformation*, 15 (2010), 169–89, esp. p. 174.
- 74 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 15, f.158 'A copy of a letter from the Council to the Bp. of London' [1572].
- 75 TNA, SP 12/60 f.202, 'Abstract of the examinations of such gentlemen of the Inns of Court as have lately been summoned before the Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes' [1569].
- 76 TNA, SP 12/60 f.202. Discussion also provided in William Trimble, *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England, 1558–1603* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964), pp. 58–60.
- 77 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 15, f.158.
- 78 Sarah Bastow, *The Catholic Gentry of Yorkshire, 1536–1642: Resistance and Accommodation* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007), pp. 178–90; Parmiter, *Elizabethan Popish Recusancy in the Inns of Court*; W.R. Prest, *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts* (Harlow: Longman, 1972).
- 79 TNA, Stat. 1 Elizabeth I, c. 24 (Statutes of the Realm, IV, 397–400); R.M. Fisher, 'The Reformation of Clergy at the Inns of Court 1530–1580', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 12, 1 (1981), 69–91.
- 80 Fisher, 'The Reformation of Clergy', p. 89.
- 81 TNA, SP 12/95 f.201, 'A survey of the chambers and societies of all the Inns of Court' [May 1574].
- 82 TNA, SP 12/111 f.59, 'A view of the chief Readers' [Jan 1577]; SP 12/118 f.136, 'Certificate for the Inner Temple' [1577]; SP 12/118 f.140, 'Certificate of such as refuse or neglect to attend church in Gray's Inn' [1577]; SP 12/118 f.138, 'Certificate of such as refuse to attend the church in Lincoln's Inn' [1577].

- 83 John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821), p. 392.
- 84 Frederic Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 259.
- 85 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 17, f.81, 'The Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer; concerning the libel called "An Admonition to the Parliament:" Written against him.' [2 July 1573].
- 86 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 17, f.81.
- 87 Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519? 1588)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 88 Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519? 1588)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 89 A.F. Scott Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925), p. 58.
- 90 Patrick Collinson, 'Cartwright, Thomas (1534/5–1603)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 91 Collinson, 'Cartwright, Thomas', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 92 McGrath, *Papist and Puritans Under Elizabeth I*, pp. 126–7.
- 93 Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 84–5.
- 94 R.J. Acheson, *Radical Puritans in England 1550–1660* (London: Longman, 1995), p. 11.
- 95 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 274.
- 96 Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright*, p. 58.
- 97 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 274–5.
- 98 L.J. Trinterud, ed., *Elizabethan Puritanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 235; J.K. Luoma, 'Restoration or Reformation? Cartwright and Hooker on the Elizabethan Church', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 46 (1977), 85–106.
- 99 Luoma, 'Restoration or Reformation?', p. 86 on the vision of groups such as Anabaptists and Cartwright.
- 100 W.H. Frere and C.E. Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origins of the Puritan Revolt* (London: PSPCK, 1954), p. xi.
- 101 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 124.
- 102 John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, Vol. 1, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1851), p. 14.
- 103 T. Cartwright, *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: Agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer, Touching the Church Discipline* (1575), EEBO.
- 104 Daniel Eppley, *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 149.
- 105 Marshall, *Reformation England*, p. 132.
- 106 For a discussion of differing types of Protestant see, A. Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 6.
- 107 G.W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erasmian Reformer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 67.
- 108 Michael P. Winship, *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), p. 41.
- 109 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 68; Ray Alden Ketch, 'The First Elizabethan Religious Controversy: Puritan versus Vestments' (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Ohio, 1949), p. 50.
- 110 Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 68.
- 111 Usher, *Cecil and the Episcopacy*, p. 102.
- 112 B. Usher, 'The Deanery of Bocking and the Demise of the Vestiarian Controversy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52, 3 (2001), 434–55.

- 113 Usher, 'The Deanery of Bocking', pp. 435–6.
- 114 Winship, *Godly Republicanism*, p. 41; John Strype, *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821), pp. 42–3.
- 115 D. Englander, D. Norman, R. O'Day and W.R. Owens, eds., *Culture and Belief in Europe 1450–1600: An Anthology of Sources* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), p. 450.
- 116 J. Bruce and T. Thomason Perowne, eds., *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker: Letters Written by and to him from AD 1535 to His Death AD 1575* (Eugene, OR: Parker Society, 1853; Wipf and Stock, 2005), p. 65.
- 117 W.H. Frere, C.E. Douglas, J. Fields, T. Wilcox and T. Cartwright, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt: With a Reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and Kindred Documents, 1572* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907), xiii.
- 118 H. Robinson, ed., *The Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1842), p. 73.
- 119 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 73.
- 120 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 74.
- 121 R.W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England: Elizabeth. A.D. 1558–1563*, Vol. V (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), p. 176.
- 122 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 40.
- 123 Jenkins, *John Jewel*, p. 67.
- 124 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 252.
- 125 Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons*, p. 24.
- 126 A. Hunt, 'Tuning the Pulpits: The Religious Context of the Essex Revolt', in *The English Sermon Revised*, eds. L.A. Ferrell and P. McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); A. Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); M. Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534–1642* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1958) updated in *Register of Sermons Preached at Paul's Cross, 1534–1642* (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989); P. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons*; S. Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- 127 Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons*, xiii.
- 128 W.J. Torrance Kirby, 'The Public Sermon: Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1534–1570', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 31, 1 (2008), 3–29.
- 129 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96, 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, complains to Lords Leicester, and Burghley' [5 Aug.1573].
- 130 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 84.
- 131 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96.
- 132 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 149.
- 133 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96.
- 134 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96.
- 135 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96.
- 136 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96.
- 137 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96.
- 138 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 139.
- 139 Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 152.
- 140 Patrick Collinson, 'Dering, Edward (c.1540–1576)', *ODNB*, online edition.

142 *Religion in London*

- 141 Collinson, 'Dering, Edward', ODNB, online edition.
- 142 McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, pp. 36–7; J. Craig, 'Sermon Reception', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. P. McCullough, H. Adlington E. Rhatigan, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 183–4.
- 143 E. Dering, *M. Derings Workes: More at Large Then Euer Hath Heere-tofore Been Printed in Any One Volume* (1597).
- 144 E. Dering, 'On the Duties of a Prince: A Sermon Preached Before Her Majesty', in *In God's Name: Examples of Preaching in England from the ACT of Supremacy to the ACT of Uniformity, 1534–1662*, ed. J. Chandos (London: Hutchinson, 1971), p. 73.
- 145 McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, p. 37.
- 146 M. McGiffert, 'Covenant, Crown, and Commons in Elizabethan Puritanism', *Journal of British Studies*, 20, 1 (1980), 32–52.
- 147 Bruce and Perowne, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 410; S. Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England 1570–1625* (London: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 21–4.
- 148 *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon: The Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire: 1572–1582*, Vol. 2 (London: HMSO, 1888), pp. 63–4.
- 149 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100, 'One letter and a copy of another, from the Bp. of London to the Lord Treasurer' [28 August 1573].
- 150 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 2, p. 483.
- 151 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 2, p. 483.
- 152 A. Lindsley, 'Edward Dering: A Model of Puritanism', in *Knowing and Doing: A Teaching Quarterly for the Discipleship of Hearts and Minds* (2009), 1.
- 153 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f.67, 'Edwyn, Bishop of London, to the Lord Treasurer' [3 June 1573].
- 154 E. Dering, 'On the Duties of a Prince', p. 72.
- 155 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f.67.
- 156 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f.67.
- 157 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100.
- 158 Collinson, 'Dering, Edward (c.1540–1576)', ODNB, online edition.
- 159 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100.
- 160 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100.
- 161 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100.
- 162 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100.
- 163 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 282.
- 164 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 370–85.
- 165 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 375–6.
- 166 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 376.
- 167 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 383.
- 168 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 372.
- 169 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 380.
- 170 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 61 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer', 30 April 1573.
- 171 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 81, 'The Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer', 1573.
- 172 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 81.
- 173 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 61.
- 174 'A Letter written by Master Robert Johnson to Master Edwin Sandes, superintendent of popish corruptions in the Diocese of London, and delivered this 2 day of Februari, Anno 1573', in *A Parte of a Register Contayninge*

- Sundrie Memorable Matters, Written by Diuers Godly and Learned in Our Time, Which Stande for, and Desire the Reformation of our Church, in Discipline and Ceremonies, Accordinge to the Pure Worde of God, and the Lawe of Our Lande*, ed. John Udall (1593), pp. 101–5, EBBO.
- 175 Udall, *A Parte of a Register*, p. 105. Johnson was a minister who was taking a much more radical interpretation of godly religion and was brought before the Queen's commissioners as he was refusing to use the official service, was marrying his congregation without a ring and was baptising without the sign of the cross.
- 176 BL Lansdowne, Vol., 17, f.81.
- 177 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f.81.
- 178 Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 290.
- 179 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1 (Parker Society, 1842), p. 295. 'Bishop Sandys to H. Bullinger'. Recorded as 15 August in the edited letters but as 12 August in the Lambeth Palace Archives.
- 180 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 295.
- 181 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 296.
- 182 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 296.
- 183 Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 296.
- 184 Patrick Collinson, 'Dering, Edward (c.1540–1576)', ODNB, online edition; Michael S Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church: John a Lasco and the Forma ac ratio* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 150.
- 185 Collinson, 'Grindal, Edmund', ODNB; Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p. 150.
- 186 Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 271–2.
- 187 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 41.
- 188 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 20, fol.151, 'The Bishop of London to Lord Burghley' [11 April 1575].
- 189 Hans Jürgen Goertz, *The Anabaptists*, English ed. (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 33–4.
- 190 Robert Kreider, 'The Anabaptists and the Civil Authorities of Strasbourg, 1525–1555', *Church History*, 24, 2 (1955), 99–118.
- 191 A. Spicer, '“L'Evesque en soit adverty:” Excommunication in the Exile Congregations', in *The Vocabulary of Censure and Exclusion in the Early Modern Reformed Tradition*, ed. R. Mentzer, F. Moreil and P. Chareyre, Series in Church History, Vol. 40 (Boston, MA: Brill, 2010), p. 138.
- 192 Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, pp. 140–1; Edmund Grindal, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal Successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, ed. W. Nicholson (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1848), pp. 245–6.
- 193 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 20, fol.151, 'The Bp. of London to Lord Burghley' [11 April 1575]; Thieleman J. Van Braght, *Martyrs Mirror: The Story of Seventeen Centuries of Christian Martyrdom, from the Time of Christ to A.D. 1660* (1660), translated by Joseph Sohm (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1998), pp. 1008–12.
- 194 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 20, fol.151.
- 195 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 20, fol.151.
- 196 BL Lansdowne, Vol. 20, fol.151.
- 197 Alastair Duke, 'Martyrs with a Difference: Dutch Anabaptist Victims of Elizabethan Persecution', in *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low Countries*, ed. Judith S. Pollmann and Andrew Spicer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 263.
- 198 Duke, 'Martyrs with a Difference', p. 264.

- 199 Braght, *Martyrs Mirror*, p. 1008, 1010.
- 200 Braght, *Martyrs Mirror*, pp. 1008–9.
- 201 Braght, *Martyrs Mirror*, p. 1010.
- 202 Braght, *Martyrs Mirror*, pp. 1008–9.
- 203 Braght, *Martyrs Mirror*, p. 1009.
- 204 Braght, *Martyrs Mirror*, p. 1009.
- 205 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 2, p. 90.
- 206 Peter Iver Kaufman, 'Prophesying Again', *Church History*, 68, 2 (1999), 337–58.
- 207 P. Denis, 'La Prophetie dans les Eglises de le Refome au XVI Siecle', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 72 (1977), 289–316.
- 208 Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 233.
- 209 Patrick Collinson, John Craig and Brett Usher, eds., *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church 1582–1590* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003), p. xxvii.
- 210 Grindal, *The Remains of Archbishop Grindal*, p. xi; Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, 'Preaching, Homilies, and Prophesyings in Sixteenth Century England', *Churchman*, 89, 1 (1975).
- 211 J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, Vol. 3, Part 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), p. 480 citing F. Bacon, *An Advertisement Touching a Holy War* (1629).
- 212 Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 236; S.E. Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, xxxiv (1965), 87–145, a copy of Sandys' letter taken from Lambeth Palace Library, Lambeth MS. 2003, fol. 27 is printed on pp. 99–100.
- 213 Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal', p. 99.
- 214 Lambeth Palace Library, Lambeth MS. 2003, fol. 27 cited in both Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 236; Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal', pp. 99–100.
- 215 Lambeth Palace Library, Lambeth MS 2003, fols. 5r, 8r, 13r, and 16r, in Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', pp. 97, 108–9, 101113.
- 216 Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p. 233.
- 217 Lambeth Palace Library, Laud-Selden-Fairhurst MS. 2003, fol. 25. 'Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London to Grindal'; Add. MS. 29, 546, Fol. 50 in in Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', pp. 87–145.
- 218 Lambeth MS. 2003, fols. 12–13, 14 and 16–18 in Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', pp. 101–9.
- 219 Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', p. 102.
- 220 Lehmborg, 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', p. 101 in reference to BL Add Ms 29546 fo. 54v.
- 221 Collinson, Craig and Usher, *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, p. xxix.
- 222 BL Lansdowne, Vol.25, f.92, 'Copies of three letters of the Queen; the first and third to all the Bishops, the second to the Bishop of Lincoln only; to suppress the prophesyings and exercises of the Puritans' [7 May 1577].
- 223 Collinson, Craig and Usher, *Conferences and Combination Lectures*, p. xxviii.

5 A Reformer in a Conservative County

‘That Being Delivered Out of the Hands of Our Enemies We May Serve Him’

Introduction

The appointment of Edwin Sandys as Archbishop of York in January 1577 saw him once again following the career path of his predecessor Edmund Grindal, who had also been translated from London to York, though the division between the two men was to become evident as the 1570s progressed.¹ At the end of April 1577 Sandys took ‘farewell’ as the key theme of the sermon he delivered at St Paul’s Cross prior to taking up his office at York. In the sermon, entitled ‘For the Rest, Brethren, Fare ye well’, Sandys expressed genuine regret at leaving London, making comparison between his situation and that of St Paul, who was called away from his diligent labours at Corinth to preach elsewhere.² He had even written to William Cecil on 30 April saying that he had agonised over the writing of this sermon, keeping himself indoors to cogitate over how to make his farewell.³ Adamant that he would not forget those he left behind, he was keen to state that he was not a saint like St Paul, but that he too had loved his congregation and had sought to persuade rather than to use correction to reform transgressors.⁴ Sandys’ assertion that where there was ‘backwardness in knowledge, there must needs be also weakness of faith’, was an early indication of how he was to view the North.⁵ Sandys was still very much of the opinion that it was the duty of the godly to combat corruptive papal forces which were destructive to the individual and the nation and his image of himself as a crusader for the godly cause was further enhanced by being sent to a region he had already identified as in great need of reform. During Sandys’ time in Yorkshire the threats to godly religion were not just to come from papists but again from those puritans pushing for further reform. The battle he was to find himself fighting in Yorkshire was a defence of the status quo. He found threats firstly from papists who were resisting the new settlement and secondly from those pushing for further reform. The difficulties he faced in London regarding how to restrain those seeking to move towards a more Presbyterian style of worship were to continue. Many of the disputes Sandys faced were driven by personality clashes and the

accusations were to be personal in nature. The Archbishop of York found himself facing personal ridicule, as determined attempts were made to sully his moral reputation via accusations of adultery made by Robert Stapleton and he found he had to defend his own religious stance against criticism from the Dean of York, Matthew Hutton.

Sandys represented a firmer clerical hand in seeking out wrongdoers than some of the previous Archbishops of York. This included pursuing Catholic recusants, imposing loyalty to the monarch's vision of religion, revealing usury in the county and enforcing a stricter adherence to the religious settlement amongst the conformist population. It was during Sandys' episcopacy at York that Margaret Clitherow was ordered to be pressed to death; though Sandys was less involved in this decision than some of his peers. Whilst this indicated an escalation in the willingness of the authorities to pursue and punish recusants who refused to recant it also opened a debate regarding which methods were advocated as most effective. Moreover, Catholics were no longer the only threat to the stability and integrity of the Elizabethan Church. Sandys was also in opposition to those who advocated further reform which he disparagingly referred to as Puritans. Sandys opposed the Puritan threat and through these conflicts we can see just how far he and others of his generation had moved away from the cutting edge of the reform movement. As Walsham has argued a next generation, younger men with new ideas, 'represented a threat to the monopoly on religious authority claimed by the ecclesiastical hierarchy'.⁶ Yet for Sandys it was not just a new generation that was to be perceived as problematic, but other evangelicals who did not completely ally with his own views. Sandys was not alone in his quest to reform the North. There was a strong secular reforming presence in the shape of Henry Hastings, third Earl of Huntingdon, who was President of the Council of the North and a man of ardent religious belief. Huntingdon represented the sort of civic magisterial authority that should, in theory, have appealed to Sandys' theological stance. Edwardian Protestantism was premised on the idea of dual authorities, those of the godly minister and the godly magistrate. Yet the relationship between Sandys and Huntingdon was not an easy one. Alongside Huntingdon, there were also a number of other notable reformers holding high ecclesiastical office in the North of England. Matthew Hutton was Dean of York and William Whittingham Dean of Durham; both were reformed clerics of high standing. The possibilities of an alliance of civil and ecclesiastical power at the top of society might have seemed a natural consequence, creating a perfect storm to literally sweep a godly nation into place. This was not however to be the case. Personal enmities between these men underpinned the events of the late 1570s and 1580s and tensions are clearly visible in both the correspondence and resulting narratives of the era. Initially these clashes were often sparked by minor disagreements, but often reflected a wider sense of discord over outlook

and religious interpretation. This meant that conflict was often intra- as well as inter-confessional. The other important offices holders in the north, such as local JPs alongside much of the gentry, were overwhelming conservative in both civic and religious outlook. Whilst often these men were not explicitly Catholic, they had Catholic kin and were reluctant if not openly unwilling to act against them or their religiously conservative neighbours. Sandys' attempts to befriend, or at least create a faux alliance with local men of standing, such as Robert Stapleton, backfired. Rather than illustrating an attempt to coexist these interactions revealed distrust and sparked further disputes.

It is arguable that personality clashes had a role to play in these disputes. If Sandys is seen as the anomalous factor in the mix then the discord was not reflective of the era in general and can be dismissed as a transient aberration, removed once Sandys died. Yet alongside the personal factors that underpinned many of these disputes it is also possible to see signs of strain regarding the next phase of reform. Generational changes were taking place. The first generation of reformers (including men such as Parker, Sandys and Grindal) were now ageing and dying. This was the generation that had embraced Edwardian reform and through their experience of Marian religion, whether in exile or in hiding, had fashioned the shape of English Protestantism. By the 1580s they had become the old guard, and for some of the new men this first generation of reformed religion was outdated. Thus, the difficulties and disagreements in the Northern Province cannot simply be attributed to Sandys' difficult personality, though his increasingly volatile and distrustful reactions do require some acknowledgement.

In addition to the central debate on the nature and enforcement of conformity this chapter emphasises the importance of reputation and honour in the Tudor consciousness. It was during his time at York that Sandys' name was tarnished leading to a negative posthumous reputation. Although Sandys did not know how posterity would view him, he was clearly aware of the need to secure his reputation and legacy. Sandys had become associated with financial greed and he already knew that his spending and allocation of roles to his family was being questioned. Patrick Collinson noted in his biographical summary of Sandys' life that he is 'an archbishop who has gone down in history as a model of grasping episcopal nepotism'.⁷ Sandys' personal qualities had already begun to have a bearing on his religious standing, but in Yorkshire these personal enmities were to result in further conflict. The Sandys-Stapleton scandal of the early 1580s was to further seal Sandys' fate as the epitome of a corrupt hierarchy. Sir Robert Stapleton had claimed he had witnessed an altercation at a Doncaster inn in 1580, where Sandys was staying. Stapleton testified that he and others had been awoken in the night when the innkeeper had burst into Sandys' bedchamber armed with a knife, to find Sandys in bed with his wife. Stapleton had then proceeded to blackmail

Sandys, in order to gain lands which Stapleton knew the Queen and the Earl of Leicester desired. This incident, and the following court cases, attracted widespread interest given the salacious nature of the events involved.

Chapter one of this volume highlighted that the events of the 1580s had a significant impact in shaping the way in which Sandys told his life story. He advocated a very specific construction of his early life telling of his place in the early religious reform movement in England. Thus, we have already seen how John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* constructed an image of Sandys as part of a heroic narrative and how the publication of his sermons in 1585 attempted to lay down his credentials as a great orator within a narrative of evangelical preaching. Sandys' personal correspondence in the later 1570s and throughout the 1580s reflected his concerns about the nature of religious reform in the North, but also reflected his increasing anger towards some of his contemporaries. At times his anger and frustration pour from the page. His letters to William Cecil show an increasing paranoia and he identified enemies all around. The feeling of persecution was clearly very real for Sandys and it does need to be acknowledged that he lacked allies in the North, thus his feelings of isolation were not without foundation. Robert Stapleton made a deliberate effort to discredit him; Matthew Hutton disliked him and the Queen, in alliance with the Earl of Leicester, was trying to seize church lands. As we will see in this chapter Sandys did not always respond effectively to the challenges facing him. His tendency to overreact, even for minor slights, did little to ensure he was held in esteem by his contemporaries or in the eyes of later commentators. The letters, court proceedings and sermons which form the mainstay of the sources for this chapter reveal a man increasingly at odds with all around him. It seemed to the casual onlooker in Elizabethan Yorkshire that he was just as corrupt as the papists he criticised; he appeared to be involved in financially ambiguous activities as well as morally questionable acts. Sandys' attempts to defend his reputation simply made matters worse, making known his humiliation far and wide. He was also increasingly unwell and withdrawn in the latter stages of his archiepiscopacy; he became more concerned with safeguarding his reputation for posterity and securing the fate of his children than taking a leading role in national or regional politics. This was visibly symbolised by the fact he spent much of his time at Southwell rather than York, literally withdrawing from the centre of activities. By the time of his death in 1588 he was clearly aware of the doubts regarding his behaviour that were being raised by others and had taken steps to try and combat the negative press he was experiencing. It is to the conflicts, tensions and scandals that we are drawn in this last chapter as an illustration of how fractious the political and religious situation was by the 1580s.

