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ABSTRACT

Historians have devoted much attention to Catholics in Elizabethan England at a time when tensions ran high between the Catholic Church and the English state. The current dissertation deals with perceptions of the Jesuits among the Catholic community in the Elizabethan Age. Numerous primary sources, both printed and manuscript, written by the Jesuits, their supporters, and their opponents were consulted in the writing of this dissertation. Additionally, the observations and research of other historians have been included to show how the current study differs from past scholarship on the Catholic community in Elizabethan England. Previous studies of the Elizabethan Catholics have tended to depict them as very divided on the question of loyalty to the monarchy and whether or not to support the Jesuits in their quest to restore the Catholic Church in England by overthrowing Queen Elizabeth I. The current treatise argues that the political influence of the Jesuits over the English Catholic community was very limited and superficial. The overwhelming majority of Catholics in England, even among recusants, displayed loyalist sentiments towards Elizabeth and were far more united against than divided by the Jesuits. Catholics who took the Jesuits seriously were confined to a tiny minority of conspirators involved in failed plots to carry out the will of the papacy in overthrowing Elizabeth. The Jesuits were on the extreme end of the spectrum of Catholicism in Elizabethan England because of the tradition of loyalty among English Catholics to established political authority.
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INTRODUCTION

Contemporaries in late sixteenth-century England viewed the Jesuits as a potentially destabilizing religious and political force to be reckoned with. Protestants considered them the ever-present threat of papal domination. Protestants in Elizabethan England, for the most part, were supporters of the church establishment and were generally receptive to basic ideas of Protestant theology such as salvation by faith alone while simultaneously denouncing both the spiritual and political authority of the papacy. Resentment of the Jesuits crossed what remained of the confessional divide in England, as even many Catholics expressed a genuine dislike for their strong-handed methods and perceived disloyalty to the English state. The Jesuits, however, were a very important faction within the larger English Catholic community as they came to represent the menace of international Catholicism and the ever-present subversive foreigner. In writings, the Jesuits often paid lip service to being loyal subjects. Their protestations, however, mattered little to the government that saw every Jesuit as a political traitor deserving of death instead of a religious heretic, thanks in part to a number of contemporaneous events such as the failed Rising in the North of 1569 to place Mary, Queen of Scots on the English throne and the 1570 papal excommunication of Elizabeth. In an age when religion and politics were inseparable, it was hardly possible for the Jesuits, who swore allegiance to the pope to be anything but loyal subjects in the eyes of the English government.

The English Jesuits, especially the leadership, represented a radical group within Elizabethan Catholicism that emerged as an indirect result of the English Reformation that also
produced different groups of more extreme Protestants within and without the Church of England. Although the Jesuits bolstered the number of Catholic clergy and performed the invaluable service of distributing the Sacraments to Catholic laity, they still remained a fringe group within English Catholicism. English Catholics, generally speaking, longed for the restoration of traditional services and rituals, but very few felt any great affinity for the institutional Catholic Church, especially the one that came out of the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation, which increasingly seemed foreign as time progressed. There was a real distinction between Catholicism in England and the Catholic Church in England, as many Catholics held a great love for the mass in Latin and elaborate ceremonies and rituals while at the same time not identifying much with the international Catholic Church, especially with the advent of the Counter-Reformation and its emphasis on obedience to the pope whose authority surpassed that of Scripture.

Not only did the Reformation divide Protestants in England from the European mainland, but it also produced divisions in Catholicism in England over the question of loyalty to the pope and his decrees that would gradually manifest in the Elizabethan Age. Indeed, English Catholics saw the Jesuits' direct political loyalty to the pope and opposition to Elizabeth as a sign of disrespect for traditional authority and ran counter to the culture of obedience to the law in England and elsewhere in western Europe. Eamon Duffy in The Stripping of the Altars explains the broader success of the English Reformation by stating, "And even among those complying promptly by destroying images, books, ornaments, obedience to 'the lawes of the realme...and the procedyngs of the heyghe powers' was often the operative factor, rather than communal zeal for
Protestantism" in the visitation of 1559.\textsuperscript{1} Other historians, such as David Loades, have also discussed how a general desire for order and obeying the law often overrode religious consciences throughout the English Reformation. Even during the reign of Mary, a great number of Protestants supported her ascent to the throne mainly because they thought her to be the legitimate heir despite a minority seeking to put Lady Jane Grey on the throne.\textsuperscript{2} Elizabeth held the backing of most Catholics for the same reason that Protestants approved of Mary notwithstanding their religious differences. Mary's reign, however, was too brief for her to face the same problems of loyalty among radical Protestants that Elizabeth had to deal with from a minority of Catholics, more specifically from a number of Jesuits and conspirators. Had Mary lived longer, it is possible that she could have faced an almost inverse situation with the Marian exiles training missionaries and sending them into England from Geneva and other centers of Calvinism on the continent to keep the flame of evangelicalism alive in England while hoping for better times in the future.

With the advent of the English Reformation, there were many different ways to profess religious beliefs for both Protestants and Catholics. Protestants increasingly broke away from the Church of England into dissenting groups as the English Reformation proceeded in directions that Henry VIII could have scarcely predicted. Puritanism began to crop up in the reign of Elizabeth with the return of the Marian exiles who had been educated abroad on the continent. They began to see the Church of England as a vessel, although as flawed as it may have been with the dregs of popish rituals, that could be purified and reshaped into a more godly community of Christians. A radical underground of Puritans and antinomians, Protestants who


disbelieved in the power of sin, also emerged in the wake of the English Reformation, especially in the seventeenth century in the run up to the Civil War. David Como has written extensively about this topic in his book, *Blown by the Spirit*. Como argues, "that the disputes between antinomians and their orthodox puritan antagonists were so bitter precisely because no such segregating boundary existed." In other words, antinomians were still considered part of the godly community since they shared much of the same heritage despite their radical views on the nature of sin and authority. Indeed, the situation between Puritans and antinomians appears to apply in a similar way to the English Jesuits and the other Catholics in Elizabethan England. Jesuits, secular clergy, recusants, and crypto-papists in the Church of England shared the same Catholic heritage, although they were bitterly divided over the nature of the authority of the pope and the Crown. Many Jesuits thought they should seek to reclaim England for the Catholic faith, while secular clergy tended to favor toleration for English Catholics in a Protestant state.

Although historians have until recently mostly concentrated on the diversifying effect that the English Reformation had on English Protestantism, it is equally clear that it affected Catholicism in much the same way when it came to a greater spectrum of religious expression while still retaining core beliefs.

In effect, the Jesuits were the modernizing force within the English Catholic Church, seeking to bring it firmly out of the medieval era. Pre-Reformation Christians in England cared deeply for their religious traditions, as Duffy has persuasively shown. By contrast, the Jesuits showed little sensitivity towards pre-Reformation church traditions and especially the all-important tradition that crossed confessional lines in England of loyalty to the reigning monarch.

