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INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the origins of Elizabethan Puritanism. Evidences of the Puritan spirit are present before 1559 but as an organized force in comprehensive opposition, it dates from the Elizabethan religious settlement. The first Puritan opposition to the settlement took the form of a controversy over the use of liturgical vestments.

The motivating force in the controversy was the influence and the conscientious objections of the exiles who had left England under Queen Mary. While abroad they had found refuge in German and Swiss territories which professed the Calvinistic-reformed religion. The exiles returned to England on the accession of Elizabeth determined to effect a like reformation in the Church of England. For political and personal reasons Elizabeth would not permit the reformation to proceed to the extent desired by these advanced Protestants. Elizabeth frustrated Puritan growth and this eventually led to the split in Anglican ranks.

Since ecclesiastical vestments form the substance of this early controversy in the reign of Elizabeth, the author of this thesis will endeavor to give some explanation to their origin and importance. In themselves the
vestments seem trivial but their symbolism in the eyes of all concerned was very real. The contrasting feelings toward vestments held by the Anglicans and the Puritans exemplify their opposite views on the meaning of the church.

The controversy over the use of vestments was entwined with the problems of the constitutional nature of the Elizabethan religious settlement. It will be necessary to reach an understanding of the settlement as established by parliament and its relation to the royal prerogative in ecclesiastical matters. This leads to a consideration of the matter of authority in church affairs and to the position of the episcopate.

Since the opponents of the settlement of 1559 received the name Puritans, this author will give consideration to the meaning of the word in the decade of the 1560's and contrast it with its later connotations.

The body of the thesis deals with the vestiarian controversy. Here the results of the interaction of the foregoing factors, the religious settlement, the influence of the Marian exiles, the constitutional nature of the settlement, and the Puritan philosophy toward the church, are fully seen.

In the final pages of the thesis the writer will attempt to evaluate the ultimate significance of the factors disclosed in the thesis, and to show their influence
on the evolution of English religious tendencies.
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THE FIRST ELIZABETHAN RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY
PURITANS VERSUS VESTMENTS

CHAPTER I

VESTIARIAN SYMBOLISM AND PURITAN OPPOSITION

Since the use of vestments is the problem around which the controversy of the 1560's rages, it is necessary to give a brief story of their origin, symbolism, and the meaning of the controversy over their use. The group opposed to their use began to be called "Puritans" in this period, so consideration will be given to the meaning of the word.

In the age of the Christian Apostles the followers of Christ met together to repeat the love-feast or common meal, which had been ordained by the Master. There were no formal rules for observing this practice, for it was felt that each person would be moved by the Holy Spirit to do or say the proper thing. Before many years had passed it was found necessary to select individuals from the assembly to preside at these feasts of communion services. No real difference was shown between these persons and the remainder of the congregation. Soon evidences of an hierarchical organization appear, for presbyters and deacons
are mentioned in Scripture. The organized clergy, with differing functions, had appeared. The church or *ecclesia* was evolving as an institution, and bishops or *episcopi* were recognized as having jurisdiction over certain areas, usually surrounding large cities of the Roman Empire. It appears that the dress of these persons was the same as that of the congregation of Christians.

As the Christian religion spread among the peoples of the Greco-Roman world, its organization tended to center in the large provincial capitals. Naturally the adherents continued to wear the Roman-type apparel. This dress changed little in centuries. The vestments worn by the clergy have evolved from this ancient type of dress.

Before many centuries had passed the functions of the clergy became marked and differentiated from those of the laity. The clergy became a ministering body. With this change in function, the distinction in dress between clergy and laity tended to become marked.

In the Christian priesthood there early arose opposition to lay garb. In the sixth century the civil dress of the clergy automatically became different from the dress of the country. The laity changed or departed from the ancient type of dress but the clergy withstood all desire to follow the changes in lay taste. The clergy retained the stately toga and the long, loose tunic. This change did
not come suddenly but was a long evolutionary process. The regulations for clerical dress were gradually enforced, and from the sixth century onward the clergy were forbidden to wear long hair, arms, or purple, and generally, secular dress.¹

The characteristic garb of the Christian clergy, both civil and ecclesiastic, was the long tunic. Originally it appears to have been white. Then its evolution divided; the alb derived from it on the one hand, and on the other, the civil tunic. For the civil costume the toga was added to constitute full dress. For use in inclement weather the casula or cappa, an overcoat, with a cowl, was adopted. For ecclesiastics this evolved into the cope. The long tunic survives as the surplice and the cassock.²

The dress of the sacred world tends to be the reverse of the profane. This difference is an expression of the fundamental opposition between natural and supernatural social functions. The priest has his 'office' to perform. To do it pleasingly and in a decent and orderly manner, he must have the prescribed garb.

Clerical garb therefore takes on the form of a

---

² Loc. cit.
symbolism. With the vestments the priest puts on a 'character' of divinity. He is man but yet something more. Vestments, and the color of the vestments, are changed at the different seasons of the church year. The priest multiplies the divine force by change of vestments and shows the different aspects of divinity. This change of apparel has a strong psychical appeal to the masses of the people. The dress becomes the material link between the person of the priest and that of the supernatural. It is as if the sacred garments infuse the human wearer with a portion of the supernatural power he represents. Vestments can therefore be regarded not as an expression of the personality of the celebrant of the rites, but as imposing upon him a superpersonality. The vestments plus the intoned words and ritualistic acts, make the ceremonies meaningful.

The feeling aroused by ecclesiastical vestments is duplicated in many ways in mundane affairs. The emotion aroused by a national flag, a royal crown, or a martial anthem is as natural and as irrational as that aroused by clerical vestments.

These symbols appeal more directly to the mass of men than the abstractions for which they stand. These

\[3 \text{ Loc. cit.} \]
are more effective instruments of persuasion than any argument; especially with the great majority of persons who are more accustomed to using their sight than their reason. It is logical therefore that as king and crown are symbols of one idea, so the priest and his vestments are the symbols of his office.\footnote{4}{A. F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth 1547-1603, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910, p. 357.}

The Roman Catholic Church uses in all fourteen liturgical vestments: the amice, alb, cincture, maniple, stole, tunicle, dalmatic, chasuble, surplice, cope, sandals, stockings (or buskins), gloves, mitre, pallium, succinctorium, and falcon. These were used by various ecclesiastical persons at various times, but all in connection with the sacrifice of the mass.\footnote{5}{The Catholic Encyclopedia, Charles D. Herbermann and others, ed., New York, Robert Appleman Co., 1912, XV, 388.}

The controversy over the use of vestments was a product of the Protestant Reformation. In 1517 Martin Luther nailed to the door of the castle church of Wittenburg his Ninety-Five Theses which attacked the abuses in the sale of papal indulgences. He was pushed forward in the defense of his position in the ensuing controversy,
and denied some of the doctrines of the church. Within a few years he denied papal headship, the necessity of a mediating clergy, and promulgated the doctrine of justification by faith alone. The influence of the Protestant Reformation was soon felt in England. Henry VIII was at this time a staunch defender of the church, and for his efforts was rewarded with the title "Defender of the Faith" by the pope. In 1527 Henry VIII attempted to secure a divorce from Catherine of Aragon, but negotiations could produce no solution for his desires. In 1529 Henry took the lead in opposing papal and sacerdotal power, which eventually, by action of king and parliament, resulted in the abolition of papal control over the English church and placed it under the king.

Although Henry broke with the Church of Rome, he considered himself a good Catholic in all points of doctrine and ceremonies and would permit no deviation. The heresy laws were enforced with the same severity as before the rupture with Rome.6

In 1547, on the accession of Edward VI, who was a minor, Protestantism was not only permitted but encouraged by the indulgent government. Eminent continental theologians such as Martyr, Bucer, Ochino, and a Lasco, were

---

invited to teach in English universities, especially Cambridge. By this action the reformed religion was to be provided with leaders in the years to come.

With the heavy hand of Henry VIII removed from control in the state, Protestantism was allowed full sway. This new freedom produced factious groups with differing ideas on church doctrine, ceremonies, and polity. Nearly all desired a return to what they considered New Testament usages. These groups were difficult to control and provided problems for the Protector Somerset and for the Duke of Northumberland.

Great changes ensued in church rites when the program of the government of Edward VI was produced. The Prayer Book of 1549, that of the 'second year of the reign of Edward VI,' required that the priest at Holy Communion wear a "white alb plain with a vestment or cope," while the assisting priests and deacons were required to wear "albs and tunicles." The surplice and hood were to be worn at choir services in cathedrals and collegiate churches; bishops were to wear, besides a rochet, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and a pastoral staff was to be borne either by themselves or their chaplains. The

---


8 The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed., 1937, XXIII, 111.
required garments were reduced in the second Prayer Book, that of 1552, a mark of increasing Protestantism. It permitted only the rochet and the surplice. Even this modest requirement raised opposition from a group of churchmen.

It is here, during the reign of Edward VI, that we see the first flash of the Puritan attitude toward vestments. John Hooper, called the father of English Nonconformity, began the cry against the use of vestments. Hooper began his religious life as a monk, but upon the dissolution of the monasteries, came to court. He soon found himself in disagreement with the Henrican religious requirements, and went to the continent. He spent over two years on the continent, visiting Strasbourg and Zurich. He returned to England in 1549 and became chaplain to Protector Somerset. He was by this time extremely radical in his religious ideas. In 1550 his sermons attracted much attention for he not only attacked vestments, but also the ranks of the clergy; for he felt that bishops and priests should be discontinued and only "preachers" permitted. According to his ideas 'bishops and priests do damnable and devilish superstition.' Hooper's sermons before the king, Edward VI, contained the first enunciation of special scruples concerning public worship. He preached rabidly against altars, kneeling at communion, and vestments. The continental
reformers who were teaching in England agreed with Archbishop Cranmer in stating that vestments, kneeling, etc. were only externals. Hooper engaged in violent quarrels about religious questions with his brethren, especially Ridley. 9

Hooper had been offered a bishoperic before this time, for he was a very able man. He was appointed Bishop of Gloucester but refused for over a year to accept the post. He disliked the office of bishops. The Council at last committed him to the Fleet for refusal to accept the office and wear the vestments. After a short period of incarceration he decided to accept the office and admit the "indifference" of the investments. He consented to wear the vestments at his consecration, which took place March 8, 1551, although he rarely wore them afterwards. He became a good and very strict bishop. He was especially zealous in enforcing uniformity. 10

The troubles in the reign of Edward VI were an open lesson to the young Elizabeth who would come to the throne in a few years. She saw that she could anticipate trouble with out-and-out Protestantism. It was also apparent from the reaction to Edward VI's religious program

9 Dixon, III, 217.
10 Ibid., p. 179 et seq.
that the people would accept a conservative and sensible settlement of religion.

