

Student: Lewis Thomas (F)

Essay Subject: Theology

Supervisor: MB

Essay Question: To what extent was the Elizabethan religious and political climate influenced by radical Protestantism in the period 1559-1583?

Lewis Thomas (F)

Mr Begbie

Extended Essay

August 1st 2015

To what extent was the Elizabethan religious and political climate influenced by radical Protestantism in the period 1559-1583?

In the sixteenth century, England was scorched by the fires of faith. Starting the century a bastion of Catholicism, with shrines at Canterbury and Walsingham drawing pilgrims from around Europe, the country ended it a theological pariah as the only Protestant state in Europe, with the Catholic monarchies of France (itself engulfed by religious uprisings) and Hapsburg Europe circling around it with conversion in mind. However, the English system of religion was not only threatened by Catholicism; for much of the period, radical Protestants assailed Elizabeth's regime, attempting to exert influence over the "church but halfly reformed,"¹ and turn England towards what they perceived to be a purer, godlier state. Between 1556 and 1583, these radicals forced the Church of England to confront itself, in the process becoming an institution which could represent all of English Protestantism, from Anglo-Catholics to Puritans- even at the expense of the radical movement's independence.

This essay will be divided into three sections, the first providing background and the remaining two exploring a different facet of Elizabethan society and its relationship with radical Protestantism. The first section will set out the historical background to the Elizabethan settlement, and discuss the religious and political upheavals which affected England in the mid-16th century. Moving into social analysis, the role of Bishops in the Elizabethan settlement will be discussed, with a

¹ Adam, Peter. "Church History." Church Halfly Reformed. The Theologian. Web. 12 Aug. 2015

particular emphasis being placed on the Archiepiscopates of Matthew Parker and Edmund Grindal, the theological underpinnings to their policies, and their relationship with the major figures of state. The third and final part of the essay will analyse the impact of radical Protestantism upon the Elizabethan state through the affairs of two of its defining personalities; Queen Elizabeth and her chief advisor, Secretary of State and sometime Lord High Treasurer, William Cecil. Finally, the essay will finish with a conclusion as to the extent to which radical Protestantism influenced the Elizabethan political and religious climate.

When writing an essay about radical Protestantism, it is necessary to define precisely what is meant by the concept. Protestantism had originally consisted of a single (and somewhat nebulous) creed in the form of Lutheranism, but began to split almost immediately, with Zwingli's work in Switzerland setting the movement down a more radical path than Luther, and the failure of Philipp of Hesse to reconcile Luther and Zwingli at the Colloquy of Marburg further exacerbating the split². Following the events of the 1520s, Protestantism found itself split, divided by the wish of reformers to "defend their vision of truth not merely against the anti-Christian old Church, but also against each other's misunderstandings"³- this split led to conflicts between various sects of Protestantism, including the Lutherans and the Anabaptists of Munster, who "attempted to establish a new Jerusalem,"⁴ defined by communal government, adult baptism, and somewhat freer morals than Europe was used to.

One of the central issues in the conflict within Protestantism was church governance, with debate raging over the structure of the church. While Cecil's *A Form of Government For The Church* argued that "the Bishop is counted in law the

²MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. London: Penguin, 2004. Print. Page 172.

³ MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. London: Penguin, 2004. Print. Page 172

⁴ MacCulloch, Diarmaid, Charlotte Meuthen, and Lucy Wooding. "The Siege of Munster." Interview by Melvyn Bragg. Audio blog post. In *Our Time*. BBC Radio 4, Thursday 5th Nov. 2009. Web. Tuesday 25 July 2015.

pastor of his whole diocese,"⁵ John Calvin argued for a Presbyterian form of governance based around "four functions of ministry: pastors, doctors, elders and deacons."⁶ Within England, the faction is perhaps best defined by Susan Doran, who argued that radical Protestants (often referred to as Puritans) were "a self-conscious group who were totally committed to purging the established church of its popish 'superstitions' and bringing a biblical morality to English society."⁷ Furthermore, radical Protestants were often opposed to doctrine such as transubstantiation and ornamentation in churches, and lobbied for a preaching ministry, with the ability to preach and engage in theological debate being granted to ordinary people outside the realm of court. Thus, it is by these three criteria that we must judge radical Protestants- support for a Presbyterian form of church government, opposition to certain doctrinal elements, and support for a preaching ministry.