---


4 Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*. 
Indeed, one of the hallmarks of the English Catholic community as a whole was merely getting along with neighbors and seeking as little confrontation as possible. The Jesuits, on the other hand, often sought confrontation as Edmund Campion has shown in his famous mission to England in 1580. Contemporary English Catholics often viewed the Jesuits as precisian, having very much in common with the Puritans although they occupied opposite ends of the theological spectrum. The political ideology of the Jesuits was firmly at odds with the more traditional Catholics, who comprised the vast majority of the English laity and a great number of the clergy. Garrett Mattingly has rightly viewed the invasion of the Spanish Armada as a conflict not just over mercantilist economics, but rather a struggle over two opposing systems of ideas.5 Rather than viewing the fight against the Spanish Armada as a fight between English Catholicism and Protestantism, however, it was a fight between the revolutionary ideology of the Jesuits on one hand and the traditional loyalties of both Catholics and Protestants in England. Steven Pincus considers the Glorious Revolution as the first modern revolution, but the defeat of the Spanish Armada of 1588 represented another attempt at a modern revolution. The Jesuits and their allies among the Spanish, however, failed to enforce the political will of the papacy.6

It is the central argument of the present study that although the Jesuits have received the majority of attention from both contemporaries and historians, ultimately their influence was very limited at best in swaying the political will of their English co-religionists, be they the mildest of church papists or the most intransigent of recusants. Previous historians have consistently made the mistake of assuming that most recusants approved of the intermeddling of the Jesuits as well as the papacy with the political affairs of England. The divisions, while very real in the Catholic community, were mostly between the Jesuits themselves and the rest of

English Catholics who could not bring themselves to give political support. Catholics in England were subject to pressures from their Protestant neighbors as well as the government, and in the vast majority of cases had to act pragmatically whether they desired to or not. It appears, on the whole, that looking backwards from the reign of Elizabeth, Catholics in England were more inclined to express genuine sentiments of loyalty as their forebears had done, despite the disagreements in religion they had with the Elizabethan regime, mainly over the twin issues of the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity. Historians have often observed similarities between the Jesuits and the Puritans of Elizabethan England. Although on opposite ends of the theological spectrum, both insisted on purer forms of religious worship, whether from Roman innovations or Protestant heresy. Like the Puritans' theological influence over the mass of church-going Protestants, however, the political influence of the Jesuits over their fellow Catholics was negligible at best, despite their indispensible role in administering the sacraments. Early modern Catholics in England, like modern Catholics, could disagree politically with hierarchical leadership yet still consider themselves practicing Catholics.

0.3 HISTORIOGRAPHY

Modern historiography of Elizabethan Catholicism generally starts with Jesuit historian John Hungerford Pollen's *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Pollen considers Elizabeth's reign the best starting point for writing about post-Reformation Catholicism, as will most historians who follow in his footsteps. The reforms and counter-reforms under Henry, Edward, and Mary were fitful and temporary at best while the religious change during the reign of Elizabeth, both Protestant and Catholic, tended to last far longer. Pollen notes a general collapse of the Catholic Church at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign and a
seemingly revived Church in the 1570s due to the Jesuit missionaries. Pollen views the events of the Northern Rising of 1569 and the Excommunication in 1570 as being successful from a religious point of view although they were failures politically. His reasoning is that they gave to English Catholics the impetus to resist religious change forced upon them by the Elizabethan state. The longevity of English Catholicism under Elizabeth was not due to the support of any foreign nation but rather the result of the entry of the seminary priests that boosted enthusiasm for the old Church. Despite this observation, Pollen also notes that the Marian church with whatever flaws it may have had, "resisted Elizabeth's tyranny incomparably better than the pre-Reformation church resisted Elizabeth's father." At the accession of Elizabeth, Pollen claims that the majority of English people were Catholic by default except for in London and other major cities as well as counties near London. In spite of this assertion, Pollen also notes that opposition from the laity to the Religious Settlement was very weak with no organized protests or uprisings. The laity was able to resist the religious changes longer than the clergy since they were under less pressure to conform. A number of English Catholics believed that they were far more numerous than the Protestants in government forcing religious change upon them and had only to wait a few more years since so many royal decrees concerning religion had been fleeting in the past. The real problem, according to Pollen, lay with the Catholic leadership in England which was largely nonexistent thanks to the large number of deaths of the Marian bishops as well as its leader, Cardinal Pole. The Catholic Church would fall into decline and drift until the

8 Pollen, vii.
9 Ibid., 5.
10 Ibid., 42-44.
11 Ibid., 8.
arrival of the seminarians, which Pollen says "grew to be the source of a powerful and permanent Catholic renaissance."\(^\text{12}\)

Writing around the same time as Pollen, Arnold Oskar Meyer gives a unique perspective of Catholicism under Elizabeth because he was a historian from Germany. Meyer is concerned less with the Catholic rebellions and plots against Elizabeth than the question of how and why Catholicism lost its hold on the majority of English people.\(^\text{13}\) He makes the observation, which has guided historians since, that it is nearly impossible to tell which religion held a majority in England during much the sixteenth century because "a nation which allowed itself to be transferred from one church to another, three times in twelve years (1547, 1553, 1559) without serious opposition cannot have been strongly attached to any party, and it matters little which party numbered the most adherents at a given moment."\(^\text{14}\) During the reign of Elizabeth, however, Protestantism gained the ascendancy at a few critical points. Just before the arrival of the Jesuits in the 1560s, Catholicism in England was very much in danger of dying out. Meyer points to the fact that the Northern Rebellion of 1569 was confined mostly to the northern counties which signifies that the rest of England had mostly abandoned the Catholic Church. He also mentions the papal excommunication of Elizabeth in 1570 and its negative reception by the vast majority of the English as further evidence that Catholicism was decidedly on the wane. Until the excommunication, Catholic leadership in England was virtually nonexistent as the deprivation of bishops destroyed the hierarchy and the Oath of Supremacy removed most Catholic clergy, but a few Catholic priests continued on in secret as Anglican clergy, especially

\(^{12}\) Ibid., 244.
\(^{14}\) Meyer, 10.
in the northern counties and in Wales.\textsuperscript{15} Despite the heroic efforts of the Jesuits and seminary
trained priests, Elizabeth won a final victory over them in exploiting the divisions that began to
arise with the Archpriest Controversy. The Declaration of Allegiance in 1603 clearly defined
allegiance to the pope as strictly spiritual, and Meyer has interpreted the submission of the
thirteen priests who signed it as "the victory of the modern secular state over the claim of the
medieval universal church to political power." The Declaration is the final proof of a weak and
feeble Catholic opposition to Elizabeth. Most of the English people became Anglicans not
because of an absolutist style monarchy, but from a nascent sense of nationalism of which the
Anglican Church and Protestantism were natural vehicles.\textsuperscript{16}

W.R. Trimble's \textit{The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England} has been an often cited work
that appears in many scholarly studies about the Elizabethan English Catholic community.
Trimble notes that by 1558 Protestantism was well into its second generation of existence in
England while Catholicism was just entering into the Counter-Reformation, and governments
were becoming increasingly aware of the difficulty in wiping out a minority group of committed
believers. While Trimble writes that there is scant evidence available that points towards a
considerable number of Catholics in Elizabethan England, he also notices that there was a
dynamic group of Catholics that labored hard to maintain the old religion.\textsuperscript{17} Like Pollen, Trimble
writes of a general decline of Catholicism after 1559 because of the bishops being either in
prison or under close watch by government spies. Catholic nobility were few in numbers and
there were only a few gentry peers who openly professed Catholicism. There was no single
figure that Catholics could unite around to form a coherent faction. The question the Catholic

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 459-461.
\textsuperscript{17} W.R. Trimble, \textit{The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England, 1558-1603}. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard
University, 1964), 3.
laity repeatedly faced was one of how far they should practice their obedience to the queen since the Act of Supremacy effectively forbade adherence to a foreign religious authority while the Act of Uniformity substituted a Protestant oriented liturgy centered around the Word instead of the Sacraments. Trimble minimizes the importance of the Elizabethan Catholic gentry in saying that while they were the only sizable group that held any influence, they desired to be left alone and were important only in local areas. The Catholic gentry could not miss the many features of medieval Catholicism since they were a generation removed from the shrines, monasteries, and pilgrimages as well as mysticism. Trimble asserts that the Elizabethan establishment had no difficulty in controlling the Catholic population of England since it had numerous ways to apply pressure to enforce conformity. The new Elizabethan liturgy also had enough of the trappings of traditional religion to appease a great number of religious conservatives while nascent nationalism of the 1580s and 90s encouraged English people to conform to the Church of England. For Trimble, the label “Catholic” could only apply to an extreme minority of recusants who were largely powerless and presented no real threat to the political and religious establishment.

