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INTRODUCTION

Edwin Sandys (c.1519-1588), the Marian exile who rose in the ecclesiastical hierarchy under Elizabeth to become Archbishop of York, has never received extensive study. He was neither a dynamic leader nor a voluminous author. His role in the Anglican Reformation was a conservative one. It is precisely this which makes him worthy of study.

Sandys is not an exception to the rule in Anglican history. He is not the leader who actively channels reform in a certain direction. His worth comes from the fact that he was a firm supporter of the Elizabethan Settlement. He was willing to compromise on issues that he considered indifferent such as matters of clerical dress and rites and ceremonies. Only in the preservation of what he considered correct doctrine could he be labelled a zealous man.

It is fortunate for his career that on all basic issues, he firmly believed that Anglican doctrine embodied true Christianity. In his doctrinal position he was greatly influenced by his contact with continental
reformers during the Marian exile. It is perhaps fortunate that Elizabeth was not a doctrinaire. W. K. Jordan characterizes the queen well when he says,

She did not share the uncompromising zeal of either Catholic or Protestant. . . . Excessive doctrinal enthusiasm wearied and annoyed her. She found herself completely lacking in sympathy with the logical bent of the Calvinist and with the passionate zeal of the Romanist. She desired to avoid undue zeal.¹

Elizabeth cared little for doctrine as long as order and hierarchy were maintained. And to preserve these, Sandys was willing to work long and hard.

Since the topic of this dissertation is Sandys' role in the Anglican Reformation, attention will be given only to those periods and events in his life which directly influenced this role. Thus, excluded are the facts that in the course of his life he had two wives, eight children, numerous personal squabbles over leases, property, and all the other problems that a married cleric had to face in a state that did not yet provide adequately for the support of a married clergy.

Likewise, events in which Sandys did not actively take part and which have been adequately covered by

detailed studies have also been excluded. Notably these include the Vestments and Admonition controversies.  

The main emphases of this study are to investigate the formative influences on Sandys, of which his Cambridge education and the Marian exile are the most noteworthy, and to suggest how these influences are exemplified in his career as an Anglican bishop. This study is not intended as a biography of Sandys, which has yet to be written, nor as a detailed account of everything he did as an Anglican cleric. However, more attention has been paid to the cleric than the man. The purpose has been to show how his education and exile influenced his career and his doctrinal position.

Sandys lived during the formative years of the Elizabethan Settlement. He lived at a time when there was no clearcut distinction between Anglican and Puritan such as had evolved by the time of the Civil War in the next century. The Anglicans of Sandys' decades were still

---


primarily concerned with making firm the Protestantism of Anglicanism, with separating Anglican doctrine from Catholic.

This accounts for the fact that such doctrinal emphases as justification by faith alone through the grace of God, denial of good works, acceptance of the Lord's Supper and baptism as the only valid sacraments, the Bible as sole authority, and the emphasis of the role of the Anglican clergy play such an important part in Sandys' sermons. It explains why his sermons are overwhelmingly polemical to the denigration of the Catholic Church. On the other hand, the Puritans are of less concern to Sandys. He sees them as upstarts who pose more of a threat to the ecclesiastical and secular hierarchy than to doctrine. He does not foresee their success. But the Catholics he views as agents of the devil who are to be attacked zealously because Catholic doctrine is counter to the word and will of God.

Relative to his role in the Anglican Reformation, the important dates in Sandys' life were as follows:

Cambridge years:

Degrees earned:

Bachelor of Arts, 1538/9
Master of Arts, 1541
Bachelor of Divinity, 1546
Doctor of Divinity, 1549
Important Offices at Cambridge:

Proctor, 1542
Master of St. Catherine's, 1547-1554
Vice-chancellor, 1552-1553

Prison: July, 1553-May, 1554

Marian Exile: 1554-1558 (Strasbourg, Zurich)
1555--visit to Frankfort

Career in England:

London, 1559
Royal Visitation, August 22-October 28, 1559
Bishop of Worcester, December, 1559-1570
Bishop of London, July, 1570-1576
Archbishop of York, 1576-1588.

It is not always possible to date exactly the events in Sandys' life, nor are his collected sermons in chronological order or precisely dated. This fact is relatively unimportant for this study. Except for two sermons which were preached at Strasbourg, presumably during

4Sandys retained the position of Master of St. Catherine's until 1554. However, he was arrested in July, 1553.

5Attempts to date Sandys' sermons may be found in Mark Moor Schulz, Edwin Sandys, 1519-1588, and the Political and Ecclesiastical Policies of his Sermons (unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1961), who relies on Millar Maclure, The St. Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958). One problem in dating source material for this period arises from the fact that until 1752, the English retained the Julian calendar and began each year on March 25. Most dates in this study follow the modern calendar. Where the date is questionable, it has been indicated as, for example, 1538/9. In such examples, 1538 represents the date used on the document and 1539 the actual date.
the exile, his sermons, which were published towards the end of his lifetime, are the product of his ecclesiastical career. As such, they represent what Sandys considered correct Anglican doctrine.
Edwin Sandys' career at Cambridge can be considered a prelude to his subsequent ecclesiastical career as an Elizabethan bishop, at least insofar as his accretion of offices and accumulation of experience is concerned. He entered Cambridge as a young student and left as a fully qualified Doctor of Divinity who had served in all of the offices students could have, had been master of a college; and vice-chancellor of the university. Because he held so many administrative positions at Cambridge as well as during his career as an Anglican bishop, he does not deserve Powel Mills Dawley's criticism that of approximately eighty bishops appointed by Elizabeth, Sandys was one of about a dozen failures because he "lacked administrative ability."1

Sandys was not a man with uncompromising principles and excessive zeal. This made him the right man for the positions he held under Elizabeth. By the time he left

---

Cambridge, he had gained a firm appreciation for Edwardian Protestantism. Sandys was not a man whose religion was conditioned by his politics. In fact, his steadfast adherence to his convictions ultimately cost him his positions at Cambridge and caused him to become a Marian exile. The experiences he had leading up to this decisive moment in his life are the major emphases of this chapter.

Sandys was a product of the most prominent sixteenth-century college at Cambridge, St. Johns.² His university career is outstanding as an example of persistent and regular attainment of degrees. Before the Privy Council in 1563 Sandys said, "I passed through all the degrees in the university orderly without any dispensation."³ He received his Bachelor of Arts in 1538/9 at the age of about twenty. This is not unusual since students in this period often entered college at an early age. In fact, the average age for admission in the sixteenth century


was sixteen. This was not an age of mass education. Until 1560 there were never more than fifty B.A. degrees granted a year at Cambridge. Within a quarter century this number had risen to more than two hundred. Sandys, therefore, was one of a relatively small group of degree-holding intellectuals. He received his Master of Arts in 1541, his Bachelor of Divinity in 1546, and his Doctor of Divinity in 1549. This placed him among the even smaller group of fully educated men qualified for clerical service to their church and government.

Besides his formal education, Sandys held a variety of significant offices during his years at Cambridge. As he said in 1563, "I was chosen to all the offices of the university which were bestowed upon students: I was scrutator, I was taxor, I was proctor, and I was vice-chancellor." Sandys' purpose in 1563 was to defend his character against impugnment by John Bourne, who had been Mary Tudor's secretary of state. Hence, he mentioned the offices he had held at Cambridge as a mark in his favor. He

---

4 Grant, Cambridge, p.89.
5 Ibid., p.97.
6 Strype, Annals, Vol.1, Part 2, p.31. Having received his Doctor of Divinity in 1549, Sandys was not actually a student while he was vice-chancellor.
continued, "If my life was so lewd as Sir John reporteth, the university would not thus have preferred me. And my rowme was to be master of a college." 7

The offices he held helped prepare Sandys for his later career. Shortly after attaining his Master's, he served as proctor. This office was a demanding one. Grant sums up the work of proctors by labelling them responsible for "ceremonial, finance, catering, and disciplinary" duties. 8 In a sense, proctors were the core of the university as far as actual administrative work was concerned. As Cambridge grew so did the work of the proctors.

There were two proctors. 9 M. B. Hackett calls the proctors "the most important officials of the university after the chancellor" because of the nature and multiplicity of their duties. 10 Originally the purpose of proctors had been to insure that landlords charged fair rents. In this function, their office was related to

---

7 Ibid., p.32.
8 Grant, Cambridge, p.39.
10 Ibid., p.67.
that of the taxor. By the mid-thirteenth century the office of taxor existed separately from that of proctor from which it evolved.\textsuperscript{11} Sandys was a taxor before being elected one of the proctors.

Among the economic duties of the proctors was that of overseeing food and drink purchases. It was their duty to make sure fair prices were charged; reports of monopolies were investigated, and corrupt practices were reported to the chancellor.\textsuperscript{12} Thus, even in this economic function, the main part of their work was administrative.

Hackett claims for them the duties of "principal administrative officers of the university."\textsuperscript{13} In academic matters, the office of proctor was most important. It was the proctor who arranged both the time and the format of lectures and disputations. They could interrupt disputations, regulate the manner in which these proceeded, and even stop a master or student who did not keep to the subject. The proctor was a power to be reckoned with in the classroom.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p.153.
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p.156.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p.157.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.
The proctor was also responsible for maintaining discipline, a function which he performed with the help of assistants. The assistants were responsible to the proctors who, in turn, were responsible to the regents and chancellor.\(^1\)

The proctor's disciplinary power extended even to minor officials such as bedells. Proctors had the power of suspension which worked in two ways. They could stop masters and bachelors from lecturing. They could stop students from entering the schools. Of course those who fell under this power could appeal to the chancellor's court, but this did not undermine the proctor's importance in disciplinary matters.

Proctors performed a variety of lesser functions such as regulating religious observances, arranging funerals, and acting as masters of ceremony. Thus, though an eclectic, time-consuming, demanding administrative position, the office of proctor was worth coveting for an enterprising young student who sought advancement in his career. And the office of proctor was an excellent way to gain administrative experience.

Two proctors were elected each year and designated senior and junior proctor. Originally these elections had occurred in convocation with the chancellor, regents, and masters of the three medieval colleges (theology, canon law, and the arts) taking part. In the fourteenth century the election was under the auspices of only the regents in arts. The proctors had to be masters in arts.16

By the sixteenth century the right to nominate proctors rotated. Sandys became junior proctor in 1542. That year Pembroke and St. Catherine's Colleges had the nominating privilege. One of the nominees, Cuthbert Haggerstone, took himself out of the running at the instigation of Sandys. Allegedly Sandys gave Haggerstone £2.13s.4d. to resign his claim. Sandys become a candidate in his place and won election as junior proctor, defeating Matthew Stokys.

The election was disputed by Stokys and his friends who appealed to the vice-chancellor, Richard Standish. Standish ruled in favor of Stokys on the grounds that Sandys had voided his rights to the office by canvassing for it before the election. But Stokys was not allowed to assume office until charges made against him by Sandys

and one of his friends could be investigated. Eventually the dispute was referred to Stephen Gardiner, the chancellor, and to Thomas Thirlby, bishop of Westminster.\(^{17}\)

What is of interest about this election is what it shows about the hierarchy of offices, that is, who had the power to decide disputed elections. The case also shows the persistence with which Sandys sought the office of proctor. He campaigned before the election, an action which gave Stokys grounds to dispute his right to the office. As the allegedly guilty party of a disputed election, he did not quit. When the decision went against him, he provided for appeal to a higher authority by counter-attacking his opponent. The result of his persistence was the office of junior proctor. Also of interest is the fact that Stephen Gardiner was one instrument by which Sandys gained the office. A decade later Gardiner would be responsible for removing Sandys from a higher office and causing him to become a Marian exile.

Sandys was proctor for one year, the usual duration. A more permanent and much more prestigious position was

that of master of St. Catharine's Hall. Sandys held this position from 1547 until he was replaced by Edmund Cosyn in 1554 on Gardiner's orders. St. Catharine's was a relatively new college, having been founded in 1475. Sandys does not seem to have left a mark on the college as a particularly noteworthy master.

Nevertheless, the office of master was a responsible position. The master was elected by a majority of the fellows in the college. In St. Catharine's there were approximately six fellows, the actual number depending on revenue. The master was in charge of the college and ranked above the fellows and other students. His stipend according to the Statutes of Edward VI (1549) was six pounds annually with an additional eight pence per week with which to pay a servant. This stipend was one pound more than that of a fellow, not including the master's allowance for a servant. By 1860, the next revision of St. Catharine's statutes, the income of the master was twice that of a fellow.18

There were no provisions for married masters. There had been no need for such under a Catholic system. But after the Reformation and the acceptance of a married

ministry, Cambridge faced the problem of married officials. Fellows were not permitted to marry under the statutes of either Edward VI or Elizabeth. Nothing is stipulated about married masters although Stephen Gardiner in a letter addressed to the president and fellows of St. Catharine's Hall, the letter by which he replaced Sandys, says that marriage of masters is against the statutes of St. Catharine's as well as contrary to ecclesiastical law. Certainly the law was not enforced under Edward. But it is a fact that Sandys lost his mastership on the grounds that he was married, at least this is the stated reason. Gardiner's letter, dated January 13, 1554, reads as follows:

Whereas it pleased the Queens Highness to commit unto me the ordering of all matters appertaining to the University, and that nothing there is more necessary for the same than to have good and discreet heads in the colleges; therefore saying that the mastership of your house, by reason that the master thereof is married contrary to the ecclesiastical laws and your statutes, is now void, this shall be to desire you that you will choose the bearer hereof, Master Cosyn, a man for his wisdom and honest behavior very meet for that room.19

Sandys was in prison at the time of this letter. He had been arrested in July, 1553. By May, 1554, he

was in exile. Whether or not he was arrested for heresy or treason depends on from which side of the fence one looks at the situation. But, marriage was hardly the reason Sandys lost his post. It appears more likely that it was the least troublesome excuse that could be found for removing him.

One interesting sidelight of Gardiner's letter is the influence it shows which the chancellor could have even in intracollegiate elections. Cosyn did in fact become the next master of St. Catharine's probably on the strength of this letter.

Perhaps because of the small income, it was not unusual for masters to hold other positions. In the majority of cases, whoever was vice-chancellor was also master of one of the colleges. In fact, only eleven vice-chancellors in all of Cambridge history were not masters at the same time.20

Sandys was vice-chancellor the last year he was master of St. Catharine's. He also held a variety of ecclesiastical preferments. He was Vicar of Haversham, Buckinghamshire; in 1548. He served as prebend of Peterborough 1549 through 1554. This benefice was taken

away from him following his arrest but was restored in 1559. He also served as prebend of Carlisle 1552 through 1554.21

Sandys' position as vice-chancellor was the most important office he held while at Cambridge. Here again was an excellent opportunity for him to gain administrative experience. As vice-chancellor, he had the opportunity to function as chief executive officer as well as chief justice of the university.

Originally the vice-chancellor was the chancellor's substitute who performed all the duties of the chancellor during the latter's absence. He had the chancellor's powers.22 Regarding statutes concerning the office of chancellor, J. B. Mullinger says, "Whatever powers are assigned to the chancellor in such statutes may be considered virtually to apply to the vice-chancellor, his deputy in his absence."23

The vice-chancellor presided over a court. In the chancellor's absence this court was the supreme authority.

21John Venn and J. A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900, Part 1; from the earliest times to 1751, Vol.4; Saal-Zuinglius (Cambridge: University Press, 1927).

22Hackett, Original Statutes of Cambridge, p.113.

When the chancellor was available and after the vice-chancellorship had become a permanent office, the vice-chancellor's court served as a preliminary court from which appeals could be made to the chancellor. For example, in Sandys' disputed election for proctor, the final decision was referred to the chancellor. The vice-chancellor could also excommunicate, confer licenses, summon convocations and perform the other duties of the chancellor. Originally the office was abolished when the chancellor returned. In the fifteenth century the vice-chancellorship became a permanent office. Gradually the vice-chancellor assumed more of the work whereas the office of chancellor eventually became an honorary position. Under Elizabeth statutes were passed which concentrated the power of governing the university in the office of vice-chancellor and the heads of the colleges rather than the chancellor. These statutes remained valid until the nineteenth century.

Sandys was vice-chancellor 1552/3 at a time when it was an office of growing proportions and significance. Unfortunately for him, the vice-chancellor could find

---

24 Hackett, Original Statutes of Cambridge, p.113.  
26 Ibid., p.94.
himself in difficult political situations which made his tenure precarious. He was under the influence of the chancellor as well as the crown. It was the vice-chancellor who could be called upon to muster university support for political purposes. For example, under Henry VIII, William Buckmaster, the vice-chancellor, was asked to gain university support for Henry's divorce. Being moderately successful, Buckmaster received commendation from the crown.  

Sandys was not so fortunate for he was vice-chancellor during the chaotic period following the death of Edward VI. On July 15, 1553, the chancellor arrived, dined with Sandys and the other leading masters, Parker, Bill, and Lever, and asked Sandys to preach the next day. The chancellor was Northumberland. The cause was to gain support for Lady Jane Grey. Here was an issue that could determine a man's future.

John Foxe, the martyrologist and also a Marian exile known to Sandys, describes what happened. Sandys let fate determine the biblical passage on which he based his sermon. He awoke in the early morning, prayed, and held his Bible. As he let it fall open, it opened to the first chapter of Joshua. The passage recounts the rallying of

\[27\]Grant, Cambridge, p.80.
the people around Joshua as their new leader after the death of Moses. Given the setting, with King Edward newly dead, Northumberland's army in the background, and Northumberland there as a new leader, it is little wonder that Sandys' eloquence "... pulled many tears out of the eye of the biggest of them." Sandys was implored to write down his sermon so it could be taken to London and published. Polishing his sermon took a day and a half. Just as Lever was leaving for London to get it published, one of the bedells informed Sandys that Mary was queen.

At this point Northumberland opted to support Mary. He called Sandys to go with him to the marketplace. He told Sandys that he expected a general pardon. Foxe reports that Sandys answered,

My life is not dear unto me, neither have I done or said anything that urgeth my conscience. For that which I spake of the state, hath instructions warranted by the subscription of sixteen counsellors; neither can speech be treason, neither yet have I spoken further than the word of God and the laws of the realm do warrant me, come of me what God will.29


29 Ibid., p.591.
Sandys thus justified himself by stating that his speech had been approved and that he had spoken nothing treasonable.

Sandys learned the consequences of supporting the losing side. He was forced to give up his office as vice-chancellor. A day later he was arrested. Probably no charges were stated. He seems to have been part of the general round-up of Northumberland's supporters.

For three weeks he was kept in what Foxe calls a "bad prison" in the Tower of London before being put into the "Nun's-bower, a better prison." Here his prison mate was John Bradford for twenty-nine weeks. During Wyat's uprising, space was needed for new prisoners so Cranmer, Ridley, and Bradford were put in one prison whereas Sandys and nine other preachers were transferred to the Marshalsea.

At the Marshalsea Sandys befriended the keeper, Thomas Way. This gained him numerous privileges among which was that of walking unattended in the fields. Such freedom probably meant he could have escaped at any time. During these walks he would meet Bradford who, though at a different prison, was receiving like treatment from his keeper. Bradford was burned at Smithfield in 1555.

---

30 Ibid., p.593.
When Wyat and his army arrived at Southwaite, he offered to free the prisoners and wanted Sandys' advice. Foxe relates Sandys' answer as, "Tell master Wyat, if this rising be of God, it will take place; if not, it will fall. For my part, I was committed hither by order; I will be discharged by like order, or I will never depart hence."\(^{31}\)

After nine weeks in the Marshalsea, Sir Thomas Holcroft, knight-marshall, pressed for Sandys release. He pestered Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and Chancellor of England, until Gardiner agreed not to oppose Sandys' release if the queen permitted it. Holcroft, with a warrant prepared, followed Gardiner into the privy chamber. The warrant was signed by both the queen and Gardiner.

Foxe reports that Gardiner verbally admonished Holcroft not to release Sandys until he was bonded not to leave the country. Sandys refused to agree. Allegedly he said, "I came a freeman into prison; I will not go forth a bondman."\(^{32}\) Holcroft arranged for him to be freed anyway. Sandys was in no hurry to leave. He gave a dinner for the prisoners, dallied long enough to visit

---

\(^{31}\) Ibid., p.594.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., p.595.
Bradford and Ferrar at the Bench, took a boat from Winchester and spent a couple of nights in London with friends.

By this time Dr. Watson and master Christopherson had complained to Gardiner that he had allowed the release of "... the greatest heretic in England, and one that had of all others most corrupted the university." Gardiner alerted the London constables to arrest Sandys. Sandys eluded them. By May 6, 1554, he was on Cockrel's ship heading for Antwerp. Cox was on the same ship. They were destined to remain abroad with the other Marian exiles until the end of Mary's reign.

The account presented by Foxe of Sandys' sermon and arrest correlated with statements Sandys made before the Privy Council ten years later. At that time, Sandys, then bishop of Worcester, had to defend himself against the complaints of Sir John Bourne. Bourne had been Mary's secretary of state. At the time of his attack on Sandys, he was an influential parishoner in Worcester. One must realize that Sandys' purposes were to undermine the attacks of a papist and show himself worthy of his office of bishop. Nevertheless, the account is interesting because it is his interpretation of why he was arrested and what happened.

33Ibid., p.596.
The specific points of Bourne's attack which relate to Sandys' Cambridge experience involved the content and alleged lack of authorization for his sermon, the grounds for his imprisonment, his prison escape, and his foul-mouthing of Queen Mary. In his complaint to the Privy Council, Bourne stated that Sandys claimed to have been imprisoned in the Tower for religion whereas Sandys "... was not sent to the Tower (as the bishop had said), but to the Marshalsea, and remained there, not for religion, but for treason." 34 Sandys replied that he had been in the Tower twenty-nine weeks. He named his keepers, mentioned that some members of the Privy Council had seen him there, and added that just before the arrest of Wyat, he was "... by order removed into the Marshalsea." 35

Sandys was adamant about not having been in prison for treason. As he said, "I neither was, nor by the law could at any time be charged with treason: for the matter objected against me was, for words uttered in my sermon at Cambridge: which were not within the compass of any law of treason." 36 Most of the supporters of Lady Jane

35 Ibid., p.25.
36 Ibid.
Grey, Sandys included, who became Marian exiles, came to be quite practiced at declaring that they were persecuted for religion rather than politics. One reason is that during the exile they were not granted privileges, not allowed to become citizens, or even sometimes not allowed to reside in their adopted cities unless they could prove to be religious exiles. Sandys applied for citizenship in Strasbourg during his exile. According to the Strasbourg archives dated September 7, 1555, Sandys and two other English exiles, "having been banished by the Queen of England because they will not accept the religion of the Papacy, have come to dwell here for some time."  

The archives continue, "Edwin Sandys would like to remain permanently and become a burgher; only, that as a Doctor of Theology he begs exemption from watch duty, service at fires, and the muster roll. He will not be the less ready to serve the state in case of war." The decision was to allow these three to become citizens, but Sandys never appears on the lists of burghers. Garrett surmises that his political opposition to Mary was the reason that he probably was not granted permanent citizenship, but

---


38Ibid.
at least he was allowed to reside in Strasbourg. It is probable Elizabeth would look more kindly on Sandys as a religious rather than political exile which may explain why he emphasized that his arrest was for religious reasons.

Bourne also accused Sandys of preaching his sermon without authorization. Bourne had been present when Northumberland was questioned after his arrest. Northumberland was asked if he had ordered Sandys to preach the sermon. Bourne told the Privy Council that Northumberland claimed to have been so offended by Sandys' sermon that he would have punished him if Sandys had not been out of his mind with love or some other infirmity.

Sandys emphasized that he had received authorization for his sermon. In his words, "I answer to that, that the duke's grace of Northumberland, and others of the council then there, both commanded me, and gave me instructions. Divers of the masters and heads of the colleges both conferred with me, and consented to my doings. . . ." Later Sandys added that Northumberland had been so pleased that he had asked Sandys to prepare

---

39 Ibid., p.283.
41 Ibid., p.25.
his sermon for publication and Lever could support this statement. 42

Another accusation made by Bourne was that Sandys had escaped from prison. Bourne was positive that there had not been an order for Sandys' release. He claimed to have heard that Sandys broke out of prison with the help of Thomas Holcroft. He denied that he had ever tried to hinder Sandys' release. 43 Sandys refuted these claims as follows:

I being a prisoner in the Tower, suit was made to queen Mary and the Privy Council for my enlargement; and it was reported unto me, the bill of my delivery was allowed by the privy council, and sent up in the docket to be assigned by the queen. When it came thereunto, sir John Bourne hindered that bill, by reporting what my father was; what my brother was; and how that I was the greatest heretic in Cambridge, and a corrupter of the university. And so I was stayed. . . . 44

To further establish that Bourne had delayed his release, Sandys said,

He saith also, that he never hindered my pardon. Truth it is, my friends never sued for my pardon, but only for my delivery and discharge of imprisonment; which he a great while by untrue and unhonest surmises stayed; as sir Thomas Holcroft and others, then suitors for the same, reported to my friends. 45

42 Strype, Annals, Vol.1, Part 2, p.35.
43 Ibid., p.16.
44 Ibid., p.20.
In answer to whether or not he broke prison, Sandys was most explicit. He said, "I was delivered by queen Mary's warrant, signed with her own hand..." This warrant was also signed by Gardiner and others. In addition Sandys had letters from the council commanding the restoration of goods he had been deprived of at his arrest. As further support he said, "That I brake not prison, Mr. Waye, yet keeper of the said Marshalsea, who brought me forth of the same by the authority aforesaid, and set me at liberty, can well testify."

