

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH.

BY KATHLEEN M. GARDINER, M.A.

THE power of the Pope and the mediæval Church in England was broken by Henry VIII; his daughter, Elizabeth, established the Anglican Church on the lines which it was thenceforward to follow. While much attention has always been given to the former, too little is sometimes paid to the latter. Yet, in the life of the English nation, the work of the great queen is of infinitely more importance than that of her blustering sire. He established, and sought to perpetuate, a house divided against itself; she, less blinded by her own desires, set up a Church which government and doctrine alike combined to render truly national, and which has been an element of incalculable importance in the lives of Englishmen for more than three centuries. The Church *in* England became the Church *of* England in 1559, and the following years confirmed and substantiated the settlement then made. Criticism and dissension there was in plenty, even in Elizabeth's reign, while the Stuart times saw a struggle in which it seemed as if the whole structure would come crashing to the ground. But the work had been so thoroughly done that all assaults upon it proved unavailing, and the revolution of 1688 secured its continuance as a part of the national life. Had Elizabeth's settlement been other than it was, the outlook of Englishmen would have been different in a hundred ways. For the Anglican Church has worked itself into the fabric of national life so securely that it colours the thought and affects the everyday life even of those who dissent from it: it is as much an English institution as Parliament and the Throne, the country squire and the Derby.

The lasting nature of the Elizabethan settlement, together with the extraordinary power which the Church possesses of adapting herself to changing conditions in the world outside, makes it appear as if the work of the early years of Elizabeth's reign was done by men who were free from limiting conditions and could make a settlement good in itself, not merely as good as possible under the circumstances. Yet circumstances played a large part, if not the major part, in deciding the course which Elizabeth and her advisers followed, and therefore to understand the settlement aright, the circumstances, both in England and in Europe in November, 1558, must be briefly reviewed.

The outstanding factor in European history was the Counter-Reformation which may conveniently be said to begin as an active movement with the accession of Paul IV to the Papal chair in 1555. The Pope's vigorous personality and his sturdy determination to reform the Church and to restore her universality could not fail to affect England, trembling in the balance as she was between

Catholicism and Protestantism. Elizabeth scrupulously observed the courtesies by informing the Pope of her accession ; according to the commonly accepted story, her conciliatory message was met by the blunt reply that the kingdom of England was held in fee of the Apostolic See and that she could not succeed because she was illegitimate. Even if the actual wording of the reply be the invention of ultra-patriotic Protestants of a later age, there is ample evidence in contemporary documents for the antagonistic attitude of Paul IV, and this profoundly affected Elizabeth's handling of religious affairs.¹ It is generally assumed that, owing to the circumstances of her birth, Elizabeth had to be a Protestant, but Maitland suggests another view : " It is sometimes said that Elizabeth's birth condemned her to be Protestant or bastard. But it would be truer to say that, had she cared much about legitimacy, she would have made her peace with Rome. Hints came to her from thence that the plenitude of power can set these little matters straight for the benefit of well-disposed princes." ² These hints came, however, from Pius IV, not from his uncompromising predecessor, and they came too late to alter the trend of events. The Anglican settlement was an accomplished fact before Pius IV succeeded to the Papal chair, and their policy once decided upon, Elizabeth and her advisers firmly adhered to it, supported by the bulk of the English people, who saw in the Pope only one " from whom nothing is to be feared but evil will, cursing, and practising." ³

Protestantism was thus to be the accepted religion of England, but it still remained to be decided whether it was to be the Lutheran or the Calvinistic form. Here again circumstances on the Continent radically affected the decision. By 1558 Lutheranism had lost its first enthusiasm, its organization was weak, and its powerful supporters were occupied with secular affairs. The influence of Calvinism, on the contrary, was at its height. Geneva was not only a refuge for the oppressed ; it was also the home of a missionary spirit which had already been felt in England in the reign of Edward VI, and which was only waiting its chance for a fresh effort. At Elizabeth's accession, therefore, the Marian exiles poured back into England, and among these were many of the ablest men of the time. It was on these men that Elizabeth had largely to depend for support in her Protestant policy, and it was from amongst them that the more influential of the bishops under the new *régime* were chosen.⁴

¹ See *Venetian Calendar*, June 11, 1559, and *Spanish Calendar*, June 19, 1559. The earliest authority for the reply appears to be Heylin, and it is accepted by Tierney, Lingard and Hume amongst others. Dixon, however, throws doubt upon its authenticity (see *History of the Church of England*, Vol. 5, pp. 249-254).