In the years preceding the Elizabethan settlement, English society had suffered substantial political and religious upheaval. Under Henry VIII, the country had broken from Rome but retained many Catholic doctrines, including that of transubstantiation- Sacramentarianism (the denial of transubstantiation) remained an offence, with the *Act of Six Articles* formally asserting transubstantiation in 1539⁸ and John Lambert being burnt at the stake for Sacramentarianism in November 1538⁹. Under Edward VI, the Act of Uniformity was revised to more closely follow Protestant doctrine, with communion in both kinds being available and transubstantiation being denied. These changes were reversed under Mary I, who brought England back into the Catholic orbit, executing Reformists such as Latimer, Cranmer and Ridley and forcing other, more junior figures such as Edmund Grindal, into hiding abroad. These Marian exiles would return under Elizabeth, often occupying senior positions in the clergy- Grindal was to be made Archbishop of

⁵ Cecil, William. *A Form of Government of the Church*. August 1578. Online, accessed July 5th 2015.

⁶ MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. London: Penguin, 2004. Print. Page 238.

⁷ Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion: 1558-1603*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print. Page 24

⁸ "The Act of the Six Articles." *The Act of the Six Articles*. www.tudorplace.com, n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2015.

⁹ Guy, J. A. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print. Page 184.

Canterbury in 1575, with his close friend and fellow exile Edwin Sandys occupying the sees of London and York. The religious environment at the time of the Elizabethan settlement was by no means stable- England had experienced tremendous religious changes in the preceding decades, and could easily turn to radical Protestantism, Catholicism, or a *via media*, with elements of both faiths being combined in order to ensure stability within the regime.

Prior to the Reformation, the Archbishop of Canterbury had merely been the senior cleric in England- in conjunction with his colleague in York, he would administer the Eucharist at coronations, fulfil a role in government, and act as one of two English delegates to the College of Cardinals. This changed following the break from Rome- the Archbishop became the highest ranking priest in the faith, second only to God and the monarch (known as "Supreme Governor of the Church,"¹⁰ by Elizabeth's reign, so as to avoid allegations of the monarch being placed above God). Thus, the Archbishop became a far more politicised role (in what had already been an extremely politicised environment). To borrow from Henry II, a turbulent priest could be even more of a problem for the monarch.

This problem was reflected throughout Elizabeth's reign, with a strained relationship existing between her and her Archbishops, often manifesting itself in disagreement and discord. The first Archbishop of the Elizabethan era, Matthew Parker, had not held major office before being elevated to the Archbishopric- he had been an academic in Cambridge and chaplain to Anne Boleyn before living "as a private individual, so happy before God in my conscience"¹¹ in his home county of Norfolk during the reign of Queen Mary. Parker did not want the episcopate- in his writings, he greeted news of his appointment with the plaintive complaint "that he had found himself in deep waters, and the flood hath overwhelmed me."¹² He then sought divine guidance, writing "O Lord, I am oppressed, answer for me, and

¹⁰ Book of Common Prayer-Articles. Web. 25th July. 2015.

¹¹ Rupp, Gordon. *Matthew Parker, A Man*. Cambridge, 1975. Page 5

¹² Parker, Matthew. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D.* Cambridge University Press, 1852. Print. Page X.

strengthen me with thy free Spirit.”¹³ However, once ensconced in his seat, Parker set about his role, pursuing his duties in a broadly Protestant manner. A central aspect of his character was the issue of clerical marriage- he had been investigated under Mary for marrying, and had a notable disagreement with Elizabeth on the matter. Following Elizabeth’s order to bar women from the colleges of universities and Cathedral precincts (in a burst of religious conservatism on her part), she rebuked Parker for his policy on marriage- in a letter to William Cecil, Parker wrote that “I was in a horror to hear such words to come from her.”¹⁴ Regarding Parker’s relationship with radical Protestantism, the issue of marriage is telling; the ability of priests to marry was one of the hallmarks of Protestantism, and was first allowed under Henry VIII, only to be banned with the Act of Six Articles- Elizabeth also opposed the concept, indicating that while she thought of herself as a Protestant queen, she retained a substantial conservative streak.