John Bossy’s seminal work *The English Catholic Community* has influenced every succeeding historian that has taken an interest in post-Reformation English Catholicism. Bossy is the first scholar to observe a coherent, almost monolithic, Catholic community in Elizabethan England. He identifies a post-Reformation English Catholic Church that was closely related to the Counter-Reformation. According to Bossy, this new ecclesiastical order was unique from the old medieval church in England that existed from the missionary trip of St Augustine to Kent in

---

18 Ibid, 5.
19 Ibid, 7.
Bossy gives most of the credit to the Jesuits for the continued survival of English Catholicism in the face of Elizabethan repression. Bossy states that the formation of the English college at Douai in 1568 should be the real starting point of a distinct English Catholic community, of which the Jesuit mission formed the backbone. While Bossy recognizes the claim of William Allen to be the founder of the English mission, he argues that Allen was influenced too much by the conservative nature of the Marian church and the real credit should go to more modern Elizabethans with a humanist background and training who had no role in the Marian establishment, such as Gregory Martin, Edmund Campion, and Robert Persons. According to Bossy, they disagreed with the royal supremacy not because it conflicted with traditional belief and practice or their political ideals, but because they felt it undermined the position of the clergy which they believed was needed to spread true religion. Bossy also locates English Catholicism firmly within the English tradition of dissenting religions. He divides English dissent into Protestant and non-Protestant segments, with Catholics, Quakers, and Unitarians occupying the latter while the Puritan offshoots Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists are within the former; he recognizes that non-Protestant dissenters did not have as many shared beliefs as did the Protestant non-conformists.

While Bossy recognizes a unique phase in English Catholicism during the Elizabethan Age, Christopher Haigh challenges Bossy's assertion that discontinuity characterized English Catholicism in Elizabethan England. Haigh uses Lancashire as a case study to argue that Catholicism was able to continue unbroken from medieval times in outlying areas, primarily due to the inadequacy of the ecclesiastical administrative structure after the 1530s as it was

---

21 Bossy, 12.
22 Ibid., 15-16.
23 Ibid., 396.
attempting to bring about religious change.\textsuperscript{24} According to Haigh, the Church of England lacked so much authority in Lancashire that sometimes "the influence of a local gentleman could be more effective than the sanctions of the Church." In more populated areas under the watchful eye of the Tudor authorities, those who refused to obey court orders could be coerced through excommunication. In remote rural areas, however, enforcement of the Religious Settlement was very difficult and excommunication held little meaning to those who did not care. Although many people got in trouble for disobeying Church discipline in Lancashire, it meant little since the Church could not effectively control them.\textsuperscript{25} Haigh also makes the observation that there was a general neglect of catechizing in the theological principles of the Church of England, which made it likely that Catholicism was not going to die out with the pre-Elizabethan generation. Anglican clergy were often in short supply, and the few who were available were simply incompetent or too conservative leaning to provide ample instruction, which made the job for recusant priests and missionaries relatively simple since the established church offered little opposition.\textsuperscript{26} Although Bossy had suggested that the seminary priests created widespread recusancy, Haigh observes that it already existed on a large scale in Lancashire by 1578 which was unlikely to have been created by the seminarians. Only 44 missionaries had been sent into England by 1577, and even fewer penetrated into the northern counties.\textsuperscript{27}

J.J. Scarisbrick ultimately draws a similar conclusion to Haigh's regarding the survival of Catholicism in Elizabethan England, but is more cautious in giving full credit to Marian priests for the endurance of Catholicism. Scarisbrick observes that the old ecclesiastical order all but collapsed in the wake of the 1559 Elizabethan Religious Settlement as many people obeyed

\textsuperscript{25} Haigh, 16-17.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid, 246.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid, 264.
except for a number of bishops. Despite this, there was also little enforcement of the Settlement early in Elizabeth's reign as the goal initially was to win over people to the Church of England by taking a lenient stance towards those who might have been lukewarm to the new religious establishment, not to exclude them through harsh punishments. The Oath of Supremacy also was often evaded and not everyone took it as seriously as the government might have hoped. There were many communities across England that gave little heed to the Settlement for a long time, and there were some priests who made a compromise by celebrating the old mass and the new communion service.\footnote{Scarisbrick, J.J. The Reformation and the English People. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1984), 137-138.} Although the old Marian religious order did collapse, there still remained sufficient Catholic leadership in the early parts of Elizabeth's reign, thanks in part to the laxity of enforcement of the Religious Settlement, to lay the groundwork for the survival of Catholicism. Additionally, the material trappings of Catholicism, such as vestments, missals, and prayer beads were found in many recusant households when they were despoiled by the authorities. Priests who arrived in private homes to say Mass often found everything they needed to give the Sacraments. Traditional rituals and pilgrimages still held a degree of popularity well into the Reformation as well. This all suggests that the Marian clergy did play a large role and were pioneers in maintaining Catholicism when it was most in danger of dying out in England through Elizabeth's reign and even beyond as the oldest of them was still active in 1616.\footnote{Scarisbrick, 140-142.} Scarisbrick ultimately concludes that the Jesuit missionaries did breathe fresh life and confidence into the Catholic community but they were indebted to the Marian clergy for making possible the continued survival of Catholicism in England.\footnote{Ibid, 145.}
In Sussex as well there was difficulty in enforcing the Elizabethan Religious Settlement as R.B. Manning makes clear in his book *Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex*. The core problem, as Manning identifies it, is that the Settlement pleased everyone and no one at the same time. As in many other places in England, rural Sussex presented many obstacles to enforcement of the new religion. The local government in Sussex placed social stability ahead of religious conformity, which prolonged the transfer of power from Catholic aristocracy to Protestant nobility by 25 years, gradually accomplished in stages. Sussex, similar to Haigh's Lancashire, also had its problems with the Church of England's administrative structure with no effective leadership and ineffective church courts. The physical topography of Sussex further hindered the progress of the English Reformation as most roads were impassable except during dry summers, and steep hills and thick forests made communications difficult. The people of Sussex tended heavily towards social conservatism because of the most prosperous economic activities such as arable farming and ironworks being controlled by the gentry. In Sussex, those who did the most to keep Catholicism alive and to resist the Settlement were the recusant gentry because Elizabethan Catholicism had the best chance at survival wherever there were social institutions to support it.

While Manning states that the Jesuits were indispensable in maintaining Catholicism, he also makes note that "the Catholic gentry played a major role in preserving Catholicism because the missionary priests were absolutely dependent on their hospitality." Also, the homes of the Catholic gentry in Sussex provided an important connection between seminaries in continental Europe and London, from where missionaries could temporarily stay with the wealthier gentry in their townhouses and filter into the rest of England. Catholic gentry

---

32 Manning, 3.
33 Ibid, 151.
in Sussex were able to keep priests in their homes with relative impunity until the High Commission started to crack down on religious heterodoxy in the summer of 1580. From then on they were compelled to rely on the nobility for Catholic services.\(^\text{34}\)

Due to the influence of John Bossy, historians who immediately succeeded him have preferred to focus on the more militant side of Catholicism with the Jesuits and their supporters. Arnold Pritchard, however, focuses on loyalist sentiments within the Catholic community. Pritchard believes that the biggest issues that English Catholics had to face were political since almost all of the problems they dealt with had to do with friction between the Catholic Church and the Elizabethan state. Every English Catholic eventually had to deal with the problem of the relationship of his or her religious community to the wider community of England whose most visible symbol of unity was the monarch.\(^\text{35}\) Pritchard lays special emphasis on the 1570 papal bull of excommunication and how much it changed the political relationship between the Catholic Church and England as well as its effect on the character of Catholicism in England. The dividing line in the 1560s between Catholics and Protestants was not as clear as it would later become. While there was much conservative religious sentiment and retention of traditional rituals, especially in outlying and northern counties, there was comparatively little recusancy as of yet since it seemed more natural for a parishioner to attend the church he or she always had instead of leaving it for a small group of Christians that retained the Latin Mass and clerical celibacy. Pritchard also notes, however, that the Catholic community from Elizabeth onwards was a wholly new creation, and he tends to side more with John Bossy on the question of

---

\(^{34}\) Ibid, 157-158.  
discontinuity. Pritchard goes on to state that the presence of the Jesuit missionaries helped to sharpen the differences between Catholics and Protestants in England as they encouraged outright recusancy and it was likely that without them, the English Catholic community would have never come into existence. While Allen and Parsons expressed radical sentiments aimed at overthrowing Elizabeth, most missionary priests sought to avoid politics and instead concentrate on preserving Catholicism and converting Protestants whenever possible. The missionaries agreed that Catholics should avoid all contact with the Church of England, but they publicly took no position on political matters such as whether the pope had any right to depose Elizabeth. It was beneficial for the missionaries to take such a position because the majority of Catholic landowners thought of themselves as loyal subjects of Queen Elizabeth. The Catholic landowning class often sought to emphasize the political irrelevance of their religious beliefs to win the approval of Protestant nobles and gentry. While the government regarded Catholicism as inherently undesirable and imposed punitive fines for recusancy whenever possible, it did distinguish to a degree between the politically loyal and subversive.