² *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 559.

³ *Device for the alteration of Religion*, Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, ed. Pocock, Vol. V, p. 497.

⁴ Grindal, Sandys, Cox, Whitehead and Pilkington, all returned exiles, were members of the Committee which drafted the Prayer Book for presentation to Parliament, and the first three were made respectively Bishops of London, Worcester and Ely.

Their leanings towards Calvinism tended to give the Anglican settlement a more extreme form than it might otherwise have taken, a form which, it is generally believed, Elizabeth herself regarded with distaste in many respects.

While these two opposing currents from Europe were meeting on English shores, what of home affairs? The hazardous state of England is depicted in a document called *The Distresses of the Commonwealth*, which was drawn up in the first month or so of the reign. The unknown writer summarizes "the many and most grievous diseases that our Commonweal . . . travaileth with at this day" as follows: "The Queen poor. The realm exhausted. The nobility poor and decayed. Want of good captains and soldiers. The people out of order. Justice not executed. All things dear. Excess in meat, drink, and apparel. Divisions among ourselves."¹ One of the causes of these divisions is said to be religion, and the warning note is struck that the case is to be warily handled "for it requireth great cunning and circumspection both to reform religion and to make unity between the subjects being at square for the respect thereof."² Elizabeth saw that not only cunning and circumspection but also promptitude was required, and therefore the first problem that she took in hand was the religious settlement.

Personalities, no less than circumstances, played their part in moulding the settlement. Of Elizabeth herself little need be said; the battle has been waged around her complex personality too long and too fiercely for any lengthy analysis of it to be necessary. But it may be noticed that in regard to her religious settlement all her best qualities come into play, her shrewdness, her remarkable capacity for putting aside her own prejudices and desires, her intuitive understanding of her people and their needs. "Lonely upon her throne . . . without ceasing to be a woman, and while loving life in all its fullness, she made everything subservient to purposes of State,"³ and her statesmanship never served her better than in her settlement of the religious problem. That the settlement was her own is undoubted. "I will never be by violence constrained to do anything," she told members of Parliament; but she was too wise not to take sound advice when she could get it, and side by side with her cool and tolerant outlook there can be traced in the settlement the characteristics of two of her most faithful and devoted helpers. William Cecil and Matthew Parker were both men of the Eastern counties and of the middle class, and they had the virtues of integrity, caution, reticence and sound common sense that are associated with their district and their class. Both went to Cambridge, after which one took up law and the other went into the Church. Both had Protestant leanings, hence the Marian reaction meant a temporary set-back in the career of each. Cecil, though he conformed and went to Mass, as did many others, was more or less in the shade throughout Mary's reign, while Parker lost his Church preferment and retired to poverty, obscurity and his beloved books in his native county of

¹ *State Papers Domestic*, Eliz. I. 66.

² *Ibid.*

³ Trevelyan, *History of England*, p. 326.

Norfolk. Elizabeth's accession meant the turn of Fortune's wheel. Cecil became "Mr. Secretary Cecil," while Parker reluctantly accepted the Archbishopric of Canterbury; and henceforward each man laboured in his office in Church or State till he died. Elizabeth and England owed much to Cecil's administrative ability, energy, foresight and loyalty; they owed an equal debt to Parker's learning, and the tact and moderation which never degenerated into weakness. Elizabeth's debt to Cecil is now universally admitted, but Matthew Parker has hardly had his due. Yet he did as much for the Church of England as Elizabeth and Cecil: they established its distinctive character, but he ensured its permanence, its moderation, and its dignity.