While his position on marriage points towards a man influenced to a great extent by radicals, Parker’s position on ornamentation in Churches is even more telling- he opposed Elizabeth’s “quiet persistence in maintaining her crosses, candlesticks and music in her chapel royal,”¹⁵ to the extent that the two became involved in a spat over ornamentations- Parker’s men would remove them, only to be overruled by Elizabeth. Rupp stresses this tension when he describes the “mistrust... of popish garments and of the offendicle of the cross and candles of the Queen’s chapel.”¹⁶ However, this opposition to ornamentation did not necessarily make Parker a radical- he had not been involved in the theological debates and stresses of the Marian exiles, and enjoyed a strained relationship with his bishops, in which they offered him “their friendship but not what he most wanted, their

¹³ Parker, Matthew. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D.* Cambridge University Press, 1852. Print. Page X.

¹⁴ Rupp, Gordon. *Matthew Parker, A Man.* Cambridge, 1975. Page 8

¹⁵ Pollnitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain.* Cambridge: Cambridge U, 2015. Print. Page 252

¹⁶ Rupp, Gordon. *Matthew Parker, A Man.* Cambridge, 1975. Page 10

loyalty.”¹⁷ He did not enshrine more extremist Protestant ideas, crafting the 39 Articles in such a way that “complaint seems to have been made of the indicting and hard usage of many godly [i.e., radical] preachers”¹⁸, and did not surround himself with extremists- the exiles who returned to England tended to be of a slightly more moderate persuasion than some of their colleagues, many of whom remained in Geneva to work on translating the bible and participating in Presbyterian circles. Parker must not be seen as a radical, despite his personal history- he was an academic man, happier on his estates than at court, who enjoyed a strained relationship with his monarch and tried above all else to be the “anchor man”¹⁹, seeking to reconcile competing factions in the church and produce a workable settlement. To a great extent, he succeeded- his middle way found its ultimate expression in the 39 Articles, and did much to craft a particular kind of Anglicanism- not too radical, but certainly not a watered down version of Catholicism. Thus, while he had much in common with radicals, his Archiepiscopate was not influenced by them- it was defined by bridging divides, not by ideological crusades.

Following the death of Parker in 1575, Elizabeth appointed Edmund Grindal as his successor. Hailing from Cumbria, Grindal had studied under Martin Bucer at Cambridge before being appointed by Bishop Ridley as one of his personal chaplains- Ridley took Grindal under his wing, writing to a colleague in 1551 that Grindal “doth move me much; for he is a man known to be both of virtue, honesty, discretion, wisdom, and learning.”²⁰ After fleeing into exile under Mary, Grindal returned, successively holding the dioceses of London and York (he was succeeded in both by his childhood friend Sandys) before being appointed Archbishop of Canterbury. Theologically, Grindal was more extreme than Parker, having been influenced by the debates within the Marian exiles and lobbied against the use of the

¹⁷ Rupp, Gordon. *Matthew Parker, A Man*. Cambridge, 1975. Page 13

¹⁸ Strype, John. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The First Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1821. Print. Page 202.

¹⁹ Rupp, Gordon. *Matthew Parker, A Man*. Cambridge, 1975. Page 19

²⁰ *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D.* Cambridge University Press, 1843. Print. ii

surplice during Parker's archiepiscopate. Consequently, it becomes clear that Grindal was both a member of the Protestant camp during the Vestiarian Controversy (thus directly opposing the policy of both Parker and the Queen), and opposed to the idea of ornamentation in the church- both marks of radical Protestantism. This opposition to ornamentation within the church is borne out by Grindal's entry in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which describes him as possessing "scruples about the "ornaments" rubric in the Elizabethan prayer book, the vestments of the clergy, and the use of wafer bread for Holy Communion."²¹ Indeed, his opposition to ornamentation often went beyond mere scruples, as seen in his *Injunctions For The Laity*, written during his term as Archbishop of York. In the *Injunctions*, Grindal wrote that "all vestments, albes, tunicles, stoles, antiphonons, pixes, paxes, hand-bells, sacring-bells, censers, chrismatories, crosses, candlesticks, holy-water-stocks, or fat, and all other relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry, be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed."²² Consequently, it would appear that Grindal was far more opposed to ornamentation than Parker, and more radical as a result. This opposition to the more traditional aspects of the Church (and, consequently, much of the Elizabethan settlement) must lead to the conclusion that Grindal was influenced by radicals to a very great extent- however, the true extent of his radicalism was to emerge in the later 1570s, in the furore surrounding issues of preaching.