Bourne's attempt to denigrate Sandys' character was a failure. Sandys had too many influential witnesses who could prove most of the charges untrue. Grindal, then bishop of London, a former fellow exile, and a friend who had known him since childhood, was one. Matthew Parker, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and though not a fellow exile, a former Cambridge colleague, could also support Sandys. Besides his keeper and others directly involved in Sandys' Cambridge experience and imprisonment, he listed clerics and gentlemen who could testify that he was of upright character. He concluded, "Having this

---

testimony of my honest life, I trust ye will not suffer sir John Bourne thus impudently to slander me with hearsay." 48

The only charge for which Sandys threw the burden of proof onto Bourne was Bourne's complaint that Sandys frequently referred to Mary as "plain Mary, or Mary Marral, Bloody Mary, and Drunken Mary" and had been known to claim that Mary was drunk the night she pardoned him. 49 Sandys refuted this on the grounds that he had never really received a pardon, hence he could hardly have used such a term for his release. He added, "... as the assertion is most untrue and odious, so shall he never be able to prove it." 50

At the time of his defense against Bourne, Sandys was a returned exile and established as bishop of Worcester. Ten years earlier he was a young exile sailing for the continent and leaving behind wife, possessions, positions, and prison. And it is to his exile that one must look for further examples of experiences which prepared Sandys for his role in the Anglican Reformation.

---

48 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
49 Ibid., p. 16.
CHAPTER II

SANDYS IN EXILE

Sandys was one of the three hundred and sixty-one known exiles who lived in the Holy Roman Empire during Mary Tudor's reign (1553-1558). These exiles lived in English communities established in selected Germanic cities.¹ The cities chosen for the exiles' sojourn were Strasbourg, Frankfort on the Main, Zurich, Emden, Wesel, Basle, Geneva, and Aarau. Of these cities, the first five were original settlements.² Like many of the exiles, Sandys was not exclusively connected with one city. Most of his exile was spent in Strasbourg, or so it can be implied from the facts that his wife joined him there, he applied for citizenship there, some of his letters and

¹Garrett, Marian Exiles, pp.38-39. Garrett points out that of a total 472 exiles, 397 claimed asylum for religious rather than political reasons. Of these, 361 can be located in the English colonies within the empire.


31
at least two sermons are dated there. His exact itinerary is not known. He was in Frankfort for the disturbances there in the spring of 1555. He applied for citizenship in Strasbourg in the fall of 1555. He signed a letter of reconciliation to the Frankfort congregation in 1557. This letter probably originated in Strasbourg. He was living in Zurich with Peter Martyr or Gaulter when news of Mary's death arrived. That he stayed with Gaulter at some time is definite. In 1572 Sandys helped Gaulter's son who came to England as a student. At that time Sandys wrote to Gaulter admonishing him for even planning to pay his son's expenses. As he wrote, with more emotion than usual, "Should I receive even a farthing from you? Do you think that I have satisfied you, when I lived at Zuiric [sic] with you?" Thus, Sandys was connected with three of the leading exile refuges.

Strasbourg was the city with which he was most closely associated. His presence is first recorded there on November 23, 1554. That he chose Strasbourg is not

---


4 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p. 283. Sandys was one of the signatories of a letter which appears in William Whittingham, "A Brieff Discours off the Troubles begonne at Fraunceford in Germany A.D. 1554", University Microfilms, S.T.C. 25443, English Books before 1640, Roll 372 (publ. 1575), p. 22. Also Roll 1161 (publ. 1574). Hereafter cited as Whittingham, Troubles. Garrett uses this letter as proof that the sixteen exiles who signed it resided in Strasbourg.
surprising. For one thing, he could be assured of personal acquaintances and a friendly reception there. Significant continental reformers had been in England during Sandys' Cambridge days. In 1549 no less a group than Martin Bucer, John a Lasco, Peter Martyr, Peter Alexander, Bernard Ochino, Matthew Megelin, Paul Fagius, and Francisco Enzinas (better known as Dryander) were guests of Archbishop Cranmer at Lambeth Palace.

Sandys may not have known all these reformers directly while they were in England. But there is no reason to doubt that he at least knew them by reputation. All these men had been associated with Strasbourg. They maintained ties with that city. Most of them returned there during Mary's reign. The exceptions were Bucer and Fagius who both died in England. But in their cases, their families returned to Strasbourg. The fact that most of these reformers returned to Strasbourg and were there when Sandys left England would be a strong reason for his going there.

Sandys had known Bucer personally at Cambridge. It is possible that he and some of his colleagues at Cambridge

---

were influential in Bucer’s production of his book *De Regno Christi*. Bucer dedicated this book to Edward VI. In it he emphasizes the need for a properly instructed ecclesiastical hierarchy. Strype says that Sandys, Parker, Bradford, and Grindal met with Bucer in what appear to have been informal talks; possibly this work was a topic of their conversation. Such cannot be stated definitely, but it is known that they all approved it.\(^6\) As Thomas Sampson, who had been at Pembroke Hall in 1551 and a fellow exile of Sandys, wrote to Cecil in 1573,

*Bucer wrote his book in England, being but a stranger; yet of England most aptly, touching the state of it, to the king of England; but by report of his familiars in Cambridge. And they were the same which are now archbishops of York [Grindal] and Canterbury [Parker], bishop of London [Sandys], Bradford, and such like. I know not what conference they had with him when he made the book, but I am sure, that since his death, in private talk, they have much approved his book.\(^7\)*

In addition to this connection with Bucer, Sandys and Parker supported him in a public disputation he had with John Young in 1551.\(^8\) Young became vice-chancellor


of Cambridge during Mary's reign and was instrumental in reinstating Catholic practices there. 9

Sandys' association with Bucer at Cambridge is probably a strong reason why he chose Strasbourg as an exile city. Though Bucer died in England, his influence in Strasbourg was great. He had been one of the original reformers of that city. Although exiled to England after Charles V's Interim, he nevertheless kept in contact with his church in Strasbourg and probably hoped to return there.

Bucer's wife was Catherine Wibrand Rosenblatt, already the widow of Ludwig Cellarius, Oecolampadius, and Wolfgang Capito who had shared in the reform of Strasbourg. That Bucer married Capito's widow was not unusual. The difficult part was to reconcile that she had been married thrice before. That Bucer was an advocate of marriage would hardly cause raised eyebrows. It had been Bucer who recommended Catherine as Capito's wife. And Capito as well as Bucer's wife both requested that Bucer marry Catherine after their deaths. This pretty much sealed Catherine's marital fate. Like Fagius' wife, she followed her husband to England.

On her return to Strasbourg after Bucer's death, she probably took back favorable impressions of the

---

Certainly she had no complaints about their hospitality and generosity. She returned to Strasbourg with one hundred crowns given to her by the university. King Edward VI gave her one hundred marks plus Bucer's semi-annual pension despite the fact that he died before it was due. Bucer's annual salary was one hundred pounds, three times what his predecessor had received. Compensation was given to her for repairs Bucer had made to his house. In addition, she was provided with passage for herself and her household.

Contact with Bucer's wife was maintained at least for some duration. On April 20, 1552, two years before the first Marian exiles arrived in Strasbourg, Cranmer wrote to her,

>The especial favour with which I regarded your husband during his lifetime is by no means diminished now that he is no more. His remarkable piety, indeed, and profound learning, has produced not a transient but an everlasting benefit to the Church, whereby he has not only bound all godly persons, but myself more than all of them, under perpetual obligation to him.

Another person who was in a position to make the citizens of Strasbourg receptive to the exiles was the

---


12 Ibid., p.370.
wife of Paul Fagius. Sandys probably did not know her in England. She had accompanied her husband to England and been sent back to Strasbourg when he died. Paul Fagius had been invited to England by Cranmer. He was supposed to teach Hebrew at Cambridge. Had he lived to fill this position he would certainly have been known to Sandys. Unfortunately he died November 13, 1550, in London. Fagius had been a close friend of Bucer. In fact, the desire of these two reformers to stay together had prompted Cranmer to change his original plan for Fagius to teach at Oxford. Instead, he was supposed to accompany Bucer to Cambridge.

Fagius died before he could assume his duties at Cambridge. In fact, he probably never made it there at all. It was Bucer who arranged for Fagius' wife to return to Strasbourg. On December 26, 1550, Bucer wrote to his church (St. Thomas') in Strasbourg, "He [Fagius] commended his wife and wards to your fidelity. We shall send his widow to you at the beginning of the spring."\(^{13}\) She also did not return to Strasbourg empty-handed. Cranmer sent her twenty-seven pounds shortly after Fagius' death. He mentions this in a letter to Bucer

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p.373.
expressing the hope that Bucer can "soften and assuage the grief of that excellent woman the wife of our friend." 14

Fagius' son Paul also returned to Strasbourg, though not with his mother and not to stay. During Edward's reign he had been a student in England. In fact he preceded his father there and was educated at Canterbury with Cranmer taking a personal interest in his welfare. When Fagius arrived in England, he wrote, "We found my son Paul at Canterbury in good health. He has become well acquainted with the English language and has a tolerable understanding of French, so that he now acts as my interpreter." 15

In 1554 the young Fagius left England for Strasbourg, but he did not stay there. On May 2, 1554, Dryander wrote to Bullinger,

The young Paul Fagius, son of that most learned man of most honourable memory, is intending to go to Zurich. I commend the youth to your friendly notice. He has within these few days arrived from England, in which country he devoted himself to learning; and you may learn from him some particulars respecting the state of that kingdom which would not perhaps be mentioned in your other correspondence. By the advice of his friends, he intends to enter himself at your school, to be instructed in literature and religion. 16

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid., p.372.
16 Ibid., p.377.
One resident of Strasbourg who might not have been known to Sandys in England, but who certainly must have been in Strasbourg, was Peter Alexander. He had been partly responsible for Bucer and Fagius seeking refuge in England. Alexander had come to England as early as December, 1547. Cowell suggests that he acted as an unofficial secretary for Cranmer to implore foreign reformers to come to England. Certainly his letters are strong pleas of the need for men like Bucer and Fagius in England, as well as seemingly thinly veiled bribes. For example, in writing to Bucer in March, 1549, he said,

Since these churches of ours [England] are in great want of learned men, he [Cranmer] desires to see you in this kingdom as soon as possible. . . . I know for certain that you will be appointed to a most distinguished office in the university either at Oxford or Cambridge, where you will derive a greater salary from your lectures than you ever received in your own city from your most important duties as a preacher.17

By May 25, 1554, Alexander had returned to Strasbourg. He certainly was there when Sandys arrived. In fact, he was elected July 27, 1554, to the pastorate of the French-speaking church. This congregation had originally been formed by Calvin. On August 12, the city council approved this election.18 The significance of

18Ibid., p. 358.
Alexander's appointment to St. Andrew's lies in the fact that it was at this church that the English exiles worshipped. 19

The relationship of English exiles to foreign congregations is interesting. Strasbourg already had a foreign congregation so there was no need to establish a separate worship for the English. The foreign congregation at St. Andrew's had been established by Calvin who still kept an eye on its progress. The services were in French. That Calvin maintained a direct interest in this congregation is shown in 1555 when he reprimanded Alexander for using Latin as well as French. Alexander justified his use of Latin on the grounds that it was not popishness but necessity. He had too many English aristocrats in his congregation who would have been totally lost without a few Latin interspersions. 20 Three years later when he was again reprimanded by the Genevan divine, Alexander "... told everyone that Calvin was a kind of Pope and that he ought to concern himself only with his own church at Geneva." 21

19Garrett, Marian Exiles, p. 56.
20Ibid., p. 21.
The interchange between these two reformers brings to view one problem the English exiles had worshipping with a strange congregation. Probably the English divines when given the opportunity to preach would have done so in either Latin or even English. And the difficulties encountered as foreigners may have made some of them desire all the more to hang on to English practices. Certainly there is not an open-minded welcome of new ideas evident in the letter the Strasbourg congregation wrote in 1554 to the congregation at Frankfort expressing the hope that the "former perfection ... [we had] had in England so far as possibly can be attained."22

Two points must be made in regard to St. Andrew's. No one knows for sure that the English always attended St. Andrew's. Certainly a closer connection could be expected between the English clergy and the Lutheran church of St. Thomas which had been Bucer's church. Conrad Herbert was the pastor.23 St. Thomas' remained the leading church in Strasbourg. This is borne out by the fact that only the Lutheran baptismal ceremony

22Whittingham, Troubles, p.22.

was accepted as official and could not be performed in non-Lutheran churches.  

That the English divines were familiar with the leaders at St. Thomas' is supported by the fact that Grindal kept up a correspondence with Conrad Herbert after the English returned to England. There is no reason to suppose that Sandys, a close friend of Grindal's, was not equally well known to Herbert.

Another possible reason for associating the English divines with St. Thomas' rather than St. Andrew's is the conservatism they retained. When these exiles returned to England they were in favor of retaining the episcopal system. This is not surprising considering that it was or became their living. But they manifest this conservatism in their opposition to Knox at Frankfort in 1555. It is possible that the conservatism of Strasbourg as represented by St. Thomas' congregation influenced some of the English exiles.

To return to those continentals from Strasbourg who had been in England during Sandys' Cambridge years and who helped to make the English exiles welcome, none was more influential than Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire Vermigli). He had come to England in December, 1547.

---

24 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.20.

accompanied by Ochino and aided by the English merchant-
banker John Abel acting on Cranmer's orders. 26

Both Martyr and Ochino stayed with Cranmer at
Lambeth until, as Froude says, "Cranmer . . . procured
them such preferments and appointments as were suitable
to their talents and inclinations." 27 In 1548 Martyr
was made Regius professor of Divinity at Oxford. He
found England so favorable that, like Alexander, he wrote
Bucer to entice him to England. In a letter dated
December 26, 1548, he wrote, "Such is the splendour of
your name in this country that you cannot but be most
honourably received." 28 In January he wrote again, "You
and Paul Fagius ought to come over. . . You are both very
much wanted in these universities." 29

After Edward died the English universities were not
such a favorable place for the continental Protestant
reformers. Although Mary did not initially hinder the
returning exiles, Martyr was aided by William Whittingham
and Julius Terentianus in obtaining his passport. In a


27 J. A. Froude, "The Marian Exiles", The Edinburgh
Review or Critical Journal, Vol. 85 (Edinburgh: Ballantyne
and Hughes, 1847), p. 401. Hereafter cited as Froude,
"Marian Exiles".


29 Ibid.
letter dated November 20, 1553, Terentianus wrote that Martyr was a virtual prisoner at Oxford and that he had gone to London for help. He continued,

Whittingham and I conceive the project of presenting a petition to the Queen and Council, in which we embrace the entire circumstances of master Peter; how he had been invited over from Strasburgh by the deceased King, and had been recalled by the magistrates of Strasburgh during the last year, but that the King would not give him license to depart; . . . We added that master Peter had committed no offence either against the Queen or the laws of the realm. . . .

Through their intercession Martyr was allowed to return to Strasbourg.

One interesting aspect about this event is the fact that though directly helped by Whittingham to leave England, Martyr apparently took no part in the dispute the English exiles in Strasbourg had with Whittingham, Knox, and others of the Frankfort congregation in 1555. In fact, Martyr's house was a center for those divines who returned from the Frankfort controversy.

Martyr's significance in Strasbourg centers around his prestige as a theologian, the fact that he housed some of the English exiles, and the fact that when he left Strasbourg for Zurich, some of the leading English exiles, including Sandys, either went with him or followed later.

While in Strasbourg, Martyr was public reader of divinity. As such he had many of the English exiles, including Sandys, in his audience. Certainly his prestige and the facts that he had been in England, had preceded the exiles to Strasbourg, and welcomed them there influenced those who chose Strasbourg as their exile home.

After the English exiles returned from Frankfort in 1555, Jewel stayed with Martyr. Martyr's house was a center for those exiles, including Sandys and Grindal, who had represented the conservatives at Frankfort. Cowell describes Martyr's hospitality as follows: "In the home of Peter Martyr a congregation of learned men lived as in a college at a common table." It is not clear whether Sandys actually lived with Martyr or elsewhere. But his connection with the conservatives is shown by his being part of Cox's committee for revision of the prayer book during the Frankfort troubles.

---


33 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.284.
followers of Cox, including Grindal, signed two letters to Calvin which justified their position.  

Sandys also followed Martyr to Zurich, though possibly not immediately. Martyr was invited to Zurich to teach Hebrew in May, 1556. The Strasbourg archives record for May 4, 1556, that the Burgomaster and Council of Zurich have written requesting the Council of Strasbourg to negotiate with Martyr as a replacement for Conrad Pellican. The entry for June 29, 1556, records:

Herr Peter Sturm and the other Schulherren report that, with regard to the request from Zurich, they have discussed the matter with Doctor Peter Martyr, and have made every effort to retain his services themselves. But he has pointed out that when he accepted the position here, he signed the Augsburg Confession—conveniently interpreted to accord with his Calvinism—but that since then he has been subjected to all manner of unpleasantness from the preachers, and has suffered from considerable interference with his lectures. He makes freedom from such interference his condition for remaining.

Decided that the Council does not wish to oblige him to do anything against his will, and in either case will try to meet his desires. If he wishes to go it will be readily allowed and a letter of recommendation sent to Zurich.

---


35 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.367.

36 Ibid., p.368.
Martyr left for Zurich in July. According to Froude Sandys, Grindal, Jewel, and others accompanied Martyr. This probably incorrect since Sandys signed the letter of reconciliation from Strasbourg to the Frankfort congregation in 1557. Nevertheless Sandys did eventually join the group at Zurich where he was in close contact with Martyr, Bullinger, Gaulter, and the other reformers there. Writing to Bullinger as late as 1566, Sandys mentions his stay in Zurich when he says, "You . . . received me most kindly, and treated me with the greatest benevolence, when as an exile and wanderer without a home I formerly came to Zurich . . . ." Martyr's influence was probably the reason exiles like Sandys left Strasbourg for Zurich where they came in closer contact with the reformers there. Likewise it was the presence of Martyr who drew some of the exiles to Strasbourg initially. But other reasons exist for this choice. Garrett points out that all the continental cities chosen were those which had had a congregation

---

37 Froude, Marian Exiles, p.412.
38 Whittingham, Troubles, p.174.
in England. Strasbourg also seems to have been the choice for a large number of aristocrats and former supporters of Northumberland. Certainly Sandys fits this latter category.

The first mention of Sandys in Strasbourg, in fact the first notation for several of the exiles, is in the list of signatures on a letter from Strasbourg to the Frankfort congregation dated November 23, 1554, which is preserved in William Whittingham's account of the controversy at Frankfort. Whittingham refers to the sixteen signatories of Strasbourg as "the learned men there." These "learned men" in the order in which they appear were: James Haddon, Edwin Sands (Sandys), Edmund Grindal, John Huntington (Huntingdon), Judi Eaten (Guy Heton), John Geoffrye (Jeffrey), John Pedder, Thomas Eaten (Heton), Mighell Reyrmger (Michael Reniger), Augustine Bradbridge, Arthur Saule, Thomas Steward, Christopher Goodman, Humphrey Alcocson, Thomas Lakin, and Thomas Crafton (Crofton).

40 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.47.
41 Ibid., p.329.
42 Whittingham, Troubles, p.22.
43 Ibid. The names are cited as they appear on the letter. Parenthetical spellings are as the names appear in Garrett's census in Marian Exiles. Garrett provides additional variations.
Exactly why the names occur in this order is unknown. But, for the first three the following reasons seem probable. Haddon had been invited by the Frankfort congregation a month earlier to be their pastor, a position he refused. Sandys' name carried authority. He was the only one of this group of sixteen who was a Doctor of Divinity before the exile. Grindal was one of the bearers of the letter to the Frankfort congregation. According to Garrett, he had been chosen by John Ponet, the ranking ecclesiastic in exile, for this purpose.

Curiously, Ponet did not sign this letter. One might have expected him to do so as one of the leading authorities to whom the exiles could look for advice. However, he had offered himself as a pastor to the Frankfort congregation two months earlier (August, 1554), and had been refused. This fact may account for his remaining behind the scenes regarding the problems at Strasbourg.

---

44 Whittingham, *Troubles*, p.16.

45 This is not to imply that the sixteen signatories were the only learned men in Strasbourg, or that Sandys was the most learned. John Ponet was the most prestigious ecclesiastic at Strasbourg, having been bishop of Winchester before his exile.


Frankfort. But that he was behind the scenes and took an active interest in the controversy is strongly advocated by Garrett who says, "There can be little doubt that John Ponet had been the chief director in that campaign." The campaign resulted in success of the conservatives under the leadership of Strasbourg exiles over Knox in Frankfort.

This controversy was the most serious problem faced by the exiled Anglicans. It is to the credit of the group from Strasbourg, who can be labelled conservatives for the part they took in this controversy, that the basic tenets of Anglicanism were preserved during the exile. W. M. Southgate strongly supports the ideas that Calvin was only one influence on the exiles, that the Calvinism in the Anglican church stems as much from Martyr and Bullinger as from Calvin, that actually the Strasbourg group represent opposition to the Calvinists and constitute a core of conservatives. He claims that to the exiled divines should go "the credit for preserving Anglicanism during the exile and re-establishing it upon firm ground in the difficult early years of the new reign."49

48 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.256.

On close examination, one might expect to find a homogenous group of conservatives. One might hope that the sixteen signatories of the first letter from the Strasbourg congregation would represent the intellectual elite, perhaps a small clique who had studied at the same university, or had gone into exile together, or who had similar beliefs so that one could point to them as the conservatives who defeated Knox and Whittingham in the spring of 1555. Such is not the case. Except for the facts that most of them were very well educated, truly "the learned men of Strasbourg," and signed the letter, they had little else in common.

The group was split almost evenly between Cambridge and Oxford graduates. Of the Cambridge alumni, Sandys topped the list with a D.D. Grindal and Pedder both had B.D.'s. Haddon, Lakin, Steward, and Geoffrye had received M.A.'s. The Oxford alumni consisted of one B.D., Guy Heton. Those with masters included Goodman, Bradbridge, Saule, and Reymuger. The last had been a student at Cambridge before going to Oxford. Alcocson had a B.A. Huntington had no degree though he had been a student at Oxford before his exile. Crofton was a student. Thus, this group of "learned men" was composed of one D.D., three B.D.'s, eight M.A.'s, one B.A., and three persons without degrees. Of these latter, Thomas Heton deserves
comment. Besides being an influential merchant and friend of Grindal, he had been one of the five merchants among the group of twenty-six "Sustainers" organized in London to give financial support to the exile. He is also significant as the only member of this original group of sixteen to join Sandys in signing a letter of reconciliation to end the Frankfort troubles in 1557.

Ideologically, the sixteen "learned men", though all technically Anglican, represent a wide range of views if one considers their subsequent actions as exiles and their later careers. Not much is known about their individual actions as regards the controversy at Frankfort. Unfortunately Whittingham, the most valuable source on this controversy, does not single out his opponents or even his supporters as individuals. All we really know is that these sixteen men were united and represented the English congregation at Strasbourg long enough to sign two letters to the congregation at Frankfort. Before commenting further on these men, it is necessary to turn to these letters.

What became the most serious controversy the exiles faced began in a seemingly harmless manner. The congregation at Frankfort, which apparently did not have an

---

50 Garrett, Marian Exiles, pp.7-8.
51 Whittingham, Troubles, p.174.
ordained minister, wrote a general letter dated August 2, 1554, to the congregations at Strasbourg, Zurich, Wesel, and Emden. This letter which was signed by Whittingham and six others was written in general terms and glorified Frankfort as a place where it was possible to have a church "... free from all drags of superstitious ceremonies." 52

This desire to be free from superstitious ceremonies, which here can be interpreted as Catholic ceremonies and later comes to include English ceremonies, plus the desire to elect their own minister are the chief reasons for the controversy at Frankfort. The general letter did not specifically mention the election of ministers or anything else which should have been offensive to the other English congregations. The closest the Frankfort congregation came to mentioning a hierarchy within the church was their citation of St. Paul (Ephesians 4) that "... he hath ordained ... some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, others to be teachers and instructors, to confirm the godly and to labor to finish the building of Christ’s body til we be all brought to one consent in faith. ..." 53

52 Ibid., p.9.
53 Ibid., p.12.
Unfortunately this unity was not obtainable. The troubles at Frankfort are usually cited as the origin of English Puritanism. Of these troubles Froude says, "Such a dispute would seem to be too trifling to deserve mentioning; but the troubles at Frankfort were the direct progenitors of the Puritanical disturbances which afterwards arose in England."\(^{54}\) Certainly similar points of difference existed between the opposition of Knox's followers to the followers of Cox (the Strasbourg conservatives and others) and the opposition of the later English Puritans to the Anglican hierarchy. But one must suggest that, at least in late 1554, both groups were seeking a unified Anglicanism.