Upon the death of Edward VI, in 1553, his sister Mary ascended the throne. She was a devout Catholic and very soon restored the papal jurisdiction. With this accomplished, full Catholic doctrine and rites returned and, as we shall see, many of the advanced Protestants left England.

The Elizabethan Prayer Book, that of 1559, restored, at least in theory, the requirements of the Prayer Book of 1549. The Act of Uniformity stated:

Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers there- of, shall be retained and be in use, as was in the Church of England...in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, until other order shall be there- in taken by the authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of her commissioners...for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realm.11

This regulation in the Act was to lead to the controversy over vestments in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign. Many of the clergy refused to obey, or scrupled at obeying, the vestment injunction of the Act. Many of the nonconforming clergy remembered the embryonic vesti- arian controversy under Edward VI, or had been exiles

under Mary and came into contact with continental ideas on rites and ceremonies.

The group of persons who refused to accept the Elizabethan religious settlement are usually called "Puritans," and it is our problem to understand the meaning of the word in the decade of the 1560's; the period with which this study principally deals.

In the *New English Dictionary* the word "Puritan" is defined as: "A member of that party of English Protestants who regarded the reformation of the Church under Elizabeth as incomplete, and called for its further 'purification' from what they considered to be unscriptural and corrupt forms and ceremonies retained from the unreformed church; subsequently, often applied to any who separated from the established church on points of ritual, polity, or doctrine, held by them to be at variance with 'pure' New Testament principles." It can be seen that the definition gains in comprehensiveness in the course of events.

Thomas Fuller, writing in 1655, makes the following statements in regard to the origin and meaning of the

---

word Puritan: "The English Bishops conceiving themselves impowered by their canons, began to shew their authority in urging the clergy of their diocese to subscribe to the Liturgie, Ceremonies, and Discipline of the Church, and such as refused the same were branded by the odious name of Puritans...Puritan here was taken for the opposers of the Hierarchie and church service as resenting superstition. But prophane mouths quickly improved this Nick-name, therewith on every occasion to abuse pious people."\textsuperscript{13} Fuller places the first use of the word in 1564. John Stowe puts the date somewhat later. Writing in July, 1567, he states: "About that time were many congregations of Anabryptysts in London, who cawlyd themeslvs Puritans or Unspottygd Lambs of the Lord."\textsuperscript{14}

It is extremely difficult to say exactly when the word came into use, but Fuller's date of 1564 is usually accepted.\textsuperscript{15} Regardless of the exact date, we know that

\textsuperscript{13} Thomas Fuller, \textit{The Church History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the year 1648}, London, John Williams, 1655, Book IX, 76, paragraphs 66, 67.


\textsuperscript{15} A. P. Scott Pearson, \textit{Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism}, Cambridge, University Press, 1925, p. 18, see footnote 5.
people of the Puritan persuasion existed long before 1564, as we have seen in Hooper's case.

In Elizabethan usage the name Puritan was applied impartially to any and all who condemned the theory and practice of the established church. These Puritans felt that the religious settlement had been too timorously wrought, and for spiritual reasons, desired the removal of unreformed survivals which, as they believed, hindered the church's spiritual ministry to its own members and the church's spiritual impression upon the world. The reform which these Puritans had in mind would be patterned after that of Geneva. At this time the Puritans believed fully in the maintenance of one national church. Neal, seeing Puritanism after its full development, states in his History, "A Puritan was a man of severe morals, a Calvinist in doctrine, and a Non-conformist to ceremonies and discipline of the church, though they did not totally separate from it."

Neal includes in his definition nearly all the

---


18 Daniel Neal, History of the Puritans, New York, Harper and Bros., 1848, I, x.
attributes of the Puritan, except the political. It should be pointed out that in the decade of the 1560's the term does not have the connotation it acquires in the later years of the sixteenth and in the seventeenth centuries. In this period it has no reference to those qualities of character and mind which the seventeenth century attached to the name.\(^{19}\) Thomas Cartwright often repudiates the name Puritan for his party; he repels the charge that the party is strait in life. He states that they introduce no monachism or anchorism; they eat and drink and are appareled like other men, and use the same recreation.\(^{20}\)

The definitions of the word Puritan given by the various writers vary little except in points of emphasis. John Strype states simply that they were a rank of Protestants that required further reformation and attacked the establishment through books and libels and by frequent bills and addresses in parliament.\(^{21}\) Maitland states that Puritans were those who strove for a worship purified from all taint of popery (and who therefore were known as "Puritans"), scrupled the cap and gown that were to be worn by

\(^{19}\) Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

\(^{20}\) Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-89.

the clergy in daily life, and "scrupled" the surplice that was to be worn in the church. This definition comes nearest the meaning of the word in the decade of the 1560's.

It is evident that in the period of this study, the word "Puritan" encompasses only those who refuse to accept the settlement of religion of 1559 as final. The name, as Fuller points out, began as a term of reproach. Archbishop Parker had his own names for these people. He termed them "precise folks," precessionists," or "silly recusants."  

The only moral factors which are evident at this period and which also appear in the seventeenth century are their problems of conscience, their earnestness, and their insistence upon biblical warrant for actions in the church. The Puritans were earnest, and could also be violent in their condemnations, as is shown by the words of Anthony Gilby in regard to vestments: "They are known liveries of AntiChrist, accursed leaven of the Blasphemous Popish Priesthood, cursed patches of Popery, and Idolatry, they are worse than lousey, for they are the sibbe

---


23 John Bruce and T. Perowne, eds., Correspondence of Matthew Parker, Cambridge, University Press, 1853, p. 271, Parker to Cecil, March 28, 1566.
to the sarke of Hercules that made him tear his own bow-
els asunder."24

These Puritans had not as yet developed that
spiritual outlook, way of life, and mode of expression
which eventually characterized their party.25

It is difficult to understand the Puritan abhor-
rence of vestments but this split over their use was
basic and went to the roots of religious belief. The
Catholic conception was that of the church as an insti-
tution which seeks to work inward toward a spiritual
religion by the influence of its rites and ceremonies.
It followed that the rites themselves were efficacious
regardless of the feeling of the individual, that is,
the rites became opus operatum. The Puritans held the
reverse belief. They would begin with the individual,
and his personal spiritual life, from which the church
and its manifold activities are evolved as products.
The church to these Puritans was the 'mystical body of
Christ,' which was made up of all believers. They de-
nied the efficacy of the rites and denied the right of
the church as

24 Fuller, op. cit., Book IX, 76, paragraph 70.
25 William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, New
an institution to ordain them. 26

The Puritans felt that the vestments were "Aaronic," that is, associated with the idea of a sacrifice—the Catholic dogma of the Sacrifice of the Altar. They believed them the "garb of Anti-Christs," that is, Rome. They had been dedicated to idolatry in their eyes and therefore logically their use should be discontinued and the vestments themselves destroyed.

Finally the Puritans argued that the vestments were unnecessary and superstitious. Even though it was expressly stated by law that no special honor, or holiness, was to be ascribed to the vestments, this did not quiet the clamor against them. The Puritans retorted that the vestments 'offend weak brethren and encourage stout papists' and should therefore be done away with.

As we shall see in the study of the Elizabethan vestiarian controversy itself, and in the appeals to the foreign divines, the problem turned on the matter of the "indifference" of the vestments. The divines of Zurich, who were Calvinistic in doctrine, stated plainly that one must obey the magistrate when the order was not definitely contrary to Holy Scripture—therefore the crown

26 Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, IX, 382.
could order rites and ceremonies. The divines stated that they did not like or approve the use of vestments, but for good order in the church, and for the liberty of preaching, the orders should be obeyed. They capped their arguments by stating that in themselves the vestments were merely externals and therefore their use was a matter of indifference.

Regardless of all debate on the question of the use of these vestments, some of the Puritans felt that although they were "permissible," that did not mean that they should be used. They could not conscientiously wear them while performing their functions. In the end, as we shall see, some gave up their positions in the establishment rather than conform.
CHAPTER II

THE ELIZABETHAN RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT:
CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

In the Palace of St. James on November 17, 1558 Mary Tudor died. Two hours later the Lords of the Council proceeded to Westminster, where the parliament was in session, and proclaimed the twenty-five year old Elizabeth Tudor, Queen of England. The announcement of the accession of the new queen to the city of London was hailed with manifestations of joy. 27 This joy was in expectation of religious change and peace.

Elizabeth had been well educated and was essentially a child of the Renaissance. She had also received a religious education, but her education was based on the New Learning, and not on the scholasticism of medieval times. Elizabeth was proficient in many languages for as Roger Ascham, who writes rather extravagantly of his queen and pupil states: "I will now only state in addition, that neither at court, nor in the universities, nor among our heads in church or state, are there four of

our countrymen who understand Greek better than the queen herself...I was one day present, when she replied at the same time to three ambassadors, the Imperial, French, and Swedish, in three languages; Italian to the one, French to the other, Latin to the third; easily, without hesitation, clearly, and without being confused, to the various subjects thrown out, as is usual, in their discourses."

The queen had learned more from life about statecraft than she had from books. She had lived through violent religious changes; the Anglo-Catholicism of her father, the advanced Protestantism of her brother, and had been at least a nominally practicing Catholic under her sister Mary. This was no mean feat in itself and had required a great deal of circumspection. She had seen the results of advanced Protestantism under the weak rule of her brother Edward VI, and this experience certainly tended to make her cautious in seeking religious change and tenacious of her royal prerogative in ecclesiastical matters. Regardless of this, for its full effects would appear only with experience, the Protestants had great

---

hopes at her accession and seemed to have no doubts about her intentions. Rodolph Gualter, a leading minister of Zurich, wrote to her on January 16, 1559, calling her "a new star which God has caused to rise" and complimented her for what she had already begun—the return to the faith of her father and brother, but in such hopes of ardent Protestant partisanship in the young queen they were doomed to disappointment. It was Elizabeth's desire to settle the religious situation in such a fashion that the religious issues would no longer be burning political issues. The safety of her throne was the paramount problem; all else was subordinated to it.

Elizabeth had to keep a delicate balance between domestic actions and foreign reactions. She had to be careful not to offend her brother-in-law Philip II of Spain, the most powerful monarch in the world of that day, and a staunch advocate of religious orthodoxy. When

29 Ibid., p. 1, Sir Anthony Cok to Bullinger, December 8, 1558.

30 Ibid., p. 3, Rodolph Gualter to Queen Elizabeth, January 16, 1559.

31 Clark, op. cit., I, 156.

she came to the throne the nation was at war and she had to move cautiously until the peace was signed at Cateau-Cambresis. During the progress of the negotiations she signed herself, in letters to Philip, as his "sister and perpetual confederate." Her policy was one of extreme caution in which she weighed every possibility.

Elizabeth seems to have had no real religious convictions but she was a consummate actress, as Bacon shows: "In religion Elizabeth was pious and moderate, and constant, and adverse to innovation...if she chanced even in common talk to speak of God, she almost always both gave him the title of her Maker, and composed her eyes and countenance to an expression of humility and reverence; a thing which I have myself often observed. Of the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers, especially those of St. Augustine, she was a great reader."