Following his enthronement, Grindal established a system of theological conferences for local preachers and priests known as Prophesyings, at which issues of theology and church governance would be discussed. This was part of a wider strategy to encourage preaching and diversity in the church, with Grindal pursuing a course of action in which "preaching was warmly encouraged and conformity was not widely

²¹ "Edmund Grindal | Biography - Archbishop of Canterbury." *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Encyclopedia Britannica. Web. 2nd August 2015.

²² *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D.* Cambridge University Press, 1843. Print. Page 132

enforced.”²³ In turn, these meetings encouraged the participation of radical Protestants in the church, further demonstrating the extent to which Grindal was influenced by their ideology. Elizabeth disagreed with Grindal on the matter, ordering him to first call a halt to the meetings and then, after he failed to comply, suspending him as Archbishop. As a response to more radical elements within the church, it had a huge effect- it led to a situation whereby the radical impulse was “crushed”²⁴, and radicals were forced underground. Grindal was a man in thrall to the more radical impulse within Protestantism- he supported a preaching ministry, opposed the idea of ornamentation in churches and vestments, and expressed a desire to disobey the Queen in the matter of Prophesyings. Thus, he was certainly the most radical Archbishop of the Elizabethan era- his policies were created with radicalism in mind, and led to a split within between episcopate and monarch over Prophesyings. Furthermore, with his suspension by Elizabeth, relations between Monarch and Archiepiscopate reached a low not seen since the late 1300s, and prompted a conservative reaction from the monarchy which marked one of the main moments of radical influence.

John Whitgift was not a radical individual. Having spent much of his life in Academia, including a spell as vice chancellor of Cambridge University, he was appointed to the Archiepiscopate in 1583, upon Grindal’s death, in a move which marked a conscious decision by Elizabeth to place a conservative in the post. While Whitgift was a Calvinist, he was also a traditionalist- Guy describes him as sharing Elizabeth’s “abhorrence for innovation in religion.”²⁵ This view is supported in a letter from Whitgift to Cecil of 1573, in which Whitgift asks for Cecil’s assistance in the matter of a Puritan preacher named Nicholas Brown, who preached “certain doctrine in two sermons... against the state of the ministry now established.”²⁶

²³ Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion: 1558-1603*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print. Page 37

²⁴ Guy, J. A. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print. Page 306

²⁵ Guy, J. A. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print. Page 307

²⁶ Whitgift, John. *The Vice Chancellor and Heads of Colleges, Cambridge, to Lord Burghley*. Cambridge, 1573. Online. Accessed July 10th 2015

Consequently, upon his accession to the Archiepiscopate, Whitgift pursued a policy of opposition to Puritan thought, serving to ensure that within ten years, Presbyterianism was all but extinguished as a major force in English political life, with its members joining the Anglican Church and accepting their position as the more radical wing of Anglicanism. This must be considered a key moment of radical influence- by so angering Elizabeth with the policy of Grindal, the radical faction provoked a backlash against themselves which eventually led to the creation of a broader church. Following the appointment of Whitgift, Presbyterianism ceased to be an issue which impacted on the daily life of the church, allowing radical ministers and citizens to go about their daily lives within the established church, broadening it and sowing the seeds of the Puritan movement within the Anglican Church. Despite having an ally occupying the episcopate in the form of Grindal, the radical element's main influence was seen under Whitgift- by provoking a conservative backlash, the radical fringe all but destroyed itself, forcing its members to merge with the mainstream Anglican church, and thus engage with it in the long run. Consequently, radical Protestantism was able to exert a far greater influence in the 17th century than would otherwise have been the case had it been left crying in the Presbyterian wilderness. This in turn led to a greater ability to influence the state, going beyond the scattered allies found during the early part of Elizabeth's reign.