Had the controversy been handled with more compromise initially on the part of the Strasbourg conservatives along such lines as that suggested, and rejected, in 1557, it might never have broiled into the irremedial conflict it became. Garrett blames Bishop Ponet for much of the resulting quarrel. She claims he was piqued because Whittingham had refused his offer to become Frankfort's minister. In addition, he was a bishop before his exile, and he apparently had no intention of letting anything happen which might impair the Anglican

system of church government. As Garrett says, "... the whole tendency of the Frankfort colony was towards the establishment of a Bible Commonwealth in which there would be no place for bishops."\textsuperscript{55} However, this tendency is not obvious in the early stages of the quarrel. It seems to develop in reaction to what might be termed the presumptuousness of the Strasbourg conservatives.

For example, no sign of the potential controversy is even evident in the general letter. Unfortunately, the answer of Strasbourg did not sit well with the Frankfort congregation. Strasbourg stressed the necessity of finding a minister to take charge of Frankfort. The signatories suggested Ponet, Scory, Bale, Cox, or any two of them. Moreover, they added that if this was not done, the Strasbourg congregation would take it upon itself to appoint a divine from Strasbourg and Zurich should do the same. With this end in mind, Grindal wrote Scory to persuade him to head the congregation at Frankfort.\textsuperscript{56}

Scory was willing, but, meanwhile, the congregation at Frankfort "... had written to Knox at Geneva, to Haddon at Strasbourg and to Master Lever at Zurich whom they had elected for their ministers."\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Garrett, \textit{Marian Exiles}, p.329.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Whittingham, \textit{Troubles}, p.13.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Lever both refused, but Knox responded to the call. In reply to Strasbourg, the Frankfort congregation stressed that they had not asked for a superintendent and stated, "... the choice and election thereof ... ought to have been reserved to the congregations." On October 24, 1554, David Whitehead reached Frankfort (Knox had not yet gotten there) and took charge "... at the request of the congregation." Thus, the situation which underlies the Frankfort controversy was that of a lay congregation electing its own ministers and refusing to conform to the advice of congregations such as Strasbourg which did have ordained ministers. The controversy erupted into heated differences about what form of liturgy to use and how much Anglican methods could be made to conform to continental ones. Foxe, who was present, described the resultant mess in a letter to Peter Martyr as follows:

All the young men, even such as were but boys, joined themselves to the one side or the other. Nay, and those that were old men, and divines, that should have been the promoters of peace and concord, added more to the fire than the rest. He lamented the hatreds, the envies, the defamations, the evil-speakings, the suspicions and jealousies that were among

---

59 Ibid., p.16.
them, and he could never have believed, . . .
that so much of anger and passion could be in
such, whom the daily use of the Scriptures
should have qualified to all gentleness and
goodness.  

This was the situation as it developed. That the matter
would get so out of hand was not obvious from the tone
of the letter from Strasbourg dated November 23, 1554,
and delivered to the Frankfort congregation by Grindal
and Richard Chambers. The general theme of this letter,
signed by the sixteen "learned men", was the need to
create a congregation in Frankfort which conformed to the
Anglicanism known in England before the exile.

The letter laments the fact that so many English
exiles were wandering abroad without pastors and mentions
the intention of the Strasbourg congregation to end this
problem and gather them into one congregation. The let-
ter praises the Frankfort magistrates for allowing
Anglican forms to be retained. As it says, "... per-
mitting us frankly to use our religion according to that
godly order set forth and received in England."  

In addition the letter emphasizes the desire to re-
tain the Anglican service because of its perfection. This
is in sharp contrast to Whittingham who in opposition to

---

9 Whittingham, Troubles, p. 22.
the English form of prayer used that of Geneva. Whittingham considered Geneva to have "... the purest reformed church in Christendom [sic]."62

The exiles at Strasbourg offered two reasons for preserving unity. The first was the desire not to change those things for which the martyrs in England were dying. The other was not to give opponents a chance to label English doctrine imperfect because it caused disagreements among the English.63 One can appreciate the motives of the Strasbourg congregation in attempting to preserve unity. Perhaps it is a moot point whether or not tolerance on their part in the early stages could have prevented the Frankfort troubles.

Sandys' role in the Frankfort controversy was not a major one. Whittingham does not single him out as a disputant. Besides signing two of the early letters from the Strasbourg congregation to that of Frankfort, Sandys signed the letter of Cox's committee to Calvin on April 5, 1555, and a letter of reconciliation to the Frankfort congregation in 1557. Nevertheless, Sandys' actions give some indication of his beliefs and support the idea that he was a conservative, but a conservative

63 Whittingham, Troubles, p.23.
who was willing to compromise. In other words, he did not want to see basic Anglican practices changed. At the same time, he preferred change to divisiveness. This is evident from his being one of the signatories of the letter to Calvin which explains what the committee has done and the compromise spirit with which they would like Calvin to believe they acted.

This letter definitely places Sandys among the supporters of Cox in the Frankfort controversy. The letter justifies the actions taken in revising the prayer book. The signatories apparently represent Cox's committee since they explain what they have done.

Besides Sandys and Grindal, who had signed the earlier letters from the Strasbourg congregation to Frankfort, the other signatories were: Richard Cox, David Whitehead, Richard Alvey, Thomas Becon, John Bale, Robert Horn, Thomas Lever, and Thomas Sampson. These ten men can not really be said to represent Strasbourg. Horn, for example, had been in Zurich until the Frankfort troubles. Later he replaced Whitehead as pastor of the Frankfort congregation (March 1, 1556). He resigned in February, 1557, during the second controversy at Frankfort, this one over the election of ministers.

Lever was more closely associated with Zurich and Geneva. Bale and Alvey can more properly be linked with
Frankfort than Strasbourg. Whitehead is connected with Frankfort from the beginning of the controversy. He arrived there before Knox and assumed his role as pastor as Whittingham relates. However, Garrett suggests that his arrival is a bit too timely to be coincidence. Rather, she suggests that he may have been sent as an advance agent in a combined effort of Strasbourg and Zurich to supplant Whittingham's influence at Frankfort and raise up a formidable opposition to John Knox.

Grindal, Sandys, Becon, and Sampson directly represent Strasbourg. Cox is more elusive. Whittingham reports that Cox arrived in Frankfort March 13, 1555. He implies that Cox and his followers are fresh from England. However, according to Foxe, Cox had left England on the same ship with Sandys. Also, Cox, as well as Bale, had been suggested as a possible pastor for the Frankfort congregation in the letter from the Strasbourg congregation in 1554. This would have been unlikely had he still been in England.

64 Whittingham, Troubles, p.16.
65 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.326.
66 Whittingham, Troubles, p.38.
68 Whittingham, Troubles, p.12.
Cox is the acknowledged leader of this group. It is he whom Whittingham singles out as the chief opponent of Knox. Garrett suggests that Cox may have been sent by Ponet although there is no proof. However, as she points out, it took only two weeks for Cox's group to effect the expulsion of Knox from Frankfort and to revise the prayer book. This was completed by March 28, 1555.  

The group which signed the letter to Calvin justifying their revision of the prayer book shows more homogeneity than the earlier group of "learned men" which signed the letters from Strasbourg. Of interest are the connections these men had even before the exile. All of them except Whitehead were graduates of Cambridge. Sandys, Lever, Horn, Alvey, and Becon all hailed from St. Johns; Grindal and Sampson from Pembroke. Cox represented an earlier generation, having received his D.D. in 1537, more than a decade before Sandys. But he had traveled into exile on the same ship with Sandys, as already noted. Sandys and Grindal had known each other well at Cambridge. It is Sampson who connects them with Bucer's De Regno Christi there.  

69 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.135. Cf. also Whittingham, Troubles, pp.45-47.  

the earlier letters from Strasbourg. As for Sampson, besides being known to them, he had been involved in a riot at Paul's Cross which had led to the arrest of Becon and Bradford. According to Foxe, Sampson should have been arrested, but he escaped. This is the same Bradford with whom Sandys was closely associated in prison and who was burned at Smithfield in 1555.

That there may have existed a sense of being on the same side is suggested by Nicholas Ridley, writing from prison in 1554 to Bradford, also in prison. As Ridley says,

> It should do us much comfort, if we might have knowledge of the state of the rest of our most dearly beloved, which in this troublesome time do stand in Christ's cause, and in the defence of the truth thereof. . . . We long to hear of . . . Dr. Sands, . . . Beacon. . . .

Considering that most of the signatories of the letter to Calvin probably knew each other before the exile and that they represent some of the leading divines in exile, it is not surprising to find them working together on a revision of the prayer book. As such they represent the conservatives who attempted to preserve unity among the exiles abroad.

---

72 Ibid., Vol. 7, p. 424.
This conservatism is evident in the letter to Calvin. The letter evinces a strong desire not to ruffle Calvin’s feelings. At the same time it shows a tendency to keep Anglican matters in the hands of Anglicans.

Calvin was familiar with the Anglican service. A translation had been sent to him early in the controversy, in fact, before Cox arrived in Frankfort. On January 20, 1555, Calvin had written of this Anglican service, "I see that there were many tolerable foolish things . . . that there was not that total purity which was to be desired."  

In March Cox arrived in Frankfort. By the end of the month Knox had been banished and Cox’s followers had revised the prayer book. The letter to Calvin justifies their actions. The signatories claim to be writing to Calvin as soon as possible. It is worth noting that they are not writing for advice. They are telling Calvin what they have done and why they feel justified in having done it. They admit that he may feel it is a little late to be writing him when "... the matter is altogether brought to a termination." This implies that they

73 Whittingham, Troubles, p. 34.

do not want interference from Geneva where Knox, Whittingham, and their other opponents were then living.

They claim that they had not written earlier because they wanted to settle the controversy themselves and not disturb Calvin with "... our trifling and domestic concerns." But, they state that they are writing then because they want Calvin to be properly informed. They also seem to want to demonstrate to Calvin that they have acted in a spirit of compromise and with the agreement of the majority of the congregation at Frankfort. To demonstrate their willingness to compromise, they tell Calvin,

For neither are we so entirely wedded to our country, as not to be able to endure any customs differing from our own; nor is the authority of those fathers and martyrs of Christ so much regarded by us, as that we have any scruple in thinking or acting in opposition to it.

Cox's group then continues with a summary of what they have done and why. As they report:

... we freely relinquished all those ceremonies which were regarded by our brethren as offensive and inconvenient. For we gave up private bap-


They are most adamant that they have not given up these

75 Ibid.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid., p. 754.
parts of the service because they consider them to be
superstitious ceremonies. Instead, they gave them up,

... not as being impure and papistical, which
certain of our brethren often charged them with
being, but whereas they were in their own nature
indifferent, ... 78

They conclude that they have done everything with the
consent of the majority of the congregation at Frankfort.
After subscribing to Edwardian doctrine, the congregation
chose one pastor, two preachers, four elders, and two
deacons. The letter states that the election took place
with the consent of the congregation and "... the
greatest care being taken that every one should be at
perfect liberty to vote as he pleased," that is, once he
had accepted the summary of Anglican doctrine as it
existed under Edward. 79 The final part of the letter
states that if they thought Calvin would oppose what they
had done, they would send copies of the revision to him
so that he could tell more precisely. But they express
the hope that he will understand that their intention is
only to purify their church. 80

The revision was accepted by the Frankfort congre-
gation. As Southgate notes, there was general acceptance

78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
80 Ibid.
of the Edwardian prayer book modelled on earlier English forms rather than on the Genevan model. 81 This was one of the accomplishments of the conservative divines on Cox's committee.

After the settlement of this initial controversy in Frankfort, Sandys returned to Strasbourg where in September he applied for citizenship. Presumably he remained there rather than follow Martyr to Zurich at this time. In 1557 the Frankfort congregation again became embroiled in a controversy. This problem concerned the election and power of ministers. It resulted in the resignation of Horne. He did not want to see the powers of ministers made subservient to the congregation. Southgate sees the basic issue as "... the threat of what is later known as Congregationalism." 82

In 1557 a group representing both Frankfort and Strasbourg attempted to end this controversy through compromise. Sandys was one of the signatories to the letter which tried to lay the basis for this compromise. The letter, though rejected by the leaders of the Frankfort congregation, supports the view of Sandys as a conservative willing to compromise.

81 Southgate, "Historical Revision", p.152.
82 Ibid., p.149.
The letter claims to have been written at the request of the Frankfort congregation for the following purpose:

to make an end of this sorrowful controversy which so grievously so long time hath vexed this congregation; slandered religion and infamed the name of all England.83

The letter was the result of a conference of representatives of both sides to reconcile differences about the Frankfort discipline. The signatories claim not to take sides. Instead they hope to hold further conferences if the points they have agreed upon are accepted by the Frankfort congregation. As they say,

we have thought good to offer unto you our brethren on both parties such a form of agreement touching certain points of your discipline as had seemed unto us upon conference between certain chosen persons on both sides before us most convenient so to satisfy all men that every man might willingly and cheerfully submit himself unto the the [sic] obedience thereof.84

To this end, they formulated seven articles which can be summarized as follows:

1. The "exercise of learning"—not to be mentioned at all in the book of discipline, but the services of learned men to be utilized, as long as such exist in the congregation.

---

83 Whittingham, Troubles, p.170.
84 Ibid., p.171.
2. Treasure—Deacons to be responsible for collecting and distributing the revenue, but not without the "knowledge and consent of the minister and seniors."  

Garrett suggests that this later controversy may have revolved around Horne's administration of the exiles' common purse, a function he shared with Richard Chambers.  

3. Contributions—This article gave the ministers and deacons the right to extort money from the rich when the treasury was low.  

4. Common letters—These were not to be mentioned in the book of discipline, but were still to be considered a necessary policy. As the article states, "... the ministry with all possible secrecy use such policies and means as may best serve to the relief and maintenance of the congregation."  

It is probable that the signatories stipulated secrecy in the use of common letters to prevent controversies such as that which had broken out previously in Frankfort following the general letter to the other exile congregations.  

85 Ibid.  
86 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.189.  
87 Whittingham, Troubles, pp.171-172.
5. Legislative power—This power was to be in the hands of the ministers and congregation jointly. Regarding making laws, the article states, "... that they be made by the ministry and body of the congregation being called together for that purpose." 88

However, in regard to this power, if the ministers or others refused to appear when summoned, the congregation had the power to deprive them and choose new ministers.

6. Election of ministers—Every year the ministers were to be examined by a group of "Scrutiners". These were to be "six or eight grave and wise men" chosen by the congregation. If the charges against the minister were serious, as determined by the Scrutiners, they were to be made known to the congregation for correction or deprivation of the ministers. Lesser offenses were left to the Scrutiners for correction.

7. Testaments—This article allowed the congregation to choose "eight or ten grave, wise, substantial, and honest men" from whom the testator would choose who would make known those

88 Ibid., p.172.
parts of his will which applied to the general welfare to the congregation.\(^89\)

These seven articles were sent in the letter to the Frankfort congregation. The signatories suggested that the congregation choose two "discreet and sober persons, lovers of peace and concord," to meet with two of the signatories. Their purpose would be to rework the articles so they could be incorporated into the Frankfort discipline.\(^90\) However, this offer to reconcile the problems was refused by fourteen members of the Frankfort congregation. Among those who refused the offer of Sandys and the other signatories of this letter of reconciliation was David Whitehead, the former pastor and member of Cox's committee in 1555. Also included was John Pedder who had been one of the signatories of the early letters from Strasbourg to Frankfort, and who was now a member of the Frankfort congregation.

Although this attempt to settle the controversy in 1557 failed, it does throw light on Sandys as a conservative. This Frankfort incident was the last controversy with which Sandys was involved during his

\(^{89}\)Ibid., pp.172-173.

\(^{90}\)Ibid., p.173.
exile. He joined the other Anglicans centered around Martyr and Bullinger at Zurich where he remained until the end of Mary's reign.

His exile experiences helped to prepare him for his role in the Anglican Reformation. Not only was he in direct contact with continental reformers such as Martyr and Bullinger, but he also worked with other Anglicans in attempting to solve problems which faced the exile congregations. This experience influenced his development as an Anglican divine.

The role he took in the Frankfort controversies demonstrates his adherence to basic Anglican tenets as well as his willingness to compromise on points which were not considered basic to Anglican doctrine. This is best shown by his participation on Cox's committee to revise the prayer book. This committee tried to adopt a form of Anglicanism acceptable to the Anglican congregations faced with the problems of adapting to continental conditions.

His role in the later Frankfort controversy concerning the relationship of ministers to the congregation gives some indication of his willingness to compromise. It also shows his adherence to the committee system of solving problems. Although the compromise platform was not accepted, it shows the desire of Sandys and the other signatories to work with dissident groups to find solutions suitable to all.
Through these controversies Sandys came into contact with the types of problems to be faced later in England when dissidents who eventually formed the core of the Puritan party would attempt to reform the Anglican Church along lines unacceptable to Sandys and other divines who can be labelled the conservatives among the Marian exiles.

Sandys left England as a somewhat sheltered university divine. He returned from exile with the concrete awareness of problems to be faced in making Anglicanism viable. He left England fully aware of the problems Catholicism presented. He returned with the added awareness of the problems Puritanism was to present. His exile was a valuable experience in preparing him for his role in the Anglican Reformation. The specific effects it had on his doctrinal position will be discussed later.
CHAPTER III

SANDYS' PRECONSECRATION ACTIVITIES

On December 20, 1558, before his return to England from exile, Sandys wrote to Bullinger from Strasbourg. His letter expresses his optimism about Elizabeth as queen. He explained to Bullinger that during Mary's last illness she sent word to Elizabeth that in return for the crown Elizabeth was to pay Mary's debts, not to change the members of the Privy Council, and to "make no alteration in religion." According to Sandys, Elizabeth claimed to have the same privilege as Mary to choose her counselors. She was less adamant but more ambiguous about religion. Sandys reports her to have said, "As to religion, I promise thus much, that I will not change it, provided only it can be proved by the word of God, which shall be the only foundation and rule of my religion." To Sandys and others of the returning exiles, this could be interpreted as support for Protestantism.

---

1Zurich Letters, p.2.
2Ibid., pp.3-4.
That Sandys believed Elizabeth would support the Protestant cause is suggested when Sandys writes,

The queen has changed almost all her counsellors, and has taken good Christians into her service in the room of papists; and there is great hope of her promoting the gospel, and advancing the kingdom of Christ to the utmost of her power.\(^3\)

Mary had had thirty-five counselors at the end of her reign. Of these, Cardinal Reginald Pole died the day after Mary. His death delighted Sandys who told Bullinger, "We have nothing therefore to fear from Pole, for dead men do not bite."\(^4\) Of the other Marian counselors, Elizabeth retained eleven. She added eight who favored Protestantism. These new counselors were the Marquis of Northampton, the Earl of Bedford, Sir Thomas Parry, Sir Edward Rogers, Sir Ambrose Cave, Sir Francis Knolles, Sir Nicholas Bacon, and Sir William Cecil.\(^5\)

Of these men, Knolles had been in exile and had been one of the supporters, with Sandys, of the attempt to reconcile the troubles at Frankfort in 1557. He became a member of the Privy Council January 14, 1559. Garrett

\[^3\]Ibid., pp.4-5.
\[^4\]Ibid., p.3.
\[^5\]Ibid., p.5, fn. The retained Marian counselors were: Powlet, Marquis of Winchester, Lord Treasurer; Fitzallen, Earl of Arundel; Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury; Stanley, Earl of Derby; Herbert, Earl of Pembroke; Edward, Lord Clinton, Lord Admiral; Lord Howard of Effingham; Sir Thomas Cheyney; Sir William Petre; Sir John Mason; and Sir Richard Sackvil.
believes this delayed appointment suggests that he had not yet returned from exile by Mary's death. The date of his appointment coincides with the return of Sir Anthony Cooke and Sir Thomas Wroth who left Strasbourgh the day before Sandys.6

Sandys' optimism about the queen's appointment of "good Christians" to her council is in line with his belief that a ruler has an obligation to preserve religion, as will be discussed later. What he did not seem to realize was what W. K. Jordan describes as the Erastian nature of Elizabeth's policy. Jordan suggests,

The Elizabethan Government was almost completely secular and Erastian in its philosophy and policy. . . . The extermination of heresy involves a crusading psychology, and this mentality was completely absent in the Elizabethan Council.7

Not only does Jordan deny a crusading psychology, but he goes on to elaborate as follows:

The Government made most important contributions to the view that the State is concerned only with the external welfare of its citizens and that salvation is a matter which the individual will have to attain by the grace of God and the assistance of the clergy. This view at once dissociated the secular power from any attempt to coerce religious opinion, and placed whatever requirements it chose to frame regarding worship no higher than the grounds of political necessity.8

7 Jordan, Development of Religious Toleration, p.20.
8 Ibid.
Sandys, who looked upon Catholicism at the greatest threat facing the Anglican Church, expected that Elizabeth would do everything she could to stamp out Catholicism. He wrote to Bullinger that Elizabeth "... caused the gospel to be preached at ... Paul's Cross [by her chaplain Bill]." He said, almost with delight, that Elizabeth had arrested Christopherson, bishop of Chichester, "a notorious papist," for a sermon preached there a week later. Sandys claimed that Christopherson said, "Believe not this new doctrine; it is not the gospel, but a new invention of new men and heretics," and suggested this is why Elizabeth had him arrested. Such actions caused Sandys to be optimistic about the future of a Protestant Anglican church. Sandys reached England on January 13, 1559. Before his consecration as bishop of Worcester the following December, he was involved in several attempts to formulate and enforce Anglican policy. These also served to increase his optimism and, in the long run encouraged him to compromise.

Sandys' first involvement was his possible connection with what is usually called Thomas Smith's Prayer Book Committee. Allegedly, in 1559, a committee sat at the house of Thomas Smith to revise the prayer book. Whether or not this committee ever sat and, if so, who

---

\(^9\) *Zurich Letters*, p.4.
its members were and what they did are questions that remain in the realm of historical speculation. However, the events of early 1559 suggest a somewhat united influence of the returned divines; thus it is not impossible that a committee did meet.

Traditionally the most significant document to support the existence of this committee is a manuscript entitled "The Device for Alteration of Religion, in the first year of Queen Elizabeth." This undated document, which on the basis of internal evidence most historians place before December 27, 1558, advises the appointment of a committee of leading Protestant divines. As the "Device" says,

This consultation is to be referred to such learned men as be meet to show their minds herein; and to bring a plat or book hereof ready drawn to Her Highness. Which being approved of Her Majesty, amy be so put into the Parliament House, to the which for the time it is thought that these are apt men: Dr. Bill, Dr. Parker, Dr. May, Dr. Cox, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Grindal, Mr. Pilkington.

---


It should be noted that Sandys is not included among these divines. The fact that he had not yet returned from exile is inconsequential since the same is true of some of the others. However, the "Device" goes on to name Thomas Smith as coordinator and to allow for the inclusion of other men. The "Device" continues,

And Sir Thomas Smith do call them together, and to be amongst them. And after the consultation with these, to draw in other men of learning and gravity, and apt men for that purpose and credit to have their assents.\textsuperscript{13}

Possibly Sandys would have been among these "other men" at least on the grounds that his Doctor of Divinity qualified him, and he was known to the others. But this is speculation.

Unfortunately, it is not known whether the advice according to this "Device" was ever carried out. Although most historians have assumed that a committee did meet, Frocter and Frere have pointed out that there is no evidence to support that contention.\textsuperscript{14}

That Thomas Smith sat on a committee is suggested by the Acts of the Privy Council. On December 23, 1558, a month before the first session of Parliament, the council

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., pp.200-201.

appointed a committee composed of "The Lord Great Seal, the Judges, the Sergeants at Lawe, Mr. Attorney, Mr. Solicitor, Sir Thomas Smith, and Mr. Gooderick" who were to work together "for consideration of all things necessary for the parliament." Neale believes that this was the only official committee. As he says, "I do not think that we need invent any second committee." In taking this position, Neale is opposing the majority of Historians who have "... assumed that a committee substantially the same as the one recommended did meet and that the Elizabethan prayer-book was the result of its deliberations."

None of the Protestant divines appear on the committee set up by the council. In fact, this is a parliamentary committee and there is no reason to expect Sandys and the other divines, who technically had no contact with Parliament, to be present. It would also be noted that this committee is not specifically instructed to consider religious problems.


17 Ibid., p.305.

18 Smith, though usually considered a layman, had been ordained a priest in 1546, but he was not a practicing cleric.
Despite these facts, the idea of Thomas Smith's Prayer Book committee is so commonly accepted that Garrett, speaking of Sandys' experience during the Frankfort Troubles, says, "Presumably it was this experience of his which led to his appointment to Sir Thomas Smith's Prayer Book committee in January, 1559, when he was one of the four exiles on that board."\(^{19}\) Not only does she accept the existence of a Prayer Book committee, but she characterizes the nature of the discussions this alleged committee had. She claims,

> In its stormy sessions during late January and early February, Sandys' quarrelsome temper and "Germanical nature," acting in support of the arrogance of Cox, must have added almost insupportably to the "grief and distress" of Parker as moderator.\(^{20}\)

Here we have not only a committee, but stormy sessions and a moderator. Garrett is following the conventional theory that there was a committee. But her evidence for describing this committee is questionable. For example, the reference to Sandys' "Germanical nature" has nothing to do with the events of 1559. In a letter written to Parker dated October 24, 1560, almost two years after the alleged Prayer Book committee, Sandys wrote, ". . . I think ye will not utterly condemn all

\(^{19}\)Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.284.