Upon her accession she immediately appointed William Cecil her principal secretary. He was a Cambridge man and had studied law at Grey's Inn. He had been Protector Somerset's secretary and was a well-known Protestant. He had conformed to religion as by law established under Mary and had been used by her on some diplomatic

---

missions. As he had conformed in religious matters under Mary, he might expect others to conform to religion as established under Elizabeth. He took his oath of office November 20, 1558, and Elizabeth said to him, "This judgment I have of you, that you will not be corrupted with any manner of gifts, and that you will be faithful to the state." 34 Cecil was faithful for he remained in his position until the day of his death in 1598. 35 With Cecil's advice the queen formed her new council. 36 Within a month the composition of the council had changed decisively; for of the old council, only eight had places on the new. 37 Elizabeth's other great minister, Sir Nicholas Bacon, came in as Lord Keeper of the Great Seal. He was also a Cambridge man with Protestant views, but had conformed and held office under Mary. He was a great friend of Cecil's and had also studied law at Grey's Inn. It can be seen in the case of both Cecil and Bacon that they were not radical, unbending Protestants, but were fundamentally conservative in religious matters, and could be expected to advise the queen to shape her

34 Frere, op. cit., p. 2.
36 Birt, op. cit., p. 12.
37 Dixon, V, 25.
religious settlement along such conservative lines. It is also interesting to note that they suggested the appointment of a religious conservative, Matthew Parker, to be archbishop of Canterbury. One of Bacon's early duties was to inform his friend Parker that he had been so chosen.  

In the proclamation of Elizabeth's accession an innocent-looking change was made in the royal style. She was proclaimed on November 18 as "Queen of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc." The "etc" replaced the title 'Supreme Head' and seems to have been planned by Cecil and the queen beforehand. This seemed to indicate that the queen would refuse the title of 'Supreme Head,' as events proved she did. The idea of the monarch being called supreme head caused searching of hearts among the advanced Protestants.

In many personal acts the queen showed her displeasure with the Romanists, especially those who had

40 Frere, op. cit., p. 3.
41 Zurich Letters, I, 1. Thomas Sampson to Peter Martyr, December 17, 1558.
been active in the last reign. When she arrived in London, she refused to permit Bishop Bonner to kiss her hand. On Christmas day, 1558, she ordered Bishop Oglethorpe not to elevate the host in her presence. At the opening of parliament, as Elizabeth approached the Abbey, the last of the abbots, Feckenham, came to meet her with monks and candles; she said, "Away with those torches, we can see well enough." 42 At this time she also listened to the zealous reforming sermon of the former exile, Dr. Cox. 43 Philip II's sharp-eyed ambassador, Count de Feria, noted these evidences of changes to come and reported them to his master. 44

In the meantime the plans had been well laid for the new settlement. These plans were being laid not by ecclesiastics but by statesmen and lawyers. 45 The council was divided into five committees, with other persons of state not in the council, for certain definite purposes. One committee was "for the consideration of all things necessary for the parliament." This group may have produced the "Device for the Alteration of Religion,"


43 Dixon, V, 52.

44 Birt, op. cit., p. 19.

45 Frere, op. cit., p. 4.
although Strype thinks it was written by Sir Thomas Smith, a member of the committee. In this instrument the dangers involved are clearly seen. By the question and answer method, the work to be done, the method to be used, the persons, time, and place were clearly set forth. The 'Device' urged parliamentary action to restore the church to its former status under the crown. The 'Device' suggested that the alteration be planned at once and that a committee be formed to plan the religious change in detail, which plan could be presented to parliament. 47

This committee suggested by the 'Device' consisted of Dr. Bill, Dr. Parker, Cox, May, Pilkington, Whitehead, and Grindal; to which was later added Sandys and Guest. It met at the home of Sir Thomas Smith in Cannon Row, Westminster, and was under his general supervision. Smith was a doctor of civil law and an outstanding lawyer of the period. He was educated at Cambridge, and had been a professor of civil law there. He was acknowledged by all to be an upright and scholarly gentleman. He had been a strong supporter of Somerset during Edward

47 Dixon, V, 20-21; Frere, op. cit., p. 5.
VI's reign. This committee revised the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. It was here that the book was tempered somewhat by the omission of the petition against "the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities." 49

Another document of lesser importance, which was written before the 'Device,' but which is equally valuable in showing the feelings of the court, was Richard Goodrich's "Divers Points of Religion Contrary to the Church of Rome." Goodrich had studied at Cambridge and at Grey's Inn, was a member of the committee of the council, and a member of parliament. He had also been active under Edward VI. 50 His ideas were extremely cautious. He felt that no definite innovation in religion should be made even in parliament. The royal supremacy was stated in the document. It gives proof of the determination of the government to make a change. 51 It can be


49 Dixon, V, 23.


51 Dixon, V, 25 et seq.
seen that the 'Device' was much more advanced than Goodrich's recommendations.

While all of these plans were being laid behind the scenes, in preparation for the coming parliament, the people were being aroused against the papists and in favor of change by the Protestants and the returned exiles. Elizabeth found it necessary to issue a proclamation against preaching on December 27, 1558.\footnote{52} It added that any alteration, except the Gospel and Epistle and the Ten Commandments, together with the Litany, the Lord's Supper, and the Creed, which were to be said in English, must wait "until consultation may be had by parliament, by her Majesty and her three estates of this realm."\footnote{53} The mention of the "three estates" was to inform the spiritual lords that they would have a vote on the matter.

Within a month of this proclamation Elizabeth's first parliament met. It began its sittings on January 25, 1559. Convocation assembled at Westminster on January 24, 1559. Here the clergy showed unanimity in opposing any alteration in religion. They drew up a formal protest against any alteration and this was later en-


\footnote{53} Gee and Hardy, p. 416 et seq.
endorsed by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The fears of these bodies were quickly realized.\footnote{54}

The mood of the government was evident to all soon after the parliament had met. The speech in the House of Lords by Lord Chancellor Bacon was distinctly Protestant in tenor.\footnote{55} The doomed church made a valiant struggle against its own extinction. The struggle took place in the House of Lords. The bills introduced concerning religion did not face great difficulty in the House of Commons. The records of this parliament are incomplete and there has been much controversy over the question of whether or not it was packed. Authorities differ completely on the point.\footnote{56}

The bills creating the settlement of religion had a tempestuous life in parliament. Great differences appeared between the two houses. A bill reviving the royal supremacy and the Edwardian Acts of Uniformity was introduced but in the face of opposition the program was split into two parts: the Bill of Supremacy and the Bill

\footnote{54} Gee, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 3.
\footnote{55} Dixon, V, 53.
of Uniformity. The spiritual lords were against both bills. 57 The Bill of Supremacy finally passed the two houses by April 29 and after several changes was entitled, "An Act Restoring to the Crown the Ancient Jurisdiction of the State Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, and Abolishing all Foreign Power Repugnant to the Same." (1 Elizabeth, c. I) The Bill of Uniformity was introduced February 16 but was not finally passed until April 28. It suffered many changes in its title but it ended as, "An Act for the Unity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church and Administration of the Sacraments." 58 The bill did not receive a single clerical vote in its favor. 59

The Act of Uniformity was to take effect June 24, 1559, that is, the feast of St. John the Baptist. Penalties were put into the Act for using any other service or for depraving the service. The archbishops and bishops were empowered to make use of church censures, or justices, in conjunction with the bishops, were allowed to hear and determine cases brought before them, in order to carry out Uniformity. 60 Since any other service in

57 Loc. cit.
58 Gee, op. cit., pp. 9-29. Both Acts, fully titled, are to be found here, appended to Chapter I.
59 Birt, op. cit., p. 91.
60 Gee, op. cit., pp. 8-9.
the church was expressly declared to be illegal, the Act made the church inelastic and unable to develop along the lines wished for by the more advanced reformers. The only hope which existed for them was that the queen would take 'further order' and reform the rites and ceremonies. We may infer that the revision of the Prayer Book of Edward VI, which was made a part of the Act of Uniformity, was the one prepared by the committee which met at the home of Sir Thomas Smith shortly after the accession of Elizabeth.

In the Act of Supremacy much trouble was taken to substitute 'supreme governor' for 'supreme head.' The queen was entitled "supreme governor as well in all matters ecclesiastical as temporal." The queen had refused to take the former title, 'out of humility,' as Cecil told the House of Commons. Yet the Act expressly revived a statute (37 Henry VIII, c. 17) where it was declared that 'the king is and has always been, by word of God, supreme head in earth of the Church of England.' A divine right such as this could not be abolished by act of parliament. Regardless of the title, she was supreme,

---

61 Birt, op. cit., p. 83.
63 Birt, op. cit., p. 83.
undisputed sovereign over church and state alike. 64

Before parliament had finished its work, Sir Thomas Cook had written to Peter Martyr stating: "We are now busy in Parliament about expelling the tyranny of the pope, and restoring the royal authority, and re-establishing the true religion. But we are moving far too slowly..." 65 The Protestants had great expectations. Richard Hilles writing to Henry Bullinger in Zurich on February 28, 1559, said: "Nothing has yet been publicly determined with respect to the abolishing of the popish superstition, and the re-establishing of the Christian religion. There is however a general expectation that all rites and ceremonies will shortly be reformed by our faithful citizens and other godly men in the parliament." 66 It is evident from these excerpts that the Protestants expected more than they received in the way of radical change. The rites and ceremonies were not changed to their satisfaction.

The exact wording of the Oath of Supremacy included in the Act of Supremacy is as follows:

I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that the queen's highness is the only

64 Pollard, op. cit., p. 212.
66 Ibid., p. 16.
supreme governor of this realm, and of all other her highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, has, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the queen's highness, and her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges, and authorities granted or belonging to the queen's highness, her heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm. So help me God, and by the contents of this book.\textsuperscript{67}

The Act of Supremacy treats the royal supremacy as an ancient authority of the crown, recovered by the legislation of Henry VIII, and now once more restored after being resigned by Mary. All spiritual jurisdiction heretofore lawfully exercised in the realm was annexed to the crown forever. The Act empowered the crown to issue commissions from time to time to exercise the royal authority. All persons in receipt of stipends from the crown were required to take the Oath of Supremacy, recognizing and accepting the queen as 'only supreme governor.'\textsuperscript{68} The Act explicitly bestows on the sovereign ecclesiastical power—in almost the same words as the

\textsuperscript{67} Gee and Hardy, p. 449.

\textsuperscript{68} Keir, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 80.
first Supremacy Act of Henry VIII. The enactments in regard to religion say nowhere that the supremacy is purely temporal. Nowhere is the ecclesiastical jurisdiction previously expressed or conferred expressly abolished.\textsuperscript{70}

The problem of 'authority' in ecclesiastical matters caused much misunderstanding and trepidation on the part of the clerics and parliament soon after the settlement had been reached. The exact power of the archbishops and bishops was left undefined.