The Elizabethan state, while centred on the Queen, could not function without Elizabeth's advisors, chief among who were her Secretary, Francis Walsingham, and her Secretary of State, William Cecil. Both were committed Protestants, with Walsingham's experience as the English ambassador to France during the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre driving a lifelong antipathy towards Catholicism- this became evident in the 1570s, with his support for English intervention in the Netherlands and efforts to combat Catholic missionaries in England- as the Queen's secretary, he became the "cool organising intelligence at the centre of things, the

spider who knew every thread of the Elizabethan web.”²⁷ However, his power paled in comparison to Cecil who, as Elizabeth’s secretary of State, was Elizabeth’s closest advisor. A committed Protestant and secretary to Edward VI who had endured Mary’s reign by retreating to his country estates, Cecil was a man of two parts- the private zealot and the pragmatic statesman. In his personal life, Cecil was a committed Protestant- his biographer Alford described him as being “for the English church as it had been in the years of Edward VI.”²⁸ He also lobbied for a Protestant settlement, acting as the driving force behind the *Device for the Alteration of Religion*- his radicalism is evident in the fact that, rather than the subtle middle way proposed by Richard Goodrich, Cecil’s Device was an unashamedly radical document, clearly breaking with Rome once more and returning to the theological settlement of Edward’s reign. Like his colleague Walsingham, Cecil sought to prevent the reestablishment of Catholicism in England and set about this aim with a singular drive- his support for William of Orange in the Netherlands and the Huguenots in France was motivated as much by a desire to see Protestant regimes established in those states as a desire to destabilise France and Spain. Upon examination of his policy and views, it is clear that Cecil was a deeply pious, radical man who was motivated by his faith in everything he did- even to the extent of “cajoling and persuading”²⁹ Elizabeth to take a firm line with regard to Mary Queen of Scots. Consequently, he must be considered one of the main vessels of radical influence- not only was he a radical himself, but he sought to pursue a radical agenda within the state.

Cecil’s radical impulses went beyond using his faith to inform the direction of his policy- he was a supporter of radicals in government, and often used his influence to facilitate the radical cause. This was seen in the 1570s in the case of Edmund Dering, a radical preacher who roundly criticised the clergy, stating that “manie Preachers

²⁷ Alford, Steven. *The Watchers*. Penguin, 2014. Print. Page 17.

²⁸ Alford, Steven. *Burghley*. Yale, 2011. Print. Page 93.

²⁹ Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England, 1480-1642*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2012. Print. Page 128

in *London*, whiche are unlearned, and rashe of Speache... flatter to gett Lyvinge, they make the Pulpitt to be contemned."³⁰ Sitting in judgement on Dering with Archbishop Parker, Cecil chose to give Dering the benefit of the doubt, rescinding his suspension from Cambridge and allowing him to retire quietly. Based on this, it could be inferred that Cecil was a man in thrall to his religion, blindly pursuing his goals with missionary zeal- and one would be justified to believe that; Cecil was a deeply religious man, who was doubtless motivated by his faith. However, Cecil's support for radicals had its limits- like Parker, while he professed to elements of radical theology, he considered stability to be more important, a view communicated in his *Form of Government of The Church*. Written in 1578, with debates about Puritanism and separatism simmering in the background, the *Form* argued that while "the bishop is counted in law the pastor of his whole diocese... and therefore bound to have a special knowledge of every particular man of his diocese as far as he possibly may,"³¹ he would be unable to reconcile his pastoral duties with the management of the diocese and relationship with central government. Consequently, Cecil ordered that each district be given a "preacher resident in that deanery, orderly, grave, learned, discreet and zealous."³² The implications of this decree are telling for Cecil's relationship with the radical elements in the church- while it encouraged preaching at a local level (a cornerstone of radical theology), the decree did not provide for unrestricted preaching or the Propheesyings of Grindal- it kept preachers firmly under the thumb of central government, and was introduced in order to make the church more efficient, rather than reduce its power. To this end, the *Order* held that the preacher (known as a "Superintendent"³³) would have the power to call the local ministry once a month and "inquire of all disorders, and compound or reform the lesser, certify to the Bishop the greater."³⁴ In this fashion,

³⁰ Dering, Edward. *Letter To the Privy Council*. 1573. Print.