Elizabeth succeeded to the throne in November, 1558, and Parliament was summoned for January 25, 1559. For the settlement was to be a national one, not a royal one; not the Queen, but the Queen in Parliament was to lay down the lines along which the religious life of the English people was to develop. Until this could be done, Elizabeth's great object was to prevent disturbance, and so her first act was to issue a Proclamation forbidding preaching and maintaining the *status quo*. She then proceeded to indicate for the benefit of her faithful Commons her own views as to the nature of the settlement to be made. She commanded the Gospels and Epistles, the Ten Commandments, the Litany, and the Lord's Prayer to be read in English. She forbade the Elevation of the Host in her own chapel, and walked out when Bishop Oglethorpe refused to comply. At her Coronation the old ceremonial was used, but Mass was said without the Elevation. Marian prisoners were released, Marian exiles were allowed to return to the country. The Council was remodelled, extreme Romanists were dismissed and replaced by men of Protestant views. Thus the Parliament which duly met in January had a very fair idea of the lines on which their legislation must proceed if it was to meet with the approval of the Queen's Majesty. Their work, the salient features of which were enshrined in the two great Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, was accomplished in less than five months. According to modern ideas, this seems a remarkably short time for bringing about changes of such magnitude, but Parliamentary machinery was far less developed in Tudor times and the influence of Crown and ministers was far stronger than in our own day. It is commonly said that matters were expedited by the device of packing Parliament, but recent research has shown that this is not true,¹ and that far from forcing a Protestant settlement upon an unwilling country, the Queen acted as a restraining force upon the Commons, at any rate. Moreover, the fact that it took over two months to get the Act of Supremacy through shows that there was an opposition of considerable strength in Parliament. The settlement may therefore be said to be representative of the majority of opinion in the country and thus in the very first months of the reign the Queen and Council had gauged aright the feelings of the mass of the nation.

¹ *English Historical Review*, July and October, 1908.

The main features of the Act of Supremacy are indicated by its full title, an "Act to restore to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same."¹ The Papal authority over the Church in England, recognized again by Mary, was explicitly denied; the Queen was to be acknowledged "only supreme Governor of this realm . . . as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal," and an oath to that effect was to be taken by all clergy and office-holders. The jurisdiction, visitatorial and corrective, of which the Papacy was deprived, was given to the Crown, and the Queen was empowered to appoint Commissioners to exercise it. This was the origin of the High Commission Court, the machinery for enforcing obedience both to this Act and to the Act of Uniformity, which was its natural complement.

The speed with which the Act of Uniformity² went through both Houses (April 18-28) was probably due partly to the fact that Parliament had expended a large amount of its energy on the Act of Supremacy, and partly to the fact that the Book of Common Prayer, which was placed before the House of Commons, had been drawn up by a committee of Protestant divines carefully selected by the Queen for the purpose of drafting a form of service which should excite as little opposition as possible. The Act prescribed the use of this Book of Common Prayer and none other. It was based upon the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, but the history of its adoption is obscure. There is some reason to believe that the First Prayer Book was originally considered, but was discarded owing to the influence of the more extreme Protestant element in the committee. On the other hand, the Second Prayer Book, as it stood, was considered too severe by the moderate party; and Elizabeth herself objected to it because she was anxious not to offend the Lutheran element in Continental Protestantism. A compromise was therefore arrived at, designed to remove the severity of the Second Prayer Book without returning to the ambiguity of the First. The Second Prayer Book was to be used "with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used every Sunday in the year, the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants and none other or otherwise." The alteration in the Litany was the well-known omission of the phrase "the detestable enormities of the Bishop of Rome," and the change in the Communion Service consisted in the addition of the words of the First Prayer Book to those of the Second Prayer Book at the administration of the Sacrament. Heavy penalties were inflicted upon both clergy and laity who used any other form of service, and the shilling fine was imposed for absence from Church on Sundays and holy days.

Limitations of space make it impossible to enter fully into the controversial question as to the precise ornaments established by the

¹ 1 Eliz. c. 1. Printed in Gee and Hardy, *Documents of English Church History*, p. 442.