As the church evolved into an institution the episcopate gained many powers. Originally the bishops held independent power over their dioceses for they were elected by the people as overseers for a definite area. This election, with the passage of time, came to be intrusted to the chapters of the cathedrals. The nominees for the bishoprics were proposed to the chapters by the pope or by the king, as the church became feudalized. The person nominated was nearly always elected by the chapter. In the meantime the bishops had lost much of their independent power, for their elections had to be confirmed and


\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., p. 258.
the pallium bestowed, by the Holy See. The authority of the individual bishops could always be overruled by the papal representatives, called legates.

The bishop had four main powers or responsibilities. (1) He set the conditions under which persons might enter communion with the church, and he confirmed those who met the conditions. (2) He had the authority to set rules of conduct for those who aspired to become Christians and for those already Christians; and the clergy. (3) The bishops sat as judges, although, later, ecclesiastical lawyers were appointed as the bishop's representatives, and cut off from communion those who failed to live up to the moral precepts of the church, or those who would not obey church law. The laity could be excommunicated for serious infractions of the rules. The clergy were suspended from the practice of their functions, or deposed for their infractions. These actions were taken, in theory, for the benefit of the souls of the persons so disciplined. (4) The bishop had the power to impose penitential works upon the excommunicated or deposed, before they would be admitted again into full communion.71

These powers included the power to examine, ordain, and license priests or ministers. The bishop, as overseer of his diocese, had the power to visit all churches under his jurisdiction and inquire into all church matters.72

In the Elizabethan religious settlement the bishops recovered something of their lost independent authority when they were freed from subordination to the papacy. The exact power of the bishops was not defined, as has been pointed out, but when we look at the actions of the bishops after the settlement, we find them using all of the powers they possessed under the old religion. Although only in the Act of Uniformity was it plainly stated that the bishops had the power to use church censures, it was evidently to be understood that they should continue to use their historic authority. There is no doubt but that Elizabeth wanted a strong episcopate, for she had seen the results of radical Protestantism under Edward VI, but one which would in all matters be subordinate to the royal will. As we shall see in the next section, Elizabeth failed to support the archbishop in his efforts to secure uniformity, evidently feeling that he had all necessary powers to carry out the program, or

72 Cecilia Ady, The English Church, and How It Works, London, Faber and Faber, 1940, pp. 32-33.
that he could use the extraordinary power of the Commission for Causes Ecclesiastical. The archbishop was in no sense so certain that he held such power.

There are two branches to the meaning of authority in ecclesiastical matters; the one is *potestas jurisdictionis*, the power of jurisdiction over the church and all members of it, and the other is *potestas ordinis*, the power of holy orders which springs from consecration and ordination. The crown never claimed *potestas ordinis*. In spite of the general expression 'authority' used in the first Supremacy Act of Henry VIII, there was never ascribed to the king the ecclesiastical power which springs from consecration. This was acknowledged by Henry VIII in a letter to Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, in 1553. On the other hand, with the 'jurisdiction' which passes to him, passed also the sovereign power to make ordinances touching spiritual matters and the right to supreme control in ecclesiastical administration. 73 Therefore it can be seen that the use of *potestas jurisdictionis* often made the difference unreal, for although the ruler did not administer the sacraments, for example, he could decide what sacraments should be

73 Ibid., p. 255.
administered. Elizabeth emphasized in the Injunctions of 1559 that supremacy did not imply acceptance of an "authority and power of ministry of divine service in the church." It meant only "under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries...." 74 In the final analysis the prelates were almost completely dependent upon royal favor in carrying out any policy, or putting down any schism.

There are two positions which can be defended in regard to the constitutional question in the royal supremacy. One is that the royal supremacy over the church was entirely different in kind from its authority in secular affairs. In other words the parliament had restored and recognized the authority, but the crown, once in possession, could use it without parliament, through ecclesiastical channels exclusively, and without any reference to parliament except such as it chose to make.

The other position is that there was no constitutional difference between the authority of the crown over the church and any other department of the royal power. It was vested in the crown by parliament; it could in the

74 Gee and Hardy, p. 417 et seq., "The Injunctions of Elizabeth--1559."
last resort be abridged or restricted by parliament. The only conception which was not put into the argument, was that the church possessed an authority independent alike of crown and parliament. 75

There can be no doubt where Elizabeth stood on this constitutional question; indeed, it probably posed no question for her. She took the position that initiative in ecclesiastical affairs was a part of the prerogative of the crown. She ordered policies to be carried out by the ecclesiastical officers, even, as we have seen, to ordering Bishop Oglethorpe not to elevate the host in her presence. She later ordered parliament not to consider legislating on ecclesiastical matters. 76

Time was soon to prove to Elizabeth the difficulty of exercising the royal supremacy, even through reformed ecclesiastical channels. The reformed church advanced pretensions to regulate its own affairs by its own actions. As we shall see, a very active group would have gone on to further reformation on the continental model. 77

75 Loc. cit.
76 Frere, op. cit., pp. 133, 161.
77 Keir, op. cit., p. 88.
The effects of the use of the royal prerogative are fully seen in the vestiarian controversy. The queen's policy of enforcing uniformity with the established forms through ecclesiastical channels, led to the ultimate failure of the program. The first reformed Convocation of 1563 made claims to innovate on its own authority. 78

The Supremacy Act gave to the queen power to appoint commissioners by letters patent under the great seal to exercise under the crown all manner of jurisdictions and to visit, reform, redress, correct, and amend all errors, heresies, and schisms which might come within the scope of the spiritual or ecclesiastical power. 79 The Commission was to ensure the operation of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. It was an administrative body, a disciplinary court for clergy and laity, and was used to suppress heterodox Protestants, as we shall see in a later chapter. 80

Commissions of this type had been appointed before this time. In the history of these Commissions, there


80 Makower, op. cit., p. 262.
was no important change either in 1559, when the Act of Supremacy was passed, nor in 1565, when Elizabeth's religious settlement was firmly established. The High Commission of 1559 seemed the first to later generations because it was the first empowered by a religious settlement which was itself permanent. These Commissioners were the first who had an opportunity to turn their attention to anything but the maintenance of the royal supremacy and the pressing needs of a new religious settlement. After 1559 the Commissioners held office rather permanently, and developed traditions and judicial forms, which, in time, caused contemporaries to call the session of "Her Majesty's Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical" the "Court of High Commission." The High Commission was an evolution, therefore, and not a 'creation' of 1559. The first Commission was appointed by the queen July 19, 1559. The first Commissioners were Matthew Parker, Archbishop-elect of Canterbury, and Edmund Grindal, Bishop-elect of London. They were charged by the queen to carry into execution the Acts of Uniformity of Common Prayers and for restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction of the state ecclesiastical. On January

82 Ibid., p. 30.
83 Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1547-1580, p. 134.
22, 1561, the queen ordered the Commission to alter certain letters of the Prayer Book and to substitute others in their place. She also ordered Latin copies of the Book of Common Prayer to be used in collegiate churches.\footnote{Ibid., p. 170.}

The royal power over ecclesiastical affairs was complete. The Convocations could issue binding laws only with the consent of the crown; whereas the crown exercised an uncontrolled right to settle by ordinance the affairs of the church. Appeal lay from the decisions of the church courts to a civil tribunal, while the crown was supreme in the High Commission Court.\footnote{Makower, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 97.}

The Bills of Supremacy and Uniformity received the royal assent May 8, 1559, and little time was wasted in putting them into execution. In a short period of time the old church ceased to exist as an open, organized force.\footnote{John Hungerford Pollen, \textit{The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth}, London, Longmans Green and Co., 1920, p. 35.}

According to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity the new ritual was to come into force June 24, 1559. It was used in the queen's chapel on May 12, and
was introduced into St. Paul's by Bishop Grindal on May 15.\textsuperscript{87} By June 26 seven bishops had been deprived for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy. The remaining ones, except the Bishop of Llandaff who subscribed, were removed by September 28.\textsuperscript{88} The deprived bishops were treated leniently, on the whole, being permitted to retire into private life. Elizabeth had no desire to make martyrs of them. Thus within three months the ancient hierarchy had tumbled to the ground and the lower clergy and laity were left leaderless and without plans for resistance to the change.\textsuperscript{89} The remainder of the clergy offered little resistance to the royal will. The majority acquiesced in the settlement. After exhaustive research in the bishop's registers, Mr. Gee states that the number deprived was not more than 200.\textsuperscript{90}

This surrender on the part of the clergy was little less than a debacle. Jewel wrote that "the ranks of the papists have fallen almost of their own accord."\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{87} Dixon, V, 124.

\textsuperscript{88} Gee, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 30-38 \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{89} Pollen, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 36-37.

\textsuperscript{90} Gee, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 247.

The opposition of the laity was very faint; they raised no protests, organized no resistance, and looked on with little show of disapproval as the changes were being made. It is to be doubted if the average Englishman of the period understood the deeper significance of the change. He still went to his parish church and the only significant change was that the services were read in English, which he could understand, rather than in Latin. The practice of the old religion never completely died out, but simply went underground and was protected, in some cases, by the great Catholic lay lords.

Constitutionally the Elizabethan settlement had been made. It was now the task of the government to see that it was put into practice. The episcopate was nearly empty, for only one of the Catholic bishops had decided to accept the settlement. It was necessary for Elizabeth to fill the vacant positions with men of reformed ideas who were loyal to her. It was now clear that England was not to be Roman Catholic. The great question was, would the form adopted be one which the "true Protestant" would acclaim as his own?

The man selected by the queen and Cecil for the

92 Pollen, op. cit., p. 43.
93 Black, op. cit., p. 18.
Primacy has received the plaudits of both Catholic and Protestant historians for his outstanding character and scholarship. As Birt states when discussing the various bishoprics: "The See of Canterbury brings us into contact with Matthew Parker, and we at once pass into a purer and sweeter atmosphere...as he was the first of the line of Elizabethan prelates, so he was undoubtedly the most distinguished, both for his learning and statesmanship, and for his personal qualities."

Parker was well liked by the queen. He had been chaplain to both her mother, Anne Boleyn, and her father. He had also had considerable administrative experience in the University of Cambridge and in the church. He had been master of Corpus Christi College and vice-chancellor of the University. The highest position he had held in the church was that of dean of Lincoln. During Mary's reign he had gone into seclusion with his wife and family. He was married from place to place by the authorities and in one instance had a fall from a horse which maimed him for the rest of his life.

---

94 Birt, op. cit., p. 471.

many of the clerics, who had been exiles, garnered on the continent.