³¹ Cecil, William. *A Form of Government of the Church*. August 1578. Online, accessed July 5th 2015.

³² Cecil, William. *A Form of Government of the Church*. August 1578. Online, accessed July 5th 2015.

³³ Cecil, William. *A Form of Government of the Church*. August 1578. Online, accessed July 5th 2015.

³⁴ Cecil, William. *A Form of Government of the Church*. August 1578. Online, accessed July 5th 2015.

the *Order* strengthened the structure of the church and state, and established a means to track and, if necessary, crack down on deviations from Orthodoxy- precisely the opposite of what the radical wing of the Church intended.

Cecil was a man of contradictions- he was a zealous Protestant in private, and was motivated by his faith in his public policy. However, he also recognised that the stability of the state was not aided by extreme radicalism. Consequently, he resisted attempts by radical elements to overtly influence the church, ensuring that while they may have influenced theology, they did not influence the structure of the church, even going so far as to strengthen the power of Bishops and systems of diocesan administration in order to prevent corruption and radical entryism, as happened under Parker. Thus, while he was the “driving force for an empathically Protestant settlement”³⁵, he was also the driving force for a stable settlement- even if it resulted in the maintenance of a “church but halfly reformed.”³⁶

While Cecil was undeniably powerful, final power lay with Elizabeth. Having been exposed to Henry VIII’s ever changing theological moods as a child and imprisoned under Mary, Elizabeth had developed an idiosyncratic Protestantism, which accepted the stringent Calvinism of the Edwardian settlement while at the same time maintaining elements of gaudy ceremony and ornamentation in her personal chapels- she retained crucifixes and ornaments in the Chapel Royal (in spite of Parker’s protestations), and even patronised Thomas Tallis, “a practicing Catholic and former monk”³⁷, commissioning various pieces of choral music from him throughout her reign. In her opposition to clerical marriage, Elizabeth also professed conservative views, again coming into conflict with Parker. However, she could be ostentatiously Protestant when she chose, as demonstrated by her conduct on Christmas Day 1558. After hearing the sermon from the preacher only to be

³⁵ Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England, 1480-1642*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2012. Print. Page 128

³⁶ Adam, Peter. "Church History." Church Halfly Reformed. *The Theologian*, n.d. Web. 12 Aug. 2015.

³⁷ Spiller, Melanie. "Composer Biography: Thomas Tallis (c1505-1585)." Melanie Spiller and Coloratura Consulting. N.p., 19 Mar. 2013. Web. 10 Aug. 2015.

confronted with the host “in the old ffworme [i.e., the host was elevated in the Catholic fashion], She with hyr nobled, reaturnyd agayn ffrom the Closet and the Mase onto hyr Privey Chamber...”³⁸- this display indicates a woman who, while accepting the need for a degree of circumspection around her faith, was firmly, albeit idiosyncratically, Protestant. In the Elizabethan settlement, the Communion service acted as a key indicator of the extent to which the radical element exerted an influence- while it retained the same prayer before Communion as the Edwardian Prayer Book, the administration of the sacrament was modified significantly. B stating “the body of our lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life, and take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thine heart by faith,”³⁹ the service reached a compromise between the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the Protestant idea that the communion service was merely a commemoration of Christ- this stood in contrast to the 1552 formulation, which merely stated “take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christe dyed for thee.”⁴⁰ This compromise, combined with Elizabeth's support for conservatives such as Whitgift, means that she was not a radical- while she was more radical than her father, she did not support any alterations to the government of the Church, and maintained her support for numerous pieces of conservative doctrine. Consequently, while she may have presided over a government riddled with radicals and an episcopate engaged in squabbling over the direction of the settlement, she remained idiosyncratically conservative- and when confronted by radicalism, decidedly lukewarm.