Peter Holmes, like Arnold Pritchard, also focuses on politics and the English Catholic community in his book *Resistance and Compromise*. Holmes notes immediately that English Catholics were in a unique position compared to their co-religionists in the vast majority of European countries. Usually, Protestants made up the religious minority in a given country during the Reformation. This, according to Holmes, made it more difficult for Catholics in England to modify their position under Elizabeth since they had no precedent to follow.

---

36 Pritchard, 3.
37 Ibid, 5.
38 Ibid, 37-38.
39 Ibid, 41.
According to Holmes, the Catholic minority in England, like other religious minorities elsewhere in Europe, had a choice between two options. The more popular option was to obey the commands of a monarch with no regard to his or her religion or how oppressive the government may have been. Cruel monarchs would be punished by God in the end and subjects would be rewarded by God for their meek submission to authority. The other option was to resist a political ruler who persecuted those faithful to the true religion or abused royal power. The Church of England at the time of Edward VI viewed disobedience and lawlessness as inherently sinful. Interestingly enough, the Protestant Bishop of Winchester under the reign of Mary argued that "royal authority was derived from the people, who were able to choose their government and to change it if necessary." The same views that the Bishop of Winchester held would later become shared by English Catholics in the reign of Elizabeth. Unlike Bossy and previous scholars of Elizabethan Catholicism, Holmes downplays the divisions in the English Catholic community. He sees little printed evidence available for any significant ideological differences between the Appellants and those who supported the Archpriest regime and even less for a distinct loyalist faction within the English Catholic community. Holmes also sees much more continuity from the early years of Elizabeth's reign to the more dramatic days of the Jesuit seminarians. He also fails to find much printed evidence supporting the notion that there was any significant division or disagreement between the Catholic clergy and laity.

Lucy Wooding adds to the existing historiography of Elizabethan Catholicism by examining how Catholic thought developed in England from the 1530s until the beginning of the 1570s. Wooding holds the position that "the progress of Catholicism was as much a part of the English Reformation as the emergence of Protestantism, and should be studied as part of a wider

---

41 Holmes, 3-4.
42 Ibid., 6-7.
movement of religious development, as well as in terms of the emerging religious divide."

Wooding sees English Catholicism as having a unique identity in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign until around 1570 when international ideas of Catholicism began to dominate in the English Catholic community. Early in the Elizabethan Age, being Catholic was more about self-identification than belief in a rigid set of doctrines. While it is possible to define Catholics as believing in the restoration of the traditional Mass, their adherence could be described in various ways.\(^{43}\) The English Reformation had a deep influence on Catholicism in England by making it more scripturally based under Henry, Mary, and Elizabeth. Vernacular religious instruction was common in Marian England while polemical works were in short supply, which closely followed the ideals of Erasmian Christian Humanism. Even though the Council of Trent began before and continued after Mary ruled England, the English Reformation still held far more influence over the development of Catholic thought at the time. The English Catholic community in exile at Louvain under Elizabeth continued the tradition of the English Reformation by promoting the same ideas about Scripture and preferring to focus on the conception of church authority based on consensus rather than hierarchy. Wooding places blame on Elizabeth's early religious policies for exacerbating the divide between Protestants and Catholics but she also recognizes that during the 1560s English Catholics began to move more into line with Counter-Reformation Catholicism with its emphasis on submission to the pope and the notion of Church Tradition above Scripture.\(^{44}\) With these new developments, English Catholicism as a whole became more isolated and sectarian characterized by its recusant community post-1570 as it moved out of the mainstream of English Reformation thought.\(^{45}\)


\(^{44}\) Wooding, 11-12.

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 182.
Alexandra Walsham has contributed greatly to the understanding that there were many different ways to profess Catholic beliefs in Elizabethan England in her book, *Church Papists*. She charges that the understanding of Elizabethan Catholicism has been distorted too much by the preoccupancy with recusancy. Walsham argues that those Catholics who did conform to the Church of England to meet the minimum requirements of the law did much to sustain the faith in the face of increasing persecution from Elizabethan authorities. By drawing attention to the church papists, Catholicism in Elizabethan England begins to look less like a monolithic recusant sect and more like an amorphous English dissenting religious group. It also becomes more socially diverse with a broader lower class base instead of an almost exclusive upper class nonconforming sect. Walsham further argues that there was much more division among the missionary priests than was previously thought. Missionaries such as Thomas Bell allowed occasional conformity because of the views of their lay patrons and protectors who had to deal with the realities of living with a government that was inherently hostile to Catholicism. There was a much more undefined border between recusancy, conformity, and the troubled consciences of those who conformed half-heartedly to the Church of England in order to avoid persecution. Many church papists who did conform were not merely trying to deceive government officials, but rather they sincerely thought they were able to bring about a serious change of heart among their fellow parishioners. According to Walsham, the attempted evangelization of Church of England ministers and lay people only increased the hardships of the rest of the English Catholic community in much the same way that the militancy of the Jesuit missionaries would provoke further hostility from the Elizabethan state. The main purpose of conformity was a way to satisfy the requirements of the law and to show loyalty to the crown while professing faith to a religion that had been officially proscribed.  
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Walsham wants scholars to look at half-hearted conformity not as a surrender to the forces of state Protestantism, but rather as a temporary refuge for better days when the old religion would reestablish itself in England. Church papistry was also a way to foster civil interaction with "heretical" opponents and preserve the culture of order that English people desired above all else. Church papistry was a not insignificant segment of both the Anglican and Catholic communities because of the general reluctance with which most English people greeted the English Reformation, as revisionists such as Christopher Haigh and Eamon Duffy argue. In the first years of Elizabeth's reign it is very difficult to distinguish between dedicated Catholics and half-hearted conformists who did not want to cause any disturbance. Although Protestant polemicists often railed against "church papists," they were a very real segment of the religious spectrum within England. It is important to note that conformity was far from a monolithic religious identity because there were committed as well as reluctant parishioners in the Church of England.

If one accepts Walsham's contention that there were laymen who considered themselves Catholics in the Church of England, then it is not much of a stretch to think of certain Anglican clergymen, such as Anthony Tyrrell, as being Catholic as well. Anglican priests might communicate with the Church of England out of the desire to fulfill the minimum requirements of the law to prove themselves loyal subjects, but not all displayed an enthusiasm for Protestant theology.

Michael Questier as well has contributed greatly to a modern understanding of the diversity of interests in Elizabethan Catholicism. While Roger Manning tends to focus on the Catholic gentry in Sussex, Questier examines entourage networks among the Catholic aristocracy in Elizabethan England. Questier argues that most historians in the past have been too

---
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preoccupied by the popular opposition among Catholics to the state run English Reformation. He also believes that the perception that English Catholicism was leaderless and nearly a spent force after the Settlement in 1559 is incorrect when taking the aristocratic entourage networks into account. The contemporaries' view of Catholicism as a pervasive political and religious force was not very far off the mark since many aristocratic Catholics did have a presence in local and state government. Among the Catholic aristocracy that Questier studies, he finds evidence of elaborate kinship networks. English Catholics have tended to portray themselves as a group of orthodox believers who had the courage to express themselves in matters of faith, and many historians have followed this same description of the English Catholic community uncritically. Questier, however, suggests "that contemporaries might well see the Catholic community as a series of entourages and networks, often factionally aligned internally, whose ideological concerns inflected the more basic fact of their blood, kin, and client relationships." 