Parker's nomination was engineered by his two great friends Cecil and Nicholas Bacon.\textsuperscript{96} Bacon wrote to Parker on December 9, 1558, telling him that he was wanted for some important affairs. Parker surmised what was in store for him. He had no desire for advancement in the church. Parker wrote to Bacon telling him that he desired simply,

...to be enabled, by the revenue of some prebend, without charge of cure or of government, to occupy himself to dispense God's word among the simple strayed sheep of God's fold in poor destitute parishes and cures; more meet...for his decayed voice and small quality, than in theatrical and great audience...if he might be bolder with him, to disclose his desire, of all places in England he would wish to bestow most of his time in the University...in his heart he had rather have such a thing as Bene't College, and a living of twenty nobles a year at most, than to dwell in the deanery of Lincoln, which was two hundred at least. He entreated him, either to help that he be quite forgotten, or else so appointed, that he were not entangled now of new with the concourse of the world, in any respect of public state of living.\textsuperscript{97}

On December 30, 1558, Cecil wrote a peremptory letter, in the queen's name, that she planned to use him in certain matters of importance, and ordered him

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., p. 71.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., p. 72.
to come to London at the sight of the letter to await the queen's pleasure. Parker pleaded ill health but upon receipt of another letter from Bacon, went to London. He stayed only a short time because of his health. Parker again pleaded to be forgotten for the preferment. Bacon wrote to him on May 17, 1559, and advised him to "commit to the judgment of his friends his ability or disability, to serve where and when he should be called." Shortly thereafter the Council ordered him to London with all possible speed. Parker wrote a letter to the queen asking not to be forced into this office, but the appeal was to no avail. Only in one respect did he displease the queen: he was married, and she preferred a celibate clergy. Parker had known the great protagonists of the English reformation—Crammer, Bucer, Latimer, and Ridley, for he was nearly fifty years old when he was called to the Primatial See of Canterbury. Parker was a scholar and was distinguished from many of his fellow workers by his love for medieval antiquities and his encouragement of historical scholarship.

\[98\] Ibid., p. 73.  
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\[101\] D. N. E., XLIII, "Matthew Parker" by J. B. Mullinger; Pollard, op. cit., p. 216; Gee, op. cit., p. 156.
License was given by the queen to the Chapter of Canterbury by congé d'élie to elect the archbishop in July. August 1 Doctor Parker became the elect of Canterbury. On December 17, 1559, he was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel by Bishops Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins. With Matthew Parker seated in the chair of St. Augustine, it was not difficult to fill the other bishoprics. On the whole the bishoprics were filled by learned men, many of whom had been exiles under Mary. Jewel went to Salisbury, Cox to Ely, Grindal to London, Parkhurst to Norwich, Horne to Winchester, Sandys to Worcester, and Pilkington to Durham, to name but a few of the more important. Even at this early date some scrupled at taking service in the establishment. No other archbishop of Canterbury ever elevated so many men to bishoprics, as did Matthew Parker.

Parker faced enormous difficulties in his new position. His task was to put the Elizabethan settlement into

102 Dixon, V, 198-248. Archbishop Parker's consecration is fully attested. For a complete discussion and refutation of the "Nag's Head" fable, the story that Parker was consecrated in that Inn, see the pages cited above.
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effect. He had to accept many men for positions of leadership in the church who were far more advanced Protestants than he. The church as yet had no established views and Parker, the queen, and her advisers desired a church outwardly at least, modeled after the old church. To many of the advanced Protestants this was anathema.

This divergence of opinion by these and other men from the establishment was to cause great trouble and heartrending for Dr. Parker. Not only did he have to face opposition from the Catholics but also from these advanced Protestants who were coming to light, especially over the use of vestments by the clergy. These controversies which began over rites and clothes in the 1560's led to the controversy of the 1570's over polity, until at last Presbyterians and Episcopalians stood arrayed against each other. 105

In a later section of the thesis we will investigate the beginnings of this Puritan movement as seen in the vestiarian controversy. Archbishop Parker had the unpleasant work of forcing conformity to the established order. He was forced into this position by the queen and left practically unsupported. In truth he disliked all controversy, but his position as Primate, and as a member

of the Commission for Causes Ecclesiastical, made it impossible for him to escape his duty. Therefore he will be the main character running through the study of this controversy over the use of vestments.
CHAPTER III

THE VESTIARIAN CONTROVERSY: ARCHBISHOP VERSUS EXILES

Doctor Matthew Parker took his seat as Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Metropolitan, and proceeded with his primary task of carrying out the religious settlement in the face of great difficulties, and with no support from the queen. Much of his time was consumed in seeing that the royal supremacy was upheld. This took the form of action against Catholics who refused to adhere to the settlement. He had little time or inclination to molest Protestants who did not adhere strictly to the letter of the law, though it was evident to all that they were deviating from the requirements of the Act of Uniformity in regard to vestments. The root of this problem is found in the attitude of the returned Marian exiles, and in the attitude of those who had been influenced by Hooper's denunciation of vestments during Edward VI's reign.

In 1554 a group of clerics and country gentlemen left England as a faction but they returned in 1558 as a party. "They returned augmented in numbers, allied to party ends, experienced in self-government untrammelled of bishops; trained in effective propaganda; and actuated by a political philosophy which looked askance at the
prerogative of kings." When the first group of clergy and students left England they had suffered no persecution. The emigration was inaugurated as a voluntary movement, and directed to the fulfilment of a clearly conceived purpose. Both Cecil and Bishop Gardiner appear as collaborators in the program. It seemed a practical solution of the religious problem. There were two main movements of the exiles. The first group went to Germany where they set themselves up in communities at Basle, Geneva, Aarau, Emden, Wesel, Zurich, Strasbourg, and Frankfort. The second group of exiles went to France and settled mainly in Rouen and Caen. In these places they found mainly strict Calvinistic and Zwinglian churches which were stripped of all traces of popery and which, in many cases, controlled the political life of the cities. Here the exiles indulged in quarrels among themselves over rites and ceremonies. The English church at Geneva suggested to the other English churches abroad that they agree on a book of common prayer and on
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the ceremonies of the church, but the church at Frank-
fort refused "trusting they wouldn't be burdened with
unprofitable ceremonies," and stating that they would
discuss such things when they returned to London. 111
Some of the exiles wanted to use the Edwardian Prayer
Book and others the Genevan one. These 'troubles begun
at Frankfort' were to plague the English church for years
to come. Miss Garrett, after exhaustive research, puts
the total number of exiles at 788, including men, wives,
women, children, and servants. 112

Many of the exiles returned to England as soon as
they received news of the death of Mary, and could fin-
ish their work on the continent. Jewel, the future
bishop, arrived in England before March 20, 1559, after
a fifty-seven day journey from Zurich. 113 They had no
sooner returned than they felt pangs of conscience at
many things, the remnants of the "popish religion," the
royal headship, the power of the bishops, and the queen's
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112 Garrett, op. cit., p. 32.

113 Zurich Letters, I, 9, Jewel to Peter Martyr,
March 20, 1559.
private mass in her chapel. 114

These returning exiles took service in an establishment which was pledged to peaceable and friendly relations with the continental reformeds by little except common enmity to the papacy. Thus, within the establishment, were men more extremely protestant than the church under which they took service. 115 These advanced Protestants did not seem to realize that a large body in the church liked the vestments and ritual, and did not desire radical changes which would make the service unfamiliar to the people as a whole. Few of the Protestant leaders of the church felt it worth while to make any vigorous protest against their use in opposition to the wish of the queen and many condemned the agitators for stirring up discussion and controversy over the question. 116 Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London and one of the former exiles, was of this opinion. 117

The Injunctions of 1559 contained, in part, these instructions in regard to vestments and order:

114 Ibid., pp. 6, 9, 13, 17, 19, passim.
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...Her Majesty...wills and commands that all archbishops and bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or ministry of the sacraments, or that be admitted into any vocation ecclesiastical, or into any society of learning in either of the universities, or elsewhere, shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were mostly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward VI; not thereby meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments....

Item, that no man shall willingly let or disturb the preacher in time of his sermon, or let or discourage any curate or minister to sing or say the divine service now set forth; nor mock or jest at the ministers of such service. 118

The vestments of the clergy alluded to were chiefly the square cap, the tippet, and the surplice, which were worn in the last year of Edward VI. The cope was to be required at certain other times. These regulations were well known to the clergy but many were averse to following them; believing them anti-Christian, popish, or smacking of superstition. Parker had been ignoring most of the vestianian legislation since his installation and was loath to persecute because of it. 119

In 1564, after her summer progress, the queen was
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dissatisfied with the results of the conformity regulations. William Cecil, the Lord Treasurer, told the bishops that the queen was determined to have a reform in the use of clerical dress. Cecil had gathered information on the varieties in the service of the church. In regard to the vestments of the clergy his report reads, "...some with a square cap; some with a round cap; some with a button cap; some with a hat. Some in scholar's clothes, some in others." To Parker, as Primate, fell the unpleasant duty of enforcing the queen's wishes. This importunate duty was to consume much of his time for the remainder of his life. He began in a typical way for the kind-hearted archbishop. He undertook to persuade the worst offenders by reason rather than by force.

The most eminent of the Nonconformists in learning and in position were the returned exiles Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, and Humphrey, President of Magdalen. In December, 1564, Parker sent Sampson and Humphrey ten questions asking them if the surplice was to be considered a thing 'indifferent' or not. They admitted the vestment's

120 Frere, op. cit., p. 112.

121 Strype, Parker, I, 302, "Varieties in the service and administration used," Cecil MSS, given verbatim.
'indifference,' but drew a distinction between theory and practice. They added that by long association with popery it could not be considered a thing indifferent. They did not wish to condemn or forcibly correct ministers using attire, but on the other hand, they did not believe the bishops had the right to force the surplice on them. The tenth question, asking whether a minister should leave the ministry rather than wear the habits, was not answered. These two men felt that there should be charitable permission of diversity in externals where there is a unity of faith. For all the efforts of the Archbishop they could arrive at no formula.