The period from 1559 to 1583 was one of great change for the political and religious climates of England. With a monarch in a deeply insecure position and deep divisions within the church, the situation was ripe for radical influence- they had

³⁸ Fitzwilliam, Sir William. Letter CLVI. *Original Letters Illustrative of British History*. Ed. Henry Ellis. Harding and Lepard, 1827. Print. Pg.262

³⁹ *The Communion Service, 1549, 1552, 1559 compared*. Extract from *Elizabethan Religious Settlement, 1559-63, documents*. Ed. Johnston, Dr. Andrew. Print.

⁴⁰ *The Communion Service, 1549, 1552, 1559 compared*. Extract from *Elizabethan Religious Settlement, 1559-63, documents*. Ed. Johnston, Dr. Andrew. Print.

exerted a substantial influence under Edward VI, and could have done so again under Elizabeth. However, they failed to do so. With a monarch who, while not altogether behind mainstream Protestantism, was not a radical, and political figures who professed radicalism in private but did not put that into practice in government, the radical movement failed to influence the government to any substantive extent, relying more on the pragmatic manoeuvrings of Cecil to exert any indirect influence. In the episcopate, they were more successful, finding a sympathetic ear in Grindal, only to be severely damaged and put firmly under Anglican control under Whitgift. Somewhat paradoxically, it is in this that we find the main radical influence- through the conflict between Grindal and Elizabeth, radicals brought the full force of the state down on themselves, first neutering Presbyterians and then bringing themselves into the mainstream Anglican church, a situation which persisted until the emergence of Methodism in the early 18th century. By bringing matters of church government to a head, the radicals influenced the development of a broader Anglican church which would shape England- so in their destruction, they had immeasurable influence.

Bibliography

Books (with authors).

- Alford, Steven. *Burghley*. Yale, 2011. Print.
- Alford, Steven. *The Watchers*. Penguin, 2014. Print.
- Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion: 1558-1603*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Fitzwilliam, Sir William. Letter CLVI. *Original Letters Illustrative of British History*. Ed. Henry Ellis. Harding and Lepard, 1827. Print.
- Guy, J. A. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988. Print.
- *The Communion Service, 1549, 1552, 1559 compared*. Extract from *Elizabethan Religious Settlement, 1559-63, documents*. Ed. Johnston, Dr. Andrew. Print.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. London: Penguin, 2004. Print
- Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England, 1480-1642*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2012. Print.
- Strype, John. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: The First Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1821. Print.

Books (without authors).

- Parker, Matthew. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D.* Cambridge University Press, 1852. Print.
- Pollnitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge U, 2015. Print.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Matthew Parker, A Man*. Cambridge, 1975.
- *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D.* Cambridge University Press, 1843. Print.

Websites

- Adam, Peter. "Church History." Church Halfly Reformed. *The Theologian*. Web. 12 Aug. 2015.

<http://www.theologian.org.uk/churchhistory/achurchhalflyreformed.html>

- Cecil, William. *A Form of Government of the Church*. August 1578. Online. Accessed July 5th 2015.
- Dering, Edward. *Letter To the Privy Council*. 1573. Web. Accessed July 5th 2015.
- Spiller, Melanie. "Composer Biography: Thomas Tallis (c1505-1585)." Melanie Spiller and Coloratura Consulting. N.p., 19 Mar. 2013. Web. Accessed 10 Aug. 2015.

http://melaniespiller.com/lavender_187.htm

- Whitgift, John. *The Vice Chancellor and Heads of Colleges, Cambridge, to Lord Burghley*. Cambridge, 1573. Online. Accessed July 10th 2015
- "The Act of the Six Articles." The Act of the Six Articles. www.tudorplace.com. Web. Accessed 04 Aug. 2015.

http://www.tudorplace.com.ar/Documents/act_six_articles.htm

- "Edmund Grindal | Biography - Archbishop of Canterbury." Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Web. Accessed 2nd August 2015.

<http://www.britannica.com/biography/Edmund-Grindal>

- Book of Common Prayer-Articles. Web. 25th July. 2015.

<https://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/book-of-common-prayer/articles-of-religion.aspx>

Audio

- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, Charlotte Meuthen, and Lucy Wooding. "*The Siege of Munster*." Interview by Melvyn Bragg. Audio blog post. *In Our Time*. BBC Radio 4, Thursday 5th Nov. 2009. Web. Tuesday 25 July 2015.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00nkqrv>