\(^{20}\)Ibid.
Germanical natures. For Germany hath brought forth as good natures as England hath."\textsuperscript{21} Garrett uses this letter to infer that Sandys' temperament caused Parker problems in 1559. But this letter was written to justify events in 1560. Sandys may have had a "Germanical nature", but to use this letter to explain the atmosphere at committee meetings in early 1559 requires too much elasticity in time.

One can also question that Parker was moderator. Garrett cites his letter to Bacon dated March 1, 1558/9. In this letter Parker refers to his illness and does mention his unpleasant visit to London. He claims the visit involved "displeasing cogitations concerning the state. . . ."\textsuperscript{22} There is no reference to his actions as moderator or to a definite Prayer Book committee. Rather, the letter is full of statements about his unfitness for the office of Archbishop of Canterbury and his desire for a position at Cambridge.

Parker suggests that his illness would make it difficult for him to attend convocations, a duty which would


\textsuperscript{22} Correspondence of Parker, p.57.
be expected of the Archbishop of Canterbury. If any inference could be made about Parker as moderator on the basis of this letter, such would have to concern his future role rather than inferring that he had been moderator in 1559.

This is made clear upon examination of the letter. Parker refers to a fall from a horse which has disabled him. He cites this as a reason why he would prefer a position at Cambridge. With such a position, he says, "I might be abled . . . to wear out my life tolerably, and should not by that be occasioned to come up to any convocations."\(^{23}\) This reference clearly concerns future convocations.

In a passage which might be misinterpreted, Parker continues, "... and peradventure being there, I might be a mean for the fewer matters of disturbance to come up to Mr. Secretary, now chancellor there. . . ."\(^{24}\) This portion of the letter is definitely a reference to Parker as a moderator, but it is still in the suppositional tense. More significantly, the reference is probably to Cambridge and the fact that Parker could function as a moderator there. This seems the most likely interpretation for two reasons: first of all, the whole letter deals

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 59.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
with Parker's desire for a position at Cambridge instead of the office of Archbishop which he later accepted; secondly, Cecil had become chancellor of Cambridge in February.²⁵ Considered in this light, Parker's letter to Bacon can hardly be used to support the idea of Parker as moderator of Thomas Smith's Prayer Book committee in 1559. This is especially true if one remembers that there is no real evidence that there ever was such a committee, as already noted.

Whether or not there was an official Prayer Book committee, what is important is the fact that the events of early 1559 suggest that the Protestant divines were not idle. In his article describing passage of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, Neale develops the theory that the Protestant divines acted as a pressure group on Parliament. Such action is possible whether or not they ever sat as a formal committee and despite the fact that they were not members of Parliament.

Neale develops his argument by concentrating on the events and suggesting what actions by the divines lay behind these events. Using the Zurich Letters as proof that the divines were in London during Parliament, Neale

²⁵Ibid., pp.54-56. In fact, Parker had written to Cecil earlier in March about affairs at Cambridge as this other letter shows.
infers that they remained in contact with left-wing leaders in Commons. One reason for making this inference is the fact that some of these leaders had been in exile. It seems reasonable that men who had worked together during the exile would also do so in England.

Neale uses the same logic to discuss the first, and only, reading of a bill for the Book of Common Prayer, which took place on February 15. He discounts the idea that the Puritan Genevan Book was advocated. As he says, "The 'Troubles at Frankfort' among the Marian exiles had decided that; and the divines in London--Cox, Sandys, Grindal, and others--who were probably behind this move in the commons, would, I think, have opposed any such proposal."  

Concerning the alleged actions of the Protestant divines, Neale comes closest to treating his theory as fact when he likens them to a convocation. As he says, "the protestant divines--who might almost be likened to an unofficial convocation assembled in London" inspired the House of Commons.

Philip Hughes gives credit to Neale for what he calls an "extremely careful study", but he is hesitant to accept

---

27 Ibid., p.313.
28 Ibid., p.324.
Neale's idea that the Protestant divines acted as a pressure group on Parliament. He criticizes Neale's tendency to treat his theory as fact when he discusses the divines as a unified group. Hughes bases his opposition on his belief that had the divines acted as a united pressure group and been consulted during Parliament, they would have said so later. Hughes particularly emphasizes Jewel's reaction. He cites Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr in which Jewel laments that things are not going as well as he had hoped and states, "we are not consulted." However, this letter was written later in the summer, after Jewel had been appointed a commissioner for the visitation to the west. Neale suggests that his letter reflects Jewel's disillusionment because Jewel continues, "Others are seeking after a golden, or as it rather seems to me, a leaden mediocrity; and are crying out, that the half is better than the whole."  

Hughes also stresses Jewel's conflict with the Catholic adherent Harding to support his belief that if the divines had worked as a pressure group, they would have said so later. Harding taunted Jewel about the number of opponents the Reformed party had had in the Parliament.

---


He emphasized that the work of Parliament had been done by laymen in the face of united opposition from the spiritual lords. Hughes believes that had the Protestant divines been consulted, they would have said so. However, one can speculate that the divines might not have risen to such taunts. If their role was that of an unofficial pressure group, and the accomplishments were in line with what they wanted, they may have remained silent in the interests of peace. It is also probable that they wished to remain in the queen's favor.

Both Neale and Hughes emphasize the role of Elizabeth. Hughes considers her the determining factor in the events of 1559. As he says, "... what, in the end— even in this new hypothesis— settled the matter, was not any pressure from the Protestant divines, but the will of Elizabeth. ..." However, even if Elizabeth was the determining factor, she needed the support of the Protestant clergy to effect religious change.

It is true that Neale's idea that the Protestant divines exerted an influence on Parliament, especially on Commons, is only a theory. But his theory is a plausible explanation of the events of early 1559. No

32 Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 27, fn.
documents exist to prove that an official committee met to revise the Prayer Book. Yet, the Parliament of 1559 adopted the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, the Prayer Book of 1552, with a few revisions which made the Elizabethan Prayer Book slightly less radical than 1552, but still thoroughly Protestant. Certainly it is logical to assume that the Protestant divines, especially Sandys, Grindal, Cox, and the others who had been so concerned to retain the Edwardian book during the Troubles at Frankfort, would have tried to do the same in England. Sandys and the others who had been so concerned to preserve what they called "... that godly order set forth and received in England" during the exile, who had labored together to write letters, travel to Frankfort, and take an active role as spiritual leaders on the continent, were not likely to sit idle in England.

In 1559, in England, they were not Anglican bishops sitting in Convocation. It is true that Elizabeth drew many of her bishops from these former exiles. But they had not yet been consecrated. Many of the sees were vacant. Jewel had written to Martyr in January estimating that there were fourteen vacant sees. He was not far wrong. Of the total twenty-six sees in England and

---

33 Whittingham, Troubles, p.22. See above p.57.
34 Zurich Letters, pp.6-7.
Wales, ten were vacant by death by the end of 1558. No new bishops were consecrated until December, 1559. Until some of them were consecrated in December, the only influence these Protestant divines could have was extra-parliamentary.

The group which should have been consulted for doctrinal reforms was convocation. But convocation was filled with the remnants of the Marian bishops and strongly opposed to change in a Protestant direction. In fact, convocation met the first week of the new Parliament and issued a statement opposing change. This statement included five points of which three were concerned with the mass, the fourth upheld papal supremacy, and the fifth maintained the authority of the clergy in religious matters. The first four points were presented to the Lords. Thus, it was clear at the outset of Parliament that the spiritual lords would oppose a Protestant settlement.

Actually the Marian bishops in Parliament were few in number. Of the sixteen who still held sees at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, only nine attended

---


36 Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.3.
Parliament regularly. But these nine represented a unified opposition group. This is why Neale can say, "With the Marian bishops—such as were left of them—entrenched in the upper house . . . and with Convocation firmly reflecting the views of the episcopacy, the main assault on the Catholic church was bound to be opened in the Commons." And if Neale is correct about the events of 1559, Sandys and the other Protestant divines were trying to influence Commons.

The strongest support for Neale's theory is the fact that Parliament accomplished what the Protestant divines wanted. Neale suggests that Elizabeth may have preferred adoption of the more conservative Prayer Book of 1549 and a slower reform. He suggests that she may have wanted only a supremacy bill passed in this first Parliament. The supremacy act could then have been used to remove recalcitrant bishops. The result would have been a new, Protestant convocation, filled with Elizabethan bishops, which would have supported a Protestant prayer book. Then, as Neale says, "constitutional, not revolutionary procedure would have been possible." Instead, the act of uniformity, which revived the Second Prayer Book of

---

37 Ibid., p. 31.
39 Ibid., p. 310.
Edward VI, passed with the unanimous opposition of the Marian clergy. And it seems plausible that it passed with the support, albeit unofficial, of the Protestant divines.

Specific reasons exist for including Sandys in this group of divines. It is a fact that he was in London during Parliament. Not only do his letters provide evidence of this, but he is mentioned in the letters of other former exiles as well as in Machyn's diary. For example, we know that Sandys was in London in February because Machyn records, "The 25 day of February did preach Sandes." In March Sandys is mentioned in Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr dated March 20. In this letter Jewel informs Martyr of the proposed Westminster disputation between Catholics and Protestants which was to take place beginning March 31. Jewel specifically includes Sandys as one of the nine Protestant disputants, the others being Cox, Grindal, Horne, Jewel, Whitehead, Aylmer, Scory, and Guest. All these divines had been Marian exiles except Guest. Six of them, including Sandys, had been directly involved in the troubles at Frankfort during the exile. More significantly, all of them except

---


Whitehead became bishops. Neale suggests this fact is "... striking proof of the new government's dependence upon them, and therefore of the pressure which potentially they could exercise." 43

The actual disputation was a fiasco. It broke up on April 3, the second day of the dispute, without either side persuading the other. Sandys may not even have taken a direct part although he was probably present. 44

The purpose of the dispute may have been to spread propaganda about the religious settlement, or to discredit the Marian clergy. Shortly after the debate two of the Marian bishops were sent to the tower, two others had their papers searched, and recognizances were taken for three more plus three of the four doctors who had taken part in the debate. 45

Neale suggests that it was at this time, in early April, if ever, that a committee of the Protestant divines met to revise the Prayer Book. Thus he suggests, "... a new prominence had been given to those nine--if

42 Although most of these divines replaced Marian bishops, Horne was not consecrated until 1561 and Aylmer succeeded Sandys to London.


45 Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.32. One of the three bishops for whom a recognizance was taken had not participated in the debate although he had been present the second day.
that was the number—protestant divines of the Westminster disputation." 46 Certainly the timing would have been appropriate. Several of the Marian clergy were feeling the effects of adhering to Catholicism, the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were in process, and the ever-present Protestant divines were available.

On April 30, two days following passage of the Uniformity Act through Parliament, Sandys wrote to Parker. This letter provides the strongest indication that the Protestant divines were working together. In this letter of less than two pages, Sandys uses the collective "we" several times. For example, regarding how the Prayer Book proviso about ornaments should be interpreted, Sandys writes,

The last book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen. 47

Certainly Sandys seems to be speaking for the group of Protestant divines rather than as an individual in the above statement.


47 Correspondence of Parker, p.65.
The second indication of joint action appears when Sandys describes how Boxall, a privy councilor under Mary, tried to influence the treasurer and the Spanish ambassador, de Feria, to dissuade the queen from signing the act. Sandys suggests that they would not be successful because, "Mr. Secretary is earnest with the book, and we have ministered reasons to maintain that part."\(^48\) The latter reference is to a passage in the liturgy which Boxall and others opposed. Sandys seems to imply joint action by the Protestant divines. To whom could this "we" refer if not to these divines who were on the scene and with whom Sandys would naturally be associated?

Gee suggests that not only were the divines collaborating but that they also were in close contact with Cecil. If this were not the case, Sandys would not have asserted Cecil's viewpoint. Gee also suggests that Cecil is the most probable authority for the opinion that the divines would not be forced to use the ornaments.\(^49\)

The strongest indication that the Protestant divines were working together occurs when Sandys says,

> We are forced, through the vain bruits of the lying papists, to give up a confession of our own faith, to show forth the sum of that doctrine which we profess, and to declare that we dissent not among ourselves.\(^50\)

\(^{48}\) Correspondence of Parker, p.66.

\(^{49}\) Gee, Elizabethan Prayer Book, p.110.

\(^{50}\) Correspondence of Parker, p.66.
This statement surely does not imply that Sandys is speaking for himself alone. He is definitely referring to collective action. This idea is reinforced when he continues, "This labour we have now in hand and purpose [sic] to publish it as soon as the parliament is ended. I wish that we had your hand unto it." Sandys' switch to the first person singular suggests that here alone he is voicing his own opinion. The consistent use of the first person plural in the rest of the letter falls in line with the idea that Sandys is speaking for the group of Protestant divines.

A final suggestion that the divines were in close contact, close enough to know the feelings of each other, occurs when Sandys writes, "Ye are happy that ye are so far from these tossings and griefs, alterations and mutations; for we are made weary with them." Thus, Sandys' letter, taken as a whole, provides almost conclusive proof that the Protestant divines worked together even if they did so unofficially.

Even if there is no proof that the divines met in a formal committee, the facts remain that they were in London, that they had a genuine interest in what was

51 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
happening, and that Parliament passed acts which these men favored. These facts taken with the evidence in Sandys' letter which points to collective action, leads one to conclude that these men must have collaborated and, in so doing, been at least partially influential in the initial Elizabethan Settlement.
CHAPTER IV

ON THE ROYAL VISITATION

Although the influence of Sandys and the other Protestant divines on Parliament and the religious changes enacted in early 1559 remains in the realm of historical speculation, such is not the case with respect to Sandys' role in the royal visitation. Sandys was one of the leading visitors to the northern province. He merits being called such by virtue of the fact that he was one of the few who did most of the work.

Elizabeth's only royal visitation took place in late summer and fall of 1559. Its purpose was to enforce the religious settlement and remove the remnants of Marian opposition. England was divided into six areas and a commission appointed to visit each area. Five of the commissions visited the more populous southern province. Only one commission visited the entire northern province. And it was on this commission that Sandys served.

For the visitation Elizabeth utilized the services of many of the former Marian exiles. Sandys was the chief clergyman on his commission. As Haugaard points out, in
all of the six commissions, the chief working cleric was a former Marian exile.¹ For many of the exiles, this was the first official work done by them since their return to England. The visitation took place before any of them became bishops. Thus, it served as a proving ground for their abilities, a test of their willingness to carry out the Elizabethan Settlement, and a source of valuable experience. All the major clerics on the commissions with the exception of Becon became bishops shortly after conclusion of the visitation. Haugaard comments that the more conservative of the former exiles, such as Sandys, became bishops whereas the more radical former exiles, though they were allowed to preach, were not chosen initially for the higher offices which entailed administrative responsibility.²

Serving as visitors was a temporary job, but it was a way for the crown to make use of the unemployed returned exiles. As noted before, most of these men were in London. It Sandys' letter to Parker is any indication, they were concerned about their futures. On April 30, Sandys wrote to Parker, "They never ask us in what state we stand, neither consider that we want; and yet in the

¹Haugaard, Elizabeth, p.136.
²Ibid., p.137.
time of our exile were we not so bare as we are now brought. But I trust we shall not linger here long, for the parliament draweth towards an end."³ Later he alludes to the fact that the returned exiles seem to be waiting for places to be found for them. As he says, "The bill is in hand to restore men to their livings; how it will speed I know not. The parliament is like to end shortly, and then we shall understand how they mind to use us."⁴

By June 24, Sandys' immediate future was assured. On that day the "Letters Patent Directing the Northern Visitation"⁵ appeared naming him to the commission. Although a temporary assignment, for the duration of the visitation the visitors were the primary enforcers of ecclesiastical policy in the country.

Following the visitation, cases could be referred to the Court of High Commission. This permanent ecclesiastical court was chosen in July. It was created to enforce the religious settlement. In a sense it perpetuated the visitation. The visitors were empowered to appoint "assessors" to carry out their work after the visitation was concluded. These "assessors" were supposed to refer

³Correspondence of Parker, p.65.
⁴Ibid., p.66.
⁵A copy of this document can be found in Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, pp.89-93.
cases to the Court of High Commission. 6 Besides receiving such cases, the Court also perpetuated the visitation by virtue of the fact that members of this court were empowered to visit any area of England "... from time to time, and at all times during our pleasure. ... "7 Thus, the Court of High Commission took over the work of the visitors on a more permanent basis.

It is interesting to note that of the nineteen original members on the Court of High Commission, only three --Grindal, Knolles, and Cook--had been Marian exiles. Six members constituted a quorum, and one of these six had to be Parker, Grindal, Smith, Haddon, Sackford, Godrick, or Gerrard. 8 For this, the first Court of High Commission, Elizabeth chose mostly men who had remained in England during the exile. But, as already stated, for the work of the visitation she relied on those clerics who had been Marian exiles.

Actually, clergymen were a minority in the visitation commissions, but only in terms of numbers. Most of the

---

6 Ibid., p.92. Sandys served on this court while bishop of London.


8 Ibid., pp.224-225.
work was done by the clerics and the lawyers. Four types of men were named to the commissions. In general these were Lords (including the Lords-lieutenants), country-gentlemen, clerics, and lawyers. Fourteen men made up the commission to the north. On paper they were a prestigious group. Named by rank in the Latter's Patent, they were: Francis, Earl of Shrewsbury who was President of the Council of the North and Lord Lieutenant of Yorkshire; Edward, Earl of Derby who was Lord Lieutenant of Chester and Lancaster; Thomas, Earl of Northumberland who was Warden of the East and Middle Marches as well as Lord Lieutenant of Northumberland and the bishopric of Durham; and William, Lord Evers.9

Below these peers were four knights: Sir Henry Percy, Sir Thomas Gargrave who was Vice-President of the Council of the North, Sir James Croftes, and Sir Henry Gates. Sandys appears next on the list followed by Henry Harvey, the chief lawyer on the commission. They are followed by four men designated as gentry—Richard Bowes, Christopher Estofte, George Brown, and Richard Kingsmill.10

Not all fourteen members had to be present for the visitation to take place. As Dixon initially pointed out,


10Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.90.
most of the actual work of this northern visitation was done by Sandys and Harvey.\textsuperscript{11} He characterizes the commission as follows:

The commissioners were, on paper, nearly all noblemen and gentlemen of quality, with a very small equipage of clergymen and lawyers. Any two of them might act, and the clergy were not specified of the quorum. But it was the clergy who did the work, along with the professors of civil or common law, the great laymen not concerning themselves to go the laborious circuit with them.\textsuperscript{12}

With the exception of Lord Evers who was present at the Durham Chapter House September 23, none of these "great laymen" took part in the visitation. Thus, Gee comments, "The burden of the work fell upon the shoulders of Sandys, Harvey, Gargrave and Gates, who seem to have been present in all parts of the province."\textsuperscript{13}

The amount of work accomplished on the northern visitation was prodigious. The Letters Patent appointed two notaries, Thomas Percy and John Hoges, to keep records


\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{13}Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p. 72.
with the help of assistants. The result was a manuscript of several hundred pages. ¹⁴

The northern visitation began August 22 at Nottingham and was finished by the end of October. In this two-month period Sandys and the other working visitors held sessions almost every other day. The area covered included the four sees of York, Durham, Carlisle, and Chester which made up the northern province.

York occupied the visitors for almost a month. They held twelve sessions between August 22 and September 21 at the following places:

Nottingham—August 22     York—September 6-9
Southwell—August 24       Hull—September 11
Batley (Blythe)—August 26 Beverley—September 12
Pontefract—August 29      Malton—September 13
Halifax—August 31         Northallerton—September 16
Otley—September 4         Richmond—September 21.

The see of Durham was visited in the last ten days of September. Here the visitors held four sessions, one at Auckland on September 21, Durham on September 22 (23), Newcastle on September 27, and Alnwick on September 30.

The see of Carlisle was visited in two sessions, the first at Carlisle on October 3, and the last at Penrith on October 6. The final stage of the northern visitation was the see of Chester which took the remainder of

¹⁴The original is preserved in State Papers. Domestic. Elizabeth. Vol.10.
October. The itinerary for Chester included sessions at the following ten places:

- Richmond—October 8 (Norwich—October 20)
- Kendal—October 9
- Lancaster—October 13 (12) (Tarvin—October 24)
- Wigan—October 14 (16)
- Manchester—October 17 (18) Chester—October 23 (26)
- Chester, St. Oswald's—October 28

From this itinerary, the scope of the visitation in terms of places visited and distance traveled is evident. But what about the actual work done during the sessions? The Letters Patent had clearly designated the duties of the visitors. These duties may be summarized as follows:

1. to visit all churches in the Northern Province;
2. to investigate the condition of these churches and the lives of the clergy;
3. to deprive and punish the recusant clergy;
4. to grant probate of wills and provide for the administration of goods;
5. to censure, imprison, or grant recognizance to recusants;
6. to deliver the Injunctions;
7. to declare vacancies and provide pensions for those deprived;

---

8. to receive presentations, to institute and induct during the visitation;
9. to examine letters of orders and certifications of institution, removing doubtful cases;
10. to call synods and chapters of clergy;
11. to collect fees for the visitation, to censure and commit recusants;
12. to commission preachers;
13. to restore those men unlawfully imprisoned;
14. to restore those men unlawfully deprived;
15. to possess full power to act as necessary.

In addition the Letters Patent gave the visitors the power to appoint deputies to assist them during the visitation, to continue their work after its conclusion, and to provide for the referral of cases to the Court of High Commission in London. In short the visitors were given full power to act as judges and to enforce the Elizabethan Settlement.

The task before the visitors must have seemed momentous. They knew by the latter part of June that they had been chosen as visitors. The actual visitation did not get underway until August 22. In the interim it is probable that at least some of the visitors met to decide upon

16 The Letters Patent are reprinted in Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, pp.89-93.
a course of action. This seems plausible because the 
visitation was not a haphazard affair. The visitors fol-
lowed a set itinerary and, for the most part, adhered to 
the same format at the sessions. Where necessary they 
used emergency measures such as appointing deputies to 
conclude unfinished business or referring cases to 
another session. These actions seem to indicate that 
they had planned ahead as to how they would conduct the 
visitation.

Of course, a planned itinerary was necessary so that 
each locality could be informed of the impending visi-
tation. Notices were probably sent to the archdeacons or 
other officials in July. For each proposed session, 
a "mandatory certificate" was sent addressed to the local 
dean and chapter or archdeacon instructing him to summon 
the parishioners and clergy to the session. The date and 
place were specified and evidence that the certificate's 
instructions had been carried out was usually the first 
order of business at each new session.

The session at Nottingham is a typical example of 
the work of the visitors. This session took place in the 
parish church of St. Mary's. First on the agenda was a 
sermon by Sandys after which he and the other working 

17Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.71. 
18Ibid., p.73.
visitors Harvey, Gargrave, and Gates took seats and directed the scribe Thomas Percy to read aloud the Letters Patent. The local official then brought forth the mandatory citation which had instructed him to summon the populace to the session. He also provided the visitors with evidence that he had done so, including a list of the names and titles of those persons summoned. It was from this list that the visitors worked. They proceeded publicly to cite those who had appeared and denounce those who were absent. This was followed by an address by Sandys, a reading of the Injunctions and the Visitation Articles, and instruction to those present to return later with written statements answering the Visitation Articles. The clergy were also instructed to appear personally with documents concerning their right to hold office. At the appointed time the session convened again. The churchwardens and parishioners presented their statements and inventories of church goods. Then followed individual examination of the clergy as to their fitness and the conditions under which they held office.¹⁹

Sandys participated in the sessions both as a clergyman and as a member of the court. As the chief working cleric on the commission, Sandys preached at ten of the

¹⁹Gee, *Elizabethan Clergy*, pp.75-76.
most important sessions. Specifically these were Nottingham, Southwell, York, Hull, Durham, Newcastle, Carlisle, Richmond, Kendal, and Manchester. This constitutes the major part of the preaching done on the visitation.

Among Sandys' extant sermons there is one entitled, "A Sermon made in York, at a Visitation."\(^{20}\) This sermon provides a good example of one of his visitation sermons and presents his ideas about the value of visitations. Gee suggests that it may have been made in 1559 during the Royal Visitation.\(^{21}\) However, on the basis of internal evidence it is more likely that it dates from his later career.

The first reason for placing this sermon later than 1559 is the fact that Sandys states that he is beginning the visitation in York. He says,

> And as Christ began with the most magnificent temple of Jerusalem ... so thought I it convenient and meet first to visit this most ancient and famous church, the head and example to all the rest. ...\(^{22}\)

York was the most important city visited in the northern province, but on the Royal Visitation it was not visited

---


\(^{21}\)Gee, *Elizabethan Clergy*, p. 75, fn.

\(^{22}\)Sandys, Sermon 13, p. 236.
first. In 1559 the visitors proceeded geographically and visited York in the order in which it most logically fell in their itinerary. York was singled out in one respect. It was here that cases from the earlier sessions were referred. This created a backlog of work which resulted in the York visit being the longest and necessitated the visitors holding sessions individually with Gargrave, Gates, Sandys, and Harvey dividing the work.

As regards Sandys' visitation sermon at York, it is also unlikely that he would have referred to himself individually during the Royal Visitation when he shared his duties with other commissioners. He does so not only in the example cited above, but also when he says,

"...considering my calling and the charge committed unto me, I thought myself... in duty forced and in conscience bound... to view and see in what state the church of God committed to my oversight and government standeth."  