Questier takes issue with Trimble's interpretation of the Elizabethan Calendar of State Papers, which suggest a powerless Catholic minority and an all-powerful state enforcing its will. The State Papers consisted of government informants relating events as they were happening on the ground which could be rather slanted to what they wanted to believe. Questier believes that patronage systems among Catholics or those who sympathized with them offers a different view of the vitality of the English Catholic community. While the historiography of post-Reformation Catholicism has often stated that it consisted of divided and isolated pockets of recusancy, members of the Catholic aristocracy did exercise positions of authority although not as great as their Protestant counterparts. The Brownes of Cowdray often remembered their
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service to the crown in the first half of the sixteenth century although they lost their positions in
the government on the accession of Elizabeth. This still, however, did not prevent them from
keeping their political aspirations alive despite their religion. Questier argues "that they lacked
'official' positions of authority, nationally and, eventually, even in their own country, certainly
did not mean that they could not exercise authority and influence within the Catholic
community."

William J. Sheils's essay, "The Catholic Community," attempts to highlight the
commonalities that English Catholics shared with their Protestant counterparts. Sheils observes
that in the reign of Mary, Catholicism was not as backward looking and insular as once thought
in traditional historiography, but rather a dynamic religion that held influence over scholars in
the universities as well as support from influential groups in the government across England.
The continuing appeal of Catholicism made Protestantism no less influential, due in part to
evangelical innovations in the English Reformation during the reign of Edward VII and the
Marian exiles being exposed to Reformed theology abroad. Elizabeth's own religion was
somewhat more akin to the old Lutheran influences of the English Reformation. This made for a
religiously divided nation at the time of Elizabeth's accession, although those who held
attachment to traditional religious observances were still in the majority. In spite of the
wording of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, the Church of England continued many
traditional religious observances and imagery even at the center with the royal chapel retaining
many images and even more so at the local level with rood screens still being in place in some
churches. That said, despite whatever resemblance the Church of England may have had to
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Catholicism, there was still a great number of Catholics who felt uneasy attending Anglican church services and for them, the Marian clergy provided a viable alternative. While there was much affinity for traditional religious worship, and while the Marian priests did play a central role in sustaining English Catholicism during the early years of Elizabeth's reign, it is also equally clear with the general collapse of traditional piety in the mid-1580s that without the aid of the Jesuits the English Catholic community would have been in a very difficult situation.

Sheils then assesses whether the mid-1570s represented a dramatic break with the past in the English Catholic community or not. He observes that while priests were essential to perform the Sacraments, he also says that the protection provided by the gentry was indispensible and that they saw themselves as having a long tradition of suffering for their faith. As has been part of the recent trend in historiography, Sheils widens the definition of the English Catholic community to include those who conformed outwardly but were Catholics inwardly. He estimates that for every one recusant there were three to four church papists and he therefore argues that recusants made up a minority of the English Catholic community. Not unlike Puritans, they were the "hotter sort" of Catholics that existed in a diverse community that saw themselves continuing traditional worship. English Catholics were far from a monolithic group, according to Sheils. They separated from Protestants through their religious preference, but other than that they shared a very diverse range of outlooks on other aspects of life that confronted them, such as how far they should negotiate with the Elizabethan regime and how they should deal with their immediate community. Sheils concludes, "that not only was there a wide range of opinions and positions available within the Catholic community but that in
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religious, political, social, and cultural contexts, the boundaries between English Catholics and their Protestant neighbors were far more porous than contemporary polemic might suggest.”

The historiography of English Catholicism in the reign of Elizabeth has come a long way from Pollen to Bossy and then to Walsham and Questier. No longer viewed as an insular, monolithic religion made up of an exclusive minority of die-hard recusants and Jesuits, the nature of Catholicism in Elizabethan England has been progressively widened so much that some are now questioning whether there even is a coherent enough body of Catholics to qualify as a real community of believers in England. The Jesuits have often been portrayed as being central to the preservation of Catholicism in England, although some scholars have rightly pointed out that the Marian clergy laid the foundation for the Jesuits’ work.

Although it is certainly correct that the Jesuits played an indispensable role in the continued survival of Catholicism through their administration of the Sacraments and their reinforcement of the religious divide, it must be remembered that they were one group among many in the Catholic community with Questier's aristocracy, Walsham's church papists, Manning's gentry, and Trimble's lay recusants. It would certainly be most helpful to think of the English Jesuits and their recusant laity as being towards the radical end of the spectrum in early modern English Catholicism, with church papists and other Anglican parishioners sympathetic to traditional religion as the moderates. Indeed, Protestantism in early modern England is very much thought of in a similar way, ranging from Puritans within the church establishment to antinomian dissenters and separatists as the more radical Protestants, to those who were genuinely satisfied with the Church of England as Judith Maltby has brought to attention.57

56 Ibid, 267.
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other scholars in the historiography of English Catholicism have frequently implied that the Jesuits were the mainstream of the community because of their central importance in administering the Sacraments. In their political views, however, they were very much an outlier when taking into account historiography that has identified the more moderate groups. As Sheils recently suggested, one should look at the many other aspects of English Catholicism besides strictly theological views that distinguished Catholics from their Protestant countrymen. When this is accomplished, the Jesuits suddenly look less like the mainstream of English Catholicism and more like a new and radical group emphasizing the new ideals of the Counter-Reformation, some of which ran against the traditions to which English still felt great attachment in the Elizabethan Era.

The present study diverges from recent historiography by showing that it is still useful to refer to a solid, though not monolithic, Catholic community in Elizabethan England. Although the Jesuits were certainly not in the mainstream of religious or political expression of the majority of English Catholics, the Jesuits actually both hurt and helped the Catholic community at the same time. With their confrontational tactics, as exhibited by the mission of Campion and Persons to England, the Jesuits actually drove some English Catholics to make greater efforts to show their loyalty more forcefully than in the past so that they might win toleration and relief from their embattled status. Bossy was correct in constructing a Catholic community that was clearly different from the rest of the realm, but he went too far in claiming that their identity centered around that of the Jesuits and the Counter-Reformation that they represented. William Sheils makes the important observation that the Catholic community of England was indeed amorphous, as does Alexandra Walsham in calling attention to reluctant conformists with

Catholic sympathies, they do not do so to the point that it is no longer useful to refer to a Catholic community.

Indeed, the actions and writings of the Jesuits show that the idea of a Catholic community in Elizabethan England is still a useful one and that it was the very presence of the Jesuits as well as the failed invasion of the Spanish Armada that succeeded in driving the Catholic community to make a firm declaration of allegiance to Elizabeth. The divisions, though very real in the Catholic community, have been not so much underestimated by previous historians but rather mistakenly identified. The Catholic community was far more united against than divided by the Jesuits; English Catholics were not split over whether to aid or resist a possible overthrow of Elizabeth that would presumably be accomplished by the Spanish.

In effect, the Jesuits found themselves in a similar position among Catholics as the Puritans did among Protestants, although they occupied polar opposites of the theological spectrum. The Jesuits insisted on what they considered a purer form of Catholicism, with strict spiritual as well as political adherence to the pope. The Puritans, in turn, sought to cleanse the Church of England of the last vestiges of its medieval heritage, which they viewed as being obstructive and in some cases detrimental to the establishment of true religion. Puritans were deeply unpopular among most parishioners in the Church of England who conformed mainly out of respect for authority as well as tradition, both of which Puritans defied in pursuit of their more perfect form of religion. Few Anglican churchgoers could appreciate the more nuanced theological concepts of Elizabethan Puritan divines such as William Perkins or Thomas Cartwright. The very same could be said for the ideas of the Catholic polemicists Edmund Campion, Robert Persons, and William Allen. While not all English Catholics conformed to the Church of England, the vast majority still held a reverential respect for the English monarchy.
The idea that all Catholics should follow the political dictates of the pope ahead of allegiance to the Crown was something that ran contrary to long established traditions in England that could be said to originated with the Statute of Praemunire. The notion that the pope was a political entity to be obeyed at all costs made the Jesuits even more unpopular among English Catholics than Puritans were among Protestants in the Church of England. Historians of the Catholic community in Elizabethan England have taken too literally paranoid assertions of the Elizabethan government that support for the Jesuits ran deep at all in the Catholic community. Instead, the divisions among English Catholics were not among the laity or the majority of the clergy on political obedience to Elizabeth, but rather between the Jesuits and everyone else on political obedience to the pope.