Since reason alone failed to move the Nonconformists, Archbishop Parker asked Cecil to draw up a letter ordering him to enforce uniformity and to have the queen sign it. Cecil sent the form of a letter from the queen to Parker on January 15, 1564, and asked him to alter or abridge any part he desired. Cecil stated that

---
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he feared the queen would be angry because of the need for more reform. This request was the beginning of many of the future woes of the Archbishop. He received more than he had bargained for from the queen. On January 25, 1565, the queen wrote him a most reproachful letter blaming him and the rest of the commissioners for the present condition:

Through lack of regard given by such superiors as you the Primate, and other the Bishops of your Province, there is crept into the Church, brought by some few persons abounding in their own senses more than wisdom would, open disorder by diversity of opinion, especially in rites and ceremonies.... We have heard of these things a good while; yet we have thought until this present that you, the Primate and Metropolitan, and your brethren the Bishops, it should have been stayed, lest it should breed a schism or deformity in the church: for you have had charge herein from us heretofore. But lately we perceive that the same increases: and we mean not to endure it...if you find any superior officers disagreeable beyond your authority to reform, we will that you inform us: for we will have no disension or variety grow by suffering such persons to remain in authority...use all expedition; that we be not occasioned for lack of your diligence to use further sharp proceedings: whereof we shall impute the cause to you.126

125 John Bruce and T. Perowne, eds., Correspondence of Matthew Parker, Cambridge, University Press, 1853, p.223. Hereinafter cited as Parker Correspondence.
There were many difficulties which Parker had to face in securing uniformity. There was a great prejudice against vestments because they were not used in continental reformed churches. In Geneva and Zurich the services were conducted in black scholars’ gowns and no other vestments were used. The Nonconformists had many friends in high places, including the Earl of Leicester, who was hailed by them as their patron. Turner, Bishop of Wells, and Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, were great opponents of the program. Pilkington wrote to Leicester asking his intervention for the Nonconformists. 127

Archbishop Parker took up his assigned role as ecclesiastical disciplinarian. Upon receipt of the queen’s peremptory letter, he communicated the contents of it to Grindal, Bishop of London, through whom the other prelates of the province were customarily notified. 128 Grindal was very much in sympathy with the Nonconformists, but he carried out his assigned task. 129
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In the meantime the Primate was engaged in the labor of composing a code of conformity or book of articles which might be the standard applied in the enforcement of discipline. He was assisted in this work by the Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical, Grindal, Guest, and Cox, plus Horne and Bullingham.\textsuperscript{130} When these were completed, they were sent to the queen for her approval. To the dismay and disgust of Parker the queen refused to sanction the proposed articles.\textsuperscript{131} He had great reason to complain. He had been driven into action, and not supported, but left to sustain himself as best he could.\textsuperscript{132} This was what the queen desired for she wanted the Archbishop to have the vexatious responsibility of enforcing the Injunctions. The ordinances were returned greatly defaced and altered, either by Cecil or the queen, or both. Parker had termed the "laws" and "constitutions," but they came back to him simply as "temporal orders."\textsuperscript{133}

Archbishop Parker considered his independent authority to be practically non-existent. He feared to take

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., p. 49.
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any action in his own name until driven to it. This is undoubtedly why he appealed to the crown for express authority to act in the case of the early Puritans. He seems utterly to have underestimated the power of the High Commission, although it had by law the power "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all... errors whatsoever." The queen felt that the Primate had all necessary power to perform his ecclesiastical functions and she wished to have no active part in it. She wanted religious peace, quiet, and uniformity for the safety of her throne and the kingdom.

Elizabeth was in complete harmony with contemporary philosophy on the matter of uniformity. The ruler could establish the mode of worship and compel uniformity with it on the principle of **cuius regio eius religio**. This had been adopted for the Empire in the Religious Peace of Augsburg of 1555. The advanced Protestants in England wanted uniformity also, but a uniformity based upon their ideal, not on the desire of the queen. Tolerance arrived only when it was found extremely difficult or impossible to fit, or force, all persons into one religious mold.

Elizabeth later stated her position in a letter to some eminent members of foreign churches who had asked her to be tolerant of diversity. She replied: "That it was not with her safety, honor, and credit, to permit
diversity of opinions in a kingdom where none but she and her council governed; not owning either imperial or papal power, as several of the princes and states [in the Empire] did, and were glad to compound them.  

Since the queen would not give her assent to the articles, Parker felt that there was nothing for him to do at present but to continue with such powers as he could gather together. He began by calling Sampson and Humphrey before the Commissioners. He asked Cecil to "step over to us" to add official sanction to the Commissioners, but no representative of the government appeared. At the same time he asked Cecil to have the queen write a letter to Bishop Grindal charging him to reform London. This was done by the queen and Grindal seems to have become more active. The meeting of the Commission with Sampson and Humphrey did not advance the cause of uniformity for they remained obdurate. Parker asked the queen or the Council to call the two men before them, as he had been ordered to do by her letter, for he could do nothing

---
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with them. They were called before the Council but were only scolded and permitted to go their ways. 137

"Better not to have begun, except more be done," said Parker. He complained that Cecil principally began to press for uniformity. "If this ball is tossed unto us, and then have no authority by the Queen's Majesty's hand, we will set still," threatened the Primate. While in the complaining mood, he added, "that the queen hadn't spoken or written to Grindal about uniformity...if this remedy be not by letter, I will no longer strive against the stream, fume or chide who will." 138 As we have seen the queen did write to Grindal, but it is doubtful if the action resulted from the Archbishop's threat. Later Cecil attended a meeting of the Ecclesiastical Commission to arouse their zeal and to overcome their general distaste for the business. He peremptorily bid them to do the queen's will or expect worse. 139

Parker complained that the Council used nothing but words on the principal defendants. He was later astounded to learn that both Sampson and Humphrey had been appointed to preach at Paul's Cross during Lent. 140
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This was a distinct honor and Parker did not know how they had received the appointment but actually it had been obtained for them by Leicester.\textsuperscript{141} The Archbishop at last, April 29, 1565, decided to deprive them, although, as we have seen, he had grave doubts of his power to take such drastic action. He had the two before him and ordered them to conform or depart. They were told that unless they consented to wear the gown and cap abroad, and in chapel a surplice and hood, and to communicate, kneeling, in wafer bread, they must go. They replied that their consciences would not permit them to conform.\textsuperscript{142} Before the deprivations could take place, Parker had to overcome other difficulties. Sampson, as Dean of Christ Church, held, in this case, an ecclesiastical office which was at the disposal of the queen. In June the deprivation was finally accomplished with the queen's permission, and Sampson was imprisoned for a time. Now that the example had been made, Parker interceded with Cecil and he was soon released. Humphrey, as President of Magdalen, was elected and could not be
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easily removed. He was given a benefice in the diocese of Salisbury and after a short period of rustication he returned to Oxford. 143

Oxford was not the only university which had a share in the Nonconformist trouble. At Cambridge, St. John's College turned openly Puritan. On October 12, 1565, almost the entire body threw off their surplices. 144 Only with difficulty did Parker and Cecil reduce the university to order. 145

Sampson's experience did not daunt the clergy of London. They knew that Bishop Grindal was reluctant to impose uniformity, so they used what service they liked. Yielding to pressure, Grindal proposed a compromise to the clergy, requiring the surplices in the church and a round cap, "turkey gown" and falling cape for exterior wear. 146 Archbishop Parker pressed for the full program of his book of articles. He sent the document again to Cecil, soliciting the queen's approval but it was not forthcoming. At last Parker decided to publish it without the queen's approval, despite his doubts as to the
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legality of the act. Concurrently he moved to put the metropolitan area in order. On March 10, 1566, Parker had an interview with the queen. He told her that these "precise folks" would rather go to prison than conform; she replied, "Imprison them, then!" The queen still refused to authorize the book of articles. Parker decided to go ahead on his own responsibility.

Archbishop Parker decided to have one more try with the metropolitan clergy before issuing his articles. The clergy of the diocese of London, of Southwark, and of the London peculiar of Archbishop Parker, were summoned before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners at Lambeth Palace. John Stowe, in his *Historical Memoranda* states: "The xxvij day of Marche, in anno 1566, beyng Twesday, ye parsons and mynystars of ye churches in and abought London were (by commaundyment) at Lambeth, before ye Archebyshoppe of Caunterbury and other of ye townsell, wher charge was gyven to them to serve theyr churchis and were theyr apparyyll accordyng to ye quens injunctions, or ells to do no sarvyse." Present at this

---
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March 26 meeting were the Archbishop, Bishop Grindal, and Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster. One hundred and ten ministers appeared before the Commissioners. A clerical mannkin, Mr. Robert Cole of St. Mary le Bow, was exhibited before them in the proper clerical habit. The assembled clergymen were told to cease all conversation and vote: \textit{Volo}, for those who would subscribe; \textit{Nolo}, for those who would not subscribe. Of the one hundred and ten, only thirty-seven refused to subscribe to the rules. Parker sadly admitted that these were the best ministers of the diocese. Those who refused to conform were given three months in which to make up their minds; conform or be deprived completely of their livings. There was much discussion and many appeals against this treatment. The queen left all disciplinary measures to Parker and within the three-month period many subscribed.\footnote{Fryer, op. cit., p. 118.}

The articles or ordinances of the Archbishop still remained unpublished. They were published two days after the Lambeth meeting—March 28, 1566. Stowe observed this and wrote that soon thereafter "came forthe a boke in print subscribyd by ye Archebishops of Caunterbury, ye Byshopps of London, Wyncester, Elii, and dyvers othar,
which apoyntyd ye sayd mysisters to were theyre gowns
and clokes with standyngs colars and corneryd capse, and
at theyr servyce to were syrplysys, or else not to mynys-
tar."

Parker felt that he must have some weapon to
combat nonconformity, so he changed the articles and
toned them down a bit and published them under the new
name of "Advertisements." They were to have effect in
the province of Canterbury only. They were based on the
royal Injunctions, acts of parliament, plus the letter
which the queen had sent to the Archbishop January 25,
1565.

In the original ordinances Parker had given the
authority as from the queen's hand, with his and the
Commissioner's assent, in practically the same words used
in the Act of Uniformity stating that the queen could
issue further orders. This wording implied a limited
prerogative in ecclesiastical matters and was certainly
not very diplomatic:

The Queenes Majestie...hathe, by the assent of
the Metropolitane, and certeine other her Commis-
sioners in causes ecclesiastical, decreed certain
rules and orders to be used....

In the Advertisements Parker had drastically changed
the nature of the authority, for now he was 'directed' by
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the queen to take action with the authority at his command. It is clear from this that the Advertisements were not the queen's 'further order':

The queen's majesty...hath by her letters directed unto the Archbishop of Canterbury and metropolitan, required, enjoined, and straitly charged, that with assistance and conference had with other bishops, namely, such as be in the commission for causes ecclesiastical, some orders might be taken, whereby all diversities and varieties among them of the clergy and people...might be reformed and repressed, and brought to one manner of uniformity through out the whole realm....153

The Archbishop doubted the effect of the Advertisements but was gratified to learn that the document at once acquired great authority, for contemporaries thought they saw the queen's hand in them.154 The queen was empowered by the Act of Uniformity to "ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory," with the advice of the Commissioners or the Metropolitan.155 The Advertisements were not her further order for they did not have her sanction, although she practically forced the Archbishop to take the action he did.