² 1 Eliz. c. 2. Ibid, p. 458.

Act of Uniformity. But whatever the exact meaning of the proviso in the Act establishing the ornaments of the *second* year of the reign of Edward VI "until other order be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty," and whatever the circumstances which led to the inclusion of the proviso, it seems clear that in practice the surplice was the dress of ministration during the years 1559 to 1566.¹ The use of the cope was connived at by the authorities, but priests who wore alb, chasuble and tunicle did so in defiance of authority and risked punishment for doing so. It may be suggested that the proviso in the Act of Uniformity was a device quite in keeping with Elizabeth's general methods. She sought to lessen the opposition to the Act of Parliament by holding out a hope of concession in ceremonial matters to the conservative element and then, having by this means got round a point likely to arouse strong feeling, she took the loophole provided by the words "other order be therein taken" to put in practice the usage most in keeping with the general trend of legislation and most calculated to preserve peace and order in the country.

When the Anglican Church had been established by legislative enactment, administrative action inevitably followed in order to bring the practice and *personnel* of the Church into conformity with the statutory position. The first business of the Queen and her advisers was to reconstitute the hierarchy of the Church upon a definitely Protestant basis. In the summer and autumn of 1559 the oath of supremacy was tendered to all the Marian bishops. Refusal to take it was met by deprivation, and by the end of the year, all the Romanist bishops had gone except Kitchin of Llandaff. Their places were filled by men of Protestant views. The most important appointment was that of Matthew Parker to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, vacant since the death of Cardinal Pole. The delay in filling the see was due in part to Parker's reluctance to leave his retirement, but even more to the insufficiency of bishops to perform the ceremony of consecration. "There is no archbishop, nor are four bishops to be had."² Furthermore, the Edwardian Ordinal of 1550, which had been abolished in Mary's reign, had not been re-enacted by Elizabeth's First Parliament and therefore there was

¹ As evidence for this statement may be cited the silence of the records of the time regarding the use of the ornaments of the First Prayer Book, a remarkable fact if they were openly and legally used, and the fact that the spirit of the Injunctions of 1559 is entirely against the use of these ornaments. The Injunctions are Protestant and somewhat extreme in their general attitude, and it would be contradictory to pull down shrines and altars and keep the Mass vestments. Moreover, if the Thirtieth Injunction dealing with the apparel of the minister "both in the Church and without" refers not only to the outdoor garb of the clergy but also to the dress of ministration, as seems most probable from the words, the latter was that "commonly and orderly received in the *latter* year of the reign of Edward VI," i.e. 1553, and was therefore the surplice prescribed in the Second Prayer Book. But see J. T. Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, for a full discussion of the question.

² Cecil, annotation of letter from Parker. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, Vol. 5, p. 201.

no authoritative form of consecration service except the Roman Catholic one. This difficulty was got over by the insertion in the Queen's Commission for consecration of a special clause to make good any statutory defects by her supreme royal authority.¹ The Edwardian Ordinal was then used, and the position was regularized by its confirmation by a later Parliament. The difficulty of lack of bishops for consecration automatically adjusted itself as elections were made to vacant bishoprics. With Parker's consecration, the validity of which it is hardly necessary to defend, the hierarchy of the Anglican Church was re-established and one great stumbling-block to order and good government in matters ecclesiastical was removed.

The next business of the Queen and Council was to see that practice accorded with precept, and therefore in June, 1559, Royal Commissions were issued for a Visitation of the Kingdom. The Injunctions of the Commissioners show clearly the practice which was contemplated by the Elizabethan settlement, and throw light on the attitude of Elizabeth and her advisers towards Church ceremonies and ritual. The Injunctions of 1559 were based upon the Injunctions of Edward VI,² but ten were omitted and twenty-four additions were made. They covered a vast range of subjects, from the observance of the royal supremacy to the leading of exemplary lives. The most important referred to the removal of shrines, pictures and images in churches and houses, the provision of tables instead of altars, the preaching of monthly sermons and quarterly homilies, the reading of the Bible and the care of the poor. The marriage of the clergy was distinctly permitted, though not encouraged. The Thirtieth Injunction, prescribing as the apparel of the clergy "Such seemly habits, garments and such square caps as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth," seems to be in direct contradiction to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity, but the difficulty disappears if the injunction is regarded as "other order . . . taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty," and therefore superseding the proviso regarding the ornaments of the second year of the reign. As a whole the Injunctions show a distinctly Protestant spirit, and, if strictly carried out, they would have enforced a fairly extreme form of Protestant worship in churches all over the country.