0.4 SOURCES

Many of the sources used in this study come from the Jesuits and their allies. Most English Catholics did not wish to call attention to themselves as they desired to remain as apolitical and secretive as possible to avoid persecution and confrontation. The Jesuits, on the other hand, cheerfully sought out both and they had everything to gain by making their sentiments public in order to convince their co-religionists in England to join them in reestablishing the Catholic Church in England. The leadership of the English Mission especially provides the most revealing sentiments of the Jesuits. Cardinal William Allen, the founder of the seminary at Douai, wrote a number of tracts and pamphlets encouraging religious separation between English Catholics and Protestants. He also expressed radical political views concerning the authority of the queen, and he questioned how far faithful Catholics should obey her. While not a Jesuit himself, Allen fell heavily under the influence of the Jesuit Robert Persons, and their opinions regarding the state of affairs regarding religion and politics in Elizabethan England
became virtually indistinguishable. It was not Allen's original intent, however, to found the seminary as a mission to England; rather, he initially desired to promote a sound Catholic education that was lacking in post-Reformation England. Allen's views became known far and wide throughout England because he published them not just in Latin, but in the vernacular as well in order to address as great an audience as he could. Allen became one of the more prolific writers on religion and loyalty in Elizabethan England, rivaling his Protestant counterparts in the Church of England. Allen's most revealing sentiments came with his *Admonition to the Nobility and People of England* in 1588, which coincided with the attempted invasion of the Spanish Armada and he urged English Catholics to rise up and overthrow Elizabeth. Allen most famously responded to William Burghley's accusations of treason in a pamphlet entitled *A True, Sincere, and modest Defence*. He also made a theological defense of Purgatory in *A Defense and Declaration of the Catholike Churches Doctrine touching Purgatory*, which ran directly counter to Anglican doctrine. Other writings of Allen include *A treatise of treasons against Q. Elizabeth* as well as *A Briefe Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of xii Reverend Priests*.

Father Robert Persons of the Society of Jesus, Allen's close associate, held a stature arguably equal to that of Allen himself. Persons was one of the biggest influences on Allen and contributed greatly to the spreading of the Counter-Reformation to England. Like Allen, with whom he shared much correspondence, he wrote considerable literature dealing with recusancy and held it up as the ideal state for English Catholics. Persons makes this view loud and clear in his first book in 1580 entitled *A Brief Discours contayning certayne reasons why Catholiques refuse to goe to Church*, also known as *Reasons of Refusal*. He also wrote a number of pamphlets, *A Brief Censure uppon Two Bookes* (1581), *A Defense of the Censure* (1582), and *A
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Discoverie of I. Nicols (1580) to participate in the debate prompted by Campion's Brag.

Persons's life work, The Christian Directory (1585), was intended to provide an example to lay Catholics of how they should live their lives and apply their faith to everyday situations. It quickly became one of the more popular devotional works in England not just among Catholics, but among Protestants as well since it could be disarmingly ecumenical. Persons also wrote on the ministry of Anthony Tyrrell, a dissembling Catholic priest. Persons, however, did not publish his work on Anthony Tyrrell because of his unexpected reversion to the Church of England as he went back and forth from Anglican to Catholic identity frequently. Unlike Allen, Persons put down on paper what he thought a restored Catholic Church in England would look like in his Memorial for the Reformation of England (1596). He believed that the missionary status of English Catholicism was far from permanent, and he wanted a clear picture of what it would soon look like. It is notable that Persons published it in 1596, after the death of Allen. Both Persons and Allen exchanged many letters with Claudio Acquaviva, the Father General of the Jesuits in which they discuss what they thought of their respective roles as cardinal and missionary. Although the writings of Persons and Allen provide valuable insight to what they believed their objectives were, they were often out of touch with the reality of the religious situation in England since they spent most of their ministry outside of England, except for the well-known mission to England in 1580 that Persons embarked on with Edmund Campion.

The best known of all the Jesuit missionaries, Edmund Campion, left behind few writings compared to either Allen or Persons, but the limited number of tracts he did author were circulated widely throughout Elizabethan England and quickly became very popular. One of his
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most famous, yet published without his consent, is the letter "To the Right Honourable Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Council," (1581) better known as "Campion's Brag" as it came to be called by Protestants. In it, Campion declared the primary reason for his mission to England was to restore the faith, and he asserted that it was inevitable that it would rise again because no amount of persecution would be enough to stop it. He also offered to debate any Protestant who wished to engage him which swiftly drew responses. Campion also authored *Rationes Decem* (1581) in which he repeated the challenge he set forth in his "Brag" and gave ten reasons for his confidence that he would win. Although writings from Campion himself are few, there are also a number of contemporary accounts of his mission, trial, and martyrdom at Tyburn as well as the responses of those who debated him. Allen wrote a detailed account of Campion's martyrdom in *Martyrdom of Edmund Campion* (1582) which includes his trial and execution. William Charke sought to counter Campion's claims in *An answere to a seditious pamphlet* (1581) as well as Meredith Hammer in *The great bragge and challenge of M. Champion a jesuite* (1581). There is also an official government account of Campion's debate in the Tower of London entitled *A true report of the Disputation* (1581) while his Catholic supporters overheard the debate as well and wrote their own version, which has extra material that the government version neglected to include. Throughout the ages, Campion has won universal acclaim on both sides of the confessional divide for being an excellent debater as well as being a heroic example of Christian faith.

Although Campion, Allen, and Persons are the best known figures within the missionary movement, there were a great number their supporters who have been catalogued by contemporaries and later historians or have left behind some writings. There are obvious limitations to using such sources, however, since the first Jesuit historians were motivated
primarily by confessional or hagiographical concerns and are far from impartial as is the nature of almost any primary source. These sources can still be useful, however, by providing a contrast with the more moderate nature of the Catholic community. There were a few Jesuit priests, such as William Weston and John Gerard, who wrote autobiographies of their efforts. They wrote them probably in order to help fulfill the request of Father General Claudio Acquaviva in 1598 that all provincials write the history of their respective provinces. A general history of the English province, however, did not come until later in 1660, when Father Henry More wrote his still important work, *Historia Provinciae Anglicanae Societatis Jesu* (1660). More himself participated in many of the events that he relates, so it is a very important source to historians of religion in early modern England.62 Much later in the nineteenth century, Father Henry Foley went about the task of collecting manuscripts from the archives of the province of Jesuits in England from Stonyhurst and London and created his seven volume work *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* in the 1880s.63 While Foley's work is not strictly contemporary, he has nevertheless performed a vital service in shedding more light on an underground community that did not keep very good records of themselves being in perpetual fear of government persecution. Similarly, Father John Morris's three-volume source collection, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, draws upon a wide range of sources not only from the Elizabethan Jesuits, but from groups in the Catholic community such as the secular priests and lay recusants. Morris's work contains accounts of the most radical Catholics such as Father Oswald Tesimond, also known as Father Greenway, who arrived in England around 1597 and later participated in the Gunpowder Plot. The repeated theme that runs throughout almost all sources from the Jesuits is that they were being persecuted strictly for religion and that politics
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had nothing at all to do with the reason why they were in England. Although it is clear that the leadership often expressed radical sentiments, even a missionary who claimed to be the most apolitical still was part of the public sphere that contested the authority of the Elizabethan state to compel worship in the Church of England. To the government, this was treason itself although contemporary Catholic chroniclers and hagiographers much preferred to see it strictly as a matter of religious conscience.⁶⁴