Sandys and Intra-Confessional Conflict

Despite the apparent similarity in religious stance, Sandys' relationship with the Earl of Huntingdon did not begin on a good note. A dispute over the property of Bishopthorpe marred their earliest encounter. The Palace of Bishopthorpe was the official residence of the Archbishop in the North, but in the time between Grindal's departure to take up office as Archbishop of Canterbury and Sandys' arrival in York the property had been occupied by Huntingdon and his wife, in the absence of any ecclesiastical resident. Archbishop Grindal had expressed dislike of both of the ecclesiastical properties which formed the archiepiscopal accommodation in Yorkshire, namely Bishopthorpe and Cawood. He described Cawood in 1570 as 'verie moyste' and Bishopthorpe as an extremely cold house for the winter.⁸ Thus, being without family and disliking both locations, he had not asserted the Archbishop's rights as forcibly as he could have done. In the short period when there was no Archbishop present in York and Bishopthorpe palace was unoccupied it was perhaps unsurprising that Huntingdon should see the logic of taking up residence there. A lax assertion of ecclesiastical rights was not to be the case with Sandys, who was clear that accommodation for the President of the Council of the North was usually provided at the former site of St Mary's Abbey [overlooking the King's Manor].⁹ Huntingdon himself was experiencing financial difficulties brought about by inherited debt, poor investment choices and service to the Queen on the limited fees for his office and yet still needed to maintain his standing and suitable accommodation to be able to offer hospitality.¹⁰ Thus, Huntingdon may well have felt his needs were just as, if not more, justified as those of the new Archbishop. Sandys was clearly aggrieved at Huntingdon's occupation of Bishopthorpe and in January 1577 he specified to Cecil why he needed possession of the property in a list entitled 'Certaine Causes and reasons why the Archbushop of York should not depart from the howse called BushoppeThorpe belonging to his See'.¹¹ This stated ten numbered reasons why the Lord President should leave the property, including the fact that it was owned by the See of York, not the crown. Additionally this list laboured the point that the Archbishop had a duty to provide hospitality and preaching to the city and if he were to live elsewhere it would 'occasion of many troublesome Journies unmeete for a man of greate years'.¹² Bishopthorpe was around three miles from the city, on the right bank of the Ouse, whilst the other property available to the Archbishop at Cawood was eight miles from the city and more inconveniently situated.¹³ He emphasised that Bishopthorpe was only the residence of the Lord President when the Archbishop held that office, therefore Huntingdon had no right of occupation. Sandys also made it clear that in not handing back the property Huntingdon was impairing the good opinion Sandys had conceived of

him in terms of his 'defence of religion'.¹⁴ Thus, Sandys finishes with the insinuation that whilst he believed Huntingdon to be of good religion, this action had thrown that conviction into doubt, and hardly boded well for a long and fruitful working relationship. Cecil wrote to Huntingdon to let him know Sandys had been appointed as Archbishop of York and would require the use of Bishopthorpe and Cawood, which suggested intervention at a higher level had been required.¹⁵ Whilst some of this was clearly contrived to ensure that Sandys retained this property both for himself and the Church, there was also the underlying implication from Sandys that this was yet another attempt by the secular authorities to trespass into the Church's affairs.

The debacle over property ownership and the eviction of Huntingdon's family from Bishopthorpe signalled the start of hostilities between the two men. Emotions were still raw in April 1577 when Huntingdon wrote to Walsingham expressing his, and significantly his wife's, dismay at having to leave Bishopthorpe owing to the arrival of Sandys and his family. Huntingdon was offended that his tenancy of the property would not even be considered by the new Archbishop and even more indignant that Sandys' men had only given the Earl fifteen days to leave.¹⁶ Huntingdon noted to Walsingham that 'If I should not let you know in what sort I am at Bishopsthorpe, some false report may reach you' and that his leaving was 'full sore against my wife's will'.¹⁷ Sandys was victorious in this matter and Bishopthorpe became the main residence of the Archbishop, although as time progressed Sandys seemed increasingly to favour staying in ecclesiastical property elsewhere in his province, most frequently at Southwell (Nottinghamshire) which was a considerable distance from the city of York.¹⁸ This battle over property seemed to reflect a deeper conflict, firstly over the retention of ecclesiastical property rights of which Sandys was a fearsome defender, but also between the two men over authority and status. This incident was the beginning, rather than the end, of ongoing antagonism between Huntingdon and Sandys.

The enmity still seems to have been evident in December 1579 when Sandys wrote to Cecil saying that he was currently ill and therefore could not visit him personally, but that he urged Cecil not to try and engineer any reconciliation between himself (the Archbishop) and the Earl of Huntingdon.¹⁹ Sandys went on to say that any attempt to make Huntingdon and himself friends would be futile as it would be a counterfeit reconciliation that simply came from 'the lypes and not from the hart' given the Earl's 'manifold wrongs done unto me'.²⁰ Two years after the first altercation the relationship was still troubled, moreover Sandys was unwilling to make any signs of reconciliation. The antagonism between the two men must have been fairly well known and Catholic polemist Father Holtby took some satisfaction that Sandys and Huntingdon were not on friendly terms and indicated that this translated into differing practices and policies.²¹ Holtby implied that Huntingdon, 'the cheifest deviser and contriver of our troubles', had usurped religious authority in

addition to his secular power. He wrote that: 'In these parts this monster [Huntingdon] is god, king, bishop, president, catchpoll, and whatsoever else to annoy the catholics' and 'chief senior of the Puritan synagogue'.²² Holtby believed that Huntingdon and the Council were the ones responsible for the heavy financial penalties incurred by Catholics, whilst he partially absolves Sandys, who he says only deployed threats and did not impose them as punishments.²³ Although Holtby was not an impartial source and his writing was clearly propagandist in nature, this does give an indication of tensions that were present in York. It is easy to believe that Sandys saw Huntingdon's fervour as further evidence of the secular state undermining church authority and took it as a personal slight on his own ability to regulate religion.

The local records left to us from the era do little to emphasise the importance of differing personalities behind the bureaucracy, yet the nature of the individual was evidently of import. For example the records of the High Commission do not clearly differentiate between the change in archbishop (whether Grindal, Sandys, Piers or Hutton) erasing the individual in favour of the office. A lack of noticeable difference in the recorded proceedings suggests that the structures in place were sufficient to operate without a great deal of direction from the Archbishop. In analysing the impact on the recusants of the north J.C.H. Aveling has argued that in 'the heroic age of York Catholic Recusancy' (1578–1603), there was 'a remarkable continuity of personnel, methods and policies'.²⁴ There was a commonality and continuity of message from Huntingdon and Sandys, namely that the laws regarding conformity would be enforced. The Elizabethan Archbishops and the Lord President of the Council were agreed that papal influence was dangerous and as Aveling asserted, 'Sandys was as sure as Huntingdon that Rome was the antichrist'.²⁵ Yet Sandys was aggrieved that his views were not as valued as he felt they should have been. Writing to Cecil in 1578 he stated that he had not been 'made acquainted with the political government of this country and therefore cannot much say but I doubt not but that my L. president with such as he callith to take advise of will very wisely governe'.²⁶ Huntingdon had valued and held in deep esteem the advice of Grindal, but Sandys' defence of his rights and those of his church, combined with his tendency to take offence, made for a much more volatile relationship.

The one clear element of continuity across the later Elizabethan era came in the form of Matthew Hutton, who was Dean of York and then later Archbishop of York. Hutton's presence did nothing to ease the Sandys-Huntingdon tensions, but acted as a further spark for conflict as Sandys disliked Hutton too. Matthew Hutton was the incumbent Dean when Sandys arrived in the province, and had held the position since being appointed in 1567, although Sandys was not keen to retain his services. Having been chaplain to the former Archbishop of York, Edmund Grindal, Hutton had also succeeded him as master of Pembroke College.²⁷ Matthew Hutton was also making rapid progress through the ranks of

the Elizabethan Church hierarchy and was in some ways in direct competition with Sandys for the available offices within the Church.²⁸ Hutton also seemed to be well connected and well liked, which appeared in direct contrast to Sandys who did not engender the same levels of popularity. A letter written by Lady Elizabeth Russell (sister-in-law to William Cecil) implied that Hutton had been the preferred choice of many to succeed Grindal in the position of Bishop of London rather than Sandys.²⁹ Whether this was the case is unclear, but it was true that on 30 March 1569 Matthew Parker had written to William Cecil giving his advice on who should take up the See of London. This was in response to a request from Cecil for Parker's opinion on the best candidates for the position.³⁰ In this letter he recommended neither Edwin Sandys, nor Matthew Hutton. On Hutton he advised that the Dean of York was quiet, learned and honest, but not 'mete for that place'.³¹ This was not, however, to imply that Parker disliked Hutton, as he also noted other men whom he considered unsuitable. Thus, Hutton was not alone in being considered incompatible with London. The See had been left vacant and was considered to be in need of a firm hand and a forceful personality to monitor activities there. This was especially important given the political significance of the capital and the presence there of potentially disruptive elements. That Parker did not recommend Sandys to the role is also unsurprising as all the correspondence between the two men indicated that they had a tense relationship. Certainly in the early years of Elizabeth's reign Parker had been innately suspicious of exiles such as Sandys who had been influenced by 'germanical' religion.³² Sandys' letters to Parker also implied that there was unease between the two men, as he asked Parker not to condemn all former exiles and clearly felt he needed to be explicit in stating his support for Parker, as it was not immediately evident.³³

Peter Lake has argued that Hutton was a Puritan in the sense that he was not merely a conformist and that the Marian religious regime at Cambridge had an impact in shaping his version of reformed religion.³⁴ Hutton had become a member of Trinity College in 1555, having first come up to Cambridge in 1546 and had experienced the Marian religious regime at the university. Peter Lake concluded that this had a dramatic impact on him.³⁵ Hutton did not formally enter the church until 1560, thus had not experienced the same hardships as Sandys in terms of exile. In contrast to his relationship with Sandys, Hutton and Grindal were very close. In 1561 Hutton had become both Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and chaplain to Grindal (then Bishop of London). When Hutton had taken up office as Dean of York in 1567 he wrote to Cecil the following year asking that the *sede vacante* of York be filled by his friend Grindal. He was keen to point out that the new Archbishop should be

a teacher because the country is ignorant: a virtuous and godly man because the country is given to sift a man's life; a stout and courageous

man in God's cause because the country otherwise will abuse him: and yet a sober and discreet man lest too much vigorousness harden the hearts of some that by fair means might be mollified.³⁶

Hutton considered Grindal to be just such a man, one who would take a firm line, but who was also sensible in his approach. Hutton and Grindal had thus worked well together in York and they had a suitable lay counterpart in the form of Huntingdon. Again, Lake concluded that Huntingdon more than lived up to Hutton's ideal of what a godly magistrate should be.³⁷ Hutton was clearly a supporter of reformed religion, although not adhered to a defence of the settlement in the way Sandys was. Neither was Hutton a defender of Presbyterian ideas as he still advocated that church hierarchy as well as secular authority was necessary to teach and lead the general populace towards God; as left to their own devices they would certainly wander off the righteous path. In October 1573, he wrote to Cecil on his opinions 'touching the late differences in the Church.' He said of the Cartwright grouping that:

These men would not only have an equality of all ministers, but also would deprive the Queen of her authority, and give it to the people; that every parish should choose their own minister; which, if put in practice, divers parishes would have none but a papist, others would have the best companion at tables, not the best preacher in the pulpit.³⁸

Thus, Hutton was pragmatic; his reason for opposing 'equality of all ministers' was based on the premise that the people could not be trusted to make the correct choices if left to their own devising. That Hutton was seen as the 'right sort' of Protestant by Huntingdon is attested to by various correspondences and reflected a good working relationship. For Peter Lake 'in the Lord President of the North, the Earl of Huntingdon, Hutton had the perfect lay counterpart'.³⁹ On 21 July 1575 Lady Katherine Huntingdon wrote to Hutton requesting that he deliver the sermon at the wedding of the Earl's kinsman that was to take place on the following Sunday, which Hutton agreed to do.⁴⁰ In 1579, Hutton preached the sermon at a general communion at York Minster organised by Huntingdon, advocating the value of reformed religion in terms of allowing the populace access to the written gospels.⁴¹ Hutton was a committed promoter of the Protestant cause and was fiercely loyal to Huntingdon as well as Grindal. Hutton and Grindal combined with Huntingdon in the North to form a godly triumvirate set on conversion of a backwardly recusant population. The departure of Grindal and the arrival of Sandys disrupted an established relationship which was clearly based on shared religious views but seemed to go beyond this to a personal level. When Grindal left for Canterbury, Huntingdon sided with Hutton in the matter

of his retaining the office of Dean. Sandys arrived in a county where close relationships already existed and he was seen an intruder.⁴² Sandys expressed a wish to be rid of the Dean and to have the right to appoint his own man, making suggestions of alternative locations where Matthew Hutton might be best placed. Lichfield was Sandys' preferred choice for Hutton, as the position of Dean there had become vacant following the death of Laurence Nowell in 1576 and it removed Hutton from Sandys' direct orbit.⁴³ This plan clearly did not work as Hutton remained at York.⁴⁴ Sandys complained frequently about Hutton, and in 1579 Hutton wrote to Cecil to defend himself, seeking assurance that Cecil would 'not easlie give credit to evil reports without proof.'⁴⁵ Again the enmities between Sandys and the Hutton-Huntingdon alliance were such that they were observed and noted by Catholic polemicists, to highlight the lack of unity in the Protestant ranks. In 'A Yorkshire Recusant's Relation' it was recorded that:

The tyrant [Huntingdon] thinketh that none can persecute us extremely enough but himself, and therefore he will do all. The other apostata [Sandys] will not deal where his adversary hath any intermeddling. Through this discord, though we fare no better, yet Hutton, the pretended dean, which cannot brook nor patiently bear any superiority in Sands over him, is for this emulation chosen as a partner with the tyrant, though he also be a mere Protestant, to turn with every wind against the old apostata, and accounted a fit match both to countenance him and also an ungracious instrument to persecute us in such bloody manner as the tyrant shall require.

This Catholic commentary on the tensions in the North also highlighted another issue. Naming Sandys as 'apostata' highlighted one of the other accusations made against Sandys, sometimes directly and at other times more surreptitiously, namely that he had renounced his original faith and original clerical orders. The accusation of inconstancy did not just form part of Catholic polemic, as the accusation of inconstancy was also made against Sandys by Hutton. This formed part of a dispute which arose between Sandys and William Whittingham, Dean of Durham. Whittingham was also a former Marian exile, but allied with John Knox in the 1552 dispute in Frankfurt and subsequently moved with him to Geneva, where he was to work on some key theological texts including the Genevan Bible.⁴⁶ Whittingham had also been one of the other men in consideration for York when the See was left vacant, and appeared to have been the Earl of Leicester's preferred candidate.⁴⁷ Whittingham did not show any of the careerism that Sandys often displayed, and was also considered more progressive in religious terms, which was not what the Queen favoured for York. Instead what they needed was a representative in the North who was less willing to favour any further radical religious

reform; a man who knew his best interests were served by defending the settlement of religion. Sandys was an evangelical, but by the mid-1570s he was a less radical force than Huntingdon or Whittingham and one much more willing to assert hierarchical protocols. He wanted to see an educated clergy who could uphold the principles of evangelical Protestantism founded in the preaching of the word, studying the Bible and opposing the papistry, but he did not want to remove church hierarchies or see any threat that could destabilise the nation. His personality and own sense of importance would also not tolerate any attack on his beliefs, or forbear any personal slights which would reflect badly on him or his family.

Sandys tried to undertake a visitation of the Chapter of Durham in 1577, via a surrogate (Bishop Barnes of Durham) which was rejected by Whittingham. He disputed the Archbishop of York's right to intervene in the church of Durham.⁴⁸ According to the recorded life of William Whittingham the refusal to allow the Bishop of Durham access was because he was there in Sandys' name. This was a very symbolic rejection, which nearly resulted in physical conflict:

Mr. Whittingham called to the doore keeper to lock the doore, and to give him the keys, which the doore keeper did forthwith; which the Bishop hastning to prevent, Mr. Whittingham did a little interrupt him, taking holt of his gowne, and soe the business was concluded;⁴⁹

The result of this was a further commission comprising of the

Lord Archbishop of York, the Earl of Huntingdon then Lord President, the Lord Lieutenant of the North, the Bishop of Durham, the Bishop of Carlisle, the Deane of York, and Sir Thomas Boynton, Sir Robert Stapleton, Sir William Mallorye, Sir Christopher Wandsford.⁵⁰

The presence of many of those with prominent roles in the North of England such as Huntingdon, Hutton and Stapleton may be unsurprising, but equally they were all men with whom Sandys was at some point in dispute, which gives additional significance to those involved in this incident.⁵¹ In his investigation Sandys expressed concern about the validity of Whittingham's orders as he had been ordained in Geneva. The conflict at Durham reflected the fracturing of the Protestant community, with disputes over the Genevan traditions and ceremonies underpinned by personality conflicts.⁵² The author of *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort* in fact accounted for the attack on Whittingham in just these terms:

Doubtless, the incessant attacks made upon him [Whittingham], during his last days, by Archbishop SANDYS, may be safely attributed

to his professional resentment at the laying bare, in this book, before the Laity, of the quarrels of the Clergy; quite as much as to its advocacy of the Geneva Ecclesiastical Polity.⁵³

The authorship of this text is most likely to have been someone who was at Frankfurt and is attributed by many to Whittingham himself, which would account for the interpretation of Sandys' actions. Whittingham had sided with Knox's attempt to impose his version of religion over the Frankfurt English Congregation; meanwhile Grindal and Sandys had sided with Cox's opposition to Knox's efforts. Following the Whittingham incident at Durham the hostilities between Hutton and Sandys reignited, with Hutton making criticism of Sandys' religious convictions. 'Dean Hutton, who inclined to Whittingham, spoke of his ordination as superior to that of the Archbishop'.⁵⁴ Hutton was alleged to have asserted that

the ministry of Geneva was better than that ministrie which was made with these words, *accipe potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis*, with which words it is said the principals objector was made priest, and therefore had the lesse cause to except against the ministrie of Geneva.⁵⁵

This phrase translates as 'receive the power of sacrificing for the living and the dead' and was a bone of contention for Luther and later Lancelot Andrews. The phrase featured in the Catholic ordination service and formed a theme for Luther's *Conference between Luther and The Devil* (1521) which discussed the nature of the sacrament within the Mass and the extent to which Catholicism implied that this imbued the priest with a person proprietary power, rather than an instruction to lead the congregation in celebrating the Eucharist.⁵⁶ Mary Anne Everett-Green, editor of the *Life of Mr. William Whittingham*, assumes this comment implied that Whittingham's main objectors were Bennett and Swift, but this also infers that there was an accusation that Sandys' orders had first been granted in the Catholic manner.⁵⁷ It also implied that Hutton was unwilling to condemn the congregation led by Knox and Whittingham at Frankfurt, which Sandys had objected to whilst in exile. Certainly that was how Sandys interpreted matters and he took offence not only at Hutton's support of Whittingham, but also at the slur on his own religious conviction and Hutton's implication that Sandys took too much personal proprietary power upon himself.⁵⁸ Sandys valued loyalty, and thus the lack of loyalty shown by Hutton to Sandys further widened the breach.

Relations between Hutton and Sandys deteriorated further by the mid-1580s, and Sandys complained to Cecil in 1586 that 'The Dean spitteth out his venome still' and that Hutton was driven by 'mere malice towards me and myne'.⁵⁹ Sandys was irritated by Hutton's refusal to support him

in the dispute with local gentleman, Sir Robert Stapleton.⁶⁰ Sandys also submitted a list of complaints against Hutton in June 1586. These centred predominantly on the Whittingham case but also harked back to the history of bad feeling between the two men. The first complaint noted that Hutton had refused to join with Sandys 'in dutifull care' at his first appointment to the North.⁶¹ The list of thirteen complaints in all indicated just how far the disputes had progressed with Sandys complaining of Hutton's actions in the Stapleton case; his overly enthusiastic purchasing of land for his own use not that of the Church and his failure to allow Sandys, as Archbishop, his rights of visitation. He also implied that Hutton was basing his objections on old popish rulings.⁶² The accusation of a popish taint had already been made by Hutton when the nature of Sandys' ordination had been referred to and now Sandys responded in kind, with an attempt to slur the Dean's Protestant credentials.

The backbiting and sniping between the two men was also underpinned and articulated through tensions over the property, income and offices of the Church. Sandys' letter to William Cecil in May 1586 said Hutton had accused him of handing out leases to his sons along with appointing his nine-year-old son as Chancellor.⁶³ Accusations of nepotism, favouritism and corruption of this nature cut close to the bone for this was a charge levelled at members of the Roman Church and a reason often cited by evangelicals for the need for a purer reformed Protestant church. Sandys' indignation at these accusations was somewhat marred by the fact that he had in fact given two leases, in reversion, to each of his six sons. His letter stated that he had paid the Dean £4 for these and 'the Busshoprike loseth noithinge by it.'⁶⁴ Whilst scoffing at the accusation that he had appointed his nine-year-old son (George) to the Chancellorship it transpired that he had in fact appointed one of his elder sons to the office. Sandys defended this by stating that his elder son held an MA, training in the law and 'was well learned'.⁶⁵ Through these accusations and rebuttals Sandys also highlighted a reoccurring point of complaint, that there was no provision for married clergy and their families in Elizabeth's church. He noted that providing for his family in such a way was his duty, for after all he had no lands to leave them. This allowed him to contrast himself with the unmarried Hutton, who Sandys said did have lands and monies unlawfully gained from the Church. Sandys accused Hutton of not keeping 'stock in the common Chest for the defence' of the Church and more that there had been £200 in the chest which was stolen by Huntingdon's men who 'put in it their private purses' and bought land for themselves with it. Sandys also tainted his predecessor at York, Edmund Grindal, with his accusations. He stated that Grindal, after taking up office at Canterbury, gave his kinsmen, servants and himself 'round somes of money . . . six score leases and patents' and that Hutton had said nothing.⁶⁶

This dispute was not kept private and was well known amongst the other members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, who recognised it as

potentially damaging to the stability of the Elizabethan Church. Whittgift wrote to Hutton in 1586 after the most recent outbreak of hostility saying that he was sorry to hear that things were no better between the two men. He also suggested that the best thing for all would be to see an end to the conflict. He urged Hutton to make peace with Sandys for the 'redeeming of peace and quietness and the avoiding of publick offense'; further acknowledging that many things had to be done, however unwillingly, for the sake of maintaining the peace.⁶⁷

Both Sandys and Hutton condemned those factions in the Church who would 'not only have an equality of all ministers, but also would deprive the Queen of her authority, and give it to the people'. Hutton like Sandys was also concerned about the tendency of those in the North to select Catholic rather than reforming clergy and the persistent adherence to old beliefs and practices.⁶⁸ Despite this apparent unity on doctrinal matters the two men were still in opposition on a personal level. Hutton's failure to back Sandys in the Stapleton case, and his decision to actively to oppose Sandys in the Whittingham dispute ensured that a truly united front could never be presented.