The last administrative order to be considered is a document of 1566, the Advertisements of Parker.³ It is a vexed question as to whether these were issued with or without Elizabeth's sanction. The general view is that they were issued by Parker on his own authority, but Mr. J. T. Tomlinson has ably put forward the contrary opinion.⁴ What is clear is that they were not issued in defiance of Elizabeth; if they had not her express authority, they had at least her tacit acquiescence. The Advertisements were not a further step forward in the Protestant settlement, but an attempt to safe-

¹ *State Papers, Domestic, Eliz. VII.* 56.

² Gee and Hardy, *Documents of English Church History*, p. 417.

³ Gee and Hardy, *Documents of English Church History*, p. 467.

⁴ *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, Ch. IV.

guard that settlement from the extremists, who by 1566 were agitating for a still greater simplification of ceremonial and a more rapid progress towards the Calvinistic position. The Advertisements reinforced and expanded the Injunctions of 1559, and they were particularly detailed in their regulations regarding the apparel of the clergy, about which there can be no possible doubt after 1566. The Advertisements were an announcement that authority had taken its decision and was not going to be forced out of it; they safeguarded the practice of the Anglican Church from Calvinism as the Injunctions had marked it off from Romanism.

The completion of the Anglican settlement is to be found in the Thirty-nine Articles which were agreed upon by Convocation and received the royal assent in 1563. Subscription to them was enforced by Act of Parliament in 1571, against the wishes of Elizabeth, who, unlike her father, did not desire to enforce belief, but only to secure conformity. The Thirty-nine Articles were practically the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI with a few omissions to soften their severity. On the central doctrines of Protestantism, the Articles are quite clear. Justification by Faith, the taking of the Body of Christ "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," communion in both kinds, the legality of the marriage of the clergy, the supreme authority of the civil power, all find a place in the Thirty-nine Articles. The wording of some articles is studiously vague, for example, that dealing with predestination, and this was in accordance with Elizabeth's policy of making her settlement as all-embracing as possible. She was anxious not to enter into controversies which were agitating Protestants themselves; the Thirty-nine Articles definitely marked the Anglican Church as Protestant and that was enough.

Despite the many points of controversy which have arisen in connection with the Elizabethan settlement, the principal stages in the establishment of the Anglican Church can be clearly traced. Crown, Parliament and Convocation worked side by side and, taking everything into consideration, in remarkable accord, so that by 1566 the chaotic conditions that had faced Elizabeth on her accession had largely disappeared. But when we turn to the other side of the picture and ask how the Church of England, thus established, was received by the people at large, we are at once in the realm of uncertainties and tentative conclusions. This is in part due to the different nature of the evidence. We cannot rely upon statutes and administrative documents of a governmental character, for these, by their very nature, rarely supply us with any information regarding popular feeling; histories, diaries, memoirs, letters and other evidence of a local and personal nature are the sources of our knowledge, and these are too often coloured by the religious predilections of the writer. It is also due to the fact that much research in local documents still remains to be done. Parish registers and accounts that have already been printed show that much light can be thrown upon the effect of the Elizabethan enactments up and down the country by a systematic study of these sources; the terminology and the provisions of wills often give a vivid insight into the state of mind of

the average citizen and country squire.¹ A wealth of detail can thus be obtained from which we can build up a general picture of the attitude of the average man towards the settlement. Until the ground has been more systematically covered we cannot get the picture completely, but from the material which is already available we can deduce something as to the popular attitude towards the settlement and its effect on everyday life.