Since Sandys had not yet been consecrated by the time of the Royal Visitation, it is likely that this particular sermon dates from a later period in his career when he was Archbishop of York.

Three minor reasons also exist for not assigning this sermon to 1559. For example, Sandys refers to what Elizabeth had done for the church as follows:

\[23\]Ibid.
... our gracious sovereign, well following the blessed example of Christ Jesus, did that in her dominions for which she hath as worthily as ever any prince deserved ... praise. ... She hath caused the vessels that were made for Baal and for the host of heaven to be defaced: she hath broken down the lofts that were builded for idolatry: she hath turned out the priests that burnt incense unto false gods: she hath overthrown all polluted and defiled altars: she hath abolished darkness, and caused the light of God's eternal truth gloriously to shine, as we see it doth in the church of England at this day.24

Since the purpose of the visitation of 1559 was to bring about these changes, it is unlikely that Sandys would have referred to them as already accomplished, not is he likely to have glorified the church then undergoing reform as already exemplifying "God's eternal truth."

In addition, he describes the ministry as the most educated of any country. As he says, "... I am persuaded there neither is, nor ever was, a more learned ministry in any nation under heaven."25 Sandys was an inveterate antipapist. Since part of his duty on the northern visitation was to get rid of clergymen who would not subscribe to the Anglican settlement, he is hardly likely to have included these men among the educated clergy.

One final reason for not assigning this sermon to 1559 is the fact that Sandys' antipapism is subdued, much

24Sandys, Sermon 13, p.250.
25Ibid., p.245.
more so than in some of his other sermons. Sandys could reach unparalleled heights of invective when describing the popish clergy, yet in this sermon he contents himself with accusing the papacy of simony and stating that the Catholic Church lacked zeal and refused to be reformed.

Despite the fact that this sermon probably was not delivered in 1559, it is significant both as an example of a visitation sermon and because it provides a clue to the seriousness with which Sandys took his role as a visitor. The whole sermon is a justification of visitations as necessary for reform. Throughout the sermon he likens the role of reformers to that of Christ. He takes his text from Matthew 21 which describes Christ cleansing the temple. He exalts reformers as a special group of men chosen by God. As he says, "The persons . . . to whom this work of reformation belongeth are not all men indifferently, but they only to whom he hath granted the seat of special authority in his church." Extending this exaltation to secular rulers, he claims that when secular rulers are "... professors of the faith, and protectors of the faithful, their hands ought to be chief in this work."

---

26 Ibid., p.241.
27 Ibid., pp.249-250.
28 Ibid., pp.237-238.
29 Ibid., p.238.
For Sandys the justification for the work of visitors was to be found in the laws of the country. One gets the impression that he may have been a rather strict enforcer of the law when he says,

...let not us, whom the Lord hath made the overseers of his house, be slothful in proceeding to sweep, cleanse, and purge it, according as laws and statutes have wisely provided in this behalf; let us consider that we are the Lord's labourers, that the work we have in hand is his husbandry, that our duty is as well "to destroy" as "to build", "to root out" as "to plant". 30

As support for such a stringent position Sandys points to the example of Christ whom he credits with having been as severe in punishing as he was in finding out what needed reform. Sandys says in this sermon that fear is a stronger force than love for the majority of men. As he puts it, "... they are more whom fear doth constrain, than whom love doth allure to become virtuous." 31 For this reason he advocated strictness. He felt just as strongly about thoroughness. Again, using Christ as an example, he suggested that just as Christ had not been content merely to disapprove of the evils he found, neither should the visitors. Rather, they must work until "... they have throughly [sic] redressed things amiss." 32

---

30 Sandys, Sermon 13, p.239.
31 Ibid., p.248.
32 Ibid.
For Sandys the ultimate purpose of a visitation was reform accomplished by "... the maintenance of truth, the rooting out of heresy, the confirming of good orders, the redressing of things amiss, [and] the continuing of religion, peace, and innocency amongst men." These things could be obtained through orderly visitations which were properly conducted. Thus Sandys admonished the parishioners not to withhold information from the visitors and the visitors to carry out their duties as capably as possible. As he says,

> Visitations ... are needful and profitable in the church ... If we reap not this fruit [the benefits of the visitation] ... the fault is in ourselves; in the parties visited, when they hide and conceal that which should be reformed; in the visitors, when they are careless in admonishing and, if that do not serve, in punishing offenders detected and lawfully convicted before them.\(^{34}\)

The royal visitation was Sandys' first experience as a visitor. For the remainder of his career he was involved in diocesan visitations as a bishop and metropolitan ones as Archbishop of York. For these the experience gained on the 1559 visitation served him well. He gained not only a knowledge of the work of visitors, but also a further knowledge of the northern province. That he was chosen for an episcopal career was probably influenced by

\(^{33}\)Ibid., p.247.

\(^{34}\)Ibid.
the diligence with which he participated in the royal visitation. And, it hardly seems coincidence that the first see he was offered was Carlisle, one of the sites of the sessions. Sandys refused this see. Why he did so is not known, but he had firsthand knowledge of Carlisle from the visitation. Perhaps he was influenced by monetary considerations. Carlisle was valued at only 268£ whereas Worcester, the see Sandys accepted, was worth 920£.35

On the royal visitation Sandys and the handful of working visitors traveled throughout the northern province holding sessions and investigating conditions in the churches. For this purpose they were armed with the Injunctions and the Visitation Articles or Articles of Inquiry. The congregations were expected to provide written answers to these Articles, most of which were not original. As Haugaard points out, the Elizabethan Articles were based on those used by Cranmer in his 1548 diocesan visitation under King Edward. In fact, more than half of the fifty-six Elizabethan articles were exact copies of Cranmer's. Of the remaining articles, some were updated and twelve were new.36 The new articles

35Strype, Annals, Vol.1, Part 1, p.227. Strype includes a list of the vacant sees and their reputed values.
36Haugaard, Elizabeth, p.138.
were the first, which concerned residency, and the last eleven, which involved such various matters as burning Scripture, bribes, deprivations, religious persecution, a census of the dead, secret Mass, the conduct of the people regarding slander or sedition, vacancies, "unclean" songs, the Litany, and public readings of approved religious material. 37

Many of the Visitation Articles are similar to the Injunctions. The correlation between these two is that the Injunctions contain regulations and instructions for the churches whereas the Visitation Articles are questions asked by the visitors about existing conditions.

One of the more interesting Articles concerns images and other remnants of Catholicism which were so abhorrent to Sandys and the other reformers. This article, which was borrowed from Cranmer's, reads:

Item, Whether in their churches and chapels all images, shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned and false miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition be removed, abolished, and destroyed. 38

37 Copies of the Visitation Articles, i.e. the Articles of Inquiry, and the Royal Injunctions of 1559 can be found in Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, pp. 46-70. Also, in Cardwell, Documentary Annals, pp. 178-216.

38 Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p. 65.
Injunction 23, which correlates to this Article, states:

XXIII. Also, that they shall take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses; (preserving nevertheless, or repairing both the walls and glass windows;) and they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses.39

Sandys gives evidence of the diligence with which he acted when he writes to Peter Martyr a few months after the visitation, "... all images of every kind were at our last visitation not only taken down, but also burnt, and, that too by public authority."40

Sandys' opposition to images seems to have been stronger than Elizabeth wanted. He writes to Martyr that the queen favored retaining the images of the crucified Christ, as well as those of Mary and John.41 Sandys opposed her in part because the work of the visitation had entailed removing images and also on the ground that

---

39Ibid., pp. 54-55. Gee collates the Elizabethan Injunctions with those of Edward VI. The material in parentheses represents the only change from the Edwardian Injunctions of 1547. However, the Edwardian Injunctions provide for setting up a pulpit within this Injunction whereas this provision becomes Injunction 24 in the Elizabethan Injunctions.

40Zurich Letters, p. 74.

41Ibid., pp. 73-74. A facsimile of this part of Sandys' letter to Martyr appears on the next page.
Regia majestas non alienum esse a verbo Dei, imo in commodum ecclesiae fore putabat, si imago Christi crucifixi una cum Maria et Johanne, ut solet, in celebriori ecclesiae loco ponetetur, ubi ab omni populo facillime conspiceretur.

Londini festinanter, Aprilis primo, 1560.

EDWINUS WIGORN.

The queen's majesty considered it not contrary to the word of God, nay, rather for the advantage of the church, that the image of Christ crucified, together with (those of the virgin) Mary and (Saint) John, should be placed, as heretofore, in some conspicuous part of the church, where they might more readily be seen by all the people.

In haste. London, April 1, 1560.

EDWIN WORCESTER.

---

\(^a\) Zurich Letters, pp.73-74 (English translation); p.\#42 (Latin transliteration); between pp.336 and 337 (handwriting facsimile).
"... the ignorant and superstitious multitude are in the habit of paying adoration to this idol above all others."

Thus, he tells Martyr,

... because I was rather vehement in this matter, and could by no means consent that an occasion of stumbling should be afforded to the church of Christ, I was very near being deposed from my office, and incurring the displeasure of the queen. 42

Besides carrying out the dictates of the Injunctions, one of the chief duties of the visitors was to replace recusant clergy. Most of the clergy were not recusants. Hughes points out that about three-fourths of the clergy accepted the Anglican settlement. In nine hundred and sixty-eight parishes of the northern province, only three hundred and fourteen members of the clergy did not appear before the visitors. 43 Absence was not tantamount to recusancy although the absentee clergy were declared contumacious publicly by the visitors. In the diocese of York alone there were more than six hundred clergy of whom about one-fourth were absent. 44 Of the hundreds of clergy who did appear and were examined by the visitors, only ninety were deprived because they were recusants. 45

42 Zurich Letters, p.74.
44 Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.83,fn.
Recusancy was not the only reason for deprivation. The Letters Patent had clearly specified that the visitors were to restore those clerics who had been wrongly deprived under Mary. For the most part this included clergymen who had been deprived for marriage. Sandys benefitted personally from one of these restorations. While at Cambridge in 1548, he had been vicar of Haver­sham (Eversham) in the diocese of Chester. He was ousted from this position as a married cleric. In 1559, as a royal visitor, he laid claim to the living on the grounds that he had been wrongly deprived. He was restored to Haversham and threw out "the pretensed vicar", Thomas Redman. 46 Thus, Sandys gained not only in experience but also materially on the northern visitation.

On the whole the visitation was an arduous experience. Sandys and the other working visitors covered the entire northern province trying to investigate the conditions of the churches and enforce the Elizabethan Settlement. After his return Sandys wrote to Martyr as follows:

I was sent by the command of the queen into the northern parts of England, as an inspector and visitor, as they call it, for the purpose of removing the abuses of the church, and

46 Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. 5, p. 153, fn. See also Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p. 89, who includes a list of such restitutions made during the Northern Visitation.
restoring to it those rites which are consistent with true religion and godliness; and having been employed in those quarters up to the beginning of November, in a constant discharge of the duties entrusted to me, and with excessive fatigue both of body and mind, I at last returned to London.
CHAPTER V

SUPPORTING THE SETTLEMENT

On December 21, 1559, Sandys and other clerics, including Grindal and Cox, became bishops. They were elevated to this office by Archbishop Parker and three of his consecrators. Thus began the two-year process of filling the vacant sees.

Following his consecration Sandys may not have left immediately for Worcester. It is known that he was in London for Lent because on March 10 and March 21, he preached before the queen and at St. Paul's Cross respectively. He also mentions in a letter to Peter Martyr dated April 1, 1560, from London, that he is about to leave for Worcester. Since this letter summarizes his

1For an argument emphasizing the validity of the Anglican succession see Edgar Legare Pennington, The Episcopal Succession During the English Reformation (Eton College: The Savile Press, 1952).

2Strype, Annals, Vol.1, Part 1, pp.226-229. With his list of the vacant sees and their imputed values, Strype includes documents showing clerics who had not been consecrated before December, 1559, and clerics marked for preferment. Sandys appears on both of these lists.

3Ibid., p.298.
activities, it is unlikely that he would have gone to Worcester, made his diocesan visitation, and returned to London without saying so.

In his letter to Martyr he refers to his acceptance of Worcester by saying,

...an increased weight of business was laid upon my shoulders; for my services were required by the queen for the government of the see of Worcester; and the episcopal office is at length imposed upon me, though against my inclination.

Sandys tells Martyr that he had wanted to refuse the office but to do so would have incurred the wrath of the queen and amounted to a desertion of the church. He does not hesitate to tell Martyr that his new office is a burden more than an honor.

But, having accepted Worcester, he proceeded to carry out his duties, as he saw them, by making a visitation of his new see. The relevance as to whether or not Sandys visited Worcester before May, 1560, is evident when one considers the problems which resulted from this diocesan visitation. Ordinarily such a visitation would be a matter of course for a new bishop. However, Sandys ended up with problems which were not fully resolved until nearly three years later when he defended himself before the

---

4Zurich Letters, p.73.

5Ibid. Over a decade later he was to express the same feelings when he accepted the see of London. See Sandys, Sermon 17.
Privy Council against charges by Sir John Bourne, Mary's former secretary of state.

His visitation took place sometime between his consecration and October 24, 1560, when he wrote to Parker about it. Since he does not seem to have gone to Worcester, especially for an extended stay, until April, it is most probable that the visitation took place between April and October.

Whether or not Sandys was justified in making this visitation can be questioned. Certainly he faced his archbishop's censure for making it. Parker had written to Grindal on May 27, forbidding diocesan visitations. He stated that because of the poverty of the clergy, the complaints of parishioners, and the expense of visitations, he planned to defer the customary metropolitan visitation until a later date. It should be remembered that the entire country had undergone the Royal Visitation only seven months earlier. Parker also told Grindal that those suffragan bishops, of which Sandys was one, who planned diocesan visitations were forbidden to do so. Grindal, then bishop of London, was prohibited from visiting his see.⁶ A special prohibition of the same

⁶Correspondence of Parker, pp.115-117.
nature, dated ten days earlier, was sent to John Scory, bishop of Hereford and Sandys' new neighbor. Sandys could not have been ignorant of Parker's wishes. Not only was he a friend of Grindal, but in his letter to Parker he mentioned that he and Hereford often conferred. Nevertheless, Sandys did visit his new see and then explained his actions to Parker.

Parker apparently accused Sandys of proceeding with a visitation so soon after obtaining Worcester for the purpose of acquiring money. In his letter to Parker, Sandys tried to vindicate himself as follows:

For as concerning my visitation, wherewith your Grace seemed so much offended, and that therein I sought my commodity before I was lukewarm in place. First, I visited with your consent. I proceeded orderly, according to laws and injunctions. I innovated nothing. I was altogether led by laws.

Such a statement is a significant indication of the respect Sandys had for the Anglican settlement and the diligence with which he enforced it. Later examination of Sandys' sermons and his visitation articles for London will show to what extent he supported the law and upheld the 1559 Injunctions.

---

7 Ibid., p.117, fn.
8 Strype, Parker, Vol.3, p.43.
9 Ibid., p.42.
His letter to Parker is interesting not so much as an apology for making a visitation as for what it shows about his actions as a new bishop. He claims, "I redrest, as I could, disorders, and punished sin." Any pecuniary gain he denies stoutly when he says, "And my private gain was twenty-four pounds loss. I gained only in doing some piece of duty, and that with my great travail."¹⁰

Actually Sandys could be quite vehement about visitors who sought primarily their own benefit. In a sermon preached before the queen he warned against men who "... trot from one diocese to another, prying into churches. The pretence is reformation; but the practice is deformation. They reform not offences, but for money grant licences still to offend."¹¹ Sandys considered such men an anathema to the entire church, hence his strong denial that he sought his own gain in the Worcester visitation.

On the other hand, Sandys sincerely believed that the clergy should be supported in a manner which enabled them to carry out their duties. He laments often in his sermons that society does not willingly support the clergy. For example, in Sermon Five he says, "There is

¹⁰Ibid., pp.42-43.

¹¹Sandys, Sermon 6, p.122. For another reference to clergymen who seek riches see Sermon 13, p.243.
no state . . . that may more rightly challenge a competent and sufficient living, than the minister of the Word of God." He supports this statement with various references from Scripture to show that the clergy are entitled to proper maintenance. These references include Galatians VI:6, "Let him that is taught in the word make him that taught him partaker of all his goods." Then Sandys concludes his listing of biblical authorities with the suggestion that the Holy Spirit spoke so much about "the maintenance and honour due to his ministers" because he foresaw "... how God's portion should be pinched."12

In Sermon Seven Sandys implies that religious persecution is now felt in the form of poverty when he says, "No man's life hath been touched; many men's livings are." He claims that Christ will revenge the injustice done to his servants.13

He discusses impropriated tithes in Sermon Eight and argues that if the tithes went for the maintenance of the clergy as they should, there would not be a scarcity of clergy. He laments instead, "... patrons maintain themselves with those tithes which the people give, and ministers have that which the patrons leave. . . ."14

12 Sandys, Sermon 5, p.96.
13 Sandys, Sermon 7, p.128.
14 Sandys, Sermon 8, p.155. Impropriated tithes are those which were the property of lay persons.
In his Eighteenth Sermon he directly criticizes the unwillingness of the people to support the church, to "... give us worthy wages as workmen that take pains for your salvation."\(^{15}\) And in his twenty-first sermon he reiterates the poverty of the ministry when he says,

> It hath been told you often, and some have been angry to hear it so often told, that the ministry is too much pinched, the living of the church so fleeced, that many worthy ministers have scarce, nay, they have not wherewith tolerably to sustain themselves.\(^{16}\)

Since Sandys felt so strongly about the worth of the clergy and the right they had to the patrimony and other income of the church, he probably had no qualms about the income derived from visitations. Although, if his statement to Parker is true, he lost money on this particular one.

Sandys was accused of making deprivations for private gain. During the visitation he deprived Northfolk and Arden who complained to Parker. Sandys defended himself as follows:

> In Northfolk's and Arden's deprivation, truth is, I neither followed affection, nor sought my private gain. I was right sorry that they compelled me to do, as they deserved I should do. And their displacing can no ways profit me. Only I sought therein the vantage of Christ's Church.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\)Sandys, Sermon 18, p.350.

\(^{16}\)Sandys, Sermon 21, p.412.

\(^{17}\)Strype, Parker, Vol.3, p.41.
In 1563 when Sandys had to vindicate himself before the Privy Council for charges made by John Bourne, Queen Mary's former secretary of state, Sandys claimed that Northfolk and Arden were papists. As he said then, "I deprived Arden and Northfolk, two obstinate papists." A former Marian exile, now loyally serving his Protestant government as a bishop could scarcely find a better reason for deprivation. However, there is no reason to believe that Sandys was not genuinely fighting the papist threat in his eyes. Throughout his entire career he devoted himself to defending the Anglican Church from the threat of Catholicism. There is no more strident theme in his sermons than his antipapism. It would do Sandys a discredit not to believe that his first interest in his visitation was reform.

In his letter Sandys also defended himself regarding fulfilling his duty as a cleric in providing hospitality. The Elizabethan Injunctions stipulated that clergymen were to help care for the poor. Sandys took this duty seriously as a means for better reaching the people spiritually. As he says to Parker, "... for the better utterance of the food for the soul, I am forced

18 Strype, Annals, Vol.1, Part 2, p.27.

19 A copy of the 1559 Injunctions can be found in Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, pp.46-65.
largely to feed the body. Without loaves people do not follow the word."\(^{20}\)

Several times in his sermons Sandys touches upon the topic of the pastor's duty to feed his parishioners. In most cases he does not separate spiritual from physical feeding. Thus, in Sermon Five he berates clergy who "... feed themselves, and not their flock."\(^{21}\) He suggests, "... if there be any idle shepherd, that feedeth himself only, and not his flock, let him be reformed or removed."\(^{22}\)

In Sermon Eleven he more clearly spells out what he believes is a pastor's duty regarding hospitality. He states,

> The pastor is a debtor unto his flock, to feed it so much as in him lieth, to feed it both spiritually and corporally: spiritually by life and doctrine, corporally with hospitality according to his ability. Woe be to that pastor that payeth not this debt!\(^{23}\)

To return to Sandys' letter to Parker, he appealed to Parker's approval of conscience. He claimed that he had been earnest regarding matters of conscience, that he did

\(^{20}\)Strype, Parker, Vol. 3, p. 43.

\(^{21}\)Sandys, Sermon 5, p. 111.

\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 96.

\(^{23}\)Sandys, Sermon 11, p. 202. For further references to hospitality see Sermon 18, p. 355; also, Sermon 21, pp. 412, 413, and 415.
not believe he had done anything wrong. In a stirring statement that underlines his belief that he was carrying out his God-given duties, he claims, "... when God's cause cometh in hand, I forget what displeasure may follow. In all other things, ye know, I could ever be guided by you. As I followed mine own conscience, so I condemned none others."  

Fortunately for his future as an Anglican cleric, Sandys' conscience ran along the same lines as the Elizabethan Settlement. His defense before the Privy Council in 1563 shows something about his enforcement of this settlement in Worcester. In 1563 he defended himself in writing in response to charges made by Sir John Bourne. Originally both men had appeared to present their cases verbally. The discourse got out of hand with so many interruptions and verbal invectives that, as Sandys admits, "... your honours, being long troubled with our talk, ordered that we should article in writing."  

Bourne was at that time High Steward of the church in Worcester. He drew up thirteen articles criticizing Sandys both as a person and as a cleric. Sandys responded to Bourne's attack and was exonerated by the

---

24 Strype, Parker, Vol.3, p.44.
Privy Council. His defense provides the best example of how he enforced the Elizabethan Settlement in his own diocese.

One of the charges concerned the altar stone from the parish church. In full accord with the Elizabethan Injunctions, Sandys had ordered that the altar be removed and destroyed. Sandys charged that Bourne had countermanded this order by having the stone taken to his own house. This was a direct violation of two specific Injunctions, numbers twenty-three and thirty-five. Article twenty-three had commanded the destruction of shrines, tables, and other such remnants of Catholicism. The Injunctions had further instructed that altars should be removed in the presence of the curate and at least one of the churchwardens and be replaced by tables.26

As proof that Bourne had violated the Injunctions, Sandys claimed that the churchwardens could testify as to what had happened to the altar stone. As he says,

The altar stone remaining in the church I commanded to be broken. At my coming thither it was removed out of the church, but not broken. The churchwardens openly affirmed, (which they cannot deny,) that Sir John

---

26 As the Injunctions state, "... it is ordered that no altar be taken down, but by oversight of the curate of the church, and the churchwardens, or one of them at the least. ... And that the holy table in every church be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood. ..." Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.63.
Bourne's men had carried it into his house; and they durst not fet it out, nor break it.\(^{27}\)

Injunction thirty-five had stipulated that no person could keep in his house any of the items which Injunction twenty-three had commanded be destroyed. Bourne was not ignorant of the Injunctions. He denied that he had taken the altar stone. He insisted that it had been taken down a year before Sandys arrived and used as part of the pavement in one of the church aisles.\(^{28}\)

This explanation could have been plausible since the royal visitors should have provided for removal of the altar stone when they originally delivered the Injunctions to Worcester. However, Sandys could support his accusation with the testimony of the churchwardens.

Sandys was able to present a strong case to show that Bourne was a papist who impeded Sandys in his work as bishop. For example, Sandys accused him of not allowing people he could control to appear when Sandys was conducting his visitation. As Sandys says, "I sending for divers of his parish, to detect faults and disorders in my visitation, he detained them back, and would not suffer to come."\(^{29}\)


\(^{28}\) Ibid., p.18.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., p.21.
The power of local nobles and gentry was something with which the Elizabethan clergy had to contend. In part it explains why they resorted to nepotism and other practices which would not meet twentieth-century scruples. Christopher Hill crystalizes the problem when he says, "If he [the bishop] was to be an effective agent of the central authority, and not become the mere puppet of the gentry in his diocese, he had to surround himself with persons whose loyalty was to him, and who were not distracted by local allegiances."\(^{30}\)

The bishop had to be able to assert his clerical authority. One can understand Sandys' frustration at having to contend with Bourne's opposition. In one instance, again in accord with the Injunctions, Sandys attempted to investigate the religious conduct of Bourne's parson. Bourne accused Sandys of proceeding incorrectly in his visitation. Sandys countered that those who were to appear were appointed by "... his [Bourne's] unlearned parson, and altogether by Sir John Bourne's direction."\(^{31}\) Furthermore, he insisted that those who had been appointed were Bourne's tenants who would do what Bourne commanded. He elaborates on the manner in which

---


Bourne impeded his visitation when he says,

I sent for other two which favoured the gospel, that they might detect his unlearned parson; who in the pulpit moved the people to auricular confession, as a thing necessary to salvation, as the auditors did report. These two men the said Sir John so used that they durst not come; so I could not orderly proceed to the correction of the priest.32

In this case Sandys was attempting to combat papism by enforcing the Injunctions. He makes clear his view of confession in Sermon Ten when he lists it among other papal practices for which there is no Scriptural basis. Sandys thoroughly supported the Protestant belief in the Scripture as sole authority. Thus, after listing abhorrent practices of the Pharisees, he continues as follows:

Where hath God prescribed these kinds of outward service and worship to be done, as being acceptable to him without inward holiness and true righteousness? In the same rank with these pharisaical devices we may place those papal inventions of masses, pilgrimages, vows, auricular confessions, and whatsoever man hath invented without the warrant of God's word. . . . For the word of God is the only rule of our religion, our only direction in the service of God.33

Sandys also attempted to combat papism when he discharged Thomas Cecil from his consistory court on the grounds that "he hath shewed himself a most obstinate papist, and adversary to the gospel." He claimed, in addition, that Cecil practiced "both the temporal and

32Ibid.
33Sandys, Sermon 10, pp.189-190.
spiritual law, being sufficiently instructed in nei-
ther. Bourne had claimed that Sandys found Cecil un-
acceptable because Bourne favored him. Sandys insisted
that he had valid reasons for the deprivations he made.
He reinforced the problems Bourne's opposition caused when
he declared, "... for that I have punished many notori-
ous offenders: whereof many be of his acquaintance and
great familiarity, and as it is said, the more stubborn
by his supportation."35

Sandys' dispute with Bourne had personal as well as
religious implications. But he justified his defense on
the basis that Bourne's accusations hurt the clergy and
implied that Sandys was unfit to be a bishop. Sandys
suggests that Bourne's accusations are false and represent
a denigration of all the clergy when he says,

... where he doth charge me and mine in his
said articles with many and sundry great and
heinous crimes, misbehaviours, and defaults;
wherein, if he should say trouthe, I were far
unmeet [for] the office and rome wherein the
queen's majesty hath placed me ... his mal-
ice, not only borne towards me, but also
towards all that preach of the gospel, as I do.36

In 1570 Sandys was given the opportunity to serve
his church in a more important see. In July he was

34 Strype, Annals, Vol.1, Part 2, p.27.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., pp.19-20.
translated to London where he remained as bishop until he became Archbishop of York in 1576. It is interesting to note that of nearly eighty bishops appointed during Elizabeth's reign, only six were translated to a third see.\textsuperscript{37} Of these six Sandys was one and so was Grindal whom Sandys succeeded at both London and York.