To what extent the conflict between Sandys and Hutton could be viewed in terms of court politics is debatable. Brett Usher argues that both William Cecil and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, had advocated Sandys' promotion to the See of London, against Sandys' own wishes and protestations.⁶⁹ This alliance of the two key power brokers of Elizabeth's reign could be attributed to their desire to block the elevation of both Aylmer and Day, rather than promote Sandys as a particular favourite, but nevertheless they did jointly support his elevation.⁷⁰ In the case of Sandys' elevation to York there was a considerable gap between Grindal's departure and Sandys' arrival. In part this was due to the delay over the decision of who would take up the office. It has already been indicated that Whittingham was a possible candidate. Leicester had asked him to come to court to further this cause, an offer which he declined on the grounds of age and infirmity.⁷¹ Thus, Leicester may have felt Sandys was the best option once Whittingham had expressed his unwillingness. The desire to block other men from the office and the chance to promote his man to high position was the motivation that Usher ascribes to Cecil's actions.⁷² Sandys did seem to show more concern with appeasing Cecil, rather than Leicester, during his time as Archbishop.⁷³ Sandys' correspondence with Cecil over the years, whilst formulaic in address, does seem to indicate that it was to Cecil that he would turn for patronage and support in a crisis. Sandys' reactionary nature and desire to retain favour had proved useful during his time in London and in elevating him further Cecil may have viewed Sandys as a way to prevent too much, or the wrong sort of, reform in the North. Moreover, Sandys was to find himself in opposition to Leicester's attempt to seize yet more ecclesiastical lands from him in 1581, and Ambrose, Earl of Warwick (from the Leicester contingent),

had already been a key player in securing Whittingham's place in Durham. This set the stage for a scenario where Sandys was favoured by Cecil whilst Whittingham and Hutton were favoured by Leicester and his kin. This did not of course mean that Hutton was without Cecil's support and in fact Cecil later also advocated for Hutton's promotion. Sandys' family had also established a presence in the Worcester region following his tenure there as Bishop. His eldest son, Samuel, would marry (1582) and settle in Worcestershire where Leicester and his kin held sway.⁷⁴ This meant that Sandys did not want to alienate Leicester, but equally the property dispute of the 1580s suggested that they were not always on good terms.

The fact that Sandys was hunting down those of a puritanical nature in Yorkshire was also a cause for concern amongst his fellow Protestants. Huntingdon and Hutton clearly felt that Sandys may have had a part to play in the downfall of Edmund Grindal, the former Archbishop of York who was now Archbishop of Canterbury. Grindal incurred Elizabeth's displeasure over the issue of prophesying (gatherings of preachers and clergy in a forum where key biblical passages would be discussed and debated). His failure to fully forbid the exercises, once ordered to do so, was to bring about his downfall. Elizabeth considered them a potential breeding ground for dissent, whereas Grindal insisted they were a useful and effective tool for training. In the minds of Elizabeth and those in the court circle the prophesying became linked with the threat of Puritanism and potential disruption to the established church. Yet this was not a view shared by a good number of the clergy as these were exactly the sort of exercises that had been used by the former Marian exiles to train. Sandys, himself, was in favour of such training and thus did not view these exercises as an example of the Puritan behaviour he was trying to restrict. Huntingdon and Hutton seemed of a mind to assume that Sandys would have acted against Grindal given an opportunity to do so, illustrating the extent to which they were willing to think the worse of Sandys. Grindal had written to Hutton on 2 December 1577 stating that around six weeks ago he had been put in 'assured hoape off libertie, &c. Abowte that tyme arose a sudeyn contrarie tempest, which hadde browghte me to have appeared in the Starre Chamber'.⁷⁵ The appearance had not occurred as Grindal's illness prevented it. The 'tempest' which arose is not specified, but in May 1578 Huntingdon wrote to Hutton, quoting what he had heard in regards to Grindal's detention. He stated that 'the bysshoppes of Durram and Yorke have wrytten to hyr Majesty of soche sectes and puritanes that ys in those cuntryes, that hathe made a staye of hys delyuerance'.⁷⁶ Thus, the connection was made between Sandys' campaign against radicals and the fall of Grindal from the Queen's good graces. Yet Huntingdon also noted in the same letter that he had spoken to Sandys and Sandys was adamant that he had not made complaint of Puritans but had rather focused on the number of Catholics in the North

as the main cause for concern. It was unlikely Sandys intended to draw attention to these exercises, as he was advocating just the sort of training which had brought Grindal down. In a letter written to William Cecil in April 1578 Sandys stated he had 'set the preachers on work to give to every market and greate town every second Sunday a sermon'.⁷⁷ He continued that:

And in this exercises I have taken upon me to do so much as the best for the curase of learning in the ministry. I have ordered that every Archdeacon shall kepe four synods in the yeare, the charge there shall be assembled, some principall point of religion propounded, all shall be prepared to speake but suche only shall speake as shall by the graete moderators be called thereunto, they shall speake to the matter and not vagari and this shall be done amongst the ministers themselves.⁷⁸

In interpreting the events of this era the problem lay both with a significant difference between what the exercises were perceived to be and what they actually were. The exercise proposed by Sandys as part of the synods were to be closely regulated and to form part of the training programme for preachers, but only allowing the pre-approved clergy to speak out openly. Of course the implied self-regulation by ministers did leave the process open to be led by their concerns rather than those of Sandys or the monarch. The fact that Sandys was informing Cecil he was undertaking such exercises in 1578 implied that Sandys' opposition to Puritanism in the North was not in opposition to Grindal and these exercises. Whether Sandys did or did not complain to the Queen of Puritanism this was not part of a direct attack on Grindal; but did undeniably come at an unfortunate moment. Sandys felt that complaining to the Court about religious radicalism was his right, yet there is little proof of any desire to see Grindal fall over the issue of prophesying. Sandys was eager to show himself compliant with the wishes of Elizabeth and her Council, even on matters as close to his heart as preaching. A few years after the Grindal incident he wrote to the Bishop of Chester, William Chaderton, to admonish him for straying too far from what was permitted stating:

My Lord you are noted to yield too much to general fastings, all the day preaching and praying. Verlie a good exercise in time and upon just occasion, when yt cometh from good authoritie. But (when there is no occasion, nether the thing commanded by the prince or a synod) the wisest and best learned cannot like of yt, nether will Her Majesty permit it.⁷⁹

Sandys felt Chaderton's actions were allowing unsuitable preaching, and opening the possibility of radical ideas spreading as he continued in

his letter to say '[t]he devill is craftie, and the younge ministers of these oure times growe madd.'⁸⁰ Huntingdon had previously noted to Chaderton that 'nowe that you are once entered into the way of reformation, remember . . . somewhere yow must be as a father, somewhere [as] a lord' asserting that the diversity of his flock in Lancashire would require it.⁸¹ In contrast to Sandys in 1582 Huntingdon praised Chaderton for the care he took of the ministers below him and under his care.⁸² This indicated that Huntingdon was applauding progressive religious ideas, whereas Sandys was disapproving of what he perceived as radicalism. Although the majority of Sandys' complaints focused upon the number of dissenting Catholics in the county, it was evident that by the 1580s he was also concerned about the spread of radical ideas and the destabilising impact this could have on the North. Sandys' actions and writing were often tied up with wider anxieties that any opposition to the status quo, be it Catholic or Puritan, was a cause for concern. The path to salvation involved following the word of God but also the laws and regulations set down by the monarch. Whilst Sandys may have wished to focus on higher matters often his attention was occupied with more mundane concerns and he took issue with any practice which he felt was steering the country away from the true path.

*'God is no money-man': Usury and Church Money*⁸³

In the first of his published sermons Sandys discussed the nature of God's mercy advocating that salvation could be achieved without wealth. The issue of money and finance was to be one that occupied much of Sandys' time, both in terms of the battles he took up, but also the accusations he faced. The subject of usury in early modern England was a frequent point of discussion and a focus for the ire of many clerics including that of Edwin Sandys. Tawney commented that 'Books on usury by ecclesiastical writers of the sixteenth century are legion'; meanwhile I.P. Ellis noted that 'One of the features in common in sixteenth-century episcopal visitations in England, whether Catholic or Reformed, is enquiry after usurers.'⁸⁴ The condemnation of usury was universal in ecclesiastical rhetoric, but its strict legality or illegality changed with different circumstances and regimes and was never quite obliterated despite the numerous campaigns against the practice.⁸⁵ For many clerics usury's standing in law was not the real issue, rather it was the immorality of the practice that was universally condemned. When reformed bishops listed the faults of the nation they saw usury as a particular area of concern. Both Jewel and Sandys made specific reference to usury in their works and others made usury a target of their injunctions.⁸⁶ Their rhetoric seemed equally as concerned with the immorality of usury, yet they were less willing to engage with the practicalities of prosecution. One of Sandys' more positive pen portraits was given to him by John Blaxton, author of *The*

English Usurer: Or, Usury Condemned, who coined him 'the hammer of usurers'.⁸⁷ In accepting this epitaph for Sandys there has been little questioning of his motivation for targeting this practice, beyond the generic ecclesiastical condemnation of usury.

For Sandys the condemnation of usury was one of many concerns and by no means unconnected with the other aspects he felt were plaguing the nation. His action against usurers may indeed have been more proactive than that of other clerics, and was reflective of his approach which was unyielding once committed to a cause. In the sermon he delivered at his first coming to York he declared that God had commanded 'Lend freely, and look for no gain' and he cast usurers alongside idolaters who glorified in their 'ill gotten gold'.⁸⁸ Yet by the mid-1580s this campaign against usury had become closely tied into his dispute with Hutton. His concerns were expressed through his sermons and letters, and even though usury was undoubtedly one of his worries, it was not presented as the sole concern or in isolation from the other issues he held to be of importance. Most prominently listed in his sermon before Parliament 'Be this sin against the Lord' was a lack of unity in religion, but he also recorded the other common signs of a world turned upside down; the dangers of unlawful marriage and the associated sin of adultery; the wearing of gorgeous apparel and consumption of sumptuous diet; unchecked and exploitative trade and lastly 'that biting worm of usury'.⁸⁹ The 1571 Parliament had passed a number of bills with a socio-economic focus, one of which effectively legalised usury. This statute did not pass through Parliament entirely without comment. It was the focus of a debate where the moral as well as economic arguments were discussed, but still the legislation progressed to its second and third readings without lengthy comment in the record.⁹⁰ The use of interest in the commercial and business world was a concern for Parliament and the mention of usury in Sandys' sermon to them served to highlight that this was a moral as well as economic issue. Ellis argues that Sandys was a traditionalist in economic terms, that 'He could not understand the new economic forces of the age. Not surprisingly, therefore, he opposed the increased scope of money-lending.'⁹¹ His concern with the practice of usury was awoken during his tenure in York. Sandys' attempt to expose and prosecute usurers in York saw him engage the Ecclesiastical High Commission as a tool to root out and prosecute offenders. In the first round of prosecutions he called before the commission thirty-one men and in a subsequent proceeding a further twenty men.⁹² This included a clerk of the Sheriff of York and a servant of the Lord President.⁹³ From the first group called seven admitted their guilt and were punished with heavy fines of 1000 marks.⁹⁴ Matthew Hutton objected to the second hearing declaring that he dissented from the proceedings and 'mislike them, so cleare my hands of it' on the grounds that 'many things are termed usury in the civil lawes which are not usarie by the word of god'.⁹⁵ Sandys was clearly

infuriated by Hutton's citation implying that he understood ecclesiastical law better than the Archbishop, but also because Hutton called on the works of Bullinger and Bucer to support his assertion. The record suggests that Sandys answered in 'mylde and temporate wordes' admonishing the Dean that if he had 'misliked' the proceedings he should have expressed this privately and should otherwise have 'kept your voice and consent unto yourself'.⁹⁶ This was a clear statement that Hutton should have spoken to Sandys privately or should simply mind his own business and not interfere. The proceedings go further to note that the 'said dean is suspected to practice usurie him selfe'.⁹⁷ This was a charge Sandys made again against Hutton in a letter to Cecil in March 1585. Sandys related that he had been thwarted in his attempts to deal with the foul sin of usury by the Dean, who had tried to threaten witnesses and whose hands were 'deeply myred in this matter, for otherwise he cold hardly abound in such welth as he presently doth'.⁹⁸ In addition to his position as Dean of York Hutton also held a prebend at Southwell Minster and rectories in Nottingham and Settrington, which brought him in a substantial income, estimated at £440 per annum in 1575.⁹⁹ Sandys had clearly observed Hutton's finances and concluded that the acquisition of such income could not have been without some suspect dealings.

Norman Jones argues that Hutton's reaction was attributable to a lack of understanding of the usury statutes, a belief that leading reformers had not forbidden usury and his understanding that the ecclesiastical commission was treading on civil authority, via Sandys' use of it to prosecute the York populace.¹⁰⁰ It may well be the case that Hutton's interpretation of civil law was faulty, but when seen in the light of the wider disputes with Sandys, this incident takes on a different hue. The acts against usury were part of Sandys' campaign to combat financial corruption in the county, yet were also an extension of the conflicts between himself, Huntingdon and Hutton. It also reflected tensions regarding who held moral authority, the ecclesiastical or civil governors of the county. Sandys held the belief that he was to a great extent unsupported by his colleagues and this was a further example. Hutton failed to show Sandys the loyalty and backing he expected from him. Moreover, Sandys began to see Hutton as part of the problem rather than part of the solution to controlling his archdiocese.

Land and Property

Sandys' attempts to establish himself as a force against pecuniary corruption was somewhat marred by his own actions in regards to financial dealings. He was very aware of the importance of land and property and was particularly concerned about the retention and ownership of church land. Throughout his ecclesiastical career Sandys was adamant that leasing of church lands was the right of the bishop. Moreover, that financial

transaction should be undertaken with one eye always on retaining as much control as possible; which in practice often saw him retaining control via leases to his own family. This brought the added advantage of security for his kith and kin as well as additional position and status. He was also prepared to defend his actions in robust terms when challenged about them. In 1577 he was still being pursued by the Diocese of Worcester in regards to the financial and property management he had undertaken whilst Bishop in that diocese. A letter from the Dean and Chapter outlined issues where they felt Sandys had unduly denied the diocese and Cathedral College income.¹⁰¹ The letters they submitted to court accused Sandys of the undue destruction of property, the leasing of land to his brother Myles Sandys on long tenancies and/or very favourable terms and lastly the allocation of parsonages and prebendaries in unfair ways.¹⁰²

Sandys' tenure in London had also lead to questions regarding his financial management, especially in regards to the lack of repairs to St Paul's Cathedral.¹⁰³ By the 1580s the matter had escalated further and was a continuation of a dispute which had been going on since Sandys' translation to York.¹⁰⁴ Questions had been raised in reference to Sandys owing monies to the London diocese. Sandys had written to Cecil in March 1576 stating that

If Mr. Elmer [Alymer] fynd so great Favour as is mynded, I do not envy it; but doubtles he can never fynd such Favour at my Hands, that I will give him my Rent which I have lawfully received and honestly spent; I will not begger myself to inriche him. I am grown into so much Det already.¹⁰⁵

Sandys, in his lengthy reply to the charges made against him, was adamant that the damage to St Paul's was due to 'fire from heaven' and thus the destruction was not attributable to his lack of care for the building; moreover that as Bishop of London he did not have the funds to care for the poor, keep his office in the necessary manner and restore St Paul's. He was also keen to point out that he had inherited some of the problems from Grindal, now Archbishop of Canterbury.¹⁰⁶ By 1584, John Aylmer, the new Bishop of London, was charging Sandys with dilapidations of St Paul's Cathedral, citing the fact that Sandys had funds to spare in the North that could be sent to compensate for the lack of repairs that had taken place whilst he was incumbent in his London office. The issue did not simply disappear, as Sandys had hoped, and a commission was called to investigate further. Sandys was incensed at being called before a commission to answer these charges and indignant at not receiving a favourable decision, which he urged the judges to 'moderate and temper'.¹⁰⁷

In May 1586 Cecil made notes on a document which catalogued the grants Sandys had made to his children.¹⁰⁸ Most prominent amongst these

were grants to his eldest son, Samuel, who had been granted a number of leases on very profitable manors in both Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire. It also noted that the granting of the park at Southwell to Sandys' children and that the granting of prebendaries, also at Southwell, were not confirmed. Cecil also appeared to have tried to total up in his own hand the grants to made each of Sandys' sons: noting Samuel 6; Myles 5; Edward 4; whilst Henry, Thomas and George had two each respectively.¹⁰⁹ There was no formal admonishment from Cecil for these actions but he clearly knew what was happening and felt he needed some kind of tally to keep track of the situation. The checking of the records and annotations indicated that Sandys' word was no longer taken without question. The only one of Sandys' sons not to have benefitted directly from the grants listed on this document was the Bishop's namesake Edwin. Yet he was not left without consideration as he had previously been granted the prebendary of Wetwang (Yorkshire) in 1580/1.¹¹⁰ Sandys saw the leasing of church lands to members of his family as both fulfilling his duty as a good father, in providing for his sons, but also as a means of retaining the land within the wider church family. Yet the leasing of church lands and prebendaries to his children did suggest nepotism was at work. Moreover, it left Archbishop Sandys open to justifiable criticism as none of his sons showed any predilection to enter the ecclesiastical professions and thus illustrated a lack of real integrity in his claims that he was preserving church income within the religious fold.¹¹¹

Sandys' desire to provide for his children resulted in further outbreaks of conflict in areas where cooperation was the norm. Marchant stated that the legal personnel in the courts of York 'worked together harmoniously' except during the time of Edwin Sandys.¹¹² As Archbishop he was concerned to be surrounded by like-minded people, but like-minded people he had appointed. Moreover, if this could benefit his close kin so much the better. This caused disruption in the key roles in the diocese. Initially on taking up office as Archbishop of York, Sandys appointed Robert Lougher as his Chancellor to replace John Gibson, the previous incumbent of the office. Lougher remained in position until his death in 1585 when he was briefly replaced by Richard Percy, but the real replacement was clearly the Archbishop's second son (also named Edwin) who took up office in 1586 and proceeded to employ Percy as a surrogate.¹¹³ Archbishop Sandys' partiality towards his kin was made even more obvious in terms of the other holders of ecclesiastical office during his episcopacy. The Commissary of the Exchequer was held by Richard Percy and Miles Sandys from 1586, the Principal Registrars were Miles and Samuel Sandys whilst Thomas and Henry Sandys held the position of Registrars of the Exchequer.¹¹⁴ Sandys certainly seems to have been willing to make the most of his position in terms of advancing his family.

The financial status of the church was of continuing concern to Sandys and he did exploit his rights and position to the maximum. Yet these

problems were minor thorns in his side compared to the mainstay of his work in the North—combatting the papist threat. For he argued in his sermons

Thus you see a manifest difference between Christ and antichrist, the doctrine of God, and the learning of man, true teachers and false, sound and counterfeited religion. The one offereth true bread freely: the other, that which is no bread, for bread, and that not freely neither, but for money. The diversity of religion professed in these our times is here most plainly and lively depainted.¹¹⁵

For Sandys the continuation of Catholicism posed the real danger to the commonwealth, justice and the souls of the nation and it is to his dealings with the Catholics of the North that we now turn.

Yorkshire Catholics: ‘the greatest part of our gentlemen are not well affected to godly religion’¹¹⁶

The problem of what to do regarding reforming religion in the North of England plagued evangelicals from the implementation of the Elizabethan settlement onwards. For Sandys it had posed an immediate problem on his return from the continent as he had been part of the Royal Visitation of the North in 1559. In 1564 the then Archbishop of York, Thomas Young (1507–68), had written that: ‘This country is in good quietness, and the common people tractable touching religion in obedience to her; and the transgressors of her laws are in fear of execution of the same.’¹¹⁷ Yet he went on to add that the real worry lay with the fact that it was the nobility, gentry and clergy who clung most ardently to the old ways and even though some of the gentlemen and clergy were beginning to reform it still left a considerable proportion of the leadership of the county as suspect in regards to their true religious commitment.¹¹⁸ The problem of a conservative hierarchy was again noted by Ralph Sadler who in 1569 stated that ‘[t]here be not in all this country ten gentlemen that do favour and allow of Her Majesty’s proceedings in religion, and the common people be ignorant, full of superstition, and altogether blinded with the old Popish doctrine’.¹¹⁹ In May 1577 the Earl of Huntingdon had written to Elizabeth to state that:

The county remains quiet to all appearance, without open disobedience, except such as be obstinate in religion, or will not say amen to any prayer set out in the book of common service, nor to those godly prayers that be for Your Majesty; we have tried them therewith before ourselves, and they have refused so to do, and also refuse to come to church.¹²⁰

J.T. Cliffe writing on the Yorkshire gentry in the 1960s described a county filled with ‘church papists’ and this was a theme later taken up in Alexandra Walsham’s analysis of the tactics employed by crypto-Catholics in the era.¹²¹ In Yorkshire Sandys once again took up the fight against Catholicism, seeking to identify those unreformed individuals who were the greatest threat to the moral and religious security of the nation. For ‘[t]herefore dangerous and desperate is that doctrine of the papists which doth teach us ever to be doubtful instead and in suspense of our salvation.’¹²² In 1559 the authorities advocated persuasion and focused predominantly on identifying noncompliant clergy, now Sandys felt he could more effectively and rigorously enforce conformity and take action against dissenters amongst the clergy and the laity.

Many in the county displayed pragmatism in their efforts to maintain an outward show of compliance with the Elizabethan religious settlement, whilst also attending Catholic services, harbouring priests and overseeing a family who were often in much more open defiance of the law. Sandys had preached at York that:

He serveth the belly who frameth himself to be of any religion, so that in this world he may live by it; when popery hath the upper hand, then a papist; when the gospel is in due estimation, a protestant; all things to all men, that somewhat may be gained or saved to himself. He maketh no difference between the mass and the communion, Christ and Belial; but for his belly sake will halt on both sides, serve all times and turns.¹²³

It was this pretence that was to make the task of seeking out Catholics both difficult and personally frustrating as Sandys was to find identifying his enemy was no easy task as they were often ‘double-hearted men’ who pretended compliance.¹²⁴ Sandys’ predecessor, Edmund Grindal, had noted in 1570 that:

I cannot as yet write of the state of this country, as of mine own knowledge; but I am informed that the greatest part of our gentlemen are not well affected to godly religion, and that among the people there are many remnants of the old. They keep holydays and fasts abrogated: they offer money, eggs, &c. at the burial of their dead; they pray beads, etc, so as this seems to be as it were another Church, rather than a member of the rest.¹²⁵

In practical terms what action to take against papists also required some consideration and the Elizabethan regime had performed a balancing act until the 1570s. Too lenient and the wrong message was transmitted, namely that Catholicism was permissible, if practised discretely.