Some indication of the general willingness to accept the settlement may be obtained from the number of the clergy who were deprived of their livings for refusing to take the oath of Supremacy. Camden gives these as 189 out of 9,400; probably, however, this estimate is too moderate, and the proportion given by Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, about one-eighth of the whole body of beneficed clergy, is nearer the truth.² Even this, however, represents a remarkably small number, and it is clear that the majority of the clergy, even if they did not actually hold Protestant opinions, were not sufficiently fervent Romanists to refuse to conform. Vicars of Bray were as much in evidence in the sixteenth as in the eighteenth century. The impression thus gained from the number of deprivations is confirmed by a study of the circumstances attending the election of the Protestant bishops in 1559. The *congé d'élire* of Henry VIII was returned to by Elizabeth, and therefore the cathedral chapters participated to some extent in the filling of the vacant sees. It is not necessary to postulate complete freedom of choice, probably an indication of the royal will was given and acted upon for the most part, but as there is no record of resistance by the chapters, we may deduce that the majority of the members were no more actively averse to receiving a Protestant bishop than were the parish clergy to conforming to the Acts of Supremacy.

If this was the general attitude of the ministers of the Church it can hardly be expected that the laity should take a firmer stand. The line of least resistance was made easy by authority, whose attitude as regards conformity was not too rigid at the beginning. We hear much of the activities of the High Commission Court in enforcing obedience to the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, but this was later in the reign, when recusancy became a political danger and Puritanism a disturbing factor in the religious sphere. At first the policy of Elizabeth and her advisers was to persuade to conformity rather than to enforce it, and it seems probable that under these conditions the majority of the people, bewildered or rendered indifferent by the kaleidoscopic changes of the last decade, simply accepted the promise of a settled practice and a rest from persecution.

¹ Individual people can do a valuable service to history by copying their own parish papers and any old wills that come their way, for in spite of all that has already been done by historical and archaeological societies and enthusiastic antiquarians, an enormous field for research still remains. To the amateur, the Elizabethan handwriting may at first present slight difficulties, but these can easily be surmounted by practice. There is an excellent article to help beginners by Miss M. St. C. Byrne in the *Review of English Studies* for April, 1925.

² *A History of England*, p. 329.

It seems clear that the settlement did really make a considerable difference in the daily lives of the people. Many a parish priest had married under the Edwardian *régime*: to these the recognition of clerical marriage brought back the peace of mind and the domestic happiness which had been ruined by the Marian reaction. The worshippers in the parish churches saw their services and their ceremonial changed once more; there is plenty of evidence in contemporary writings that the signs of the old religion were removed and that Protestant usage was promptly reintroduced. Wriothesley and Machyn tell of the changes that took place in London. "There were burned in Paule's Churchyarde, Cheape, and divers other places in London, all the roods and images that stood in the parish churches."¹ "Two gret bonfires of Rodes and of Mares and Johns and other images" were made, and "copes, crosses, sensors, altar-clothes, rod-clothes, bokes, banners"² suffered a like fate. The Cratfield Parish Accounts show that the same sort of thing, though on a smaller scale, was taking place in the country.

"Item paide unto Boucher for pullinge down the aulter. viij*d*.
It. paid to John Goodwyn for helpen downe the rode
lofte iiiij*d*." ³

The same accounts show that the form of worship became definitely Protestant in character.

"It. for making the table for the commandments . . . xij*d*.
It. payde for wyne for the Communyon at Hallomes . . . iiiij*d*.
It. payde for a boke of omelyes and prayers . . . iiijs." ⁴

And the well-known passage in Harrison's *Description of England* concerning the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England shows that by 1577 the change was complete.⁵

A practical effect which can be shown by a study of Elizabethan wills is that money is no longer left to pay for chantries, and masses for the dead. On the other hand bequests to the poor are frequent; such typical examples may be quoted as that Richard Burneham of Knaresburghe bequeaths £5 to be distributed among the poor of Knaresburghe and Harrogate and 50s. among poor prisoners in York Castle and in the Kydcoote of York, and that Thos. Hill of Windesore in the parish of Knaresburghe directs that 40s. from the sale of "one spangled cow with a broken horn" is to be given to the poor of Knaresburghe within six days of his death.⁶ An almost modern aversion to pomp and ceremony in death is shown by Dame Jane Smith: "Alsoe my will is that wheare I holde it vaine and superfluous to have any pompe or vaine expences aboute

¹ Wriothesley, *Chronicle*, Camden Soc. Edn., 1877, Vol. II, p. 146.