Cecil (Lord Burghley) may have been responsible for his promotion. The introduction to Sandys' sermons states, "The bishop of Worcester was selected, chiefly through secretary Cecil. . . . The grounds for his appointment were, that he was known to be a man of spirit and determination."\textsuperscript{38}

Actually Sandys' selection was a little more complicated. Grindal, who had been bishop of London, was chosen to become Archbishop of York. He was translated to York in May and installed by proxy in June. This left the see of London vacant. In March Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, began to pressure Cecil and the crown to fill the busy see of London. Even earlier Parker had suggested Aylmer who did succeed Sandys in 1576. When Cecil asked Parker's advice at this point, however, Parker replied that most of the men who already were bishops would not

\textsuperscript{37}Haugaard, Elizabeth, p.159.

\textsuperscript{38}"Biographical Notice" to Sandys, Sermons, p.xix.
accept the see of London, nor were they fit for it. He did add that "they were as notably well learned, and well occupied, as any Prince in Europe had." 39

Apparently Sandys was not initially considered. Strype calls him a "person . . . that was scarce thought of . . . ;" but gives three sound reasons why he was chosen. First of all, Sandys was, as Strype describes him, "... a stirring and stout man, a promoter of the Queen's ecclesiastical commands." The second reason Sandys was chosen was his familiarity with the office of bishop. He had served in Worcester for a decade thus gaining the valuable experience needed to take on the duties of such a large and important see as London. And he was also chosen because he had lived in London in the past and was "... still very dear and beloved to the citizens." 40

Shortly after arriving in London, Sandys preached a sermon which gives evidence both of the fact that he had accepted his translation unwillingly and of the fact that he took his office seriously. As he says, "In respect of my many imperfections, my unfitness to execute this

39 Strype, Parker, Vol.2, pp.5-6.
40 Ibid., p.7.
great and weighty office in such sort as it ought to be performed, I receive it unwillingly."^{41}

At the same time, Sandys seems to have genuinely believed that he was called by God to be a bishop. Thus, in this sermon he says, "... in regard of the calling which I am persuaded proceedeth from the determination of Almighty God, I willingly submit myself hereunto."^{42} He elaborates as follows:

Here I see God hath placed me by the hand of his chief minister, with the advice of her wise and honourable counsellors, and the choice of them to whom it appertaineth; not without your great contention and liking, as I am given to understand. I have therefore submitted myself, and taken upon me this heavy yoke. . . .^{43}

Almost a fourth of this sermon which Sandys preached shortly after becoming bishop of London concerns his view of the office of bishop. It is worth examining this sermon for Sandys' opinion since he spent so much of his life as an Anglican bishop and since his sermons give evidence of his support of the Elizabethan Settlement.

Sandys claims that the bishop's office is a perilous one because if a bishop strives to please men in his sermons, then he cannot carry out his duties as a servant of God. He emphasizes the hard work the office entails

^{41}Sandys, Sermon 17, p. 334.
^{42}Ibid.
^{43}Ibid.
by allegorically listing his tasks and concluding with "... to preach his word, to distribute his sacraments, to execute his discipline, to govern his church, to perform so many parts as are required in him by whom this great and high charge is undertaken."44

He further describes the hard work, but also his esteem for the office when he says,

...those continual labours of studying, meditating, reading, and writing, whereunto the depth of the mysteries of God do necessarily enforce him that must lay them open before others ... all this being duly and throughly [sic] weighed, we may well conclude that he which desireth the room of a bishop in the church, desireth as a good, so also a hard, and undoubtedly a very troublesome office.45

The seriousness with which Sandys took his role as bishop of London is evident not only by what he says in his sermons. His letters also bear witness to the fact that he felt his job to be both arduous and necessary. Writing to Bullinger on February 17, 1572, Sandys gives as part of his reason for not answering Bullinger's letters sooner, that he has had "... a constant accession of business, which the station in which I am now placed daily occasions me, and by which I am almost so overwhelmed, that I have no opportunity either for personal

44 Ibid., pp.331-332.
relaxation or correspondence with others." On August 15, 1573, he wrote again to Bullinger that he longed to get rid of his present duties and spend his life visiting Zurich as he did during the Marian exile. But he claims that he cannot be "... relieved from those cases and anxieties with which I am now overwhelmed ..." because "... I am not born for myself; our church ... demands all my exertions." Again Sandys is emphasizing the importance of his work.

The degree to which Sandys upheld the Elizabethan Settlement and his respect for the authority of such is shown in part by his visitation articles of 1571 for London. This episcopal visitation took place twelve years after the Royal Visitations of 1559. Yet Sandys' articles include almost all the points inquired about in that first Elizabethan visitation. In fact, some of the very words used in the Injunctions are copied by Sandys. This is not surprising considering that episcopal visitations took the place of royal ones and used the 1559 formulas as models. As Carl S. Meyer states, "The episcopal visitations, which replaced the royal visitation of 1559, were within the framework of the royal injunctions of that year; often the very words of the royal injunctions

---

46 Zurich Letters, p.264.
were repeated. This is certainly true of Sandys' visitation articles and lends credence to the belief that Sandys was an ardent, conservative adherent to the Elizabethan Settlement. The similarity of episcopal articles to the Royal Injunctions also supports Jordan's thesis that the government gained early control of religion and never lost it under Elizabeth. One reason the government could maintain its control lies in the support given by bishops like Sandys. In Sermon Seventeen he upholds the Anglican settlement against the criticism of an opponent in Louvain by saying,

> Indeed we have less in their eye than enough. But if we weigh things according unto that rule, "Whatsoever I command you, take heed you do it," then can it not be denied but that our little is sufficient, and their more is too much.

A comparison of Sandys' articles with those of 1559 reveals that most of the differences are the result of omission of articles specific to 1559 and the combination of various articles into one. For example, the 1559 visitation articles, which were an updated, partially revised version of the Edwardian articles of 1547, total fifty-six. The Injunctions, which are the official policy

---

49 Jordan, Development of Religious Toleration, p.86.
50 Sandys, Sermon 17, p.338.
providing the basis for the Visitation Articles, total fifty-three. Sandys' 1571 Visitation Articles, by contrast, are comprised of only forty-three items.

At first glance it would seem that Sandys merely omitted several of the original articles, but such is not the case. He did exclude those items which were unique to 1559, for example, the articles concerned with religious persecution under Mary, the census of the dead for Mary's last year, and deprivations of Protestants' goods. These matters could be taken care of in the Royal Visitation. Morality of the people and, in general, enforcement of the majority of the Injunctions could only be maintained gradually through repeated visitations by the episcopacy.

The fact that Sandys' Visitation articles were fewer in number stems also from Sandys' tendency to combine several items under one article and omit the redundancy of the 1559 articles. For example, Sandys devoted four articles to conduct of the people. His article seventeen concerned church attendance, conduct in church, and general Sunday behavior; article nineteen dealt specifically with the conduct of innkeepers, butchers and other such retailers on Sunday; article twenty-four investigated clerical conduct; and article forty-three inquired as to the existence of disturbers of religion, swearers,
blasphemers, fornicators, adulterers, incestuous persons, bawds, drunkards, harborers of unmarried, pregnant women, people who practiced sorcery, witchcraft, or "other notorious evil livers." 51

These articles were not innovative. The same questions, in fact, even much of the same terminology appears in the 1559 articles and Injunctions. But in 1559, the same items were covered in seven articles and broken down as follows:

- seven—clerical conduct;
- thirty-two—talking in church;
- thirty-four—the presence of drunkards, swearers, and blasphemers;
- thirty-five—the presence of adulterers, fornicators, incestors, and evil livers;
- thirty-six—the presence of brawlers, slanderers, scolders, and sowers of discord;
- thirty-seven—witches;
- fifty-two—in part a repeat of number thirty-six.

Thus, what Sandys did was to combine seven of the 1559 articles into four and omit repetition.

Sandys did not in all cases combine the 1559 articles into a lower number. At times he subdivided the 1559 articles thereby increasing the number but usually improving the organization. For example, Sandys devotes four articles, numbers thirteen through sixteen, to the type of people who can receive Communion. These include the exclusion of evil livers or sinners who have not done penance or reconciled themselves to the wronged party; and the exclusion of anyone older than twenty who cannot recite the Ten Commandments, Articles of Faith, and the Lord's Prayer in English, as well as those between fourteen and twenty who cannot say the Cathechism. Article fifteen inquires if the minister has allowed anyone who does not belong to his parish to take Communion. Article sixteen asks if any parishioners of the proper age have not received Communion twice during the year and if the congregation can recite the above-mentioned in English before receiving Communion.\(^52\)

These same points are covered in 1559 in articles twelve and sixteen. However, in 1559 the intervening articles dealt with clerical hospitality, the repairs to clerical property, and non-English prayers or the use of beads. Thus, Sandys has improved the organization by placing the articles dealing with eligibility for Com-

\(^{52}\)Ibid.
munion together. His articles also show two other changes, the incorporation of terminology from the Injunctions and the addition of specificity regarding age which was lacking in the 1559 articles as well as in the Injunctions.

However, except for minor matters such as improved organization and increased specificity, which could be the natural accretion of living with the Settlement for over a decade, Sandys' articles are so similar to those of 1559 that they show little of his personal approach to enforcement of the Settlement. One can only suggest that his extremely close reliance on the 1559 articles and Injunctions implies his approval. He was a significant enough clergyman to have attempted innovations had he felt they were necessary. Sandys was always more concerned with maintaining order and unity than in pushing for further reformation.

On the whole he was satisfied with the Elizabethan Settlement. Again and again in his sermons he lauds Elizabeth for having rescued the church from Catholicism. For example, in Sermon Four he says that the country should thank God because he "... gave us our gracious elect Elizabeth, whom he hath used as his mighty arm, to work our deliverance, to bring us out of Egypt, the
house of Romish servitude." In Sermon Eight he repeats the same idea when he declares that God "by the hand of his mild and faithful servant delivered us from the usurped power of popery, from the Romish yoke of servile superstition."

In his third sermon he credits Elizabeth as "our prince and governor, the restorer of our religion and liberty," and calls her "a skilful overseer, one endued with all gifts and qualities fit for government," who "is the very patroness of true religion, rightly termed 'Defender of the Faith.'" He continues, "Our gracious governor, following Christ's example, hath laboured most earnestly to purge this church of England."

Sandys firmly held a hierarchical view of society. He outlines this view in two sermons. In his fifth sermon he claims that the prince is the head, the dispenser of law. The ministers are the eyes and mouth, the watchmen over the church. The judges are the ears. The nobility are the shoulders and arms which support the head and defend the body. Other men are the inferior parts in the society.
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53 Sandys, Sermon 4, p.75.
54 Sandys, Sermon 8, p.146.
55 Sandys, Sermon 3, pp.56-57.
56 Ibid., p.59.
body whose duty is to work to support the whole. In Sermon Nine he suggests that all life is a Christian war. In this war the rulers are generals; the captains are the nobility; the trumpeters are the ministers; and the rest of society are common soldiers.

His hierarchical view of society underlies Sandys' emphasis of the ruler as the source of law, hence the source of reform. As he says in Sermon Thirteen, "... when princes are ... professors of the faith, and protectors of the faithful; their hands ought to be chief in this work [reform]." They are aided by the clergy to the result that "... the prince [does] his duty, and the priests theirs; he by injunction, and they by execution; they by instructing him, and he by strengthening them in the work of the Lord." This statement is a clear indication of Sandys' support of the Elizabethan Settlement.

Sandys so thoroughly upheld the concept of the ruler as the source of law that he insists that without a ruler to govern wisely there would be no law and the result
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57 Sandys, Sermon 5, pp.99-100.
58 Sandys, Sermon 9, pp.164-165.
59 Sandys, Sermon 13, p.238.
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would be utter confusion. 61 He expresses a similar sentiment to Bullinger in 1573 when he says, "Take away authority, and the people will rush headlong into everything that is bad." 62 In Sermon Two he calls law "the life of the commonwealth." 63 In Sermons Three and Nineteen he describes magistrates and ministers as two special servants whose duty is to protect and govern the church. 64 In another sermon he admonishes those whom God has made overseers of the church to purge the church of evil "... according as laws and statutes have wisely provided in this behalf..." 65 In Sermon Two he says the "... first point of kingly service unto God is to purge and cleanse his church." 66 Sermon Four tells the people to pray not only for the prince, but for all persons in positions of authority under her. Sandys suggests this is necessary because "... every power is of God, whether it be ecclesiastical or civil power." 67

61 Sandys, Sermon 5, p.99.
62 Zurich Letters, p.296.
63 Sandys, Sermon 2, p.51.
64 Sandys, Sermon 3, p.70; Sermon 19, p.383.
65 Sandys, Sermon 13, p.239.
66 Sandys, Sermon 2, p.42.
67 Sandys, Sermon 4, p.82.
So thoroughly does he support the idea of divinely ordained, hierarchial government that he denies all right of rebellion to the people. Thus, in Sermon Twenty-one he castigates those who try "...to cast down them whom God hath set up." He suggests that the prince should express the following:

I am your prince, God hath placed me over you; ye are my subjects, God hath so placed you; ...ye owe me obedience and not rebellion, honour and not treason.

Sandys even goes so far as to suggest that it is not lawful for subjects to instigate change despite the fact that the change might result in improvement. Thus, in Sermon Thirteen he says,

...neither is it lawful for subjects, of what degree and order soever, by themselves to attempt alteration and change in the church of God, though it be from worse to better.

To Sandys God has created a hierarchical society which must be maintained if God's will is to be done. There is no tolerance for those who would destroy this order. In Sermon Two he expresses the ideal, "One God, one king, one faith, one profession, is fit for one monarchy and commonwealth."

---

68 Sandys, Sermon 21, p.406.
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71 Sandys, Sermon 2, p.49.
Jordan suggests that if Sandys truly believed this ideal to be possible, "... he misread every sign of the time."\(^{72}\) This seems to be the case. Repeatedly Sandys states that the Anglican church comes closest to embodying God's will. This is clear in Sermon Seventeen when he says as follows:

...in our churches of England, to our great comfort, God is served even in such sort as himself by his holy word hath prescribed. ... Our church prayers are the psalms, our lessons the scriptures, our sacraments according to Christ's institution.\(^{73}\)

And in the preamble to his will he affirms his support of "... that doctrine which I have privately studied and publicly preached, and which is this day maintained in the church of England."\(^{74}\)

Further support of the Elizabethan Settlement by Sandys is found in his actions as a member of the ecclesiastical commission on which he served while bishop of London. It was this body which developed into the Court of High Commission whose purpose was to enforce the Anglican Settlement.

Ecclesiastical commissions were not an Elizabethan innovation. Earlier commissions had been more or less

\(^{72}\)Jordan, Development of Religious Toleration, p.154.  
\(^{73}\)Sandys, Sermon 17, p.338.  
\(^{74}\)"Miscellaneous Pieces of Archbishop Sandys" appended to Sandys, Sermons, p.447.
temporary and had carried out the orders of the Privy Council. Under Elizabeth, however, such commissions developed into the permanent Court of High Commission and gained new prominence.

In discussing the development of Elizabethan ecclesiastical courts, Claire Cross suggests that they represent manifestation of the royal prerogative in matters ecclesiastical which had been gained by the act of supremacy. Thus the commissioners were given the power to punish crimes which fell under ecclesiastical law, to settle religious disputes, and to enforce uniformity. As already noted, Elizabeth chose her first ecclesiastical commission in 1559 and gave it the power to enforce the Injunctions which had been delivered throughout the country during the Royal Visitation. Cross suggests, "From this type of commission the Court of High Commission grew."


77 See above, pp.98, 99, and 104.

78 Cross, Royal Supremacy, p.82, citing G. R. Elton, The Tudor Constitution, pp.221-225.
Sandys is mentioned as an ecclesiastical commissioner as early as November 2, 1570, a few months after he became bishop of London. Presumably, as bishop of this see, he automatically became a member since the commission was comprised of bishops, privy councilors, plus other clerics and laymen and had its headquarters in London.

Cross cites R. G. Usher's thesis that "... the Court of High Commission for the southern province gradually evolved during the first two decades of Elizabeth's reign until it had become a fully effective permanent court by about 1580." However she suggests that the thesis may need revision since discovery of the act books for the Northern Court of High Commission shows that that group sat as a formal court from shortly after Elizabeth's accession. She adds, "... because of the destruction of the High Commission records in the south this can be more than a supposition." Letters concerning Sandys' role as an ecclesiastical commissioner, however, seem to support the idea that the court gradually evolved.

Writing to Cecil on November 2, 1570, Parker suggests some additional members for what he terms "the commission for causes ecclesiastical." Sandys and several other
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bishops and laymen including some men such as Anthony Cooke, Thomas Smith, Walter Haddon, and Thomas Sackford, who had been members of the original commission, were already on this commission. Besides requesting new members, Parker suggests that the commissioners for Winchester, Chichester, and Canterbury should not "... deal in causes out of their dioceses, to avoid confusion amongst us...." This statement seems to suggest that there was not a single, cohesively functioning commission.

Makower expresses a similar idea when he says,

"The commission was not always the same for the whole realm; sometimes separate commissions were appointed for the two archbishoprics, and sometimes a single diocese had its own commission assigned to it. These separate commissions were all included in the designation, "the High Commission Court.""

Not all of the commissioners had to be present for the court to function. It is probable that they had the choice of absenting themselves from matters with which they did not agree. Such is the implication of Parker's letter to Cecil dated June 4, 1571. He states that he is going to examine several Protestants and does not think Sandys will take part. As he says,

I doubt whether the bishop of London would deal with me to that effect to suspend them,

---

81 Correspondence of Parker, pp. 370-371.
82 Makower, Constitutional History, p. 263.
or deprive them, if they will not assent unto the propositions inserted.\textsuperscript{83}

He does tell Cecil, however, that several bishops, "being all commissioners," will support him.\textsuperscript{84}

Since Sandys was anti-Puritan by 1573, it seems surprising at first glance that he was not more interested in supporting Parker against non-conformity in 1571. This fact is plausible when one realizes that the group of men arraigned before the ecclesiastical commission on charges of non-conformity included several men with whom Sandys had been closely associated during the Marian exile. Thomas Lever, for example, had even been with Sandys at Cambridge. During the exile he had been at Frankfort as one of Cox's supporters, as had Sandys. One of the other men named by Parker to be investigated was Thomas Sampson. He may have traveled on the same ship with Sandys into exile. He also worked with him in support of Cox during the "Troubles at Frankfort." So it is not surprising that Sandys would be unwilling to support charges against these men. It should be noted, as will be discussed later, that Sandys seems to have been so concerned about preserving the church from the threat of Catholicism, that he came close to overlooking, or underplaying, the dangers of

\textsuperscript{83}Correspondence of Parker, p. 382.
\textsuperscript{84}Ibid.
Puritanism. Parker seems hesitant himself for in the same letter, though he proclaims he will serve the queen regardless of how the world judges, he adds, "... yet I would be glad to be advised, to work prudently, rather to edification than destruction." And, as late as 1573, by which time Puritans were well enough known to be labelled as such, Parker says, "Papistry is the chief wherein we should deal . . . ," a sentiment Sandys could surely have echoed.

The way in which the commission functioned is shown in some of its correspondence. For example, on June 7, 1571, a letter was sent to churchwardens stipulating that practices other than those allowed by the Book of Common Prayer and the law as well as unlicensed preaching were not to be allowed. The letter begins with a statement that the commission is doing its duty because the queen wants the laws upheld and religious unity maintained. Thus, the commission orders the churchwardens not to allow preachers who are not licensed by the queen, the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of the diocese. The language used in the letter closely follows that used in the Injunctions. The letter ends with a statement that
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Hughes suggests that the commission always followed the orders of the Privy Council. As he says, "... all initiative, all policy, lay with the council, and the commissioners were simply the council's agents, acting according to defined instructions." It is true that the commission looked to the council and ultimately to the queen for authority. But, this in no way should be construed as a total lack of initiative. Certainly the commissioners, especially those who were bishops, were in closer contact with their dioceses than was the council. Thus they were more likely to know what needed reform.

That the initiative could begin with members of the commission is shown by a rather curious letter Parker wrote to Cecil on June 17, 1571. In this letter he tells Cecil that the Inns of Court need to be reformed again, because they "... do now of late grow again very disordered and licentious in over bold speeches and doings touching religion." Parker asks Cecil to obtain a letter from the Council instructing reform. He goes so
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far as to send Cecil a draft of the letter he wants the Council to write. As he requests of Cecil, "... obtain a letter of the effect here inclosed from my lords of the council to the commissioners ecclesiastical. ..."  

The draft of the letter is addressed to himself and Sandys. Parker wants the Privy Council to send him and Sandys the following authority:

> We do hereby require your lordships, that you and such others of the commissioners ecclesiastical there as your lordships shall think most meet, will carefully peruse and consider the said order, and thereupon to call before you such of the benchers or governors of the said houses as you shall think fittest and best affected in religion, and by their good advice ... search and sift out the manner ... for the reformation.91

This letter certainly does not bespeak a lack of initiative. It is rather an example of members of the ecclesiastical commission informing the Privy Council of necessary reforms for which they will then receive the authority to proceed.

On November 28, 1571, Sandys wrote a letter to Parkhurst, bishop of Norwich, which provides an example of Sandys carrying out instructions from the Privy Council. The letter concerns a translation of Augustin Marlorate's commentary on Matthew. The Council appointed
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Parker and Sandys to make sure that all the clergy in the southern province purchased the book. Thus, Sandys writing to Parkhurst says, "The Lords of the Privy Council willed my Lord of Canterbury and me to deal with the Clergy of this province for the having of them." Sandys asks Parkhurst to let him know how many of the clergy in his diocese can purchase the book. He states that it is particularly worth having for the clergy, but valuable for anyone. He even goes so far as to suggest, "And when you deal with any offenders, it were a good part of penance for them to buy the said book."  

On January 13, 1571/2, Sandys and some of the other commissioners were signatories to a letter addressed to the Duchess of Suffolk instructing her to send her chaplain to the commission. They write to her as follows:

We are persuaded that your grace knowing the authority of our commission, and how straitly [sic] we are charged to proceed in redressing disorders, will not stay your said servant. . . . We would be loth to use other means to bring him to his answer, as we must be forced to do, if your grace will not like hereof.  

They do not stipulate what "other means" they have. Possibly they hoped the threat would be enough.

The same commission did not handle all matters of reform. For example, on May 31, 1572, Parker, Sandys,

92 Strype, Parker, Vol.2, pp.81-82.
93 Correspondence of Parker, p.390.
and Cox, all members of the ecclesiastical commission for the southern province, were joined by Grindal, then Archbishop of York, to investigate problems at Cambridge. Apparently a group of "young men" at Cambridge, who seem to have been led by the proctors, complained "...against their elders, masters of Colleges." The commission reports to Cecil as follows:

We have deliberately conferred their objections, answers, and replies... besides that we heard both the parties challenging the one the other at full.94

The findings of the commission were that changes in the statutes were not necessary and that the "young men" sought reform through disorderly methods because they did not have the vice-chancellor's approval.95 This incident is an example of a few of the commissioners functioning as a court but aided by the Archbishop of York who was not an ordinary member of the southern commission.