Many of the major families of the North had Catholic connections and removing too many members of the local gentry and nobility from offices was impractical as it would remove the hierarchical infrastructure of society. Even if the head of the household appeared to be conformist the inherent religious conservative of the family was often all too evident. Moreover, as John Alymer, the new Bishop of London, argued simply imprisoning Catholics did not work. He informed Walsingham that many of the bishops had discussed the matter and felt that imprisonment of wealthier Catholics was simply a means of sparing their housekeeping, encouraged them to spread their message and was a wasted opportunity to raise funds via fines.¹²⁶

we have thought good to forbear the imprisoninge of the richer sorte, and to punishe them by round fynes, to be imposed for contemptuose refusinge of receavinge the Communion, accordinge to or order & Commandmentes. For, if we should directlie punishe them for not comeinge to the Church, they have to alleadge that the penaltie, beinge already sett downe by statute (which is xijd for every such offence) is not by us to be altered nor agravated. This maner of fininge of them will procure the Queene a thousand poundes by yeare to hir Coffers: whatsoever it doe more, it will weakne the enymie and touch him much nerer, then any paine heretofore inflicted hath done.¹²⁷

In October 1577, soon after taking office as Archbishop of York, Sandys conducted a survey of religion in the county. Elizabeth's government ordered that lists should be compiled to show those who were not complying with the basic requirements of religion, to assess the truth of the claim that 'those that are backward in religion grow worse.'¹²⁸ In practice the survey was of a limited nature given the short time allocated for its completion. This lent weight to the assertion the purpose was in fact to search out openly practising Catholics and assess their worth. Catholic author Rev. Patrick Ryan concluded that 'The Government did not want to make such a census, but to get at a list of Catholics of property from whom fines could be extorted', a conclusion drawn from the fact that 'They only left one week for the return to be made, a space of time that was altogether inadequate'.¹²⁹ In contrast Lake and Questier have presented this survey as an attempt by the bishops in England to gain a reprieve for Grindal. Thus, it distracted the monarch from the perceived threat of Puritanism and pointed the finger squarely at the papists as the real cause for concern.¹³⁰ Sandys noted that:

I haue with all diligencie travelled therin, and haue sent vnto yor Lordships herewithall the names and abilities of suche within my dioces, as refuse to come to Church. . . . Yt was not possible for

me in this shortnes of tyme to searche owt all, being required by your Lordships to returne answere within vij daies, for as yet I haue not visited my dioces, and so canne not come by full vnderstandinge of the offendours.¹³¹

Sandys' pattern in previous bishoprics was to enact a visitation as soon as possible, and this was what he wanted to do in York as well, yet this was too soon even for him. Despite the inadequate time Sandys was able to deliver a substantial list of names. He noted further that,

I haue already laboured what I canne synce my cominge hither, as well by persuasion as by execucon of discipline, to reforme them; but litle haue I prevailed, for a more stiffe necked, wilfull or obstinate people did I never knowe or heare of: dowbtlesse they are reconciled to Rome & sworne to the pope.¹³²

There were 176 Catholics listed as residing within the diocese which was a higher figure than produced by any other religious jurisdiction.¹³³ It was clear that the 1577 survey focused predominantly on those geographically closest to the city. They could be assessed more easily and were therefore more immediate targets. The relatively high number of Catholics found given the short time frame and limited search area either indicated that there was such an abundance of offenders that there was little searching to do, or that the search in Yorkshire was more thorough than elsewhere in the country. What is of course most likely is that much of the information submitted, which included certificates of those refusing to attend church within the diocese and an estimation of the value of their goods, had been compiled from Huntingdon's information. Whilst this information was itself incomplete, what is significant is that fact that it already existed prior to Sandys' arrival in the county. This indicated that Huntingdon had already identified and begun a crackdown on Catholics before Sandys' had been involved and without the need for his input.¹³⁴ Arguably Grindal's departure and the lack of an incumbent Archbishop had not stopped Huntingdon seeking out offenders and Hutton and Huntingdon were already an active force against the papist threat.

Huntingdon had set out his approach to ruling the 'sore and subtle people' of the North in December 1572. Writing to Cecil he was clear that 'severity in justice, next to preaching of the gospel, which truly does greatly want in these parts, will prove the best bridle for this people.'¹³⁵ The High Commission records do show Sandys, Huntingdon and Hutton all acting together to combat religious non-conformity and in particular to see out and punish Catholics. In August 1580 they wrote to the church wardens of Wel Drake (Yorkshire) to say that they were acting on credible information that the parishioners were forgetting their duty to attend divine service and to instruct the same wardens that they should begin to implement

the fine of 12d. for first offences.¹³⁶ There follows in the High Commission Act Book numerous accounts of Catholics who were brought up before the commission, sometimes with Sandys, Hutton and Huntingdon present and at other points with a combination of one or more of them alongside other local officials such as William Mallory, Henry Gates, Robert Stapleton and William Bellasis.¹³⁷ William Mallory although surrounded by recusant relatives was cited by Huntingdon as ‘one of the four “most fit” persons to be added to the council.’¹³⁸ Henry Gates had influence in the East Riding and a Protestant heritage which was less dubious than either William Bellasis or Robert Stapleton. The commission itself was not uncontaminated by Catholic connections. William Bellasis of Newburgh ‘had emerged from a suspect youth’ to develop Protestant credentials alongside recusant siblings and Stapleton’s background was littered with Catholic relatives.¹³⁹ Many of these men were, like William Fairfax of Gilling, reliant on Huntingdon to vouchsafe for their religious convictions as their own backgrounds were tainted with Catholic kith and kin.¹⁴⁰ Even when action was taken against Catholics there was a good chance that the individual would be able to draw on his connections to extricate himself; for example a petition from the Earl of Leicester was deployed following the arrest of one of the Townley family in 1577, securing his release from prison.¹⁴¹ Families with strong pedigree and good contacts could often find a way to avoid the harsher punishments.

Despite this the Earl of Huntingdon was determined to proceed against the papists in the North. Claire Cross advocated that the new element of the post-1569 regime in the North was its willingness to take action against Catholics in a crusade for a ‘new political stability’.¹⁴² For Cross it was Huntingdon who was the driving force of the new harsher regime, as evidenced by more use being made of the Hull Blockhouse, an unpleasant and isolated gaol that certainly made it more difficult for Catholics to interact with others, access a priest or gain support. This notably increased in the interim period between Grindal’s departure for Canterbury and Sandys’ arrival in York. The High Commission records demonstrate that once Sandys was in office as Archbishop a variety of places of imprisonment continued to be used. In 1580 men and women were imprisoned in the Kidcote in York ‘for their obstanie in religion’ as well as in the Castle, for their ‘disobedience in religion’.¹⁴³ The Kidcote had been the medieval prison at Ousebridge which had been part of the chapel of St William, but flooding in 1565 had resulted in the rebuilding of the prison. From this point on it seems there was both a sheriff’s kidcote and mayor’s kidcote (which was used for debtors) which increased capacity.¹⁴⁴ Huntingdon also attempted to reform the city itself via correspondence with its council where he urged them to engage suitable ministry. On 29 September 1578 Huntingdon wrote to the great and good of the city, including the mayor, aldermen and local gentlemen, to do their duty and ensure that the hearts of the people were not stolen by

Romanish priests who would turn the people from their God and thus damage the commonwealth.¹⁴⁵ Huntingdon was attempting to work with the established hierarchies as far as was possible.

Sandys viewed the local hierarchies as problematic as it meant the institutions of law and government in the North were permeated with Catholic influence. Even as late as 1587 Sandys was bemoaning the nature of the men who were Commissioners of the Peace in the county to Cecil, only Gervace Nevyl, John Lewis and Walter Jobson being noted as 'wise, upright, skilful, and painful in that office'.¹⁴⁶ He had little good to say about the other incumbents of the Yorkshire commission, identifying James Ryther as a 'soure, subtil papist' and Brian Stapleton as 'a great papist'.¹⁴⁷ Brian Stapleton's son was Robert Stapleton and he had been one of the great names of the county holding office in York and presenting himself as a friend to Sandys. This friendship had been proved false following the incident at the Bull Inn in Doncaster where Stapleton had been involved in a plan to discredit Sandys by sullyng his reputation and accusing him of adultery.¹⁴⁸ This had been the cause of great distress for Sandys and seen his reputation besmirched. Another notable northern family was the Lascelles which was composed of both convicted recusants and conformists. Sandys wrote that Brian Lascelles was noted as '[o]ne that maketh divisions, maintaining evil causes; bolstering out evil matters; ever in law, and one that onely liveth by other mens losses.'¹⁴⁹ Thus, Sandys condemned Brian Lascelles as both a papist and morally bereft, unconcerned with the poverty of others. Even those who were not openly Catholic were tainted by association. He stated that husbands failed to do their duty in providing the correct religious guidance for their wives. George Woodruff was noted as having a wife who was 'an obstinate recusant' and Sandys wrote that '[s]uch men as have such wives are thought very unfit to serve in these our times'. The Sheriff of Yorkshire, Henry Constable, also suffered from the same problem, namely a non-conformist wife. Henry Constable was a Justice (appointed in 1582) and he had previously been on the commission, yet he had married into the Catholic Dormer family. Sandys noted that '[h]is wife is a most obstinate recusant, and will not be reformed by any persuasion, or yet by coercion'. Noting further that 'Her example is very hurtful' due to her inability to follow her husband in matters of religion.¹⁵⁰ Despite the fact that Constable's marriage made him brother-in-law to Catholic Viscount Montagu his appointments were not curtailed. It would seem Sandys' views and warnings were ignored, as Constable was reappointed to the Commission of the Peace and returned as knight of the shire for Yorkshire in 1589.¹⁵¹ Thus, Sandys may have wanted to pursue an uncompromising approach, just as he had in Worcester and London, but the situation in Yorkshire made this unfeasible. Catholics were everywhere and the county could not function if all who were tainted by papist connections were removed.

Catholic Women

Female recusancy was another problem acknowledged by both Huntingdon and Sandys, with the latter observing that ‘the obstinate which refuse to come to Church . . . the most parte are women.’¹⁵² The 1577 survey presented 176 peopled named as refusing to attend church and from these 101 were women.¹⁵³ This suggested that Huntingdon’s assessment was correct. Whilst husbands could be called to answer for their wives and pay the required fines, many of these women were also imprisoned and thus made answerable for their own actions, including their choice of religion.¹⁵⁴ Lake and Questier argued that Richard Topcliffe had already identified disobedient women as a threat in the county urging that their sex should not be a reason to overlook them.¹⁵⁵ Many of the women identified were of lower status and their obstinacy and religious disobedience represented the dangers posed by uninformed and ill-educated opinion. In March 1577 Huntingdon had written to Secretary Francis Walsingham to indicate that there had been a discussion about what to do regarding the ‘women prisoners in the Kydcote for religion’.¹⁵⁶ Huntingdon was emphatic that he saw ‘no warrant to release those that will submit, and you know the Act of Parliament appoints the punishment’.¹⁵⁷ The 1577 list of Catholics included six ladies, twenty-three gentlewomen and seventy-two inferior women. The ‘old countess of Cumbreland’, the ‘Old ladye Wharton’, Lady Edith Mentham, Lady Anne Wilstroppe and Lady Anne Ingleby all appeared on the list.¹⁵⁸ The first four of these women were widows and thus outside of traditional male control via husband or father. Yet they were also relatively wealthy and well connected in the county. As such they were both easy targets and also potential sources of the wrong kind of leadership. Lower down the social scale the wives of key artisans and tradesmen of York were also named. Anne Weddell, the wife of John Wedell of York (butcher); Janet Geldarte, wife of Percival Geldarte (butcher); Margaret Clitherow, wife of John Clitherow (butcher); Isabell Porter, wife of Peter Porter (tailor); Margaret Tailiour, wife of Thomas (tailor); Dorothy Vavasour, wife of Thomas Vavasour (Doctor in Physic) alongside the wives of girdlers, drapers and Elizabeth Dineleye, wife of John, the Lord Mayor of York, were all named as recusants. Dorothy Vavasour was to continue to be a source of concern for the authorities in York for many years to come and was ‘the chief matron and mother of all the good wives in York’.¹⁵⁹ She aided her husband in his work and ran a maternity home after his arrest as well as sheltering priests until her imprisonment and subsequent death. The wives of the civic middling sort were often the basis for a reformed household, but in York they represented a force of resistance to evangelical thinking.

The other female name on the list that was to prove persistent in her commitment to her faith was Margaret Clitherow. Commentators

on recusancy such as Hugh Aveling presented Clitherow as a woman who was in fact ripe for conversion to any religion, arguing that 'she might easily have been converted by the "godly preaching" and catechising of Henry More, Bunny or Huntingdon's chaplains'.¹⁶⁰ This dismissal of female networks as susceptible to anyone who paid them attention severely downplayed the importance of women in facilitating the survival of Catholicism in the North, but it also emphasised the role of the Catholic priest as heroic and the failure of the Protestant authorities to proselytise. It was during Sandys' episcopacy in York that Margaret Clitherow was pressed to death and other women were punished for their failure to conform.¹⁶¹ John Mush related that Clitherow was tried before 'Mr. Clinch and Mr. Rhodes' and other members of the council, but no mention was made of Sandys' presence or direct involvement which is unsurprising given that this was in essence a civic trial.¹⁶² She was visited by a number of ministers who tried to persuade her to conform, including Parson Wigginton and Edmund Bunny, but no mention is made of Sandys attempting to convert her.¹⁶³ Sandys was, however, patron to Edmund Bunny whose reputation as a preacher was already well established. Sandys was involved with the identification of other groups of women in the North who were causing problems. He was forced to bring a group of them to task for harassing their curate and disputing the legitimacy of married clergymen in 1580. Anna Whitehead, Elizabeth West, Jane Coggan, Elena Bynland, Margaret Croft and Elizabeth More were all brought before him regarding their disapproval of their curate's marriage:

The women were enjoined by the Archbishop to make declaration (one of them after another) that they have unwomanly and unmodestly behaved and used themselves towards Christopher Priorman clerk there curat mot onely in uttering slanderous speaches against him but also in beating him and affirming that his maraig was unlawful and his children bastards. And therefore that they shall declare that the marriage of him and all the other ministers are lawfull and agreeing with Gods word and there children legitimate and here of to ceritify under the Curates hands and churchwardens and other foure honest men of Hatefeld . . . to pay expences . . . and henceforth revently to use there curate.¹⁶⁴

Women were to pose a unique problem to numerous groups in the sixteenth century. For the Protestant authorities acknowledging them as a threat implied they held power which was an uncomfortable admission. Civic authority and national authority, as represented by Huntingdon, called husbands to the commission to answer to, and financially pay for, their wives' disobedience. Women defying male authority in this way were problematic, both in terms of the challenge this posed to familial

and national paradigms. Women defying religious authority were dangerous. Sixteenth century Catholic authors too struggled in how to portray these groups of women as they needed a narrative which promoted the role of the priest. Sandys was therefore not alone in recognising the danger this group posed to religion and the natural order of society.

Sandys and Church Authority

The battle for the hearts and minds of the North was not to be easily won. The early evangelicals had been hard at work setting down the principles that reformed evangelical religion encapsulated from their return to England in 1558–9, as seen with John Jewel's *Apology* and the creation of the Bishop's Bible. By the 1580s leading Catholic polemicists were producing material designed to provide clarity to Catholics about what remaining true to their faith meant. Robert Person's *A Brief Discourse* of 1580 followed by his *Christian Directory* of 1584 began to outline the religious changes. This saw a movement from portraying confessional disputes as simply disagreements over the details of Christian thought, to showing Catholicism and Protestantism as different religions.¹⁶⁵ Thus, ambivalence was no longer to be the pragmatic and acceptable solution for the Catholics of England. The conversion of the misled and misinformed was still however at the heart of the mission for many evangelicals. Edmund Bunny took Person's text of his *Christian Directory* and with very few amendments illustrated that Protestantism was the true Christian religion. Thus, Catholics did not need to abandon the English Church, go into exile or set up in resistance. Bunny dedicated this volume to his sponsor 'the most reverend Father in God, his very good Lord and Patron, EDWIN, by the providence of God Archbishop of York, Primate of England'.¹⁶⁶ Bunny continued, justifying his actions in publishing this text:

MAY it please your Grace to understand, that wheras at the first by a frind of mine, and after by mine own experience, I perceived, that the booke insuing was willingly read by divers, for the persuasion that it hath to godlines of life, which notwithstanding in manie points was corruptly set down: I thought good in the end, to get the same published againe in some better manner than now it is come foorth among them; that so the good, that the reading therof might otherwise do, might carrie no hurt or danger withal, so far as by me might be praevented. For this cause I have taken the pains, both to purge it of certain points that carried either some manifest error, or else some other inconvenience with them.¹⁶⁷

In correcting these errors Bunny opened to Catholics the possibility of realising their error and correcting it through joining with the Protestant nation. The fact that Sandys was willing to patronise Bunny suggested

that he approved of this approach. Whilst Sandys was often dismayed at the numbers of Catholics in the North he too had indicated that he felt education could aid the transformation of the province. In April 1578, Sandys had written to William Cecil notifying him that he had now personally made a visitation of his whole province and had discovered that the laity was generally well disposed for instruction being 'willing and of capacie to learne' in religious matters, but in want of teachers.¹⁶⁸ This narrative was tied into Sandys' view that the North was short of trained preachers and plagued by a lack of incentives to encourage good men to come there. He noted that in the North 'the smallness of the livings in her maj[esty's] gift' were hindering the process of getting the right men in place and that 'the best livings are bestowed on them that never come here'.¹⁶⁹ Thus, additional financing was one issue, but equally absentee ministers were another problem. Sandys also outlined the programme of reform that he had put in place to ensure that appropriate messages were delivered from pulpits, including appointing preachers to give sermons every second Sunday in markets and great towns. He also charged his archdeacons with holding four synods a year in order to further the learning of the clergy. Here Sandys displayed a concern for maintaining control of these discussions; whilst all were instructed to be ready to speak at such events they were told they must only speak on the instructed topic, without 'vagaries' on other matters. Thus, religion was to have direction to ensure that all were 'on message' and to avoid two additional problems. Firstly, there was a need to rein in those who were 'too precise' in their religious beliefs and were following erroneous doctrines; Secondly there was a need to target those who obstinately refused to attend church and conform to the laws of the land. His belief was that the first could be brought to be 'good conformists' whilst the only solution with the latter group was imprisonment. This letter reinforced the point that Sandys believed problems lay with the presence of both Protestant radicals and papists in the North. Those who had wandered off the right path or who had not yet realised the truth could be reformed, but equally ardent believers who did not listen to the true gospel needed to be controlled and punished. It also confirmed his belief that reform of the populace was best achieved through education and preaching, and that ultimately the responsibility for the religious reform of the nation lay with the educated elite. He could not resist a gibe at Huntingdon here, implying that if the Lord President took the right advice from the right people then he would provide good governance.¹⁷⁰ Sandys self-identified as the right sort of person; morally superior to the backward gentry of the North; steadfast to his religious beliefs through adversity; learned, educated and astute in matters both civil and ecclesiastical. It is therefore easy to see why the bane of his life became the conflict he found himself in with Robert Stapleton. This threatened his position, undermined his status and sullied his name and reputation.

Reputation and Honour

The preservation of honour and status was a concern for many early modern men and for Edwin Sandys this was no different. He defined his identity as prelate and theologian in a religious context and as a husband, father and gentleman in a social context. The slights against the nature of his ordination made by Hutton in regards to the Whittingham affair were robustly countered. Sandys was keen to uphold his reformed credentials which showed him to be a reformed cleric and man of God, an identity which was reinforced via his entry in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and the publication of his *Sermons* (1585). Thus, he was evidenced as an upright as prelate and theologian. His desire to counter any accusation made by Sir John Bourne in Worcester was driven by a need to show himself as the equal to any gentleman in the county—he offered hospitality, he defended his family's right to a coat of arms and he demonstrated to local society and his patron, William Cecil, that he was entirely in the right. The defence of his wife against all insults and the need to imbue his sons with income, position and status illustrated his need to fulfil his identity as a father. All of these identities were threatened following an unseemly incident in the Bull Inn at Doncaster which took place in 1581.¹⁷¹

Sandys was staying at the Inn as part of his tour of his diocese. A Yorkshire gentleman, Sir Robert Stapleton, was also staying at the Inn with some of his friends. Stapleton was an acquaintance, perhaps even a pretended friend, of Sandys. Until this incident it seemed Stapleton was a rising star who had been Sheriff of Yorkshire, was part of the local government of the city of York and had been on the 1577 Commission which visited Durham. Sandys recounted his version of events, stating he was awoken by the innkeeper, a man named Sisson, who burst into his bedchamber with a dagger crying out 'God's precious life, I will mark a whore and a thief'.¹⁷² To Sandys' surprise he discovered he was not alone in his bed, but Sisson's wife was with him. The account of the event provided by Stapleton and his friends, Bernard Mawd and John Mallory, differed somewhat from that given by Sandys. Stapleton stated that he had seen Mrs Sisson earlier in the evening outside Sandys' chamber and that later her husband was outside it too, listening to the whisperings and sighing from within. When Sisson eventually burst into the room Stapleton and others were able to view Sisson's wife and the Bishop naked in bed together.¹⁷³ Moreover, Stapleton asserted that the Archbishop had a longstanding relationship with Mrs Sisson begun when she was a servant in his household.¹⁷⁴

Sandys defended himself against these accusations, enlisted the support of his patron William Cecil and accused Stapleton and his confederates of setting up the entire incident in order to extort money and land. Sandys also concluded that the extortion was one element of a deliberate attempt to destroy his name and reputation, made by Stapleton for nefarious

purposes. Stapleton countered, citing the Queen as one of his patrons, albeit pre-emptively given the Queen's lack of continuing interest in him. The subsequent hearings before the Privy Council, appearances in Star Chamber and court cases in York attracted a great deal of attention and brought the incident to the attention of all.¹⁷⁵ Sandys was absolved of blame and Stapleton ordered to publicly apologise, but the damage was done. The destruction of Sandys' reputation was complete, amongst both his contemporaries and thus, for historians, he was forever connected with this unsavoury affair. This event also coloured Sandys' actions from 1582 onwards. After this point he was occupied with trying to rehabilitate his reputation and honour which dominated the last years of his life.