² Machyn, *Diary*, pp. 207 and 208.

³ Cratfield Parish Accounts. Years 1559 and 1561.

⁴ *Ibid.* Years 1562 and 1563.

⁵ Limitations of space make it impossible to quote the passage, but see W. Harrison, *A Description of England*. Second and Third Books. Ed. Furnivall for the New Shakspeare Society, Part I (Bk. II) 1877, p. 31.

⁶ *Knaresborough Wills*, Vol. I, p. 177. Surtees Society.

my funeralle insteade of blacke xlth pounde I will may be distributed among the poor, etc." ¹

"To some extent belief is also indicated in wills. There is evidence to show that the Catholic faith was still held late in the reign. For example in 1593 Owen Clonne, a Londoner, recites his faith, concluding "This is my verie faith, nam senex teneo fidem in qua natus sum puer parvulus," ² and in 1599 Jane, daughter of Edward Scarisbricke, says "I pray and hope to live and dye a member of the Catholicke Church." ³ But on the whole the evidence shows that the Protestant belief predominated. Bequests of money for sermons to be preached, and bequests of Bibles, prayers and Fox's *Acts and Monuments* (a significant indication) were common. ⁴ The formula for the commendation of the soul has in most wills dwindled into "I gyve my sowle to almightie God, and my bodie to be buryed within the p'ish church of . . ." ⁵ But sometimes very decided Protestant views are expressed, and the will of Laurence Doddsworth is worth quoting, if only for its vigorous, full-blooded, Elizabethan speech and sentiment.

"I make it manifest both hear (*sic*) and before God, that I do utterly renounce all the pope's false and usurpth (*sic*) promises and all his detestable inormities, beseeching Almighty God to deliver his Church from all his arrows and false doctryne for he is the very anti-Christ enemy and adversary to the glorious gospel of our Saviour Jesus Christ. God at His good pleasure illuminate the eyes of the world that it may discerne and know Him as He is indeed the very mistery of iniquity the man of the sin and he that exalteth himself against God. . . ." ⁶

On the whole the evidence from these various sources tends to show that the settlement was enforced and that its enforcement had considerable effect on the lives of the people in general. On the other hand, belief, as distinct from practice, was variable. There were ardent Protestants and cautious Romanists, there was also a great deal of indifference and confusion; it was only gradually that the Protestant belief took a firm hold and that practice became the outcome of belief, not of mere conformity to the precepts of authority. But slow though the process was, it was none the less sure, and we to-day have as part of our heritage the Anglican Church, conceived by the woman who, in the opinion of the Spanish Envoy to her Court, was "possessed by a hundred thousand devils," brought to birth by the wisdom and labour of her finest statesmen and cherished to maturity by the instinct for compromise and the deep-seated religious feeling of the Anglo-Saxon races.

¹ *Wills and Inventories* (2nd portion), Chetham Society, Vol. LI, p. 23.

² *Calendar of the Court of Hustings*, Vol. II, p. 716.

³ *Wills and Inventories* (3rd portion), Chetham Society, Vol. LIV, p. 23.

⁴ See *Calendar of Wills in the Court of Hustings*, Vol. II, pp. 710 and 720, and *Wills and Inventories*, Chetham Society, Vol. LI, pp. 21 and 233.

⁵ *Wills and Inventories*, by Madeleine Hope Dodds, in *History Teachers' Miscellany*, Vol. III, No. 9, Sept. 1925.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 141.