There were also a number of non-Jesuit commentaries about their activities in Elizabethan England. Both the Elizabethan regime and its apologists as well as other Catholics used the same public sphere constructed by the Jesuits as a platform to attack them. The original State Papers Domestic in the reign of Elizabeth is the most important government document that reveals the menace of international Catholicism as exemplified by the Jesuits was never far from the minds of the Elizabethan authorities. For this study, however, the Calendar of State Papers that was used which is an edited version of the State Papers that includes long summaries of the original documents published centuries earlier. The State Papers consist of written accounts of government informants reporting the situation on the ground which can be somewhat problematic as source material and should be taken at face value since these agents often had a warped and partisan view of events as they unfolded. The Puritan divine William Fulke endlessly lectured about the dangers of Catholicism and frequently wrote pamphlets that debated prominent Catholics such as William Allen and Gregory Martin. William Cecil, Lord Burghley, the chief advisor to Elizabeth throughout the majority of her reign, concerned himself constantly with the affairs of the Catholic community in England. He wrote the *Execution of Justice* (1583)
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that attempted to justify the persecution of Catholics as traitors, but he also counseled moderation in dealing with them in *An Excellent Treatise against Papists*.

Not only did Protestants in the Church of England write about the Jesuits and the Catholic community in England, secular clergy, and some Catholic laymen also wrote about the state of religious affairs in Elizabethan England. The editors of a recently published collection of sources, Ginevra Crosignani, Michael Questier, and Thomas McCoog comment that Catholic identity was defined not only by preferences in theology, but also by the level of compliance with statute laws. Christopher Bagshaw, a secular priest and leader of the anti-Jesuit faction at Wisbech Castle, was opposed to the Jesuits almost as much as the Puritans, themselves which is aptly seen in his invective against William Weston, *A True Relation of the Faction Begun at Wisbich* (1601). John Mush, one of the leading appellants in the Archpriest Controversy, wrote *A Dialogue Betwixt a Secular Priest, and a Lay Gentleman* (1601) in which he argues that it was the secular priests who kept discipline among recusants by forbidding them to go to Anglican churches while the English Jesuits were lax and would have allowed Catholics to attend Anglican parishes. Gregory Martin, one of the translators of the Douai-Rheims Bible and the founders of the seminary, published *A Treatise of Schisme* (1578) in which he argued that recusancy was the only option available to true and pious Catholics in Elizabethan England. This ideal was not without controversy, however, as either the Marian priest Alban Langdale or William Clitherow argued in the "Discourse to Mr. Sheldon" that physical presence at a Church of England service was permissible in order to satisfy the minimum requirements of the law as
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Nicholas Sanders, a Doctor of Divinity and exile living abroad, published one of the best known contemporary books commenting on the English Reformation from the Catholic perspective entitled *The Origin and Growth of the Anglican Schism* (1585), which provides excellent insight into the state of Catholicism prior to and during the arrival of the Jesuits, but should be read warily as Sanders was not present in Elizabethan England when the heaviest persecutions took place. Anthony Tyrrell, a Catholic priest, wrote to Lord Burghley protesting his innocence and his loyalty to Elizabeth. He even promised to Burghley to act as an informant to uncover plots against Elizabeth and renounced political obedience to the pope which made him far closer in sentiment to the mainstream Catholic community, although the Jesuits saw him as a lapsed heretic.

Historians of Elizabethan England have previously interpreted these sources as evidence that the Jesuits and their views were the mainstream within the English Catholic community. In reality, however, the issue of how far one should obey Elizabeth was not really a matter of debate for the rest of the Catholic community. It cannot be overstated that the Jesuits could be seen as something of a foreign import that brought a Counter-Reformation style of Catholicism to England. Insular English Catholicism, like Catholicism in other sixteenth-century countries, preferred to avoid conflict and profess loyalty to the reigning monarch even if the religion became popularly equated with treason. John Bossy has read into too literally many contemporary sources in Elizabethan England have made it seem that the Jesuits were really behind the continued survival of the Catholic community. Christopher Haigh, Alexandra Walsham, and Michael Questier, among other revisionists, have already argued against the notion that the Jesuits were at the core of the Catholic community by calling to attention other

---

66 Crosignani, et al. xxii-xxiii.
factions, such as the Marian clergy, church papists, and aristocratic entourage networks. More recent historiography, as exemplified by William Sheils, has questioned the usefulness of even referring to a Catholic community that was in danger at any time of dying out since Catholics were far more integrated into the realm at large and too divided among themselves to have any such coherence.

It is the fundamental contention of the present study that the Catholic community in Elizabethan England was far more united in opinion against the Jesuits and their followers than divided, even when taking into account the wide spectrum of English Catholicism. For that reason, it is still very useful to refer to a coherent English Catholic community. The work of recent scholars has called to attention many diverse groups in the Catholic community of England, and the Jesuits were the most diverse among them as they held a uniquely internationalist outlook and were a small minority. This makes for a stark contrast with the church papists who were the largest segment of the Catholic community and were so traditionally minded that they communicated with the Church of England out of respect for authority while still having a clear preference for Catholic theology. The radical sentiments expressed boldly by William Allen and Robert Persons generated no meaningful support in calling for the overthrow of the Elizabethan regime even among other Jesuit missionaries to England. Although historians have traditionally viewed Edmund Campion as being innocent of any political intrigue, his actions in his ministry and his disputations undermined the Elizabethan Settlement which were both more powerful than the printed polemics of Allen and Persons. The other lesser known Jesuits such as John Gerard and William Weston also showed their equally uncompromising stance towards the Elizabethan regime as they heroically endured imprisonment and interrogation for the sake of bringing England back into the Catholic fold. It hardly needs
to be said that contemporary opinion both in the government as well as among Protestant subjects as exhibited by William Burghley and William Fulke ran sharply against Jesuit ideology. Popular perception, however, often conflated the radical thought of the Jesuits with either a large part or the entire Catholic community in England as well as abroad, but it still showed that in Elizabethan England there was already a sense that there really was something that could be called a Catholic community. Other Catholics in England even before and especially during the Archpriest Controversy already made their best efforts to distance themselves from the thinking of William Allen and the Jesuits as Christopher Bagshaw, John Mush, and Anthony Tyrrell went to great lengths to prove their loyalty to the Elizabethan regime. Catholic puritanism as exemplified by the Jesuits held little appeal to Catholic laymen and clergy, just as Protestant puritanism attracted only a minority of Elizabethan subjects.

0.4 OUTLINE OF THE ARGUMENT

The first chapter examines the origins of Catholic conformity in pre-Reformation England until the accession of Elizabeth. Prior to Elizabeth, a strong culture of obedience ran throughout the English people as a whole, which affected both Protestants and Catholics equally. Traditional religious observances rather than strict obedience to the international Catholic Church characterized the English Catholic community prior to Elizabethan England. Historiographical sources will be used in this chapter in addition to chroniclers such as Nicholas Sander, Edward Hall, and John Foxe, and the Elizabethan State Papers. The contention of the first chapter is that those with Catholic leanings were conditioned to obey the English government throughout the sixteenth century, and this obedience carried over into the reign of Elizabeth. Historians of the English Reformation such as A.G. Dickens and Eamon Duffy disagree on how popular the English Reformation may or may not have been among the people,
but it is a unanimous opinion that a tradition of obedience prevented an overthrow of the Tudor dynasty in spite of religious discontent. Scholars from John Bossy to William Sheils who have examined the Elizabethan Catholic community have all agreed that the Jesuits revitalized the Catholic community, but at the same time they have discounted the earlier tradition of obedience that ran strongly among Elizabethan Catholics which ultimately ensured that Jesuit influence would be more limited and cause no major divisions on questions of loyalty.