Conclusion

Edwin Sandys had risen to the second highest ecclesiastical office in the land. As Archbishop of York he, in theory, had the authority to influence the religious beliefs of the North. Yet he was not to find his time in Yorkshire easy. He continued his fight against 'papists, Jesuits, and malcontents, with their adherents, all adversaries and enemies to the everlasting truth of the gospel' who he identified in the preface to his book of sermons as the enemies of God and the state.¹⁷⁶ He also found himself facing enemies from within; his opposition to those who were pushing for further reform led him to see threats everywhere he went. As Alexandra Walsham has argued 'the problematic concept of the generation has not been widely exploited by early modern historians', yet equally internal divisions within the reformers have been de-emphasised in an effect to create a narrative of unhindered Protestant progress.¹⁷⁷ By the 1580s Sandys was unwell and no longer a young man. Generational changes were already beginning to drive fault lines into the evangelical nation. The dilemma about how to deal with those pushing for further reform was to pose problems for not just Sandys, but also for others from the Edwardian Church who were not entirely comfortable with movement towards a Church which rejected bishops. Sandys, along with Grindal, felt methods for educating the nation in the scriptures were necessary, but how to do this without opening the floodgates for open and unfettered discussion amongst the laity was no easy matter. Sandys' personal proclivities to take offence, to hold a grudge and his undeniable acquisitive nature, were to mean that his time as Archbishop of York was not an easy one. His natural allies should have been men such as Huntingdon and Hutton, but he simply did not like them. In the case of the latter in particular he felt he was acting against him. His letters reveal a sense of a man who felt that there were enemies to the gospel all around and even his former supporters at court were becoming weary of his constant battles. His conflict with Robert Stapleton attracted the attention of William Cecil, Robert Dudley and most importantly the Queen. Although he was

vindicated by the process, the Star Chamber case brought with it negative publicity, combined with his ongoing disputes with Whittingham, Aylmer, Grindal, Hutton and Huntingdon his reputation was sealed as quarrelsome and lacking an even hand. It is notable that when Grindal died in 1582 Sandys was not considered for elevation to Canterbury. His entry into Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, discussed earlier in this volume, alongside the publication of his sermons were clearly designed to leave behind a different image of himself. He admitted as much in the preface to his sermons as he stated that by preaching, sermons and books a man may

leave behind him a witness and warrant of his godly and zealous affection, that the profession of his faith mought become the sweet savour of life to life in all, rather than the savour of death to death in any.¹⁷⁸

Acknowledgements

Parts of this chapter originally appeared as Sarah Bastow, '“Stiff-Necked, Wilful and Obstinate”: Conflict in the Elizabethan Church', *Northern History*, 50(2) (2013): 239–56. Reprinted by permission of the publisher (Taylor & Francis Ltd, www.tandfonline.com).

Notes

- 1 Edmund Grindal had been Bishop of London, Archbishop of York and was then elevated to Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 2 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 418.
- 3 TNA, SP 12/112, f.171, 'Edwyn Sandys, Archbp. of York, to Lord Burghley', 30 April 1577.
- 4 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 419.
- 5 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 424.
- 6 Alexandra Walsham, 'The Reformation of the Generations: Youth, Age and Religious Change in England, c. 1500–1700', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (2011), 93–121, 108.
- 7 Patrick Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519? 1588), Archbishop of York', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 8 TNA: SP 12/73 f.91. 'Archbishop Grindall to Cecil', 29 August 1570.
- 9 Information on the King's Manor can be located. Available from: www.york.ac.uk/admin/presspr/kmanor/ [Accessed 17 February 2012].
- 10 C. Cross, *The Puritan Earl: The Life of Henry Hasting Third Earl of Huntingdon 1536–1595* (London: Macmillan, 1966), pp. 70–1.
- 11 TNA, SP 12/111 f.21, 'Certaine Causes and reasons why the Archbushop of York should not depart from the howse called BushoppeThorpe belonging to his See', January 1577.
- 12 TNA, SP 12/111 f.21.
- 13 TNA, SP 12/111 f.21; R.S. Rait, *English Episcopal Palaces* (London: Constable, 1911) p. 32.
- 14 TNA, SP 12/111 f.21.

- 15 TNA, SP 12/111 f.37. 'Lord Burghley to the Lord President of the North', January 1577.
- 16 TNA, SP 15/25 fol.18, 'Henry Earl of Huntingdon to Sec. Walsingham'.
- 17 Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566–1579*, Vol. 25 (London: HMSO, 1871), p. 511.
- 18 Patrick Collinson, 'Sandys, Edwin (1519? 1588)', *ODNB*, online edition. Sandys is recorded as having resided increasingly at properties in the south of his province in his later years as Archbishop including Southwell.
- 19 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 28, fol. 175, 'The Abp. of York desires of Lord Burghley not to attempt to make the Earl of Huntingdon and him friends', 28 Dec 1579.
- 20 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 28, fol. 175.
- 21 J. Morris, ed., *The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers Related by Themselves*, third series (London: Burns and Oates, 1877), pp. 65ff.
- 22 Morris, *The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers*, p. 65.
- 23 Morris, *The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers*, p. 75.
- 24 J.C.H. Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy in York 1558–1791* (London: Catholic Record Society, Monograph Series 2, 1970), p. 48.
- 25 Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy in York*, p. 49.
- 26 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27, fol. 20, 'The Abp. of York to Lord Burghley', 16 April 1578.
- 27 P. Lake, 'Matthew Hutton—A Puritan Bishop?', *History*, 64 (1979), 182–204.
- 28 Matthew Hutton, *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York*, ed. J. Raine (Cambridge: Surtees Society, 1843), p. 18.
- 29 Patrick Collinson, 'Grindal, Edmund (1516x20–1583)', *ODNB*, online edition; Claire Cross, 'Hutton, Matthew (1529? 1606)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 30 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 63, f.199, 'Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, to Sir William Cecil'. The letter has no year attributed to it but the previous Bishop of London died in 1568.
- 31 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 63, fol.199.
- 32 Hutton, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 124.
- 33 Hutton, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 124.
- 34 Lake, 'Matthew Hutton—A Puritan Bishop?', pp. 182–204, 182.
- 35 Lake, 'Matthew Hutton', 182–204.
- 36 TNA, SP 12/ 48, fol. 97, 'Matthew Hutton to Cecil', 13 Nov. 1568.
- 37 Lake, 'Matthew Hutton', pp. 188–9.
- 38 'Matthew Hutton, Dean of York, to Lord Burghley', 6 Oct. 1573 in *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon: The Marquis of Salisbury, 1572–1582*, Vol. 2 (London: Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1888), p. 60.
- 39 Lake, 'Matthew Hutton', p. 188.
- 40 Hutton, *Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton*, p. 56.
- 41 Matthew Hutton, *A Sermon Preached at Yorke Before the Right Honorable, Henrie Earle of Huntington, Lorde President of her Maiesties Councill Established in the North, and Other Noble Men, and Gentle Men, at a General Communion There, the 23. of September in the Eightienth Yeare of Her Maiesties Raigne: By Mathewe Hutton Deane of Yorke* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1579); Claire Cross, 'Hutton, Matthew (1529? 1606)', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 42 Lake, 'Matthew Hutton', p. 189, fn.21. This view is supported by Peter Lake who also puts forward the idea that Huntingdon and Hutton may have seen Sandys as an abrasive intruder.

- 43 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 28, fol. 175; T. Hawood, *History and Antiquities of the Church and City of Lichfield* (1806), 213; Retha M. Warnicke, 'Nowell, Laurence (1530–c.1570)', ODNB, online edition.
- 44 Hawood, *History and Antiquities*; John Strype, ed., *The Life And Acts of John Whitgift, D.D. the Third and Last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822), p. 208; Warnicke, 'Nowell, Laurence (1530–c.1570)', ODNB, online edition. Warnicke cites Boleyn as the successor whereas Hawood lists Luke Glipin as holding the position of Dean until his death in 1587. Strype also notes Boleyn as Dean and Chapter of Lichfield.
- 45 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 29, fol.120, 'Matthew Hutton', 10 January 1579.
- 46 David Marcombe, 'Whittingham, William (d. 1579)', ODNB, online edition.
- 47 David Marcombe, 'Whittingham, William (d. 1579)', ODNB, online edition.
- 48 *The Life of Mr. William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, From A Ms. In Antony Wood's Collection*, ed. M.A. Everett-Green, Camden Society, 104 (1871), 1–48, especially p. 27; R.A. Marchant, *The Church Under the Law: Justice, Administration and Discipline in the Diocese of York 1560–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 119.
- 49 *Life of William Whittingham*, p. 27.
- 50 *Life of William Whittingham*, p. 29.
- 51 Sarah Bastow, 'An Abortive Attempt to Defend an Episcopal Reputation: The Case of Archbishop Edwin Sandys and the Innkeeper's Wife', *History*, 97 (2012), 380–401.
- 52 Patrick Collinson, 'The Authorship of a Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 9 (1958), 188–208.
- 53 Anon, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, 1554–8: Attributed to William Whittingham, Dean of Durham A.D.* (London: Elliot Stock, 1908), p. xxvii.
- 54 *Life Mr. William Whittingham*, p. 27.
- 55 *Life Mr. William Whittingham*, p. 30. The phrase translates as 'Receive the power of sacrificing for the living and the dead'.
- 56 M. Luther, *The Life of Luther*, ed. and trans. Jules Michelet (London: David Bogue, 1846), p. 432; Robert J. Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (London: T&T Clark, 2009), p. 146.
- 57 *Life Mr. William Whittingham*, p. 30, n.5.
- 58 The validity of ordinations and the words used at the ceremonies was a topic of discussion amongst the reformed clergy. Martin Luther, Martin Bucer and Lancelot Andrews all wrote about what these words meant in terms of setting the clergy apart from the laity and promoting them to an exalted position. M.J. Spalding, *The History of the Protestant Reformation in Germany and Switzerland*, Vol. 1 (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1865), p. 477; W. Van't Spijker, *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer*, translated by J. Vriend and L.D. Bierma (Leiden: Brill, 1996), p. 17.
- 59 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 72, 'Edwin Sandys', 1586.
- 60 Bastow, 'An Abortive Attempt to Defend an Episcopal Reputation', 380–401.
- 61 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 86, 'A copy of the several articles exhibited against Dr. Hutton', June 1586.
- 62 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 86 in relation to point three.
- 63 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 72.
- 64 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 72.
- 65 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 72.
- 66 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 72.

- 67 Hutton, *Correspondence of Dr Matthew Hutton*, p. 73.
- 68 *Salisbury*, Vol. 2: 1572–82, p. 60.
- 69 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, pp. 111–13.
- 70 David Loades, *The Cecils: Privilege and Power Behind the Throne* (Kew: The National Archives, 2007), pp. 89–90; Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, pp. 111–13.
- 71 *Life of William Whittingham*, pp. 25–6.
- 72 Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, pp. 139–41.
- 73 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 12, fol. 182, ‘Edwyn, Bishop of Worcester to Sir Wm. Cecil’, 26 April 1570.
- 74 ‘Sandys, Sir Samuel (1560–1623), of Ombersley, Worcs’, in *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604–1629*, ed. Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- 75 Hutton, *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton*, pp. 58–9.
- 76 Hutton, *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton*, pp. 59–60.
- 77 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27, f.20, ‘The Abp. of York, to Lord Burghley’, 16 April 1578.
- 78 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27, f.20.
- 79 Francis Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa, or A Collection of Divers Scarce and Curious Pieces Relating Chiefly to Matters of English History*, Vol. 1, Book 3, Letter, 29 (London: Thomas Evans, 1779), p. 102.
- 80 Peck, *Desiderata curiosa*, Vol. 1, Book 3, Letter, 29, p. 102.
- 81 Peck, *Desiderata curiosa*, Vol. 1, Book 3, Letter, 17, p. 91.
- 82 Peck, *Desiderata curiosa*, Vol. 1, Book 4, Letter, 9, pp. 128–9.
- 83 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 11.
- 84 I.P. Ellis, ‘The Archbishop and the Usurers’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XXI (1970), 33.
- 85 Judith M. Spicksley, ‘Women, “Usury” and Credit in Early Modern England: The Case of the Maiden Investor’, *Gender and History*, 27, 2 (2015), 263–92.
- 86 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 50, 182–3, mention is made in sermons 2, 10, 11; John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1848), pp. 850–62; Edmund Grindal, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D. Successively Bishop of London, and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, ed. William Nicolson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), pp. 108, 171.
- 87 John Blaxton, *The English Usurer: Or, Usury Condemned* (Oxford: John Norton, 1634).
- 88 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 182–3.
- 89 Sandys, *Sermons*, pp. 49–50.
- 90 Simonds d’Ewes, ‘Journal of the House of Commons: April 1571’, in *The Journals of All the Parliaments During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1682), pp. 155–80. British History Online. Available from: www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/jrnl-parliament-eliz1/pp155-180 [Accessed 18 January 2018].
- 91 Ellis, ‘The Archbishop and the Usurers’, p. 35.
- 92 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 86.
- 93 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 46, f.136. ‘Edwin, Abp. of York, to Lord Burghley’, 4 March 1585; Norman Jones, *God and the Money Lenders* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1989), p. 111.
- 94 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol.86.
- 95 BL, Lansdowne Vol. 50, fol. 86; Jones, *God and the Money Lenders*, p. 111.
- 96 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 86.

- 97 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 86.
- 98 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 46, f.136. 'Edwin, Abp. of York, to Lord Burghley', 4 March 1585.
- 99 Claire Cross, 'Hutton, Matthew (1529? 1606), Archbishop of York', *ODNB*, online edition.
- 100 Jones, *God and the Money Lenders*, pp. 111–12.
- 101 TNA: SP 12/111, f.45. 'Note of the spoils made by Dr. Sandys upon the Bishoprick of Worcester and the Cathedral College there', January 1577.
- 102 TNA: SP 12/111, f.45.
- 103 'Letter from John (Aylmer) Bishop of London, to the Lord Mayor [12 October 1581]', in *Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia 1579–1664*, ed. W.H. Overall and H.C. Overall (London: E.J. Francis, 1878), pp. 322–9.
- 104 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 42 f.46 'Inconveniences of not executing the sentence in the cause of dilapidation between the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of York, 1584'; TNA, SP 12/149 f.24, 'Note of the dilapidations of the See of London, to prove the decays left by Edwin Sandys at his translation to York', May 1581; TNA, SP 12/149 f.27, 'Answer of the Archbishop of York to the charge of decays of St. Paul's Church; with the Bishop of London's reply to the same', May 1581; TNA, SP 12/149 f.66, 'The reply of the Archbishop of York to the answer of the Bishop of London made to the reasons of the said Archbishop for the qualifying of the sentence', May 1581.
- 105 'The Archbishop of York to Lord Burghley, 10 March 1576', in *A Collection of State Papers, Relating to Affairs in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth, Transcribed from Original Letters and Other Authentick Memorials, Left by William Cecill Lord Burghley: 1571–1596*, ed. William Murdin, Vol. 2 (London: William Bowyer, 1759), p. 302.
- 106 TNA, SP 12/149 f.66.
- 107 TNA, SP 12/149 f.66.
- 108 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, f.74. 'An Account of Grants from Edwyn Sandys', May 1586.
- 109 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, f.74.
- 110 Theodore K. Rabb, 'Sandys, Sir Edwin (1561–1629), Politician and Colonial Entrepreneur', *ODNB*, (2004), online edition.
- 111 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 50, fol. 86; Lansdowne, Vol. 50, f. 74.
- 112 Marchant, *Church Under the Law*, p. 56.
- 113 Marchant, *Church Under the Law*, p. 44.
- 114 Marchant, *Church Under the Law*, p. 43.
- 115 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 12.
- 116 TNA, SP 12/73 f.91, 'Grindal from Cawood', 29 August 1570.
- 117 'Elizabeth: June 1564, 16–30', in *Calendar State Papers Foreign, 1564–65*, Vol. 7 (London: HMSO, 1870), p. 533.
- 118 *Calendar State Papers Foreign, 1564–65*, p. 533.
- 119 *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566–1579*, p. 139.
- 120 TNA, SP 15/25 f.34, 'Henry Earl of Huntingdon, Lord President, and five others of the Council of the North, to the Queen', 18 May 1577; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566–1579*, p. 514.
- 121 J.T. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London: The Athlone Press, 1969), p. 168; Alexandra Walsham, *Church*

Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England (London: Boydell, 2003).

- 122 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 185.
- 123 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 183.
- 124 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 131.
- 125 TNA, SP 12/73 f.91, 'Grindal from Cawood 29th August 1570'.
- 126 John Aylmer, Bishop of London, to Secretary Walsingham, 21 June 1577, 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales, 1577', in *CRS Miscellanea*, ed. P. Ryan, Vol. XII (1921), p. 1.
- 127 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales', p. 1.
- 128 *CSPD, 1547-1580*, pp. cxi, 45; M.M.C. Calthrop, ed., *Recusant Rolls 1592-3* (CRS, Record Series, 18, 1916), p. xi.
- 129 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales', p. 4.
- 130 P. Lake and M. Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow: Persecution, Martyrdom and the Politics of Sanctity in Elizabethan England* (London: Continuum, 2011), p. 19.
- 131 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales', p. 3.
- 132 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales', p. 3.
- 133 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales', pp. 6-7. Editor lists corrected total as 168.
- 134 *CSPD, 1547-80*, p. 561.
- 135 *CSPD, Add.*, 'Henry Earl of Huntingdon to Lord Burghley' (21 December 1572), p. 430.
- 136 Borthwick, HC.AB.10 f.29.
- 137 Borthwick, HC.AB.10 f.7ff. William Bellasis is sometimes named as Bellaise or Ballyse.
- 138 N.M. Fuidge, 'MALLORY, Sir William (d.1603), of Hutton Park and Studley, Yorks', in *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1558-1603*, ed. P.W. Hasler (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1981).
- 139 H. Aveling, *Northern Catholics* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), p. 104.
- 140 Aveling, *Northern Catholics*, p. 104.
- 141 Cross, *The Puritan Earl*, p. 231. Borthwick, HC.AB.9 f.58.
- 142 Cross, *The Puritan Earl*, pp. 170, 231.
- 143 Borthwick, HC.AB.10 f.8; v.8.
- 144 'Prisons and Gallows', in *A History of the County of York: The City of York*, ed. P.M. Tillott (London: Victoria County History, 1961), pp. 491-8.
- 145 York Explore, York House Books, 1577-80, B24, pp. 114ff.
- 146 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 3, part 2, pp. 464-5. Robert Lee was 'a notable open adulterer. One that giveth great offence, and will not be reformed'; Peter Stanley was a 'man noted to be a great fornicator. Of small wisdom, and less skill'; Thomas Wentworth was in Sandys' opinion a 'very senseless blockhead'.
- 147 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 3, part 2, pp. 464-5.
- 148 Bastow, 'An Abortive Attempt to Defend an Episcopal Reputation', pp. 97, 380-401.
- 149 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 3, part 2, pp. 464-5.
- 150 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 3, part 2, pp. 464-5.
- 151 'CONSTABLE, Sir Henry (1556/7-1607), of Burton Constable and Upsall Castle, Yorks', in *The History of Parliament*, ed. Thrush and Ferris. Available from: www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/constable-sir-henry-1556-1607.
- 152 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27 fol. 20, 'The Abp. of York', 16 April 1578.

- 153 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales, 1577', p. 7. From the 75 men listed, 56 were laymen and 11 were priests.
- 154 Anne Laurence, *Women in England 1500–1760: A Social History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1994), p. 227.
- 155 Lake and Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow*, pp. 31–2.
- 156 CSPD, *Add.*, 'Henry Earl of Huntington to Sec. Walsingham' (24 March 1577), p. 510.
- 157 TNA, SP 15/25 f.16, 'Henry Earl of Huntington to Sec. Walsingham', 24 March 1577; CSPD, *Add.* 1566–1579, p. 510.
- 158 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales, 1577', p. 4.
- 159 R. Rex, 'Thomas Vavasour, MD', *Recusant History*, 20 (1990–1), 436–54.
- 160 J. C. H. Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy in York 1558–1791* (London: Catholic Record Society, Monograph Series 2, 1970), p. 45.
- 161 Lake and Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow*, pp. 70, 119.
- 162 John Mush, 'The Life of Margaret Clitherow', in *The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers Related by Themselves*, ed. J. Morris, third series (London: Burns and Oates, 1877), p. 413.
- 163 Mush, 'The Life of Margaret Clitherow', pp. 418–26.
- 164 J.S. Purvis, *The Elizabethan High Commission of York: The Act Book 1561/2–1580* (York and Leeds: Brotherton Library, 1979), p. 83 (105v.).
- 165 Lake and Questier, *Trials of Margaret Clitherow*, p. 70.
- 166 Edmund Bunny, *A Booke of Christian Exercise Appertaining to Resolution, That Is, Shewing How That We Should Resolve Ourselves to Become Christians Indeed: By R.P. Perused, and Accompanied Now with a Treatise Tending to Pacification: By Edm. Bunny* (London: John Wight, 1584) preface.
- 167 Bunny, *A Booke of Christian Exercise*, preface.
- 168 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27, fol. 20.
- 169 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27, fol. 20.
- 170 BL, Lansdowne, Vol. 27, fol. 20.
- 171 A fuller account can be found in Bastow, 'An Abortive Attempt to defend an Episcopal Reputation', 380–401.
- 172 Strype, *Annals*, Vol. 3, part 1, p. 142.
- 173 TNA, SP 12/158, f.206, 'Sir Robert Stapleton's account of his knowledge of the affair between the Archbishop and Mrs. Sysson', Feb. 1583.
- 174 TNA, SP 12/158 f.206.
- 175 Sarah Bastow, 'A Manner of Apology: Symbols and Images in an Elizabethan Cause Célèbre', *Textile History*, 43, 2 (2012), 147–60.
- 176 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 2.
- 177 Walsham, 'The Reformation of the Generations', p. 97.
- 178 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 2.

Conclusion

Death and Legacy

Edwin Sandys died on 10 July 1588 and was buried in Southwell Minster, rather than York Minster. Southwell had been the focus of much of Sandys' attention prior to his death and he had resided there for much of his time in the last years of his life. In 1587 he had written to William Cecil to ask his assistance in preserving the revenue of the Church there.¹ Not all former Archbishops of York were buried at York, but many were and thus Sandys' choice to forever associate himself with Southwell seems a deliberate one. His attachment to both Southwell Minster and the locality appeared to be genuine. Other archbishops had died at Southwell but aside from Sandys only Thomas of Corbridge (Archbishop of York, 1300–4) chose Southwell as his final resting place.² The lack of burials of prominent individuals in the Minster ensured Sandys' tomb had a certain grandeur and pre-eminence.