The commission was not always used. In some cases the Archbishop of Canterbury would give the bishop of London the task of making known new policies to the province. Such is the case on October 29, 1572, when Parker sent Sandys a form of prayer to be used throughout the southern province.96

94 Ibid., p.393.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid., pp.402-403.
It was also possible for individual bishops to contact Cecil or other members of the Privy Council directly rather than working through the ecclesiastical commission. For example, on April 30, 1573, Sandys wrote to Cecil about the Puritan problem. In the first part of his letter, he claims that he has been unable to get a copy of Cartwright's book in order to read it. The second part of his letter concerns the billeting of men with a Mr. Mullyns. These house prisoners were complaining to Sandys, and, as he says, "... charging me that the Council hath given me authority to set them at liberty or at the least to be in their own houses." Sandys adds, "... the whole blame is laid on me for their imprisonment," and requests that Cecil let him know what to do.\footnote{Puritan Manifestoes, a Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt with a reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and kindred Documents, 1572, ed. by W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas (London: published for the Church Historical Society by S.P.C.K., 1954), pp.152-153. Hereafter cited as Puritan Manifestoes.}

Two months later the queen's proclamation dated June 11, 1573, required that all copies of The Admonition to the Parliament be brought to the bishop or a member of the Privy Council within twenty days, that is, by July 1. On July 2 Sandys wrote to Cecil that he had not received any copies nor did he expect the Privy Council had received many. Thus he says,
I thought it my duty to advertise [to] your Lordship that although the date of the late proclamation for bringing in of the Admonition to the Parliament and other sedicious books is already expired, yet the whole city of London where no doubt is great plenty, hath not brought one to my hands.98

He suggests that already "these new writers" are inspiring boldness and disobedience ". . . against the Civil Magistrate whom in words they seem to extol but whose authority in very deed they labor to cast down." In this letter he also reminds Cecil that Mullyns is burdened with "unthankful guests."99

It is clear by 1573 that Sandys was aware of the threat Protestant non-conformity was to Anglicanism. He saw this non-conformity as a threat to the hierarchy he so firmly believed was divinely ordained. On July 6, 1573, Sandys and Parker sent a joint letter to another member of the ecclesiastical commission expressing their alarm about the non-conformists. They claim that the church is being attacked by false brethren, men who under the guise of reformation actually intend to overthrow authority, both ecclesiastical and religious. As they say,

Neither do they only cut down the ecclesiastical state, but also give a great push at the civil

98Ibid., p. 154.
99Ibid., p. 154-155.
policy. Their colour is sincerity, under the countenance of simplicity, but in very truth they are ambitious spirits, and can abide no superiority. 100

With the letter they sent articles extracted from Cartwright's book which were probably the same Sandys sent to Bullinger a month later. Parker and Sandys claim that they must defend the church and oppose the "underminers" because "... God hath placed us to be governors in his church." 101

In late August Sandys wrote to Cecil telling him of some of the actions which he had taken against the non-conformists. He informs Cecil that he has found a printing press and apprehended the printer who willingly confessed to having printed a thousand copies of Cartwright's book. Sandys asks for Cecil's advice on what else he should do and suggests that the civil authorities could best handle the matter. 102

It was also at this time that Sandys wrote to his friends abroad about non-conformity. On August 15, 1573, he wrote to Bullinger as follows:

New orators are rising up from among us, foolish young men, who while they despise authority, and admit of no superior, are seeking the complete

100 Correspondence of Parker, p. 434.
101 Ibid., p. 435.
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overthrow and rooting up of our whole ecclesiastical polity, so piously constituted and confirmed.103

Sandys sent Bullinger a summary of the platform proposed by these "new orators" which is worth quoting in full because it shows why Sandys recognized the Puritans as a threat to the hierarchy. It is interesting to note that he does not yet call them Puritans. The summary is as follows:

1. The civil magistrate has no authority in ecclesiastical matters. He is only a member of the church, the government of which ought to be committed to the clergy.

2. The church of Christ admits of no other government than that by presbyteries; viz. by the minister, elders, and deacon.

3. The name and authority of archbishops, archdeacons, deans, chancellors, commissaries, and other titles and dignities of the like kind, should altogether be removed from the church of Christ.

4. Each parish should have its own presbytery.

5. The choice of ministers of necessity belongs to the people.

6. The goods, possessions, lands, revenues, titles, honours, authorities, and all other things relating either to bishops or cathedrals, and which now of right belong to them, should be taken away forthwith and for ever.

7. No one should be allowed to preach who is not a pastor of some congregation; and he ought to preach to his own flock exclusively, and no where else.

103Zurich Letters, p.295.
8. The infants of papists are not to be baptized.

9. The judicial laws of Moses are binding upon Christian princes, and they ought not in the slightest degree to depart from them.\(^ {104}\)

Sandys states that the non-conformist platform contains many other similarly absurd points which can only bring ruin and confusion to the church. He asks for the advice of Bullinger and the others with him in Zurich. One reason he gives is that the non-conformists claim to have "all the reformed churches on their side."\(^ {105}\)

Sandys does not seem to have realized the genuine threat inherent in non-conformity despite the strength of his statements in these letters. Or rather, he felt that the Anglican system could reassert control. At least he was optimistic a year later when he wrote to Bullinger that he expected the new discipline to "fall in pieces by its own weight," because people were losing interest.\(^ {106}\) On the same day, August 9, 1574, he wrote to Gaulter that non-conformity was not causing much of a problem. As he says,

> Our innovators, who have been striving to strike out for us a new form of a church, are not doing us much harm; nor is this new fabric

\(^{104}\)Zurich Letters, pp.295-296.

\(^{105}\)Ibid., p.296.

\(^{106}\)Ibid., p.311.
of theirs making such progress as they ex-
pected. . . . The author of these novelties,
and after Beza the first inventor, is a young
Englishman, by name Thomas Cartwright.107

Many months earlier Cartwright had left England for
the continent. In fact, Sandys tells Gaulter that he
thinks Cartwright is in Heidelberg and has written a de-
fense of the new discipline. It is interesting to note
that the Court of High Commission issued a warrant for
Cartwright's arrest before he left England. Sandys was
one of the signatories of this warrant.108

It is unnecessary as well as impossible to describe
all of Sandys' attempts to enforce the Elizabethan Set-
tlement during his career. How he felt is evinced not
only through his correspondence, diocesan duties, and
actions on the Court of High Commission, but also, most
importantly, in his sermons.

London was not the end of his career. He moved on
to become Archbishop of York in 1576 and held this posi-
tion until his death slightly more than a decade later.
But, by the time he was translated to York, his position
was clear. He was a moderate Anglican, firmly committed
to the defense of his church and queen. He was opposed

107Ibid., p.312.
108Ibid., p.313.
to the disorders threatened by both papists and puritans though by far he considered the former the most serious.

The records are scant. Sandys may never be more than a somewhat shadowy minor figure of the Anglican Reformation. But it is perhaps valid to suggest that it was men of his mettle who gave durability to the Elizabethan Settlement. Sandys zealously supported the queen, the hierarchy, and the Settlement. Yet he was a man who preferred compromise to disunity. He was a man who would bend rather than displease the queen or cause a breach within the church.

Sandys was not a giant. He could be as human, as quarrelsome, as overworked, and a petty as any ordinary man. Yet, in the final analysis, one can sincerely admire his loyalty, his conviction, and his willingness to take on the responsibilities of his profession. It is to such men that the Elizabethan Settlement owes its success.
CHAPTER VI

SANDYS' DOCTRINAL POSITION

No study of Sandys' role in the Anglican Reformation would be complete without attention being given to his doctrinal position. For the greater part of his life he was a servant of the church. He was elevated in the ecclesiastical hierarchy until he held the second highest position in all England, Archbishop of York. As a Marian exile and later as an Anglican bishop under Elizabeth, he was in a key position to help preserve the Protestantism of his church. He lived and served through the crucial period when Anglicanism was refuting Catholicism and beginning to feel internal strains from Puritanism.

E. T. Davies points out that the seventeenth century, which is often considered the golden age of Anglicanism, built upon the foundation laid by the reformers of the sixteenth century. He emphasizes that men like Sandys "... lived in an age when the doctrinal reformation might well have gone to extremes..."¹ It was clerics

like Sandys who prevented this from happening. Some of these men were of a conservative bent. They were interested in a sure and steady and lasting reformation. They were willing to compromise on "indifferent" matters for the sake of order and unity. Such a man was Sandys.

Sandys was wholeheartedly committed to Anglicanism, not a surprising statement to make about an Anglican bishop. However, it should be remembered that when Sandys began his service to the Anglican Church as a bishop, he was fresh from the Marian exile. Moreover, he maintained contact with continental reformers such as Bullinger and Gaulter for many years. Although his contact with the Swiss Reformation left a Calvinistic stamp on his doctrine, Sandys was by no means a Puritan. Radical Puritanism received its impetus from Geneva. Sandys was influenced by Strasbourg and Zurich. This is necessary to point out because of the tendency of some historians to overemphasize the Calvinistic influence on the Marian exiles. For example, Donald Joseph McGinn says, "Without doubt . . . Whitgift led the Church of England back from the Calvinistic school of John Jewel, Edmund [sic] Sandys, and the earlier theologians who had been directly exposed to the teaching of Frankfurt and Geneva."²

²McGinn, Admonition Controversy, p.137.
One cannot clearly distinguish between Puritan and Anglican in the early years of the Elizabethan Settlement. The most radical Puritans were still a part of the Anglican fold. The chief enemy to the Anglican Church was not dissidents among its own members, but the Catholic Church. Sandys makes only passing reference to the "new orators", and the term "Puritan" does not occur with any regularity in his correspondence though he does use it in a 1579 letter to Gaulter. His antipapism, on the other hand, is evident in almost everything he wrote. In fact, if one were to generalize about his doctrinal position, one could say that his main emphasis is to contrast the true church of God, the Anglican Church, with the church of the devil, the Catholic Church, as he viewed them.

John F. H. New stresses that the Elizabethan Settlement was Protestant, that the term "via media" is too general because one must first understand the Protestantism of Anglicanism before concentrating on the Roman Catholic undertones. He suggests doctrinal positions which unequivocally establish the Protestantism of Anglicanism. These include the rejection of papal supremacy; the belief in justification by faith, that is, that
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salvation is God's doing; and the Anglican sacramental doctrine. 5

To understand the nature of Sandys' doctrinal position, the following topics will be investigated: Sandys' conception of justification by faith alone through the grace of God, the relation of justification by faith to good works, Sandys' view of the sacraments, his deemphasis of rites and ceremonies, his belief in the Bible as the sole authority, his concept of the ministry, and the manner in which he contrasts the Anglican Church with the Catholic.

Justification by faith is one of the basic doctrines which separates Protestantism from Catholicism. It serves as a basis to so much of Protestant doctrine that a definition is necessary before one can hope to understand either the Protestantism of the Anglican Church or the specific doctrinal position of Sandys.

In its simplest terms, justification by faith alone through the grace of God means acceptance of the total depravity of man to the extent that there is nothing man can do to earn salvation. Man can never merit salvation. Instead, salvation is a free gift from God to all men who believe in the redemptive death of Christ. Faith is absolutely necessary. To the believing Protestant, there

5 Ibid., p. 104.
is no need for man to commend himself to God by doing good works. Rather, God commends himself to man. He promises to save man if man has faith.

In discussing justification by faith there are two points which Sandys reiterates frequently. They are that grace is free and that faith is necessary for salvation. How a man gains faith, according to Sandys, will be discussed later.

In several of his sermons Sandys states that grace, that is, salvation, is freely given. Usually he does so in the context of showing why the Anglican Church possesses correct doctrine whereas the Catholic Church errs. He always buttresses his statements with scriptural authority or that of the Church fathers. In his first sermon he says, "The grace of God is free, remission of sins is free, freely granted, freely given without money." He supports this by quoting St. Augustine. In his eighth sermon he repeats the idea that "... salvation is not sold, but freely given of God. . . ."

The second point concerning the doctrine of justification by faith is that faith is absolutely necessary for

6Sandys, Sermon 1, p.11. This is the first of his collected, published sermons, not the first sermon he preached.

7Sandys, Sermon 8, p.144. Further references to salvation as free can be found in Sermon 10, p.181 and Sermon 14, p.268.
a man to attain the free salvation that God offers. This conception is a key to understanding the whole gamut of Protestant doctrine. The emphasis on faith explains why Protestants consider erroneous such Catholic teachings as the veneration of saints, the necessity of the priesthood and papal supremacy, and anything else that undermines the essential Protestant belief that salvation is the work of God alone.

Expounding on Acts XIII:38-39, Sandys suggests that the New Testament shows man that "... everyone that believeth is justified." In Sermon Eight he says, "... he that cometh unto God must believe," and cites St. Ambrose as an authority. In his tenth sermon he states that it is faith that makes man able to accept the redemptive death of Christ. His eleventh sermon reiterates that man gains true justification through faith.

Sandys' longest explanation of the necessity of faith for salvation occurs in Sermon Fourteen which is based on Acts XI:34, the sermon of Peter to Cornelius. To Sandys this sermon embodies "... briefly, but most effectually, the fulness of the gospel, the perfect doctrine of salva-

8 Sandys; Sermon 1, p.13.
9 Sandys, Sermon 8, p.152.
10 Sandys; Sermon 10, p.179.
11 Sandys, Sermon 11, p.209.
tion."
Verse 43 is the key, ". . . that through his name
whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of
sins."^{12}

Sandys also cites St. Paul as an authority for the
idea that faith is a gift of God, that justification has
nothing to do with man's merit or works because, ". . . we
obtain remission of sins, not by our works, but through
faith in Christ."^{13} The scriptural passage he quotes for
support is Romans III:24-25, which states that man is
"justified freely, by the grace of God, through the re-
demption that is in Christ Jesus. . . ."^{14}

Sandys always attempted to prove that Anglican doc­
trine was established by God. He felt that it was true,
correct doctrine because it could be supported by Scrip­
ture. As he declares,

This doctrine of justification by faith in the
death and resurrection of Christ Jesu is wit­
essed by all the prophets. It is no new doc­
trine, but old; not only proceeding from the
apostles, but also from the prophets . . .
whose steps we follow . . . no doctrine is to
be established but that which is testified by
the apostles and prophets. The true church of
Christ doth build on their foundation.^{15}

Finding proof for his doctrine in Scripture was by no

^{12}Sandys, Sermon 14, p.256. He repeats this on p.282.
^{13}Ibid., p.268.
^{14}Ibid.
^{15}Ibid., p.291.
means unique to Sandys. Luther had been the first to emphasize that justification by faith means that God is responsible for salvation, that there are no works man can do, no merits man has which make man worthy to be saved.  

According to Stephen Neill, Luther's main contribution to theology was "... to restore the true relationship between faith and works."  

Like other Protestant theologians, Sandys' interpretation of good works was influenced by Luther's. At this point it is necessary to show what Sandys believed about good works in order to demonstrate how thoroughly the belief in justification by faith was accepted by him.

His interpretation is wholeheartedly Protestant. Good works are like the cart following the horse. Good works have nothing to do with man's salvation. Rather, they are expected of the faithful man as a service to God. They are expected not because they will contribute to his justification, but because he is justified.

Sandys does not devote much time to discussions of good works. He does not usually define in specific terms

---

16 Sandys does not mention Luther in his sermons. However, in his "Advertisement to the Translation of Luther's Commentary on Galatians", in "Miscellaneous Pieces", appended to Sandys, Sermons, p.435, he praises Luther.

what he interprets as good works, nor does he correlate them to the sacraments, church attendance, or anything else exactly. Instead, his main emphases are to point out the errors of the Catholic interpretation of good works and to stress that good works are not a prerequisite to faith. To Sandys they are a service to God that the true Christian does after he has faith.

In Sermon Fourteen he criticizes the papists for believing that good works are preparations to grace and that justification can be attributed to good works. He labels such beliefs as absurd and says,

...to attribute justification to our merit or works is to make "of none effect" the merit of Christ, to make grace no grace. For remission of sins is justification ... we obtain remission of sins, not by our works, but through faith in Christ. 18

This is perhaps Sandys' strongest statement about the relationship of good works to faith. There is no causal relationship of works to faith. No amount of good works can lead man to faith or make him deserving of salvation. To Sandys redemption is "... of mercy, and not of merits." 19 For Biblical support he quotes Titus III:5, "Not by works which we have wrought, but according to his great mercy he hath saved us." 20

---

18 Sandys, Sermon 14, p.267.
19 Sandys, Sermon 10, p.181.
20 Ibid.
However, there is a causal relationship between faith and works in the sense that the faithful man will do good works as a part of his service to God. "For the end of our redemption is that we may serve him without fear. . . ." Service is a way to glorify God. Thus, Sandys continues, "We are not redeemed . . . to be idle and do nothing, but to glorify him. . . . Service is required at our hands." In another sermon he stresses that man is redeemed to serve God, that it is not enough not to do evil, the faithful man is required to do good.

In part Sandys' conception of good works is related to his belief in the utterly depravity of man. The good which man does is attributed to God. It ". . . proceedeth only and wholly from him." Human nature is totally corrupt. As Sandys says, ". . . corruption is bred and settled within our bones . . . with it all the powers and faculties of our nature are infected. . . ."

So strongly does Sandys believe in the depravity of man that he suggests that even if man does not know he has done wrong, even if he believes that he has upheld God's laws diligently, ". . . yet herein could we in no

---

21 Ibid., p.182.
22 Sandys, Sermon 11, pp.213-214.
23 Sandys, Sermon 1, p.21.
24 Ibid.
wise be justified, because of secret sins, hidden even from our own selves. . . ."  

25 The implication is that man is evil whether he intends to be or not. This is related to Sandys' conception of free will. New points out that the belief in the depravity of man was accepted by both Anglicans and Puritans. He suggests that the doctrine of justification by faith is a consequence of this belief.  

26 In addition, Anglican doctrine did not accept free will regarding salvation.  

27 The reason for this is that if man is depraved, if justification is by faith, if faith is a free gift from God, if salvation is God's doing, then man does not have free will regarding his salvation.  

In Sermon One Sandys lambasts the papists for bragging about the power of free will "... as if sin had not utterly bereaved us. . . ."  

28 Sandys does not believe that man totally lacks free will. Rather, man's will is limited to earthly matters. Sandys elucidates his position concerning the relationship of free will to salvation when he says,  

... the will of man, being free unto natural and civil actions, hath of itself no freedom

25 Ibid., p.25.  


27 Ibid., p.11.  

28 Sandys, Sermon 1, p.23.
to desire things heavenly and spiritual . . .
because [of] the corruption of our nature.29

He goes on to say that this corruption adds man to
evil. Since obedience to God is voluntary, the real
question for Sandys is "... how we are made willing
unto that which is good. . . ." And his answer is
"... only by the grace of God."30

Interpreting Sandys to mean that man is free only to
do evil, New suggests that Sandys must be understood in
the theological sense. As he says,

Sandys was not condemning every earthbound action;
he was stressing the doctrinal point that original
sin so limited a man's understanding that he became
spiritually impotent, and all his efforts were in-
sufficient for salvation.31

As has been shown, Sandys' interpretation of good works
is dependent on his belief in the depravity of man and
his acceptance of justification by faith.

Sandys' doctrinal position is further attested in
his explanation of the two sacraments which Protestantism
accepted, the Lord's Supper and baptism. He devotes more
time to explaining the correct interpretation of the
Lord's Supper as he sees it than he does to baptism. His

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
exposition is lucid and demonstrates the debt Anglicanism owes to Calvin and Zwingli.

It should be noted that during his exile and until Bullinger's death in 1575, Sandys kept in contact with him, and, in part, looked to him as a kind of spiritual mentor. Sandys was not alone in this. Grindal wrote to Bullinger in 1567, that by reading Bullinger's tract "Origin of Error" in the past, he had come to know "...a correct opinion respecting the Lord's Supper; whereas before that time I had adopted the sentiments of Luther on that subject." Sandys might well have expressed the same sentiment because with respect to the crucial point of variance, the conception of Christ's presence in the sacrament, Sandys' interpretation is much more like that of Bullinger that it is of Luther and Calvin.

Bullinger had succeeded Zwingli as a leader of the Swiss Reformation. As early as 1549, a decade before the accession of Elizabeth and a few years before the Marian exile, the Zwinglian and Calvinistic churches had agreed on their interpretation of the Lord's Supper. This was accomplished by the Zurich Consensus as a result of the visit of Calvin and Farel to Bullinger. Sandys' inter-

---

32 *Zurich Letters*, p.182.

pretation of the Lord's Supper probably reflects directly the influence his contact with Bullinger and Martyr had on him during the Marian exile. Martyr was generally looked to as an expert on the sacraments. In Sandys' conflict with the papist Bourne, Sandys says, "... he reasoned with me in defence of transubstantiation, and condemned Peter Martyr's doctrine and learning in comparison of Dr. Gardiner's, late bishop of Winchester. He at that time said, he would never agree with me in religion." 34

In his fourth sermon Sandys gives his longest discussion of the meaning of the Lord's Supper. So significant is his explanation of this sacrament to understanding Sandys' doctrinal position that it is worth describing in detail.

Sandys says that there are two things in this sacrament, a visible sign and an invisible grace. The visible is the bread and wine. The invisible is the body and blood of Christ. Were one to stop at this point it would seem that Sandys believes in the real presence of Christ. This is not true. He explains that although everyone can receive the visible, the bread and wine, only the faithful can receive "... the spiritual part, that which feedeth

the soul." The idea that faith was necessary for the sacrament to be effective was basic to both Luther and Calvin.

But Sandys shows himself to be in the Calvinistic camp because he emphasizes that Christ's body is heavenly matter. It is spiritual, not corporal. He says,

Our souls, being spiritual, can neither receive nor digest that which is corporal; they feed only upon spiritual food... His natural body is local, for else it were not a natural body: his body is there, therefore not here; for a natural body doth not occupy sundry places at once.

Thus, Sandys stresses that Christ is in heaven, that his natural body is not in the sacrament.

He emphasizes that what is here is "... a sacrament, a sign, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure effectual, of the body and blood of Christ." Although he mentions that these terms were used by the Church fathers, by adopting them, he is really showing the Calvinistic and Zwinglian influence on his doctrine. He is clearly denying real presence in any sense other than spiritual. This is further exemplified when he discusses the part faith plays. "Thy faith must reach up into heaven. By faith he is seen, by faith he

35 Sandys, Sermon 4, p.88.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
is touched, by faith he is digested. Spiritually by faith we feed upon Christ."  

Faith causes man to believe in the redemptive death of Christ. Faith enables man to believe that Christ was sacrificed once, and once only, "... as sufficient for all, our sins were freely remitted, blotted out, and washed away." Thus, what one receives in the sacrament is "... our heavenly bread, our spiritual food." He continues, "... we are certified by this outward sacrament of the inward grace given unto us through his death."  

Later in the same sermon he gives a predominantly Zwinglian interpretation when he states, "... this is done only in remembrance of him; this is the blessed eucharist, a sacrament of praise and thanksgiving." Were this statement isolated it would lead one to conclude that Sandys was Zwinglian. Zwingli's basic concept was that the Lord's Supper is only a memorial, a thanksgiving for faith already received. It is true that Sandys exhibits a strong Zwinglian influence. However, as already noted, the Zwinglian and Calvinistic churches concurred in their interpretation of the Lord's Supper. In fact,

---

38 Ibid., p.89.  
39 Ibid.  
40 Ibid., p.90.
by 1580, a united doctrinal position was accepted and they became one group known as Reformed.\(^4\)

What can essentially be said about Sandys' interpretation of the Lord's Supper is that he is not Lutheran. He does not believe in the real presence. He believes only in a type of spiritual presence, available only to the faithful. Again Sandys' belief in the depravity of man enters the picture. He labels the sacraments pledges and assurances of the remission of sins and of salvation. He calls them God's seals. For support he cites Chrysostom's belief that if man were spiritual, he would not need corporal signs. But since the flesh is weak, the sacraments serve as confirmation of God's promises.\(^5\)

Sandys says much less about the sacrament of baptism than he does the Lord's Supper. It is a much easier sacrament to explain. Again, his main purpose is to show that the Anglican Church gives the correct, scriptural interpretation as contrasted with Catholicism or the more leftist Protestant sects such as the Anabaptists.

To Sandys the Scripture "... maketh baptism the consecrated seal of man's salvation."\(^6\) By baptism, "We have entered our names into the profession of Chris-

\(^5\)Sandys, Sermon 4, p.87.
\(^6\)Sandys, Sermon 1; p.19.
mony . . . we have received the truth by it.  

Like most of the Protestant sects, Anglicanism believed in infant baptism. Sandys calls the baptism of children a "... token of their new spiritual birth," and emphasizes that to partake of this sacrament is to do God's will.

G. W. Bromiley traces the Anglican idea of baptism to Luther, especially by way of Tyndale, who "... identified baptism with repentance ... and the redemptive action of Christ. ..." But he adds that some Anglicans such as Sandys and Jewel do not give detailed expositions on this point, which is certainly true of Sandys.

In Sermon Fifteen, which he preached during the Marian exile and in which he gives his longest general description of the sacraments, Sandys describes baptism as "... the outward washing of the flesh [which] declareth the inward purging and cleansing of the Spirit." He does not reiterate this idea in his later sermons. But, that he does mention it while at Strasbourg shows a strong

---

44 Sandys, Sermon 11, p.212.
45 Sandys, Sermon 13, p.253.
48 Sandys, Sermon 15, p.302.
Zwinglian influence. Zwingli believed that inward cleansing was necessary for this sacrament to be effective. 49 In general it can be said that Sandys was not concerned with expounding on the sacrament of baptism in his sermons. He was more interested in proving that Anglicanism adhered to scriptural teaching and avoided Catholic practices.