The Advertisements produced much contention among
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the clergy. This was especially true of the city of London, which was more radical religiously than any other part of the realm. Stowe gives a vivid description of conditions after the publication of the Advertisements: "After this folowyd myche troble with ye mynstars of ye citie of London; for in mooste paryshis ye sextyn of ye church dyd all shuche servys as was done,... In some placis ye mynstars themselvs dyd servyse in theyr gownes with turnynd colars and hatts as they wer wont to do, and prechid stowtly and agaynst ye ordar taken by ye quene and counsell and ye byshopps for consentynge ther unto." 156 We see in this excerpt that some clerics refused the apparel, some used the apparel they liked and preached against the order, and all saw the action as coming from the hand of the queen and Council which we know to be untrue. It is interesting to note that Stowe states that the bishops subscribed to the Advertisements, but does not mention the fact that they were Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The Advertisements contained four general headings: (1) Doctrine and Preaching, (2) Administration of Prayer and Sacraments, (3) Certain orders in ecclesiastical policy, and (4) Outward apparel of persons ecclesiastical. 157
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Most important of all was the fact that they laid down the concessions which the Ecclesiastical Commission was prepared to make by way of securing uniformity. 158

The Advertisements stated in regard to vestments, that in cathedral or collegiate churches, in the administration of Holy Communion, the principal minister should use a cope, with gospeller and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at the Communion Table, they were to use no copes but surplices. For the ordinary vestments of the chapter the rule was that the dean and prebendaries wear a surplice with a silk hood in the choir; and when they preach in the cathedral or collegiate church, to wear their hood. For the parochial clergy, it was ordained that every minister saying any public prayers, administering the sacraments or other rites of the church, should wear a comely surplice with sleeves. 159

All archbishops and bishops were to use and continue their accustomed apparel. It was further decreed that all deans of cathedral churches, masters of colleges, all archdeacons, and other dignities in cathedral churches, doctors, bachelors of divinity and law, having any
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ecclesiastical living, should wear as their common apparel abroad a side gown with sleeves straight at the hand, without any cuts in it and without the falling cape; and to wear tippets, as was lawful for them by Act of Parliament 24 Henry VIII. 160

Regulations were set up for all ecclesiastical persons in regard to habits to be worn in traveling. Any person having any ecclesiastical living, should wear the square cap appointed by the Injunctions, and they were to wear it only while traveling. Cloaks with sleeves were to be worn also while traveling. 161

It was prescribed that the ministers must swear to follow these Advertisements. A "Protestation" was appended to it which read, "Protestations to be made, promised, and subscribed by them that shall hereafter be admitted to any office, room, or cure in any church or other place ecclesiastical." The fourth head in this Protestation dealt with the problem of apparel, "I shall use sobriety in apparel, and especially in the church at Common Prayers, according to order appointed." 162
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After the Advertisements were published, Parker sent them immediately to Bishop Grindal, to the Dean of Bocking, and the incumbents of his own peculiars, with strong admonitions for enforcing them.

On this same day in which they were published, March 28, 1566, the Archbishop wrote to Bishop Grindal:

Now...as the Queens highnes hath expresly charged both you and me of late, being thersfore called to her presence, to see her laws executed, and good orders desreed and observed; I...require and charge you, as you will answer to God and her Majesty, to see her Majesties laws and injuncions performed within your diocese, and also these our convenient orders, described in these books, at this present sent unto your lordship. And furthermore, to transmit the same books with your letters, according as hath been heretofore used, unto al other our brathren within this province: to cause the same to be performed in their several jurisdictions and charges.

Shortly after the Advertisements were published a literary warfare began which was to last for many years. The first was an essay written by Robert Crowley in 1566 entitled, "A Brief Discourse Against the Outwarde Apparrell and Ministering Garments of the Popish Church." This tract stated four reasons for refusal to wear the prescribed garments: (1) the garments offend weak brethren
and encourage stout papists; (2) the authority of the Prince does not extend so far as to enforce them; (3) they are unnecessary, and (4) popish. This book was prohibited and the printers imprisoned. 165 An answer to this tract was soon forthcoming. This answer, which is ascribed to Dr. Parker, was entitled, "A Brief Examination for the Tyme of a Certaine Declaration Lately Put in Print." It stated that the civil authority was to be obeyed as long as the action ordered was not contrary to God's law. 166

These early Puritans were now facing prosecution for not wearing the prescribed habits. They felt that they must have some higher voice or authority upon which to base their opposition. Since nearly all of the formerly exiled clergy are to be found in opposition to the authorities in this controversy, they naturally appealed to their eminent friends in the reformed churches of the continent and especially to the leaders of the church of Zurich, Henry Bullinger and Rodolph Gualter.

The leading agitators on the Puritan side continue to be Thomas Sampson and Lawrence Humphrey. On February 9, 1566, Humphrey wrote from Oxford to Bullinger at Zurich respecting the habits and the use of them. He
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proposed a set of questions and asked that they be answered fully and completely by Bullinger and Gualter.\footnote{167} Later the same month, February 16, 1566, Sampson wrote from London to Bullinger and told him of the inflexible determination of those in power to carry out their program in regard to vestments. So the men in Zurich might fully understand the situation, he reduced it to twelve questions which stated their difficulty. He asked that Bullinger and Gualter plainly state their opinion.\footnote{168}

The reluctant pastors Bullinger and Gualter answered both of these letters in one written May 1, 1566. Bullinger stated that he had already written too concisely for their tastes and that he had given his opinion. He also stated that Peter Martyr had given his when he was in Oxford (he was by this time deceased). Bullinger further stated that he had given his opinion in a letter to Horne, as had Gualter. He then stated that if they were disposed to listen and desire their opinion, they would have it in this letter. The two Zurich pastors imply that by the great number of questions proposed, the basically simple question was complicated. Sampson and Humphrey were asked to receive the answers
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kindly and with a mind calm and free from prejudice. Bullinger stated, "I altogether abominate all controversy."

Pastors Bullinger and Gualter answered the questions sent to them as honestly and succinctly as possible. Humphrey's first question was whether or not laws respecting habits ought to be prescribed to churchmen, that they may be distinguished from the laity. Bullinger answered that it was quite proper for decency, appearance, and order. He would place no blame on those who adopt or order the use of them. He was also asked whether it was allowable to have a habit in common with the papists. Bullinger answered that it has not been proved that the popes introduced a distinction of habits into the church but that the distinctions were long anterior to the papacy. He added that it was not unlawful to have the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer, etc., in common with them, so why the scruples about habits? To Humphrey's question as to whether one can with a safe conscience subscribe to this "bondage," Bullinger replied at some length:

In my opinion great caution is to be observed lest this dispute, and clamour, and contention

169 Ibid., I, Appendix, 345, Bullinger to Humphrey and Sampson, May 1, 1566.
respecting the habits should be conducted with too much bitterness, and by this importunity a handle should be afforded to the queen's majesty to leave that no longer a matter of choice to those who abused their liberty; but being irritated by these needless clamours, she may issue her orders, that either these habits must be adopted, or the ministry relinquished. It appears most extraordinary to me (if I may be allowed,...to speak my sentiments without offence) that you can persuade yourselves that you cannot, with a safe conscience, subject yourselves and churches to the vestiarian bondage; and that you do not rather consider, to what kind of bondage you will subject yourselves and churches, if you refuse to comply with a civil ordinance, which is a matter of indifference, and are perpetually contending in this troublesome way; because, by the relinquishment of your office, you will expose the churches to wolves, or at least to teachers who are far from competent, and who are not equally fitted with yourselves for the instruction of the people."

As to the matter of indifference, Bullinger answers, "It certainly seems such, when it is a matter of civil ordinance, and has only respect to decency and order, in which things religious worship does not consist." The questions sent by Sampson were twelve in number and covered much the same ground as those sent by Humphrey. In reply to both men, Bullinger agreed completely with the position taken by the bishops. The answer to the last question of Sampson's finished the argument. Sampson asked whether it is more

---
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expedient to obey the church, or on account of disobedience to be cast out of the ministry? Bullinger answered flatly that the posts should not be deserted because of this, and place be made for wolves, for there is still liberty of preaching; they should take care that no greater bondage is imposed. 172

The bishops had anticipated this appeal to the Zurich reformers. Horne had written to Gualter in July, 1565, asking his opinion on the controversy:

It was enjoined us, ...either to wear the caps and surplises, or give place to others. We complied with this injunction, lest our enemies should take possession of the places deserted by ourselves. But as this matter had occasioned great strife among us, so that our little flock has divided itself into two parties, the one thinking that on account of this law the ministry ought to be abandoned, and the other, that it ought not; I beg you, my Gualter, to write me at the earliest opportunity what is your opinion of this controversy, which is the only thing that troubles us. 173

In the meantime, the learned reply by Bullinger and Gualter in answer to the questions posed by Humphrey and Sampson, was taken by Bishop Grindal and published in both Latin and English. The logic of the answers of these eminent and respected Zurich ministers had a very salutary effect. 174 This action by Grindal was to re-
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quire some explanation to the authors of the letter, for he had printed it without their permission, although he had deleted the names of Sampson and Humphrey. On September 6, 1566, the two Zurich ministers wrote to Grindal and Horne rather acrimoniously:

It has been made known to us by a report... that the letter of ours, which we wrote privately to...Humphrey and Sampson, and which,...we communicated to you, our masters and very dear brethren, has been printed and published; and that by means of it encouragement has been given to those parties who have already deprived many pious and learned ministers of the churches, and not indeed on account of the vestarian question, about which that letter was written, but on account of many other points controverted among you.\textsuperscript{175}

It was now necessary for Bishops Grindal and Horne to write to Zurich and explain their action, and to give the leaders there the necessary and correct information about the state of religion in England. They did not deny that they had printed the letter but claimed that it had the good results which they had expected and that they were justified in acting as they did. The bishops denied that any other controversies had been aroused because of the letter. Their reply was couched in most respectful terms:

Your erudite letter to Humphrey and Sampson, so well adapted for allaying both our diversities of

\textsuperscript{175} Zurich Letters, I, Appendix, 357, Bullinger and Gwalter to Grindal and Horne, September 6, 1566.
opinion respecting the habits, and our verbal altercations and disputes, we have received with the greatest satisfaction. We have also undertaken...to have it printed and published, from which step we have derived the good effect we expected. For it has been of much use to sound and sensible men,...and has certainly persuaded some of the clergy, who were thinking of withdrawing from the ministry on account of the affair of the habits (which was the only occasion of controversy and cause of contention among us), not to suffer the churches to be deprived of their services on so slight a ground; and it has established and brought them over to your opinion. If your letter had been printed and published with a view to vindicate those who deprived them; or if those who have been deprived had been removed solely on account of the habits; or if, lastly, that letter which handles the vestiarian controversy in such exquisite and perspicuous language, that it cannot be perverted to anything else, had been dragged forwards in support of your approbation of other points upon which we are ignorant, and which, by the blessing of God, are not yet agitated among us (for no difference of opinion except in this affair of the habits have hitherto arisen among our brethren), it would in truth have been a manifest injustice to you whom we love, and reverence, and honour in the Lord; just as a manifest calumny is brought against us by those who are the authors of a most groundless report, whereby it has been stated that it is required of the ministers of the church either to subscribe to some new articles, or to be deprived of their office.176

There followed a whole series of recriminations on the part of the dissatisfied ministers, with appeals to Switzerland and Scotland. Nothing was accomplished except for the creation of a bad atmosphere.177

176 Ibid., I, 176, Grindal and Horne to Bullinger and Gualter, February 5, 1567.
177 Dixon, VI, 156-65.
Bullinger and Gualter soon tired of the controversy. Humphrey and Sampson appealed to the Zurich ministers again and told them that their answers to their previous questions had not been entirely satisfactory. The two Zurich leaders showed by their reply that they desired to cease taking any part in the disputes. They realized from the beginning that their advice would not be heeded. Their answer to this appeal was an eschewal:

The sum of it is this, that you are not yet satisfied by our letter. We foresaw, brethren, that this would be the case; and therefore, if you remember, soon after the beginning of my letter, I premised these words: 'If therefore, you are disposed to listen to us, and desire our opinion respecting the vestiarian controversy, as you signified to me in your last letter, behold! you possess our opinion in this epistle. In which if you are unable to acquiesce, we are indeed most exceedingly grieved; and since we have no other advice to offer, we heartily and continually pray the Lord,...that by his grace and power he may provide a remedy for this afflictive state of things.' To these remarks we are neither able nor inclined to make any addition. We might indeed answer your objections, but we are unwilling to give occasion to contention by a renewed and interminable discussion.