The fact that Sandys had prepared for his death is unsurprising for as Alec Ryrie has argued the moment of death had enduring consequences.³ Sandys specified in his will, composed in August 1587, that he was to be 'buried neither in superstition nor superfluous manner', thus asserting his reformed credentials and assuring a demonstrative assertion of reformed principles.⁴ The burial may have been specified to occur in a modest manner, but the memorialisation of his death in terms of his tomb was an imposing affair. McNamara and McIlvenna argued that 'the dead formed a more significant social "presence" for medieval and early modern Europeans'.⁵ The commemoration of his death had been carefully planned as the alabaster monument in Southwell Minster demonstrated. The expense and care taken over the funeral monument was not unusual for a man of Sandys' status and role, but was grander than some of the memorials of his contemporaries. Nigel Llewellyn has argued the 'high cost of early modern funeral monuments and the care evidently taken by patrons and tomb-makers over their appearance suggests that weighty responsibilities were expected of them'.⁶ The need for the right sort of remembrance was of the upmost importance for Sandys and illustrated his desire to literally set in stone an honourable reputation and a pious image. The inscription on his tomb described Sandys as shining forth

with ‘Archiepiscopal dignity, which honours were the reward of great labour, merits, and virtues’. It continued that he was

A man, of all men the most free from malice and revenge, magnanimous, of open and free manners, and unknowing how to flatter; charitable and compassionate in the highest degree, and most hospitable; truly excellent, easy of access, and disdainful towards vices only; in a word, he lived and was better than has been stated.⁷

The image he wanted was one that countered the accusations of moral and financial corruption that he faced in the 1580s, but that also noted his achievements. The inscription continued to laud his merits stressing his ‘labours of preaching the gospel’, his diligence, his emphasis on study and education to produce virtue and his honour of ‘the patrimony of the church as a thing sacred to God; inviolate, he defended it’.⁸ It concluded that he was

a memorable example of the opposite conditions of fortune, who while thou didst hold such important offices, always enduredst things by so much the greater on account of thy high dignity, with a fearless mind; prisons, exiles, fines of the greatest amount, and, what is most difficult, with an irreproachable conscience, to bear with patience all cruel and unjust calumnies.⁹

The last word was to lie with Sandys and he did not find himself wanting. The alabaster tomb was topped with a carved, recumbent figure of Sandys in clerical dress. It is worth noting that his figure is not in full clerical regalia as has previous been argued.¹⁰ In many ways his tomb reflected Edwin Sandys’ approach to his life and own self imaging. He professed his lack of interest in worldly things yet had a clear sense of self-importance and the need for financial security; he was keen to emphasise qualities he felt he possessed, which were sometimes at odds with his actions; above all faith and family were the dominating themes he professed in life and death.

The arguments made in this book have emphasised that Elizabethan reformers were not uniform in their religious views. This study of Sandys’ life has illustrated that the significance of Edwardian evangelicalism should not be underestimated in terms of the lasting impact it had on shaping Elizabethan religion. It also suggests that it would be wrong to assume that all clerics who advocated for religious reform beyond that achieved by the 1559 settlement of religion were Puritans. Many of those who returned from exile in 1559 saw themselves as ‘evangelical’ but this did not mean they subscribed to ‘Puritan’ or ‘Presbyterian’ values and that stances could change dependant on the issue. There were a myriad of views amongst both Elizabethan clerics and the reformed laity which

reflected developing ideas. The one thing that really united them was their clear rejection of the Roman Catholic faith, but that did not mean that intra-confessional disputes could always be set aside.

From the time he returned to England in 1558 Sandys was actively engaged in trying to rid England of the papist threat. He viewed papal corruption as a serious threat to the physical security and spiritual wellbeing of the nation. Yet he recognised that a fracturing of the true reformed faith also posed a threat to the religious integrity as well as the actual security of monarch and state. His faith was founded in the earlier years of English reformation and strengthened by the time spent in Strasbourg, Frankfurt and Zurich in the company of Peter Martyr and Henrich Bullinger. His commitment to reformed religion had remained constant throughout his life and he advocated for a version of reformed Edwardian Protestantism, influenced by his time in exile that was to provide the foundation of the Elizabethan settlement. Sandys was clear in his will that ‘he had lived an old man in the ministry of Christ’ and that he would

testify before God, and his angels, and men of this world, I rest resolute and yield up my spirit in that doctrine which I have privately studied and publicly preached, and which is this day maintained in the church of England.¹¹

Demands for further reform were clearly visible and Sandys was correct that he had ‘lived and old man’ and was now one of the old guard of reformers. Walsham’s work on generational shifts has illustrated that whilst at first the early evangelicals represented those who had transcended from ‘their natural infantile state’, soon even they were the old men of the Elizabethan regime.¹² He rejected the ideas of Thomas Cartwright and although he may have held sympathy with the desire for further reform, as regarded the material nature of some practices, he did not believe in the wholesale reforms advocated by the *Admonition*.

He had rejected the Knoxian ideals whilst in exile and his defence of the Elizabethan Church of England did not reflect the vanguard of religious progress. It is clear that Sandys, a proponent of what was undeniably radical evangelical ideology at the beginning of his career, had moved to become a defender of the moderate Elizabethan settlement by the time of his death. Walsham has argued that by the mid-seventeenth century

Protestantism was edging towards a form of gerontocracy. To adhere to it was no longer an act of youthful rebellion against the time honoured ways of one’s forebears; it was an act of conformity with the status quo and its elder statesmen.¹³

Yet it is clear that this trend was also visible by the late sixteenth century. Sandys was already part of the old guard, securing and defending

his Church and his faith. It was not just Sandys who took this stance, a whole generation who had suffered in exile was headed by an ageing Queen. By the end of his life Sandys was keen to defend a settlement that at first he had been ambivalent about, but which now represented a stabilising element against a diversity of Protestant opinion.

His contributions to the religious nation in the Edwardian and Elizabethan eras was noteworthy but never gained the same attention attracted by his peers Edward Grindal and John Jewel. He was dedicated to his faith but equally to his family and that did not necessarily sit well with the image and expectations of an early modern cleric. He was father to ten children, and left behind eight children and a widow at his death.¹⁴ His tomb in Southwell Minster depicted a pious cleric but also a married man. His eight living children adorn the side panel of the monument knelt in prayer behind Cecily Sandys in what was a relatively common depiction for a gentleman of the time, but perhaps less common for an archbishop.

Arguably Sandys had done his duty as a father, fulfilling the requirements of a sixteenth century gentleman, in securing a stable and prosperous future for his successors. Sandys had safeguarded the future of his family, ensuring his sons were positioned to make their way in the world. His sons were well educated, had positions and finances which enabled them to reinforce their social status. As a result of their prosperity combined with their civic activities his three eldest sons gained knighthoods. Sir Samuel Sandys (his eldest surviving son) held lands and position in Worcestershire and he went on to be both Sheriff and an MP for the county. He was a member of the Virginia Company and held manors in Worcestershire, Essex and Yorkshire.¹⁵ Bishop Sandys provided his second son, Sir Edwin Sandys of Northborne, with an education alongside Lancelot Andrewes, Edmund Spenser and George Cranmer. Samuel went on to become an MP and became heavily involved in the colonisation of the New World.¹⁶ Sir Miles Sandys also became an MP and secured a good marriage. The youngest of Sandys' children, George, was to gain fame as a poet and writer. His father had secured his future via an arranged marriage to Elizabeth Norton. The arrangement was made in November 1584 and promised lands worth £3000 establishing George in Yorkshire. Sadly it did not guarantee a happy union and George's fortunes ultimately were also to lie in the Americas.¹⁷ Sandys also secured good marriages for his daughters; Margaret was married to Sir Anthony Aucher of Bishopsbourne in Kent and Mary to William Barne of Woolwich.

The reputation of Bishop Edwin Sandys was to be forever stained by the scandal of the 1580s, which cast doubt on his faithfulness to his wife and implied that he was guilty of improprieties. His tendency to quarrel with other notable reformers including Huntingdon and Hutton also ensured that he was not to be held in the same esteem as some of his contemporaries. Yet he had remained true to his religious beliefs founded

in Edwardian evangelicalism. His published sermons made it clear he wanted to leave behind ‘witness and warrant of his godly and zealous affection’. It is in Sandys’ sermons, as in all his writing that we can see the genuine passion for his faith and belief in reformed ideals that moved him to act: Thus, he hoped that

the profession of his faith mought become the sweet savour of life to life in all, rather than the sweet savour of death to death in any; as also for the words that are spoken are soon come soon gone, but written withal may make a deeper impression.¹⁸

Notes

- 1 BL Lansdowne Vol. 52 f.175. ‘Edwyn Sandys, Abp. of York, to Lord Burghley; to assist him in preserving the revenue of the Church of Southwell, in Nottinghamshire’ [21 April 1587].
- 2 Trevor Foulds, ‘In Medio Chori: The Tomb of Thomas of Corbridge, Archbishop of York, in Southwell Minster’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 167, 1 (2014), 109–23.
- 3 Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 461.
- 4 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 447.
- 5 Rebecca F. McNamara and Una McIlvenna, ‘Medieval and Early Modern Emotional Responses to Death and Dying’, *Parergon*, 31, 2 (2014), 1–10, with reference to p. 2.
- 6 Nigel Llewellyn, ‘Honour in Life, Death and in the Memory: Funeral Monuments in Early Modern England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), 179–200 in particular p. 179.
- 7 William Bennett Killpack and Thomas Hutchings Clarke, *The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Southwell* (Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1839), p. 17.
- 8 Killpack and Clarke, *The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Southwell*, p. 17.
- 9 Killpack and Clarke, *The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Southwell*, p. 17.
- 10 The tomb can be viewed in Southwell Minster.
- 11 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 447.
- 12 Alexandra Walsham, ‘The Reformation of the Generations: Youth, Age and Religious Change in England, c. 1500–1700’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (2011), 93–121.
- 13 Walsham, ‘The Reformation of the Generations’, p. 115.
- 14 Edwin Sandys’ first born (James Sandys) was to Mary Sandys of Essex and died in exile. The sons named here are to his second wife Cecily Wilford.
- 15 Glyn Redworth and Ben Coates, ‘SANDYS, Sir Samuel (1560–1623), of Ombersley, Worcs’, in *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604–1629*, ed. Andrew Thrusch and John P. Ferris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- 16 Theodore K. Rabb, ‘Sandys, Sir Edwin (1561–1629), Politician and Colonial Entrepreneur’, *ODNB*, (2004), online edition.
- 17 James Ellison, ‘Sandys, George (1578–1644), Writer and Traveler’, *ODNB*, (2008), online edition.
- 18 Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 3.

Appendix

Key Dates in the Life of Edwin Sandys

- 1519? Edwin Sandys was born at Esthwaite Hall (one mile south of Hawkshead), Lancashire. Son of William Sandys (d. 1548) and Margaret, daughter of John Dixon of London.
- 1532/1533 Entered St John's College, Cambridge (possibly under John Bland).
- 1538/9 Graduated BA from St John's College, Cambridge.
- 1541 Awarded MA.
- 1542 Proctor of Cambridge.
- 1547 Awarded BTh.
- 1548 Granted the benefice of the vicarage of Haversham, Buckinghamshire.
- 1549 Granted prebend at Peterborough.
- 1549–53 Elected master of Catharine Hall/College, Cambridge.
- 1552 Granted prebend at Carlisle.
- 1549 Graduated Doctor of Divinity.
- 1552–3 Vice Chancellor Cambridge (ejected 1553).
Married Mary Sandys of Essex (a remote cousin) who, with their only child, James, died whilst he was in exile.
- 1553 Arrested and imprisoned in the Tower of London.
- 1559 Married Cecily Wilford, daughter of Sir Thomas Wilford of Cranbrook, Kent.
- 1559–70 Bishop of Worcester.
- 1560 b. Sir Samuel Sandys (1560–1623), Sheriff of Worcestershire (1618), MP (1615, 1620) and member of the Virginia Company.
- 1561 b. Sir Edwin Sandys [jnr] (1561–1629) of Northbourne.
- 1563 b. Sir Miles Sandys (1563–1644) of Wilberton, Cambridgeshire, baronet (1612) and frequently sat in Parliament. He married Elizabeth Cooke.
- 1565 b. William Sandys (died young).
- 1566 b. Margaret Sandys, m. Anthony Aucher of Bishopsbourne, Kent.

- 1568 b. Thomas Sandys.
1570 b. Anne Sandys, m. William Barne of Woolwich.
1570–6 Bishop of London.
1572 b. Henry Sandys.
1576–88 Archbishop of York.
1578 b. George Sandys (1578–1644). Poet, traveller and signed
the Third Charter of Virginia.
1585 Founds Hawkshead Grammar School.
1588 Edwin Sandys dies.
Buried at Southwell Minster, Nottinghamshire.

Bibliography

Archival

Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York

HC.AB High Commission Act Books

Brotherton Library, Leeds

Special Collections

Purvis, J.S. *The Elizabethan High Commission of York: The Act Books 1561/2–1580* (York: Borthwick Inst., 1979).

British Library

Lansdowne, Vol. 12, f. 182. 'Edwyn, Bp. of Worcester, to Sir Wm. Cecil; His Grief That His Refusing the Archbishopric of London Has Displeased Him', 26 April 1570.

Lansdowne, Vol. 15, f. 79. 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer', 5 September 1572.

Lansdowne, Vol. 15, f. 158. 'A Copy of a Letter from the Council to the Bp. of London', 1572.

Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 52. 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer', 2 March 1573.

Lansdowne, Vol. 16, f. 54. 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, to the Earl of Leicester', 4 March 1573.

Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 61. 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer', 30 April 1573.

Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 67. 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer', 3 June 1573.

Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 81. 'The Bp. of London, to the Lord Treasurer; Concerning the Libel Called "An Admonition to the Parliament": Written Against Him', 2 July 1573.

Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 96. 'Edwyn, Bp. of London, Complains to Lords Leicester, and Burghley', 5 August 1573.

- Lansdowne, Vol. 17, f. 100. 'One Letter and a Copy of Another, from the Bp. of London to the Lord Treasurer', 28 August 1573.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 20, f. 151. 'The Bishop of London to Lord Burghley', 11 April 1575.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 25, f. 92. 'Copies of Three Letters of the Queen; the First and Third to All the Bishops, the Second to the Bishop of Lincoln Only; to Suppress the Prophesyings and Exercises of the Puritans', 7 May 1577.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 27, f. 20. 'The Abp. of York to Lord Burghley', 16 April 1578.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 28, f. 175. 'The Abp. of York Desires of Lord Burghley Not to Attempt to Make the Earl of Huntingdon and Him Friends', 28 December 1579.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 29, f. 120. 'Matthew Hutton', 10 January 1579.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 42, f. 46. 'Inconveniences of Not Executing the Sentence in the Cause of Dilapidation Between the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of York', 1584.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 46, f. 136. 'Edwin, Abp. of York, to Lord Burghley', 4 March 1585.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 50, f. 72. 'Edwin Sandys', 1586.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 50, f. 74. 'An Account of Grants from Edwyn Sandys', May 1586.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 50, f. 86. 'A Copy of the Several Articles Exhibited Against Dr. Hutton', June 1586.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 52, f. 175. 'Edwyn Sandys, Abp. of York, to Lord Burghley; to Assist Him in Preserving the Revenue of the Church of Southwell, in Nottinghamshire', 21 April 1587.
- Lansdowne, Vol. 63, f. 199. 'Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, to Sir William Cecil' 30 March [no year cited].

Cambridge University

Corpus Christi College, CCCC MS 121. 'Synodalia: A Declaration of Doctrine Offered and Exhibited by the Protestantes to the Quene . . .'

Denbighshire Record Office

Plas. Power MSS, DD/PP/839. 'Strasbourg Exiles to Frankfurt Congregation', 13 December 1554.

Lambeth Palace Library

Lambeth MS. 2003, fol. 27.
Laud-Selden-Fairhurst MS. 2003, fol. 25.
Laud-Selden-Fairhurst Add. MS. 29, 546, fol. 50.

Oxford

Bodleian Library. 'The Declaracyon of the Proceyngne of a Conference, Begon at Westminster the Last of Marche, 1559' (London, 1650).

The Hive

Worcester Record Office, b 716.093-BA.2648/9b(iv) (Episcopal Register).

The National Archives

- SP 1/101 f.40. 'Hugh Bishop of Worcester to Cromwell', 8 January 1536.
- SP 12/4 f.198. 'Commission from the Queen to the Earl of Shrewsbury', 25 June 1559.
- SP 12/111 f.45. 'Note of the Spoils Made by Dr. Sandys Upon the Bishoprick of Worcester and the Cathedral College There', January 1577.
- SP 12/28 f.127. 'Charges by Sir John Bourne Against the Bishop of Worcester', 1563.
- SP 12/28 f.135. 'Declaration of the Matters Wherewith the Bishop of Worcester Has Charged Sir John Bourne', April (?) 1563.
- SP 12/28 f.127. 'Charges by Sir John Bourne Against the Bishop of Worcester (Edwin Sandys), for Abuses in the Administration of the Affairs of That See', April (?) 1563.
- SP 12/28 f.141. 'The Bishop of Worcester to the Council', April (?) 1563.
- SP 12/28 f.151. 'A Note of Some of the Apparent Slanders Uttered by Sir John Bourne, Knt., Against the Bishop or Worcester', April (?) 1563.
- SP 12/28 f.152. 'Bishop of Worcester to the Council', April (?) 1563.
- SP 12/48 f.97. 'Matthew Hutton to Cecil', 13 November 1568.
- SP 12/60 f.202. 'Abstract of the Examinations of Such Gentlemen of the Inns of Court as Have Lately Been Summoned Before the Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes', 1569.
- SP 12/71 f.151. 'The Queen to the Lord Keeper', 28 July 1570.
- SP 12/73 f.91. 'Archbishop Grindal to Cecil', 29 August 1570.
- SP 12/95 f.201. 'A Survey of the Chambers and Societies of All the Inns of Court', May 1574.
- SP 12/111 f.21. 'Certain Causes and Reasons Why the Archbishop of York Should Not Depart from the House Called Bishopthorpe Belonging to His See', January 1577.
- SP 12/111 f.37. 'Lord Burghley to the Lord President of the North', January 1577.
- SP 12/111 f.59. 'A View of the Chief Readers', January 1577.
- SP 12/112 f.171. 'Edwyn Sandys, Archbp. of York, to Lord Burghley', 30 April 1577.
- SP 12/118 f.136. 'Certificate for the Inner Temple', 1577.
- SP 12/118 f.138. 'Certificate of Such as Refuse to Attend the Church in Lincoln's Inn', 1577.
- SP 12/118 f.140. 'Certificate of Such as Refuse or Neglect to Attend Church in Gray's Inn', 1577.
- SP 12/149 f.24. 'Note of the Dilapidations of the See of London, to Prove the Decays Left by Edwin Sandys at His Translation to York', May 1581.
- SP 12/149 f.27. 'Answer of the Archbishop of York to the Charge of Decays of St. Paul's Church; with the Bishop of London's Reply to the Same', May 1581.
- SP 12/149 f.66. 'The Reply of the Archbishop of York to the Answer of the Bishop of London Made to the Reasons of the Said Archbishop for the Qualifying of the Sentence', May 1581.

- SP 12/158 f.206. 'Sir Robert Stapleton's Account of His Knowledge of the Affair Between the Archbishop and Mrs. Sysson', February 1583.
- SP 15/12 f.226. 'The Arms and Descent of Edwin Sandes', 1565.
- SP 15/25 f.16. 'Henry Earl of Huntingdon to Sec. Walsingham', 24 March 1577.
- SP 15/25 f.18. 'Henry Earl of Huntingdon to Sec. Walsingham', 1 April 1577.
- SP 15/25 f.34. 'Henry Earl of Huntingdon, Lord President, and Five Others of the Council of the North, to the Queen', 18 May 1577.
- Stat. 1 Elizabeth I, c. 24 (Statutes of the Realm, IV, 397–400).

York City Library/York Explore

York House Books, 1565–1587: B24–29, Vols. 24–7.

Printed Primary

- Anon. *A Full and Plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline Out of the Word of God, and of the Declining of the Church of England from the Same* (1574).
- . *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, 1554–8: Attributed to William Whittingham, Dean of Durham A.D.* (London: Elliot Stock, 1908).
- Bacon, F. *An Advertisement Touching a Holy War* (1629).
- Birt, Henry N. *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement: A Study of Contemporary Documents* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1907).
- Blaxton, John. *The English Usurer: Or, Usury Condemned* (Oxford: John Norton, 1634).
- Braght, Thieleman J. Van. *Martyrs Mirror: The Story of Seventeen Centuries of Christian Martyrdom, from the Time of Christ to A.D. 1660* (1660), trans. Joseph Sohm (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1998).
- Bucer, Martin. *Scripta Anglicana* (Basel, 1577).
- Bunny, Edmund. *A Booke of Christian Exercise Appertaining to Resolution, That Is, Shewing How That We Should Resolve Ourselves to Become Christians Indeed: By R.P. Perused, and Accompanied Now with a Treatise Tending to Pacification: By Edm. Bunny* (London: John Wight, 1584).
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls: Preserved in the Public Record Office*, Part 12, vol. 2 (London: HMSO, 1948).
- Calthrop, M.M.C., ed. *Recusant Rolls 1592–3* (CRS, Record Series 18, 1916).
- Cartwright, J.J. *Chapters in the History of Yorkshire: Being a Collection of Original Letters, Papers, and Public Documents, Illustrating the State of the County in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I* (Wakefield: B.W. Allen, 1872).
- Cartwright, Thomas. *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: Agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer, Touching the Church Discipline* (1575).
- Carwell, Edward, ed. *A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1840).
- Chalmers, G. *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots: Drawn from the State Papers*, vol. 2 (London: John Murray, 1818).
- Crosby, A.J., ed. *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth*, vol. 10 (London: HMSO, 1874; reprint 1966).