One type of baptism to which he was consistently opposed throughout his life, despite the fact that it was never officially denounced by the Anglican Church, was private baptism. Sandys' opposition to private or lay baptism again reflects the influence of the Marian exile. Specifically it reflects a Calvinistic influence which he undoubtedly received through Bullinger. Zwingli, Bullinger's predecessor, had accepted lay baptism in cases of necessity, as had Luther and Anglican reformers like Tyndale and Cranmer. But Calvin and Bullinger both opposed it. 50

Lay baptism was a tradition that had grown up during the Middle Ages because of infant mortality. It was usually performed by midwives, thus, not by the ordained clergy. It was for this reason that Sandys could not accept it. His opposition was long standing, but it should

49 Bromiley, Baptism and the Anglican Reformers, p.6.
50 Ibid., pp.86-87.
be remembered that although he personally opposed the practice, he compromised and accepted the indecisive Prayer Book rubric.

At the Convocation of 1563, Sandys presented a paper in which he suggested two reforms regarding the rite of baptism in the Prayer Book. The first reads as follows:

First, that, with her majesty's authority, with the assistance of the archbishop of Canterbury . . . might be taken out of the Book of Common Prayer "private baptism," which hath respect unto women: who, by the word of God, cannot be ministers of the sacraments, or of any one of them.51

From this proposal it is clear that Sandys opposed lay baptism on the grounds that only ordained ministers can perform the sacraments according to Scripture. His position attests to his emphasis of Scripture and his belief in the necessity of the ministry. Grindal supported Sandys in this proposal, but felt that reform should be made through synod rather than by royal authority.52

That Sandys remained opposed to lay baptism is further attested by the preamble to his will. In this docu-

51 Strype, Annals, Vol., Part 1, p. 500. A copy also appears in "Miscellaneous Pieces", appended to Sandys, Sermons, p. 433. This copy is taken from Strype.

52 James Wayland Joyce, A Constitutional History of the Convocations of the Clergy, from the earliest records of Christianity in Britain to the Date of the Promulga-
tion of the present Book of Common Prayer: including a List of all Councils, Ecclesiastical as well as civil, held in England, in which the Clergy have been Concerned (London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place, 1855), p. 563. See also Strype, Grindal, p. 33.
ment he declares that the rites and ceremonies of the Anglican Church are neither "ungodly or unlawful," that he upholds them for the sake of "order and obedience." But he adds, "... for the private baptism to be ministered by women I take neither to be prescribed nor permitted." Sandys was not alone in interpreting the rubric as not authorizing private baptism. Bromiley mentions that Whitgift also, by the end of his life, "... argued that the rubric had never been intended to permit private baptism by women." 54

Sandys' second proposal at the Convocation of 1563 shows more clearly his attempt to rid the rubric of what he interpreted as papism. He was opposed to the act of making a sign of the cross on the child's forehead. Thus he says, "Second, that, by like authority, the collect for the crossing the infant in the forehead may be blotted out: as it seems very superstitious, so it is not needful." 55 Haugaard comments that this simple ceremony was vigorously attacked by Puritans as a popish remnant in Anglicanism. 56 The sign of the cross was retained.

---

53 Sandys, "Miscellaneous Pieces", appended to Sandys, Sermons, p.443.
54 Bromiley, Baptism and the Anglican Reformers, p.83.
56 Haugaard, Elizabeth, p.122.
it became a bone of contention to the Puritans, who hated it. Anglicans like Sandys and Grindal could not effectively defend the Anglican rite since, as Bromiley says, "... inwardly they agreed with their opponents."57

Actually neither of Sandys' proposals was adopted, thus he was forced to compromise. Bromiley suggests that the Prayer Book rubric may have been "... a concession to unreformed elements rather than a specific authorization."58 This certainly would have been in line with the general tenor of the ambiguous Elizabethan Settlement, but it could not have made Sandys happy.

It should be mentioned that Sandys never subordinated doctrine to form. In general he stressed that rites and ceremonies are indifferent as long as doctrine is sound. In Sermon One he states that Scripture contains the laws of rites and ceremonies.59 When he expounds on the duty of the government to purge the church of papal practices, he says, "The primitive church ... was simple in her ceremonies. The pope hath polluted and burthened the church with both."60 This sermon was preached for the

57 Bromiley, Baptism and the Anglican Reformers, p.155.
58 Ibid., p.83.
59 Sandys, Sermon 1, p.13.
60 Sandys, Sermon 2, p.43.
opening of Parliament in 1571, the first parliament in which there were no avowed Catholics because every member had to take the oath of supremacy. Sandys had been an Anglican bishop for twelve years but was still so adamant about the need for simple ceremonies that Neale says, "This surely was the Sandys of the Marian exile and of 1559 speaking. . . ."

In his twelfth sermon Sandys criticizes Durandus for explaining rites and ceremonies in a manner which would seem laughable to anyone "... unacquainted with the strange blindness of their [papists'] darkened minds."

All of the above statements express Sandys' belief that Anglican rites and ceremonies should be simple, based on Scripture, and unlike those of the papists. But his most notable statement concerning the position of rites and ceremonies comes in his fifth sermon. He declares that Anglican doctrine agrees in substance thus, "... so much the greater pity it is that there should be dissent in matters of small importance, in rites and


62 Durandus, the bishop of Mende, who died in 1296, wrote in his Rationale Divinorum Officiorum an interpretation of church symbolism.

63 Sandys, Sermon 12, p.224.
circumstances, that by contention in such things the course of the gospel should be hindered."\(^{64}\)

To Sandys rites and ceremonies were useful, in fact, even necessary. But, they were matters of indifference as long as they did not conflict with the gospel. He was in favor of some reform. As he says, "Be it granted that some rites upon some consideration might be bettered, or omitted." He adds, however, "... yet can I not say, neither any man, I suppose, can prove, that any thing is set down to be observed in the church, [that is] wicked, or contrary to the word."\(^{65}\) Again, for Sandys it was of the utmost importance that the Anglican Church have a scriptural foundation.

Sandys was a firm adherent to the Protestant belief in the Bible as the sole authority. In his first sermon he gives a detailed exposition of the differences between Protestants and Catholics. The first point he makes is that they differ regarding the foundation of religion. The Anglican Church, he claims, is the true church because its doctrine is based on Scripture. "The foundation of our religion is the written word, the scriptures of God, the undoubted records of the Holy Ghost."\(^{66}\)

\(^{64}\)Sandys, Sermon 5, p. 95.  
\(^{65}\)Ibid.  
\(^{66}\)Sandys, Sermon 1, p. 12.
For Sandys there are three reasons why Scripture should be the basis of doctrine. These are that God's whole law is written, that all "defenders of the truth" base their faith on Scripture, and that no other foundation is possible. He proceeds to describe the types of law God has given in the Bible, then asks the following rhetorical question, "If God have committed his laws moral civil, ceremonial, evangelical, and historical also, unto writing, where should we seek for the statutes of the Almighty but in his written word?"

Sandys reiterates that the Bible is the sole authority in his fourteenth sermon when he says, "God will be worshipped and served according to his prescript word." And, in another sermon he declares, "... where nothing is taught but according to the written word, where the sacraments are sincerely ministered, where the rod and sceptre of government is used, there is Christ, there is the church." This quotation embodies the three essential factors Sandys believed were necessary for the true church, the gospel, the sacraments, and discipline. He says almost the same thing in his third sermon during an

67 Ibid.
68 Ibid., p.13.
69 Sandys, Sermon 14, p.291.
70 Sandys, Sermon 19, p.372.
elaborate comparison of the Anglican Church with the Catholic. As he says,

There is a church of God, and a synagogue of Satan. The church of God is builded upon the doctrine of the apostles and prophets. The true church hath her marks whereby she is known; the gospel truly preached, the sacraments sincerely ministered, discipline duly executed. The popish church hath neither the true foundation nor yet the right marks of the church of God. . . .71

This third sermon is one of Sandys' most powerful. Jordan calls it "... a sermon whose diction and simple power mark it as a literary masterpiece. . . ."72

Sandys' belief in the Bible as sole authority is also evinced by his twelfth sermon. In this he declares,

... in matters of religion, pertaining to the service and worship of God, all things should be done according to the rule of his own will, which is set down in his written word. . . . God is well pleased, when men . . . dare not swerve a hair's breadth from his word.73

For Sandys Scripture is not only a source for Anglican doctrine but also a base from which to attack papists. Thus, if something cannot be found in Scripture, then it is subject to attack. In a verbal invective that is quite commonly the way he describes the Catholic Church,

71 Sandys, Sermon 3, p.67.
73 Sandys, Sermon 12, p.222.
Sandys denigrates non-scriptural practices as follows:

In the scriptures, wherein is contained all that is good, and all that which God requireth or accepteth of, we find no mention either of the name or of the thing of the mass, the pope, purgatory, praying on beads, hallowing of bells, either any such like popish trash; in sum, few parts of their religion have any one stone from thence [Scripture] to be founded or built upon.  

In another sermon he labels the belief in purgatory as "... vain ... and dangerous ... because it hath no foundation at all in God's word." In like manner the Catholic hierarchy is condemned for having no scriptural base. Instead, Sandys finds three types of priesthood described in the Bible. These are the Levitical as represented in the Old Testament; the royal as embodied by Christ in the New Testament; and "... the third priesthood ... that which is common to all Christians," which is "a spiritual priesthood." Sandys does not elaborate on this third priesthood, but his statement is as close as he comes to the idea of a priesthood of all believers. Again, his main purpose is to show that the Catholic Church does not have scriptural support whereas the Anglican Church does.

---

74 Ibid., p.223.
75 Sandys, Sermon 9, p.162.
76 Sandys, Sermon 21, p.411.
77 Ibid.
So thoroughly does Sandys support the idea of the Bible as the sole authority that he feels the preacher should be limited by what is contained in the Bible. No clearer indication of this exists than his statement:

The preacher may teach no other than he hath commission to speak, than is commanded him of God. He may not add to the written word, neither take from it. God's law is perfect: it doth perfectly instruct and teach all things necessary to salvation.78

On the other hand, Scripture by itself is of little use. As Sandys says, "... the outward reading of the word, without the inward working of his Spirit, is nothing."79 Scripture will not bring any man to Christ "... except the grace of the Spirit be with it."80 At the same time Sandys warns that man should not "gape for revelations." He should not "... think that God hath revealed unto us whatsoever we do vainly imagine and conceive in our brains."81

Instead, God has provided the proper means by which man can be taught his will. He has provided the Anglican clergy. Sandys places such emphasis on the role of preachers that references to their duties, character, or

78 Sandys, Sermon 14, p.274.
79 Sandys, Sermon 6, p.115.
80 Sandys, Sermon 8, pp.155-156.
81 Sandys, Sermon 6, p.115.
conditions of work appear in almost every one of his sermons. In his twelfth sermon he calls ministers "... the dispensers of God's blessed mysteries," and cautions that if they do not diligently preach, the woe of God will descend on them. According to Sandys, ministers play an integral part in salvation, not as intermediaries, but as teachers of the way to salvation. He develops this idea in his sermon on Acts 10:34. Having commented on the necessity of prayer and faith and denied good works as a means to salvation, Sandys explains that God provides teachers of the way to salvation. These teachers are not angels, but earthly ministers. As he says,

To commend the ministry, God will have his gospel preached by men, and not by angels. He will not have us look for revelations from heaven, but to give ear and credit to the voice of his messengers, to whom he hath committed the word of reconciliation, whom he would have esteemed for their office sake: to contemn such is to contemn him that hath sent them.

Ministers, of course; have the duty of preaching what is commanded by God. Sandys says, "They may not teach their own dreams, inventions; or doctrines." It is not the minister, but the fact that he preaches the word of God that makes him important. Sandys repeats

82 Sandys, Sermon 12, p.231.
83 Sandys, Sermon 14, p.269.
84 Ibid., p.275.
this point several times. For example, he says, "The preacher is to be heard for the word's sake, and not for his own sake."\textsuperscript{85} One should "... hear the word without respect to the messenger."\textsuperscript{86} In fact, he warns against revering a minister too much. His basic rationale is that by honoring a cleric too highly, one detracts from the glory of God.\textsuperscript{87}

To Sandys there are two basic duties required of ministers, to pray and to teach. What they should teach is the right way to salvation. Thus, in his second sermon he says, "The ministers ... should teach the right way."\textsuperscript{88} He repeats this in his fifth sermon during a discussion of unity and hierarchy. He describes the duty of ministers as follows:

The ministers of the word are as the eyes to watch, and ... they are placed as watchmen over the church, for the good and godly direction thereof; to take heed both to themselves, and to all the flock, whereof the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers; to teach and instruct the people of God in the way of their salvation. ... \textsuperscript{89}

Sandys believed that it was necessary for the clergy to

\textsuperscript{85}Ibid., p.278.
\textsuperscript{86}Ibid., p.271.
\textsuperscript{87}Ibid., p.272.
\textsuperscript{88}Sandys, Sermon 2, p.40.
\textsuperscript{89}Sandys, Sermon 5, p.99.
perform their tasks diligently. He even goes so far as to suggest that if they do, then God will cause England to prosper.\textsuperscript{90}

There is a strong sense of morality in Sandys. The clerical leader is expected to set a good example. He must be a little better than ordinary people. This is clear when he declares:

\ldots there is more laid upon him than any. Others must be sober, he a mirror of sobriety; they virtuous and honest, he such a pattern or virtue and honesty, that he may say with St. Paul, "Be ye followers of us, walk as ye have us for an example."\textsuperscript{91}

It is well to close consideration of Sandys' view of the clergy with a couple of his personal remarks regarding his own performance since they illustrate his main concerns. In a letter to Parker in 1560 he stresses that his major concern is that \ldots my life hinder not my preaching." He goes on to say, "And for my preaching \ldots I trust it is altogether to edify and to win. \ldots And I thank God the people hear me and believe me, and the chief comfort that I have is, that they universally favour me." He does add, however, "I speak not of such as will never receive the truth. \ldots"\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{90}Sandys, Sermon 2, pp.53-54.

\textsuperscript{91}Sandys, Sermon 17, p.332.

\textsuperscript{92}Strype, \textit{Parker}, Vol.3, p.43.
In a sermon preached in London just before he left to assume his tasks as Archbishop of York, he says,

And in doctrine, which is the chiefest point, I dare affirm even the same which the holy apostle doth, I have delivered no other unto you than that which I have received of the Lord: yea, safely in the sight of the most high God, I may say . . . you have received [it] of us.93

He continues that his greatest relief and comfort has been "that I have dealt sincerely in the house of God, as touching doctrine. . . ."94

And, in the preamble to his will, he declares,

. . . I have lived an old man in the ministry of Christ; a faithful disposer of the mysteries of God, and to my power an earnest labourer in the vineyard of the Lord . . . in the preaching of the truth of Christ I have not laboured to please men, but studied to serve my Master, who sent me not to flatter either prince or people, but by the law to tell all sorts of their sins, by the Spirit to rebuke the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and by the gospel to testify of that faith which is in Jesus Christ and him crucified.95

Thus it can be seen that Sandys fit in well within the mainstream of sixteenth century Anglicanism. He is neither Puritan nor Arminian. These terms do not really apply during the early years of the Elizabethan Settlement. The returned exiles and their colleagues who had

93 Sandys, Sermon 22, p.419.
94 Ibid.
95 Sandys, "Miscellaneous Pieces", appended to Sandys, Sermons, pp.447-448.
remained in England, such as Parker, were overwhelmingly concerned with ridding the Anglican Church of what they considered to be "papistical" trappings. To them the main threat was Catholicism. This explains the polemical nature of Sandys' sermons. It also explains his consistent attempt to prove that Anglican doctrine has scriptural authority.

Most of the basic Protestant doctrines which were upheld by the Anglican Church are lucidly presented in Sandys' sermons. These include justification by faith alone in the grace of God; denigration of good works as a means to salvation, a corollary to justification by faith; acceptance of only two sacraments, the Lord's Supper and baptism; emphasis on the Bible as sole authority; insistence on the necessity of the Anglican clergy; and continuous emphasis on preaching as the primary duty of the clergy.

To these doctrinal points must be added the consistent support of Sandys and the other Elizabethan clergy to the concept of a state church. They shared a firm belief in the ecclesiastical hierarchy which was maintained by the secular hierarchy. There is nothing Arminian in the maintenance of this position, not in the sixteenth century. There was not yet a decisive split between Anglican and Puritan. Support for the ecclesi-
astical hierarchy could not yet be labelled "papistical". Sandys probably would have laughed had someone labelled him a papist because he supported a hierarchical view of church and government. He certainly was no papist.

At the same time, he would have been shocked to be called a Puritan. It is true that his doctrine was colored by the Calvinistic and Zwinglian influences he received. During the exile and afterwards as an Anglican bishop, he maintained contact with continental leaders such as Bullinger and Martyr. This influence is particularly evident in his interpretation of the Lord's Supper. But, it should be understood that this doctrinal influence in no way undermined his Anglicanism. It was his Anglicanism. The doctrine Sandys preached in his sermons was correct Anglican doctrine according to sixteenth century precepts.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion one can say that Sandys' main value to the Anglican Reformation is dependent on the facts that he was thoroughly educated in Anglican doctrine; he was influenced by the Marian exile; he was a firm supporter of the Elizabethan Settlement; and he was moderate and conservative. He served the Anglican Church for thirty years as bishop of Worcester, bishop of London, and archbishop of York. However, even before he was ordained in 1559, he showed himself to be an ardent supporter of Anglicanism.

His role in the Anglican Reformation began while he was at the University of Cambridge. Here he proceeded regularly through his degrees until he received his Doctor of Divinity in 1549. Here he received his first contact with the basic Anglican theology which he was to staunchly defend for the remainder of his life.

His career at Cambridge was a distinguished one. He held a variety of offices which helped prepare him for the administrative positions he held as an Anglican bishop and archbishop. The most important of these offices at
Cambridge were proctor, vice-chancellor, and Master of St. Catharine's Hall. It was also at Cambridge that he had his first contact with foreign scholars. Notable among these was Martin Bucer with whom he may have discussed Bucer's *De Regno Christi* and whom he supported in a debate with the Catholic adherent John Young.

Sandys paid the price for his Protestant ideals when he was stripped of his offices and clerical preferments. He was arrested in 1553 because he would not support the Catholic queen Mary. He was imprisoned for almost a year, then released. Before he could be arrested again as a heretic, he sailed to the continent to take refuge in Strasbourg and Zurich as a Marian exile.

During the exile he showed his belief in Anglicanism by his conservative support of the Edwardian Prayer Book in the "Troubles at Frankfort". He was one of the signatories to a letter attempting to persuade the Frankfort congregation to retain the Anglicanism they had brought with them into exile. He was one of the supporters of Cox against Knox at Frankfort. In this role, he helped revise the Prayer Book so it could be more adaptable to continental practices, but still thoroughly Anglican. This is attested by the letter Sandys and the rest of Cox's committee sent to Calvin explaining the reforms they made.
These reforms included doing away with private baptism and other ceremonies which had been labelled as "papistical". However, the Anglican divines insisted that they removed these ceremonies because they were indifferent, that is, they were not necessary. Sandys retained this willingness to compromise on non-essential issues for the remainder of his life. As an Anglican bishop, he opposed private baptism and such ceremonies, but emphasized that they were indifferent and that what mattered was the preservation of Anglican doctrine.

Following the exile, Sandys returned to England. He was one of the group of Protestant divines in London in early 1559 who may have been influential in the revision of the Prayer Book and the adoption by Parliament of the Second Edwardian Prayer Book with its modifications. It can not be established that there was an official committee to revise the Prayer Book. However, it seems a little too coincidental that the former Marian exiles who had been concerned with this very problem on the continent were in London and the Parliament achieved what they wanted. One can not assume that they spent their time watching the Thames. It is more likely that they acted as an unofficial pressure group on Parliament. This is even more plausible when one considers that the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity passed despite the
unanimous opposition of the Marian bishops who were in Parliament. Thus, it is possible that Sandys was in on the groundwork of the Elizabethan Settlement.

Sandys’ support of the Elizabethan Settlement is attested throughout his life. Before being consecrated bishop of Worcester, he was sent as the chief cleric on the northern visitation. The purpose of this visitation was to deliver the injunctions, remove recusants, and enforce the Elizabethan Settlement. He worked arduously at this task.

In December, 1559, he became bishop of Worcester. For the remainder of his ecclesiastical career, which occupied the rest of his life, he was an ardent supporter of the Elizabethan Settlement. This is exemplified by his visitations. In fact, his visitation articles for London in 1571 are almost a direct copy of the 1559 articles and injunctions. His support is also shown by his work as an ecclesiastical commissioner of the Court of High Commission. Furthermore, his support, not only of Elizabeth, but of all the basic tenets of Anglican doctrine, is thoroughly attested by his sermons.

Sandys’ doctrinal position was influenced by the continental reformers he was associated with during the Marian exile. The most notable of these were Bullinger and Peter Martyr. He maintained contact with these
reformers until their deaths. Thus, his Anglicanism shows a decidedly Calvinistic and Zwinglian influence. The Calvinism in the Anglican Church comes as much from Bullinger and Martyr as it does from Calvin.¹ This is particularly evident in Sandys' interpretation of the Lord's Supper in which he expresses the reformed doctrine that the participant's faith must reach to heaven to know Christ. It is also manifested in his belief that the sacrament is a memorial which serves as a seal of God's promise of salvation.² His debt to the Swiss Reformation also shows up in his rejection of private baptism.³ Other examples could be given, but, suffice it to say that Sandys, as is true of the other Anglican exiles, was influenced by his contact with continental Protestantism.

Sandys served his queen and church for the last three decades of his life. During his career he was a zealous opponent of Catholicism. In fact, since he felt Catholics were doctrinal devils, his opposition to them was much stronger than his opposition to Puritans. In this he was like other Anglicans of his generation. Sandys, despite, or maybe because of, his experience with the "Troubles at Frankfort", underestimated Puritanism.

¹See above p.50.
²See above pp.179-182.
³See above pp.182-186.
It should be remembered that there was not strong Puritan party during Sandys' career. The term was not used until 1565. It was not generally used by the Anglican hierarchy until several years later. Sandys uses it in 1579, but even then he feels that the "new orators" are not a serious threat to the Anglican hierarchy.

It is perhaps well to close this study of Sandys with a quotation from his letter to Gaulter in 1579 because it shows the basic optimism he retained throughout his career as an Anglican bishop. This optimism was based on the fact that he sincerely believed that Anglicanism embodied the word and will of God. Thus, he writes to Gaulter as follows:

The purity of the christian religion is flourishing and prosperous among us, and that can neither be overturned not defiled by any devices of Satan. For although we are unable altogether to banish from the church, so as to prevent the appearance of a remarkable variety of names and opinions, those new men whom we call puritans, who tread all authority under foot; or the veteran papists, who celebrate their divine service in secret corners; or the profane disputants who deride the true worship of God; such, however, is the number and influence of the truly faithful, that both in numbers and appearance it very far takes the lead. . . .

Sandys was not a zealous, dynamic leader who wished to destroy all dissidents and preserve Anglican unity and

---

4Zurich Letters, p.332.
uniformity by force. He was by no means tolerant of dissent. Papism was an anathema to him. But, he was willing to allow gradual, peaceful reformation. In fact, this was what he wanted. In this respect, he is to be admired for his conservative approach to reform and his willingness to compromise on matters which were not essential to the maintenance of correct doctrine as he understood it.

It is to the moderation and diligence of such men as Sandys that the Elizabethan Settlement owes its success. It is his sure steadfastness in support of this Settlement which makes Sandys worthy of study. He may forever remain a minor figure in the Anglican Reformation. But, without such minor figures the Elizabethan Settlement might have faced such internal strife that only force could have guaranteed its survival. To Sandys and the other well-educated, conservative clerics of the Elizabethan period goes much of the credit for the gradual, well-ordered, non-bloody preservation of the Anglican Church.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES


Church of England. (Book of Common Prayer.) The Prayer-book of Queen Elizabeth, 1559, to which are appended some occasional forms of prayer issued in her reign. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1911.


"Life of Mr. William Whittingham, Dean of Durham."


Whittingham, William. "A Brief Discours off the Troubles begonne at Franckford in Germany A.D. 1554." University Microfilms, S.T.C. 25443, English Books before 1640, Roll 372 (publ. 1575) and Roll 1161 (publ. 1574).

The Zurich Letters, comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and others, with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the early part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Translated and edited by Rev. Hastings Robinson. The Parker Society, Vol.50. Cambridge: University Press, 1842.
II. SECONDARY SOURCES


Joyce, James Wayland. *A Constitutional History of the Convocations of the Clergy, from the earliest records of Christianity in Britain to the Date of the Promulgation of the present Book of Common Prayer; including a List of all Councils, Ecclesiastical as well as Civil, held in England, in which the Clergy have been Concerned.* London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place, 1855.


Venn, John, and Venn, J. A. Alumni Cantabrigienses, a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900. Part 1; from the earliest times to 1751. Vol.4: Saal-Zuinglius. Cambridge: University Press, 1927.