In spite of all the defensive measures of the Puritan leaders, Parker's program was carried out with only minor hitches. The Puritans were taken aback by the Archbishop's firmness and many subscribed. Even

---
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Humphrey at last decided to conform. Queen Elizabeth, while on a visit to Oxford in 1566, was met by Humphrey. He was wearing his scarlet robes, and as he kissed the queen's hand, she said to him: "Methinks this gown and habit becomes you very well, and I marvel that you are so straight-laced on this point—but I come not now to chide." 180 In March, 1567, Whittingham, Dean of Durham, who had been deprived, yielded. Archbishop Parker proved to be a generous victor. Thomas Sampson, who refused to conform, was provided by the Archbishop, with the mastership of Wigston's Hospital at Leicester, a post which did not require conformity, where he remained until the day of his death. 181

The vestiarian controversy, as such, had practically spent its force by the end of 1567. Needless to say, the disputes continued, but other matters increasingly took the center of the stage. The period which follows is but a lull before the storm of the 1570's over church polity—when Thomas Cartwright becomes the arch-problem of the ecclesiastical authorities. Archbishop Parker had yet this controversy to face before he could

escape his burdensome responsibility, through death, in 1575.

In the 1570's Cartwright observes that the vesti-
arian controversy is secondary. He holds the accepted
views on garments and concedes that the magistrate may
order them but observes that they need not be used be-
cause of such orders. In dealing with the duty of
the minister with regard to 'popish' apparel he states:

As touching that point, whether the Minister
should wear yt, although yt be inconvenient;
truth is, that I dare not be autor to any, to
forsake his pastoral charge for the inconven-
ience thereof: considering that this charge
being an absolute commandement of the lord,
ought not to be laid aside for a simple incon-
venience of uncomeliness of a thing, which in
the (sic) own nature is indifferent.... When
it (the surplice) is laid in the skoles, with
the preaching of the word of God, which is so
necessary for hym that is called thereunto, that
a wo hangeth on his head, if he doe not preach
yt.... For my part, I see no better way, then
with admonition of the weak that they be not
offended....

Here we see that the ideas of the Zurich pastors
have become a part of the thinking of the churchmen,
and vestments, in themselves, cease to be the main point
of controversy.

182 A. F. Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and
Elizabethen Puritanism, Cambridge, University Press,
1925, p. 99.

183 Ibid., pp. 147-49, as quoted herein from, The
Rest of the Second Reply of Thomas Cartwright against
Master Doctor Whitgift's second answer, touching the
Church discipline. Published 1577.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION: ULTIMATE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This thesis has been a study of a small segment of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the years 1558 to 1567, in which I have investigated the settlement of religion, with special emphasis on the controversy over the use of vestments and the development of Elizabethan Puritanism. This period is extremely important for the future of the nation, both politically and religiously. The effects of this period of history are to be keenly felt during the remainder of Elizabeth's reign. The movement which began here developed until the state, and a crowned head itself, fell before it. In the settlement and ensuing controversies, the idea that ecclesiastical unity was essential to political unity, was the determining factor in the formation of governmental policy.

This thesis is basically a study of Puritan opposition to symbolism in the form of vestments. The conflicting ideas of the church are clearly seen in this controversy. The Puritans held that the church was simply a body of believers who were held together by a common faith and allegiance to Christ. This does not mean that they did not have a common quantity of beliefs and practice
which they would force upon the people in the same manner that the established religion was forced upon them. The very absence of any form of symbolism would be a mark of their belief. The Puritans clearly rejected the idea of the church as a self-contained institution. The church would be in, and of, the world, and in fact their belief tended toward theocracy, for many of them had seen theocratic city government in some areas of the Empire. The Puritans hated everything Roman, or that had been retained from the unreformed church. They would return to the scriptural simplicity of the apostolic church. Vestments and ceremonies were but the first to feel the brunt of Puritan attack.

We see in this period the beginning of opposition to the monarchical principle in government. This also incubated on the continent. Although the Puritans of this period stated their whole-hearted allegiance and loyalty to the crown, they were much displeased by the actions of the crown in forcing them to conform to the settlement. They felt that they could be loyal subjects of the queen and yet practice their religious beliefs as they saw fit. This was not the feeling of the queen, for she felt that refusal to obey her religious law was just as culpable as refusal to obey her political law. The Puritans found themselves being persecuted not for their
religious beliefs but for refusal to obey the queen's injunctions. Technically they were charged with breaking the political law of the land. This led to early opposition to the royal headship in ecclesiastical matters. The crown in this period continued to be the stumbling block in the path of further reformation in the church. Early in the next reign we see the Millenary Petition being presented to James I in the hope that he would champion the desires of the Puritans, but again they were disappointed in their hopes in the crown. Opposition to the Court of High Commission arose very early. The Puritans hated it with vengeance for its tactics and its great power. It was nominated and controlled by the queen and helped to draw disfavor on the crown.

The opposition to episcopacy is very marked in this period, although it experiences its greatest growth in the next decade, that of the 1570's. The Puritans disliked the episcopacy in the first place because it was a remnant of the old church. They could find no warrant for an hierarchical organization in the Scriptures and therefore condemned it. They could see no need for archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc., and would have done away with them. We see evidences of this even as early as Hooper's case during the reign of Edward VI, for he would have replaced the whole hierarchy with one
equal class of preachers.

As we have seen the episcopacy was, in large measure, the instrument of the royal will. To be sure the episcopacy used its historic authority to carry out measures in the church, but these were often the wishes of the crown. In the vestiarian controversy the queen ordered the archbishop and bishops to carry out uniformity, for it was the law of the land. The queen as supreme head had jurisdiction over the whole church and ordered policies to be carried out, even in the face of episcopal opposition. Many clerics felt that the hierarchy should have no coercive power for they saw in the actions of the bishops the very authority which they had worked so hard to overthrow. The bishops not only acted like the old Catholic bishops but dressed for the part as well. Since the bishops had a great deal to do with the functioning of the Court of High Commission, this brought further discredit on the institution of episcopacy. The Puritans saw the power of the bishops and of the High Commission as the same thing, although we know that the High Commission was an instrument of the royal will and not of the hierarchy.

The Puritans rested their arguments on three main presuppositions in the vestiarian controversy. First, was the contention that there must be scriptural warrant
for everything done in public worship, in other words, the church had no power to institute rites or ceremonies. Secondly, the Puritans held that the matter of vestments actually was not indifferent because of their long association with idolatrous popery. 184 Thirdly, the Puritans felt that the civil authorities had no coercive power to force them to take actions against their conscientious objections. This point brought them into conflict with the crown.

It is evident that the vestiarian controversy was not of popular origin. It was originated principally by the returning exiles, concerning things which the one side termed indifferent, the other trivial, in their appeals to one another; but which the one would accept, the other not. This was not a fight for religious liberty, for the Puritans held the same ideal of uniformity as did the crown. It was basically a fight between two irreconcilable systems of church government. It is unfortunate that the controversy was not conducted in private where reason might have decided the issue. 185

The attack upon vestiarian nonconformity appears to be a part of the royal strategy. By putting this

185 Dixon, VI, 42.
seemingly unimportant aspect of nonconformity in the foreground, the great disciplinary and governmental differences were overshadowed, while the whole conflict appears to arise from the contumacy of a small group of men. 186 Archbishop Parker realized the inner meaning of the controversy. In March, 1565, he warned Cecil that it was not merely habits that were in dispute, but the whole question of rites, which would reconstruct the discipline and worship of the church. 187

We find the Puritans appealing to authority in points of doctrine and practice, just as the Catholics appealed to Rome, but the Puritans appealed first to Scripture and then to the continental reformed churches. They wrote constantly to the leaders of these reformed churches seeking approbation for their actions. They were quite free to reject advice when it did not agree with their own thoughts, witness the case of Sampson and Humphrey in regard to vestment usage.

This period saw an advance in the theory of toleration. The program of enforced uniformity must have appeared to the Puritans as nothing short of persecution.

186 Knappen, op. cit., p. 189.
187 Frere, op. cit., p. 125.
In essence it was persecution, but a persecution based, not upon the idea that these forms were religiously important, but upon the idea that the legal establishment of certain forms by legislation or royal injunction, necessitated their observance.\textsuperscript{188} The doctrine set forth in the settlement of religion was that the conscience was free, although the public exercise of any but the established religion was not to be tolerated. This is not a satisfactory theory of toleration, but it is a great advance over opinions which had prevailed in England a century before.\textsuperscript{189}

The settlement of religion of 1559 was effected by the lay power. The queen, as a part of the prerogative of the crown, had the power to lay down ecclesiastical policy. She, by her letters, ordered the Primate to enforce uniform observance of the Injunctions, although he was left with the responsibility of deciding upon the method by which her orders should be carried out. The result of her order was the publication of the Advertisements, howbeit, without her formal approval, as

\textsuperscript{188} Klein, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 161.

has been shown in this thesis. These Advertisements
did not settle the question as Parker had hoped, but
aroused much alarm at the prospect of compulsion.

The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from
this study is that these proceedings forced upon Arch-
bishop Parker, mark the real beginning of the split in
Anglican ranks.\textsuperscript{190} Elizabeth frustrated the develop-
ment of English Puritanism because it did not accord
with her state policy to allow disharmony in the church.
Shortly we see the beginnings of separatism, and conven-
ticles become another problem to the state and eccles-
astical authorities.

\textsuperscript{190} Klein, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 142.
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