- Cross, Claire. *York Clergy Wills 1520–1600: I Minster Clergy*, vol. 1 (York: Borthwick Papers, 1984).
- Dering, E. M. *Derings Workes. More at Large Then Euer Hath Heere-to-Fore Been Printed in Any One Volume* (1597).
- d'Ewes, Simonds. *The Journals of All the Parliaments During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1682).
- Everett Green, M.A., ed. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566–1579*, vol. 25 (London: HMSO, 1871).
- . 'The Life of Mr. William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, from a Ms. In Antony Wood's Collection', *Camden Society* 104 (1871).
- Fields, J., T. Wilcox and T. Cartwright. *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt*, eds. W.H. Frere and C.E. Douglas (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907).
- Foxe, J., ed. *A Commentarie of M. Doctor Martin Luther Vpon the Epistle of S. Paule to the Galathians* (London, 1575).
- . *Actes and Monuments of Matters Most Speciall and Memorable, Happenyng in the Church, with an Vniuersall History of the Same. Wherein Is Set Forth at Large the Whole Race and Course of the Church, from the Primitive Age to These Latter Tymes of Ours . . . Especially in This Realme of England and Scotland* (London, 1583).
- . *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or TAMO, 1563 ed. (Sheffield: HRI Online Publications, 2011).
- Frere, W.H. and C.E. Douglas, eds. *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origins of the Puritan Revolt* (London: PSPCK, 1954).
- Gairdner, James, ed. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. 10 (London: HMSO, 1887), 19.
- Gee, Henry and William John Hardy, eds. *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (New York: Macmillan, 1896).
- Goltwurm, Casper. *Church Calendar* (1559).
- Grindal, Edmund. *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D. Successively Bishop of London, and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, ed. William Nicolson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843).
- Hutton, Matthew. *A Sermon Preached at Yorke Before the Right Honorable, Henrie Earle of Huntingdon, Lorde President of Her Maiesties Councell Established in the North, and Other Noble Men, and Gentle Men, at a General Communion There, the 23. of September in the Eightieth Yeare of Her Maiesties Raigne: By Mathewe Hutton Deane of Yorke* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1579).
- . *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York*, ed. J. Raine (Cambridge: Surtees Society, 1843).
- Jewel, John. *The Works of John Jewel Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1848).
- Luther, Martin. *Luther on Justification, Extracted from His Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians with an Address Prefixed to the First Edition of the English Translation of the Above Work, by Dr. Edwyn Sandys* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1820), Tract 86.
- . *The Life of Luther*, ed. and trans. Jules Michelet (London: David Bogue, 1846).
- Morris, J., ed. *The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers Related by Themselves*, Third Series (London: Burns and Oates, 1877).

- Murdin, William, ed. *A Collection of State Papers, Relating to Affairs in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth, Transcribed from Original Letters and Other Authentick Memorials, Left by William Cecill Lord Burghley*, vol. 2: 1571–96 (London: William Bowyer, 1759).
- Overall, W.H. and H.C. Overall, eds. *Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia 1579–1664* (London: EJ Francis, 1878).
- Parker, Matthew. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury*, eds. John Bruce and Thomas Thomason Perowne (Parker Society, 1853; reprint Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2005).
- Peck, Francis. *Desiderata Curiosa, or a Collection of Divers Scarce and Curious Pieces Relating Chiefly to Matters of English History*, vol. 1, bk. 3, letter 29 (London: Thomas Evans, 1779).
- Rabus, Ludwig. *Histories of the Chosen Saints, Witnesses, Confessors, and Martyrs of God* (1552).
- Robinson, Hastings. *The Zurich Letters: Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1842).
- . *The Zurich Letters: Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1845).
- Ryan, P., ed. 'Diocesan Returns of Recusants for England and Wales, 1577', *CRS Miscellanea XII* (1921).
- Sandys, Edwin. *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1842; reprint 2006).
- Scargill-Bird, S.R. *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire*, vol. 2: 1572–82 (London: HMSO, 1888).
- Sharp, C. *Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569* (London: J.B. Nichols, 1810), in *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, 1558–1589*, eds. J. Stevenson, A.J. Crosby, A.J. Butler, S.C. Lomas, A.B. Hinds and R.B. Wernham, 23 vols. (London: Longman, 1863–1950).
- Stowe, John. *A Survey of London, by John Stow: Reprinted from the Text of 1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908).
- Strype, John. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the First Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Under Whose Primacy and Influence the Reformation of Religion Was Happily Effected* (London, 1711).
- . *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821).
- . *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The First Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821).
- . ed. *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D. The Third and Last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822).
- . *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together with an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, and Letters*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824).

- Tyndale, William, trans. *Tyndale's Old Testament: Being the Pentateuch of 1530*, eds. Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537, and Jonah and David Daniell (London: Yale University Press, 1992), 310.
- Udall, John, ed. *A Parte of a Register Contayninge Sundrie Memorable Matters, Written by Diuers Godly and Learned in Our Time, Which Stande For, and Desire the Reformation of Our Church, in Discipline and Ceremonies, Accordinge to the Pure Worde of God, and the Lawe of Our Lande* (EBOO, 1593).
- Van't Spijker, W. *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer*, trans. J. Friend and L.D. Bierma (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Von Klarwell, Victor, ed. *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners: Being a Series of Hitherto Unpublished Letters from the Archives of the Hapsburg Family*, trans T.H. Nash (London: John Lane, 1928).
- Whitgift, John. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, eds. Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden, vol. IV (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850).
- Whitgift, John. *The Works of John Whitgift*, ed. John Ayre, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1851).

Secondary

- Abingdon, Thomas. *The Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Worcester: To Which Are Added the Antiquities of the Cathedral Churches of Chichester and Lichfeld* (1723).
- Acheson, R.J. *Radical Puritans in England 1550–1660* (London: Longman, 1995).
- Adams, Simon and David Scott Gehring. 'Elizabeth I's Former Tutor Reports on the Parliament of 1559: Johannes Spithovius to the Chancellor of Denmark, 27 February 1559', *English Historical Review* 128, no. 530 (2013): 35–54.
- Addington, Hugh, Peter McCullough and Emma Rhatigan, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Alford, Stephen. *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Amos, Scott. '“It Is Fallow Ground Here”: Martin Bucer as Critic of the English Reformation', *Westminster Theological Journal* 61, no. 1 (1999): 41–52.
- Anderson, Marvin. 'Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (1988): 451–69.
- Aston, N. and M. Cragoe, eds. *Anticlericalism in Britain c.1500–1914* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000).
- Aveling, J.C.H. *Northern Catholics* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966).
- . *Catholic Recusancy in York 1558–1791* (Catholic Record Society, Monograph Series 2, 1970).
- Barrett L. Beer. 'London Parish Clergy and the Protestant Reformation, 1547–1559', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 18, no. 3 (1986): 375–93.
- . 'Episcopacy and Reform in Mid-Tudor England', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 23, no. 2 (1991): 231–52.

- Basler Bjorklund, Nancy. ‘“A Godly Wyfe Is an Helper”: Matthew Parker and the Defence of Clerical Marriage’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 34, no. 2 (2003): 347–65.
- Bastow, Sarah. *The Catholic Gentry of Yorkshire, 1536–1642: Resistance and Accommodation* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007).
- . ‘An Abortive Attempt to Defend an Episcopal Reputation: The Case of Archbishop Edwin Sandys and the Innkeeper’s Wife’, *History* 97 (2012): 380–401.
- . ‘A Manner of Apology: Symbols and Images in an Elizabethan Cause Célèbre’, *Textile History* 43, no. 2 (2012): 147–60.
- . ‘“Stiff-Necked, Wilful and Obstinate”: Conflict in the Elizabethan Church’, *Northern History* 50 (2013): 239–56.
- Bayne, C.G. ‘The Visitation of the Province of Canterbury, 1559’, *The English Historical Review* 28, no. 112 (1913): 636–77.
- Beckingsale, B.W. ‘The Characteristics of the Tudor North’, *Northern History*, 4 (1969): 67–83.
- Beir, A.L. ‘Social Problems in Elizabethan London’, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 9, no. 2 (1978): 203–21.
- Bernard, G.W., ed. *The Tudor Nobility* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991).
- . *The King’s Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (London: Yale University Press, 2005).
- Bindoff, S.T., ed. *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509–1558* (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1982).
- Birnbaum, Norman. ‘The Zwinglian Reformation in Zurich’, *Past & Present* 15 (1959): 27–47.
- Brietz Monta, Susannah. *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Brigden, Susan. ‘Religion and Social Obligation in Early Sixteenth-Century London’, *Past & Present* 103, no. 1 (1984): 67–112.
- . *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
- Bucholz, Robert and Newton Key. *Early Modern England 1485–1714: A Narrative History*, 2nd ed. (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).
- Carlson, Eric Josef. ‘Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation’, *Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 1 (1992): 1–31.
- . *Marriage and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994).
- Chandos, J., ed. *In God’s Name: Examples of Preaching in England 1534–1662* (London: Hutchinson, 1971).
- Clarke, P.D. ‘Canterbury as the New Rome: Dispensations and Henry VIII’s Reformation’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64, no. 1 (2013): 20–44.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. ‘The 1559 Books of Common Prayer and the Elizabethan Reformation’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 67, no. 1 (2016): 94–121.
- Cliffe, J.T. *Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London: The Athlone Press, 1969).
- Coles, Kimberly. ‘“Printed at London Anonymous”: Was There Ever an Attempt to Publish the First Edition of the Defence of Mary Queen of Scots in England?’ *The Review of English Studies*, new series, 49, no. 195 (1998): 273–81.
- Collinson, Patrick. ‘The Authorship of a Brief Discours Off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 9 (1958): 188–208.

- . *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).
- . *Archbishop Grindal, 1519–1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1979).
- . *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
- . *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: The Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation* (Reading, UK: University of Reading, 1986).
- . *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988).
- . ‘The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I’, in *Elizabethan Essays* (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), 31–58.
- Collinson, Patrick, John Craig and Brett Usher, eds. *Conferences and Combination Lectures in the Elizabethan Church 1582–1590* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003).
- Coogan, Michael David, Marc Brettler, Carol Newsom and PHEME PERKINS, eds. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Cross, C. *The Puritan Earl. The Life of Henry Hasting Third Earl of Huntingdon 1536–1595* (London: Macmillan, 1966).
- Daly, Robert J. *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (London: T&T Clark, 2009).
- Davies, Catharine. *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Dawson, Jane. *John Knox* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).
- Denis, P. ‘La Prophetie Dans Les Eglises De Le Refome Au XVI Siecle’, *Revue D’Histoire Ecclesiastique* 72 (1977): 289–316.
- Dickens, A.G. *The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York, Part 1: The Clergy* (London and York: St Anthony’s Press, 1957).
- . *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509–1558* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959).
- Dixon, R.W. *History of the Church of England: Elizabeth. A.D. 1558–1563*, vol. V (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902).
- Dixon, C. Scott and L. Schorn-Schutte, eds. *The Protestant Clergy of Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- Doran, S. and G. Richardson, eds., *Tudor England and Its Neighbours* eds. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
- Doran, Susan and Thomas S. Freeman, eds. *The Myth of Elizabeth* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (London: Yale University Press, 1992).
- . *Reformation: Europe’s House Divided, 1490–1700* (London: Penguin, 2003).
- Duffy, Eamon and David Loades, eds. *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
- Edgcumbe Hughes, Philip. ‘Preaching, Homilies, and Prophesyings in Sixteenth Century England’, *Churchman* 89, no. 1 (1975).
- Eire, Carlos. *Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450–1650* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016).

- Ellis, I.P. 'The Archbishop and the Usurers', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* XXI (1970).
- Elton, G.R. *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).
- Emmison, F.G. *Elizabethan Life: Morals and the Church Courts* (Chelmsford: Essex County Council Record Office, 1973), 214–15.
- Englander, D., D. Norman, R. O'Day and W.R. Owens, eds. *Culture and Belief in Europe 1450–1600: An Anthology of Sources* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990).
- Eppley, Daniel. *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
- Evdenden, Elizabeth and Thomas Freeman. *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Ferrell, L.A. and P. McCullough, eds. *The English Sermon Revised* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).
- Fett, D. 'Spanish Diplomacy and English Recusancy in Early Elizabethan England', *Reformation* 15 (2010): 169–89.
- Fincham, K. and N. Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Fisher, R.M. 'The Reformation of Clergy at the Inns of Court 1530–1580', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 12, no. 1 (1981): 69–91.
- Fletcher, Anthony and Diarmaid MacCulloch. *Tudor Rebellions* (London: Longman, 2008).
- Foulds, Trevor. 'In Medio Chori: The Tomb of Thomas of Corbridge, Archbishop of York, in Southwell Minster', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 167, no. 1 (2014): 109–23.
- Freeman, Thomas. 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction in Foxe's Book of Martyrs', *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 3 (2000): 601–23.
- . 'The Power of Polemic: Catholic Responses to the Calendar in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2010): 475–95.
- Freeman, Thomas S. and Thomas F. Mayer. *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England c.1400–1700* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007).
- Foyster, Elizabeth A. 'The Concept of Male Honour in Seventeenth Century England' (Durham thesis, Durham University, 1996).
- . *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999).
- Fuller, Thomas. *The History of the University of Cambridge from the Conquest to the Year 1634* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1840).
- Garrett, Christina H. *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1938).
- Gee, Henry Percy. *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898).
- . *The Elizabethan Prayer-Book & Ornaments, with an Appendix of Documents* (London: Macmillan, 1902).
- . *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London: Macmillan, 1914).
- Gilbert, C.D. 'The Protestant Ascendancy in Worcester: The Case of the Clerk of St Helen's', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society* 18 (2002): 211–16.

- . *Catholics in Worcestershire 1535–1590* (Brentwood: Worcester Historical Association Publications No. 2, 2009).
- Goertz, Hans Jürgen. *The Anabaptists*, English ed. (London: Routledge, 2008).
- Gowing, Laura. *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- Gunther, Karl. *Reformation Unbound: Protestant Visions of Reform in England, 1525–1590* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- Guy, John. *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- . *Elizabeth: The Forgotten Years* (London: Penguin, 2016).
- Haigh, Christopher. ‘The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation’, *Historical Journal* 25 (1982): 995–1007.
- . *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988).
- . *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Hamlin, H. ‘Strangers in Strange Lands: Biblical Models of Exile in Early Modern England’, *Reformation* 15 (2010): 63–81.
- Hamshere, Cyril. ‘The Ridolfi Plot, 1571’, *History Today* 26, no. 1 (1976): 32–39.
- Hart-Milman, Henry. *Annals of St Paul’s Cathedral* (London: John Murray, 1868).
- Hasler, P.W. *The History of Parliament 1558–1603* (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1981).
- , ed. *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1558–1603* (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1981).
- Haugaard, William P. *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: The Struggle for a Stable Settlement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).
- Hawood, T. *History and Antiquities of the Church and City of Lichfield* (1806).
- Heal, Felicity. *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- . ‘The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England’, *Past & Present* 102 (1984): 66–93.
- . *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- Hickman, David. ‘The Religious Allegiance of London’s Ruling Elite 1520–1603’ (Unpublished PhD thesis, University College London, 1995).
- . ‘Religious Belief and Pious Practice Amongst London’s Elizabethan Elite’, *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 4 (1999): 941–60.
- Hill, L.M. ‘The Marian “Experience of Defeat”: The Case of Sir John Bourne’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 25, no. 3 (1994): 531–49.
- Hopf, Constantin. *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2012).
- Houlbrooke, R.A. *The English Family 1450–1700* (London: Longman, 1984), 100–1.
- Hoyle, R. ‘The First Earl of Cumberland: A Reputation Reassessed’, *Northern History* 22 (1986): 63–94.
- Hunt, A. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Ingram, Martin. *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- James, M.E. ‘The Concept of Order and the Northern Rising 1569’, *Past & Present* 60 (1973): 49–83.

- . *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Jenkins, G.W. *John Jewel and the English National Church: The Dilemmas of an Erasmian Reformer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
- Jones, Norman. *God and the Money Lenders* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1989).
- Kaufman, Peter Iver. 'Prophesying Again', *Church History* 68, no. 2 (1999): 337–58.
- Keniston McIntosh, M. *Controlling Misbehaviour in England 1370–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Kesselring, K.J. '“A Cold Pye for the Papistes”': Constructing and Containing the Northern Rising of 1569', *Journal of British Studies* 42 (2004): 417–43.
- Ketch, Ray Alden. 'The First Elizabethan Religious Controversy: Puritan Versus Vestments' (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Ohio, 1949).
- Killpack, William Bennett and Thomas Hutchings Clarke. *The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Southwell* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1839).
- King, John N. '“The Light of Printing”': William Tyndale, John Foxe, John Day, and Early Modern Print Culture', *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (2001): 52–85.
- Kingsley-Smith, Jane. *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- Kirby, Torrance. *Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Kitching, C.J., ed. *The Royal Visitation of 1559: Act Book for the Northern Province*, vol. 187 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1975).
- Kreider, Robert. 'The Anabaptists and the Civil Authorities of Strasbourg, 1525–1555', *Church History* 24, no. 2 (1955): 99–118.
- Lake, Peter. 'Matthew Hutton—A Puritan Bishop?' *History* 64 (1979): 182–204.
- . *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- . *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy', 'Heterodoxy', and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).
- Lake, Peter and Maria Dowling, eds. *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England* (London: Routledge and Kegan & Paul, 1987).
- . *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow: Persecution, Martyrdom and the Politics of Sanctity in Elizabethan England* (London: Continuum, 2011).
- Lardi, Paulo and Winifred Smith. 'Anti-Catholic Propaganda in Elizabethan London', *Modern Philology* 28, no. 2 (1930): 208–12.
- Laurence, Anne. *Women in England 1500–1760: A Social History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1994).
- Lehmborg, S.E. 'Archbishop Grindal and the Prophesyings', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* XXXIV (1965): 87–145.
- Levin, Carole, Jo Eldridge Carney and Debra Barrett-Graves, eds. *Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003).
- Lewis, Jack P. *The Day After Domesday: The Making of the Bishops' Bible* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2016).
- Lindberg, Cater. *The European Reformations: Sourcebook* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

- Lindsley, A. 'Edward Dering: A Model of Puritanism', *Knowing and Doing: A Teaching Quarterly for the Discipleship of Hearts and Minds* (Summer 2009): 1.
- Liu, Tai. *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1986).
- Livingstone, E.A., ed. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Llewellyn, Nigel. 'Honour in Life, Death and in the Memory: Funeral Monuments in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 179–200.
- Loades, David. *The Mid Tudor Crisis, 1545–1565* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992).
- , ed. *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997).
- . *Elizabeth I* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006).
- . *The Cecils: Privilege and Power Behind the Throne* (Kew: The National Archives, 2007).
- . *Cranmer and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Logan, D. 'The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities, 1535', *The English Historical Review* 106, no. 421 (1991): 861–88.
- Luoma, J.K. 'Restoration or Reformation? Cartwright and Hooker on the Elizabethan Church', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 46 (1977): 85–106.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999).
- . *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).
- . *The Boy King Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002).
- . *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490–1700* (London: Penguin, 2003).
- MacCulloch, D. and P. Hughes. 'A Bailiffs' List and Chronicle from Worcester', *The Antiquaries' Journal* LXXV (1995): 235–53.
- Maclure, M. *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534–1642* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958).
- . *Register of Sermons Preached at Paul's Cross, 1534–1642* (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989).
- Marchant, R.A. *The Church Under the Law: Justice, Administration and Discipline in the Diocese of York 1560–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
- Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012).
- Marshall, Peter and Alec Ryrie, eds. *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Marshall, Peter and John Morgan. 'Clerical Conformity and the Elizabethan Settlement Revisited', *The Historical Journal* 59, no. 1 (2016): 1–22.
- Martyr, Peter and Marvin W. Anderson. 'Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542–62): His Letters to Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 4, no. 1 (1973): 41–64.
- Mattingly, Garrett. *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Baltimore, MD: Penguin, 1955).

- Mazur, Peter and Abigail Shinn. 'Conversion Narratives in the Early Modern World', *Journal of Early Modern History* 17 (2013): 427–36.
- McCullough, P. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- McCullough, P., H. Adlington and E. Rhatigan, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- McGiffert, M. 'Covenant, Crown, and Commons in Elizabethan Puritanism', *Journal of British Studies* 20, no. 1 (1980): 32–52.
- McGrath, P. *Papists and Puritans Under Elizabeth I* (London: Blandford Press, 1967).
- McMillan, K. 'Zurich Reform and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559', *Anglican and Episcopal History* 68 (1999): 285–311.
- McNamara, Rebecca F. and Una McIlvenna. 'Medieval and Early Modern Emotional Responses to Death and Dying', *Parergon* 31, no. 2 (2014): 1–10.
- Mentzer, R., F. Moreil and P. Chareyre, eds. *The Vocabulary of Censure and Exclusion in the Early Modern Reformed Tradition*, Series in Church History, vol. 40 (Boston, MA: Brill, 2010).
- Merritt, J.F., ed. *Imaging Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stowe to Strype 1598–1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Milward, Peter. 'The Jewel-Harding Controversy', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 6, no. 4 (1974): 320–41.
- Morrissey, Mary. *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons 1558–1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Muller, Aislinn. 'Transmitting and Translating the Excommunication of Elizabeth I', *Studies in Church History* 53 (2017): 210–22.
- Neale, J.E. 'The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity', *The English Historical Review*, 65 (1950): 304–32.
- . *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1958).
- . *Queen Elizabeth I* (Chicago: Review Press, 2014).
- Ocker, C., M. Printy and P. Starenko, eds. *Politics and Reformations: Communities, Politics, Nations, and Empires, Essays in Honor of Thomas A. Brady, Jr.* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2007).
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558–1642* (Leicester: University of Leicester Press, 1979).
- . *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London: Routledge, 1986).
- Outhwaitwe, R.B. *The Rise and Fall of the English Ecclesiastical Courts, 1500–1860* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Overell, M.A. 'Peter Martyr in England 1547–1553: An Alternative View', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 1 (1984): 87–104.
- Overall, W.H. and Overall, H.C., eds. *Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia 1579–1664* (London: EJ Francis, 1878).
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Palmer, W. 'High Officeholding, Foreign Policy, and the British Dimension in the Tudor Far North, 1525–1563', *Albion* 29, no. 4 (1998): 579–95.

- Parish, H. ‘“It Was Never Good World Sence Minister Must Have Wyves”: Clerical Celibacy, Clerical Marriage, and Anticlericalism in Reformation England’, *Journal of Religious History* 36, no. 1 (2012): 52–69.
- Parmiter, Geoffrey De C. *Elizabethan Popish Recusancy in the Inns of Court*, Special Supplement, No. 11 (London: Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 1976).
- Peterkin, A. *One Thousand Beards: A Cultural History of Facial Hair* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2001).
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
- . *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996).
- . *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).
- Plummer, Marjorie. *From Priest’s Whore to Pastor’s Wife: Clerical Marriage and the Process of Reform in the Early German Reformation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).
- Pollard, Alfred William. *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525–1611* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911).
- Pollmann, Judith S. and Andrew Spicer, eds. *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low Countries* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
- Pollnitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Porter, Roy. *London: A Social History* (London: Penguin, 2000).
- Prest, W.R. *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts* (Harlow: Longman, 1972).
- Questier, Michael. ‘Sermons, Separatists, and Succession Politics in Late Elizabethan England’, *Journal of British Studies* 52 (2013): 290–316.
- Rait, R.S. *English Episcopal Palaces* (London: Constable, 1911).
- Ranson, Angela, Andre Gazal and Sarah Bastow. *Defending the Faith: John Jewel and the Church of England* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2018).
- Read, C. *Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1965).
- Rex, R. ‘Thomas Vavasour, MD’, *Recusant History* 20 (1990–1): 436–54.
- Ryrie, Alec. *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realms, 1485–1603* (London: Routledge, 2013).
- . *Being Protestant in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Scarisbrick, J.J. *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1984).
- Scott Amos, N. ‘Martin Bucer and the Revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer: Reform of Ceremonies and the Didactic Use of Ritual’, *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 2 (1999): 107–26.
- Scott Pearson, A.F. *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925).
- Shagan, Ethan. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Soergel, Philip M. *Miracles and the Protestant Imagination: The Evangelical Wonder Book in Reformation Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

- Spalding, M.J. *The History of the Protestant Reformation in Germany and Switzerland*, vol. 1 (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1865).
- Simpson, W. Sparrow. 'The Palaces or Town Houses of the Bishops of London', *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 1 (1905): 13–73.
- Spicksley, Judith M. 'Women, "Usury" and Credit in Early Modern England: The Case of the Maiden Investor', *Gender and History* 27, no. 2 (2015): 263–92.
- Springer, Michael S. *Restoring Christ's Church: John a Lasco and the Forma Ac Ratio* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
- Strong, Roy. 'The Popular Celebration of the Accession Day of Queen Elizabeth I', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21, no. 1/2 (1958): 86–103.
- . *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987).
- Taavitsainen, Irma and Andreas H. Jucker. *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems* (Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin, 2003).
- Thibodeau, Kenneth F. 'Science and the Reformation: The Case of Strasbourg', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 7, no. 1 (1976): 35–50.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Penguin, 1971).
- Thornbury, Walter. *Old and New London: A Narratives of Its History, Its People and Its Places*, vol. 2 (London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co, 1878).
- Thornton, T. *Cheshire and the Tudor State 1480–1560* (Bury St Edmunds: Boydell, 2000).
- Thorp, M.T. 'Catholic Conspiracy in Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 4 (1984): 431–48.
- Thrush, Andrew and John P. Ferris, eds. *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604–1629* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Tillott, P.M., ed. *A History of the County of York: The City of York* (London: Victoria County History, 1961).
- Torrance Kirby, W.J. 'The Public Sermon: Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1534–1570', *Renaissance and Reformation* 31, no. 1 (2008): 3–29.
- Trimble, William. *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England, 1558–1603* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964).
- Trinterud, L.J., ed. *Elizabethan Puritanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- Tutino, S. *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England 1570–1625* (London: Ashgate, 2007).
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Usher, Brett. 'The Deanery of Bocking and the Demise of the Vestiarian Controversy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52, no. 3 (2001): 434–55.
- . *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559–1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).
- VanderSchaaf, Mark E. 'Archbishop Parker's Efforts Toward a Bucurian Discipline in the Church of England', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 8, no. 1 (1977): 85–103.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

- . *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (London: Boydell, 2003).
- . ‘Translating Trent? English Catholicism and the Counter Reformation’, *Historical Research* 78 (2005): 288–310.
- . *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500–1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
- . ‘The Reformation of the Generations: Youth, Age and Religious Change in England, c. 1500–1700’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 21 (2011): 93–121.
- . *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- . *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (London: Routledge, 2016).
- Warnicke, Retha M. *Mary Queen of Scots* (Oxford: Routledge, 2006).
- Wenig, S. ‘The Ecclesiastical Vision of the Reformed Bishops Under Elizabeth I 1559–1570’, *Anglican and Episcopal History* 70 (2001): 270–301.
- White, Peter. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Williams, Penry. *Council in the Marches of Wales Under Elizabeth I* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1958).
- . *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Wilson, T. Stuart. *Studies in Elizabethan Foreign Trade* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959).
- Wilson, Jean. ‘Queen Elizabeth I as Urania’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 69 (2006): 151–73.
- Winship, Michael P. *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims, and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).
- Wormald, Jenny. *Mary, Queen of Scots: Pride, Passion and a Kingdom Lost* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001).
- Wright, Jonathan. ‘Marian Exiles and the Legitimacy of Flight from Persecution’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52, no. 2 (2001): 220–43.
- Wright, D.F., ed. *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Wabuda, S. *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Yates, Frances A. ‘Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 20, no. 1/2 (1957): 4–25.
- . *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- Youngs, Frederic. *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Online

- Foxe, John. *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online*, 1586 ed. (Sheffield: HRI Online Publications, 2011). www.johnfoxe.org (TAMO).

- History of Parliament Online. *History of Parliament Trust*. www.historyofparliamentonline.org.
- Letters from Exile: Documents of the Marian Exile*. Edinburgh University. www.marianexile.div.ed.ac.uk/documents/documents.shtml.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [Online edition]. www.oxforddnb.com.
- TNA and Hackney Archives Department. 'Tudor Hackney', 2003. www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/tudorhackney/localhistory/lochsh.asp.

Index

- Act of Exchange 89–92
Act of Six Articles 18, 73
Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity 46–8
Admonition to Parliament 102, 116–17, 122, 127–8, 187
Anabaptists 12, 19, 129–32
antichrist 44, 72, 82, 101, 104, 118, 126, 151, 166
Archbishop of Canterbury 41, 50, 70, 75, 79, 134, 149, 159, 164
Archbishop of York 1, 7, 29, 60, 104, 106, 145–6, 150, 151, 155, 159, 165, 166, 168, 174, 177–8, 182n104, 185
Arden, Thomas 76–7
Aveling, J.C.H. 151, 173
Aylmer, John 52, 105, 158, 164, 178
- Bacon, Nicholas 46, 133
Baynes, Ralph (Bishop of Lichfield) 52, 53
Beer, Barrett L. 21, 105
Bell, John 73
Bellasis, William 170
Bible, the 16, 59, 63, 71, 92–4, 154, 155, 174; Bishop's Bible 71, 92–4, 174; Genevan Bible 92, 154; Great Bible 92
Bishopthorpe palace 149–50
Bland, John 14
Book of Common Prayer 18, 36n7, 53, 76, 118, 120; (1549) 18, 36n7; (1552) 18, 36n7, 53; (1559) 53, 118
Book of Martyrs *see* Foxe, John, *Acts and Monuments*
Bourne, Anthony 78, 87
Bourne, John 6, 71, 74–5, 76, 78, 81–92, 95, 102, 107, 176
- Bowler, John 22–3
Bradford, John 22–3
Bucer, Martin 18–20, 22, 25–6, 30, 36n37, 123, 163, 180n58
Bullinger, Heinrich 27–8, 41, 42, 43, 45, 54, 59, 64, 72, 119, 120, 123, 128, 163, 187
Bunny, Edmund 173, 174
- Calvinists and Calvinism 3–4, 19, 54, 64, 129
Cardinal Pole 41, 76
Carlisle 52, 58, 59, 63, 90, 155
Cartwright, Thomas 29, 102–3, 104, 116–17, 121–4, 126–7, 129, 135–6, 153, 187; *Second Admonition to Parliament* 117
Catholics and Catholicism 1–2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11–12, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 32, 42, 45–7, 48, 49, 51–3, 56, 60, 61–4, 70–1, 73, 75–6, 78, 82–3, 85, 87, 89, 94, 96n15, 101–3, 104, 107–15, 118, 120, 124, 129–32, 136, 146–7, 150–1, 154, 156, 158, 159, 161, 166–75, 172–4; Catholics in the City of London 114–15; Catholic women 172–4; Yorkshire Catholics 166–71; *see also* Roman Catholicism
Cawood 149–50
Cecil, William 47–9, 55, 64, 72, 89, 91, 92, 95, 103–4, 107–8, 110–11, 115, 121, 123–8, 130, 136, 145, 148, 149–54, 156–60, 163–5, 169, 171, 175, 176–7, 185
Chaderton, William 160–1
Church of England 2, 116, 129, 187
Clegg, Cyndia S. 48
Clitherow, Margaret 146, 172–3

- Cole, Henry 52
 Cole, Robert 12
 Collinson, Patrick 2, 12, 28, 30, 41,
 70, 75, 88, 104, 116, 118, 122,
 123, 129, 133, 134–5, 147
 communion 2, 47, 48, 115, 117, 120,
 167, 168
 compliance 61–3, 167
 Cook, Anthony 43, 64n1
 corruption 6, 11–12, 19, 21, 56, 62,
 80–1, 82–3, 94, 112, 116–17, 128,
 157, 163
 Council of the Marches 72, 88–9
 Council of the North 7, 15, 56–7,
 146, 149
 Cox, Richard 18, 32, 52, 53, 54, 156
 Cranmer, Thomas 17, 18, 25, 73,
 93, 129
 Cromwell, Thomas 18, 67n78, 73, 88

 Dering, Edward 107, 123–6
 Device for Alteration of Religion in
 the First Year of Queen Elizabeth I,
 The 49
 Doncaster 14, 62, 147–8, 171, 176–7;
 Bull Inn scandal 14, 147–8, 171,
 176–7
 Dudley, Robert 88, 103, 107, 121,
 125, 148, 158, 170, 177; *see also*
 Earl of Leicester
 Duke of Northumberland 1,
 15–16, 86
 Durham 42, 50, 58–9, 60, 62, 108,
 146, 154, 155–6, 159, 176
 Dutch church 130, 131–2

 Earl of Huntingdon 7, 15, 146, 149,
 150, 153, 155, 166, 170
 Earl of Leicester 88, 103, 148,
 158, 170
 education and training of clergy 102,
 115–16, 132–5, 159–60; *see also*
 prophesying
 Edward VI 1, 10, 15, 25, 55, 73, 78
 Edwardian reforms 1, 4, 5, 11, 17–21,
 30, 31, 34–5, 43, 75, 102
 Elizabethan era 1–6, 8, 11–12,
 18–19, 26, 27–9, 32–5, 41–51,
 56–60, 63–4, 70–2, 76, 78–9, 83,
 85, 86, 88–90, 92–3, 95, 106–26,
 132–6, 146, 148, 151–2, 157–9,
 160, 166–7
 Elizabethan *via media* 3, 42, 44
 English Church 3, 4, 18, 26, 28, 30,
 32, 41, 55, 117, 123, 131, 135, 174
 English Deborah 42, 64n3
 evangelicals 1, 2, 3–5, 8, 10, 11,
 17–20, 22, 25, 26, 30, 33–4, 42,
 43–7, 51–2, 54–7, 64, 70–1, 73,
 75, 82, 92, 94–5, 102–3, 105, 107,
 116, 135, 146, 148, 155, 157, 174,
 186–7
 exile and exiles 1, 4, 5, 9n14, 15, 19,
 24–35, 42–4, 46, 48–50, 54–8,
 65n17, 71, 72–3, 74, 90, 102,
 118–9, 124, 129, 132, 133, 152,
 154, 159, 186–8

 Field, John 14, 29, 102, 116–17,
 123, 129; *see also* *Admonition to*
Parliament
 Foxe, John 11–16, 21–4, 32–3, 50–2;
Acts and Monuments 5, 11, 12–15,
 20, 22, 25, 27, 32–3, 130, 131,
 148, 176, 178
 Frankfurt 28–33, 44, 58, 154, 156,
 187; *A Brief Discourse of the*
Troubles at Frankfort 29, 32–3
 Freeman, Thomas S. 13–14, 24

 Gardiner, Stephen 17, 57
 Gargrave, Thomas 56, 57
 Gates, Henry 56, 57, 170
 Gates, John 16, 20
 Gee, Henry 42–3, 56, 57, 58
 Geneva 28, 29, 34, 46, 51, 92, 117,
 154, 155–6; Genevan religious
 reform 4, 102, 116
 Gilpin, Bernard 56, 60–1, 68n99
 Gilpin, George 27
 Giraldi, Francisco 111–14
 Grey, Lady Jane 1, 13, 15, 34, 58
 Grindal, Edmund 39n111, 49–50, 52,
 53, 101, 102, 104, 116, 119, 121,
 129–30, 134, 16, 145, 147, 149,
 151–3, 156, 157–60, 164, 167–70,
 177, 178, 188
 Gunther, Karl 28, 30, 32, 33
 Guy, John 47, 109

 Haigh, Christopher 45, 47, 86
 Harding, Thomas 102, 110
 Harvey, Henry 56, 57–8
 Hastings, Henry 7, 15, 146, 149, 150,
 153, 155, 166, 170; *see also* Earl of
 Huntingdon
 Heal, Felicity 83–4, 89–90
 Henry VIII 1, 3, 17, 18, 55, 56,
 67n78, 88, 129
 heretics 57, 109, 132

- Holcroft, Thomas 23–4
 Holtby, Father 150–1
 Hooper, John 73–4, 75
 Horne, Robert 39n109, 52
 House of Commons 47
 House of Lords 47, 73
 Humanists and Humanism 18, 73, 128
 Hutton, Matthew 7, 15, 146, 148, 151–9, 162–3, 169–70, 176, 177–8, 179n42, 188
- iconoclasm 6, 27, 62, 73, 75
 idolatry 55, 56, 112, 116, 118, 162
 Inns of Court 112, 114–15, 116
 Italian churches 129
- Jewel, John 28, 49, 51, 52–3, 54, 56, 102, 110, 118, 121, 161, 174, 188
- Kirby, Torrance 28, 121
 Kitching, C.J. 57–8
 Knox, John 32, 92, 154
- Lake, Peter 19, 152–3, 168, 172, 179n42
 land and property 89–92, 163–6
 Lascelles, Brian 171
 Latimer, Hugh 17–18, 72–3, 75, 76
 Lever, Thomas 15–16, 32, 39n109, 51, 58, 116
 little foxes 1, 59, 60
 Loades, David 18, 70
 London 6–7, 22, 41, 50, 54, 58, 63, 86, 90, 94, 95, 101–36, 17n17, 139n59, 145, 152, 158, 164; London in 1570 105–7; Lord Mayor of London 105–6, 113; religion in London 101–36
 Luther, Martin 14, 19, 26–7, 74, 156, 180n58
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid 18–19, 28, 48, 76, 108
 Mallory, William 155, 170, 176
 Marcombe, David 60, 61
 Marian era 6, 11, 13, 25, 32–4, 41–3, 46–7, 50, 51, 74, 147, 152, 154
 married clergy 6, 8, 48, 55, 70, 75, 78–80, 85, 91–2, 94, 157; wives of the clergy 77–9, 85, 91–2, 171–3
 Marshall, Peter 4, 48, 62, 102
 Marshalsea 13, 21, 22–3, 86, 130
 Martyr, Peter *see* Vermigli, Peter Martyr
- martyrs and martyrdom 11, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25, 32–3, 74, 130
Martyrs Mirror 10
 Mary I 1, 6, 12, 13, 16–17, 20–1, 23, 26, 41–3, 45, 46, 48, 56–8, 74, 77, 78, 81, 86, 89
 Mary Queen of Scots 101, 108, 110
 Mass 7, 18, 19, 20, 45, 51, 85, 112, 113, 117, 156, 157
 miracles 24
 Mouse, Dr 17
- Neale, J.E. 47
 Northfolke, William 77
 Northern Rising *see* Rebellion (1569)
 Nottingham 58, 59, 163
 Nowell, Alexander 111
- obedience 16, 20, 21, 46, 49, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 86, 87, 114, 115, 166, 170, 172, 173
 O'Day, Rosemary 10, 48
- Papal Bull 109, 110
 papists and papistry 167–71, 175, 177, 187
 Parker, Matthew 12, 15–16, 19, 26, 50, 51, 53–4, 58, 70, 75, 76, 79, 91, 92–3, 116, 118–19, 123–4, 133–4, 147, 152
 Percy, Richard 165
 Peter Martyr *see* Vermigli, Peter Martyr
 Philip of Spain 45, 113
 Pope, the 45, 49, 60
 Pope Pius V 101, 108, 109–10
 popery 22–3, 28, 80, 82–3, 107, 112, 119, 122, 167
 Portugal 113–14; Portuguese embassy 7, 111–14
 preaching and preachers 1, 2, 7, 10–11, 13, 15–16, 19, 21, 22–3, 28, 31, 45–6, 49, 54, 56–7, 58–61, 64, 70, 71, 73, 79, 81, 103, 105, 107, 111, 115–18, 120–6, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132–5, 148, 149, 153, 155, 159–60, 167, 169, 173, 175, 178, 186, 187; *see also* Dering, Edward
- Presbyterians and Presbyterianism 4, 9n9, 102, 115–18, 122, 128, 129, 145, 153, 186
 Privy Council 76, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87–8, 104, 114, 125, 127, 133–4, 177

- prophesying 117, 132–5, 159–60
 Protestants and Protestantism 1–5, 6, 7, 8, 10–12, 13, 17–20, 21, 24, 25, 32–3, 35, 41–3, 45–9, 51, 52–5, 57–62, 71–2, 74–5, 88, 90, 92–5, 102, 104–6, 108–9, 111, 112, 114, 115, 118, 122, 123, 132, 146, 147, 153–5, 157, 159, 170, 173–5, 177, 187–8
 Puritans and Puritanism 2–4, 9n9, 42, 47, 102, 115–20, 123, 127–8, 135, 145–6, 151, 152, 159–61, 168, 186
 Questier, Michael 5, 168
 Rebellion (1569) 101, 106, 108–9, 114
 recusants 62, 146, 151, 153–4, 170, 171, 172
Regnans in Excelsis 101, 108, 109
 Ridolfi, Roberto 109, 110
 Ridolfi Plot 110
 Roman Catholicism 2, 11, 20, 26, 49, 187
 Royal Visitation (1559) 43, 55–64, 70, 75–7, 82, 114, 120, 161, 166
 Ryrie, Alec 1–2, 5, 6, 11, 17, 19, 72, 79, 102, 106, 185
 St Bartholomew's day massacre 110
 St Paul's Cathedral 105, 109, 123, 127, 164
 St Paul's Cross 7, 45, 57, 59, 84, 105, 111, 121–2, 126, 170
 Sampson, Thomas 34, 43, 50, 63, 116
 Sandys, Edwin: as Archbishop of York 1, 7, 29, 60, 104, 136, 145–78, 191; as Bishop of London 1, 6–7, 95, 101–36, 164, 191; as Bishop of Worcester 1, 2, 6, 7, 1, 27, 50, 63, 70–95, 101–4, 107, 164, 190; death and legacy 5, 185–9, 191; disputes with Sir John Bourne 6, 71, 74–5, 76, 78, 81–92, 95, 102, 107, 176; early life in the church 1–6, 10–24; in exile 1, 4, 24–35, 71, 187; family 27, 44, 70–1, 73, 87, 90–2, 94, 101, 104, 147, 150, 155, 164, 165, 188, 190–1; imprisonment 22–4; letters 2, 3, 7, 41–2, 43, 44, 45, 54, 71–2, 90, 93, 103–4, 110–13, 115, 119, 121–2, 125–7, 130–1, 132, 142n174, 148, 152, 157, 160–3, 175, 177; libel 127–8; reputation 176–7; scandal of adultery 14, 147–8, 171, 176–7; sermons 1, 2, 3, 7, 15–16, 20–1, 30–1, 33, 54, 58–62, 71, 80–2, 84, 86, 94, 103, 111, 121–2, 126–7, 132–4, 136, 145, 148, 160–2, 166, 175–8, 189; and the University of Cambridge 1, 4, 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 34, 190
 Scambler, Edmund 56, 58–9, 68n99
 sermons 19, 45–6, 48, 57, 58–9, 61, 111, 115, 119, 121–3, 132–4, 145, 153, 160, 175; *see also* Sandys, Edwin: sermons
 settlements: Charles V's Interim Settlement 26; Elizabethan settlement 1–3, 5–8, 10, 18, 28, 30, 34, 35, 42–4, 46–8, 51, 53–5, 56–8, 59–61, 71–2, 79, 101, 106–7, 114, 118, 119, 120, 136, 146, 166–7, 186–8; Henrician settlement 18
 Shelmerdyn, Robert 77
 Southwell 68n100, 148, 150, 165, 185; Southwell Minster 163, 185, 188, 191
 Stapleton, Brian 171
 Stapleton, Robert 14, 146, 147–8, 155, 157, 158, 170–1, 175, 176–7
 Star Chamber 14, 124, 137n33, 177, 178
 Stowe, John 106
 'Stranger' churches 129–32, 135
 Strasbourg 4, 26–7, 28–34, 39n111, 41–3, 46, 50, 64n1, 80, 81, 129, 187
 Strype, John 52–3, 54, 59, 60–1, 67n65, 81, 91, 92, 116, 120, 128, 132, 133
 superstition 56, 61, 62, 166, 185
 theology and theologians 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 18–20, 24, 26, 28, 30, 34, 46, 53, 64, 74, 75, 81, 83, 92–4, 117–18, 146, 155, 176
 Tower of London 22, 86, 190
 Tunstall, Cuthbert 42, 50
 University of Cambridge 1, 4, 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 34, 102, 105, 116, 152, 190
 Usher, Brett 47, 50, 90, 107, 118, 158
 usury 146, 161–3
 Vermigli, Peter Martyr 4, 18, 25, 26, 28, 34–5, 43, 49–50, 52, 62, 71, 120, 187

- vestments 12, 29, 47, 48, 73–4,
117–21
- Wabuda, Susan 72, 73, 121
- Walsham, Alexandra 4, 9n10, 12–13,
24, 33, 64n3, 82, 109, 146, 167,
177, 187
- Walsingham, Francis 108, 150,
168, 172
- White, John (Bishop of Winchester)
23, 46, 50, 51, 86
- White, Peter 19
- Whitgift, John 102, 116, 117, 158
- Whittingham, William 29–30, 32,
146, 154–9, 176, 178
- Wilcox, Thomas 102, 116–17,
123, 129; *see also Admonition to
Parliament*
- Wilford, Cecily 44, 71, 79, 190
- Wilford, Francis 44, 65n17
- Wilford, Thomas 44, 190
- Worcester 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 27, 50, 63,
70–82, 87–9, 90, 91, 94–5, 101–4,
107, 159, 164, 188; bishopric of
Worcester 63, 70, 72–7; Worcester
Cathedral 75, 76–7, 78
- Worcestershire 6, 71–2, 78, 104, 159,
188, 190
- York 1, 2, 7, 15, 29, 58, 59, 60, 61,
62, 94, 145, 147, 148–9, 151, 153,
154–5, 158, 162–3, 164, 165, 169,
170–3, 174, 176, 177, 185
- Zurich 26, 27–8, 30, 39n109, 41,
43, 46, 50, 71, 133, 187; *Zurich
Letters* 43
- Zwingli, Ulrich 19, 27