Chapter two will discuss Catholicism in Elizabethan England from 1558 to 1570 prior to the inauguration of the English mission. It was during these years that English Catholicism in the reign of Elizabeth exhibited a moderate character even while espousing recusancy. The moderate nature of early Elizabethan Catholicism did not necessarily signify that these were years of drift and decay as other scholars have pointed out. In the absence of the Jesuits, Catholicism in England took on a more conciliatory tone with the Elizabethan regime which lessened the need for serious persecution. This chapter will examine the writings of English Catholic clergy living in exile on the continent who wrote almost exclusively about matters of theology rather than questions of political obedience. In addition, chronicles of the Northern Rising of 1569 will show that it was a rebellion, on the popular level, over the disruption of traditional religious practices despite being instigated by nobles with the aim of placing Mary, Queen of Scots, on the throne. The text of the papal bull of 1570 will also be looked at to draw a contrast with Pius V's perceptions of Elizabeth with the loyalist sentiments of the Catholic community of England. Lucy Wooding remarks that the first half of Elizabeth's reign continued much the same for Catholics as had the course of the English Reformation throughout the reigns of Elizabeth's predecessors. It was during this time, however, that loyalty to Elizabeth in the
Catholic community became even more firmly entrenched, which calls into question assertions that the Jesuits caused serious divisions in any way over political support for the government.

Chapter three will reexamine the establishment of the seminary at Douai and the Jesuit mission to England in 1580 in the wake of the papal excommunication of Elizabeth in 1570. It will be shown that during these tumultuous years for the Catholic community, despite the best attempts of Persons and Campion to agitate for the fulfillment of the papal bull and a restoration of the Catholic Church in England, English Catholics for the most part displayed loyalist sentiments. While English Catholics may have sympathized with the suffering of foreign-trained Catholic missionaries for their religion, they did not condone the missionaries' essentially political aims of reversing the Religious Settlement. These contentions will be supported by printed works of both Robert Persons and Edmund Campion and those of apologists for the Elizabethan Regime and Protestant theology such as William Charke and Meredith Hanmer. Campion's debates in the Tower of London with Protestant adversaries and his trial and subsequent execution all marked the highest example, in the Jesuits' mind, of the behavior of a faithful Catholic. Despite Campion's heroic demeanor, the vast majority of English Catholics preferred to make compromises with their religious beliefs and the demands of being a loyal subject just as they had earlier throughout the rest of the English Reformation. The emergence of a public sphere through printed polemics of the 1580s and Campion's act of martyrdom provided a method of contrasting the views of the Jesuits with the English Catholic community who held very different positions on political authority and loyalty than did either Persons or Campion.

Chapter four will take an in-depth study of the years between the English Mission of 1580 and the attempted invasion of the Spanish Armada in 1588. The failure of the English
Mission to motivate a popular rising of Catholics against the Elizabethan regime did not dissuade the Jesuits from coming into the county anew, as the career of William Weston shows. The martyrdom of Campion did so much to inspire Weston that he used "Edmonds" as an alias while traveling covertly in the English countryside. Weston entered into the public sphere that Persons and Campion had already initiated in continuing confrontation against the Elizabethan state and Protestantism while the Catholic community at large had no desire to get involved. During this time, English Catholics were already actively contesting the political aims of the Jesuits as well as a small minority of plotters, most notably Anthony Babington. The secular priest Anthony Tyrrell served as an informant to the Elizabethan government and uncovered the Jesuit priest John Ballard's role in the Babington Plot which was critical in its disruption. Not only did the Jesuits seek to overturn the Religious Settlement, at this time they increasingly attempted to become the dominant faction among English Catholics which provoked more resentment in the Catholic community. It is no small wonder that the vast majority of English Catholics were driven to support the Elizabethan government as they identified the Spanish Armada with Jesuit hegemony. William Allen, the supposed author of the famous pamphlet, *An Admonition to the Nobility*, revealed clearly that, for the institutional Catholic Church, the only acceptable course of action was to rise up in support of the impending Spanish invasion of England, which would bring about a full restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in England while displacing Elizabeth. That there was no large uprising preceding the ill-fated voyage of the Spanish Armada indicates that English Catholic resistance to the Jesuits began earlier than historians have previously acknowledged.

Chapter five will put the Archpriest Controversy in a more comprehensive historical context than historians have done previously. As the Jesuits continued to hold out hope for the
restoration of the Catholic Church even after the failure of the Spanish Armada, the Catholic community became emboldened and resisted the Jesuits even more than they had done previously. Christopher Bagshaw and the secular priests at Wisbech Castle, a prison for Catholic clergy, began to contest fiercely the leadership claims of William Weston over the whole of the Catholic community at Wisbech. The rivalry between seculars and Jesuits grew so bitter that Bagshaw claimed that the secular priests received much more verbal abuse at the hands of the Jesuits rather than their common Protestant adversaries. In the meantime, the Jesuits continued their mission to England to do polemical battle with the Elizabethan regime even after the collapse of the Spanish Armada. John Gerard's ministry to England clearly shows that he had every confidence that a Catholic restoration was at hand for England as did Robert Persons and his well-known pamphlet *Memorial for the Reformation of England*. At the same time, the Elizabethan government began to draw a clearer distinction between the Jesuits and rest of the Catholic community as it began its own efforts to further marginalize the Jesuits. The priest-hunters Richard Topcliffe and Richard Partridge continued their pursuit of all Catholic clergy which in turn added a sense of urgency for the secular priests to come to an official compromise with the Elizabethan regime. The establishment of the Archpriest regime represented a continuation of earlier attempts by the Jesuits to establish the hegemony of the Counter-Reformation in England while their personal attacks on Catholic clergy even further isolated them in the Catholic community than they already were before the Archpriest Controversy. Although the Jesuits ultimately won the day in the Archpriest Controversy with the pope affirming the establishment of the Archpriest regime, their victory was a hollow one as the secular clergy decided to look beyond the Catholic Church for allies in the Elizabethan government. The Protestations of Allegiance in 1602 by leading members of the secular clergy
was not a new and dramatic shift in the political attitudes of the Catholic community as it put explicitly into writing sentiments that the Catholic community held ever since pre-Reformation England.

The implications of the present study of the perceptions of the Jesuits among Catholics in Elizabethan England call for a change in how historians have traditionally viewed the importance of the Jesuits in shaping the political persuasions of the Catholic community. The Jesuits found themselves in an essentially hostile environment, threatened not only by the Elizabethan government but also by a great number of English Catholics who more often than not made common cause with the government to rid the country of traitors, either out of genuine feelings of loyalty or a more pragmatic hope to end the penal laws for recusants. The Jesuits found themselves hard pressed at the outset ever since their arrival onto the scene of the English Reformation as they had to contend with a centuries long tradition of obedience to governmental decrees that began long before the sixteenth century in England as in other European countries. It was already hard enough for the Jesuits to arouse hostility among the Catholic laity to the Church of England in Elizabeth's reign as it retained many of the outward appearances of traditional religious practices. The Jesuits became an outlier among their co-religionists in England as they called for complete separation from Protestant heretics, and for the end of the Anglican Church. English Catholics had no desire to carry out either directive as practical considerations made it impossible to shut themselves off completely from the outside world while they at least respected the establishment of the Church of England as it was bound up with the legitimacy of Elizabeth, even if they did not necessarily agree with its theological principles.
CHAPTER 1

THE ORIGINS OF CATHOLIC CONFORMITY IN THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In order to gain an understanding of the nature of Catholicism in Elizabethan England, it is necessary to begin with the English Reformation actions of Henry VIII and his immediate successors. It is clear that religion for the greater part of the sixteenth century in England was constantly in flux with the only certainty being change in theology and ritual. Historians have constantly argued back and forth whether the English Reformation created a nation that was truly Protestant or had a veneer of Protestantism while the majority of its subjects were really Catholic at heart. Throughout the English Reformation, both Catholics and Protestants shared a culture of obedience to monarchical authority. For English Catholics, upholding religious traditions became more important than following the dictates of the Holy See, which seemed to them almost as foreign as it did to Protestants, especially when the papacy involved itself in domestic political affairs. The long tradition of conformity to established government throughout the English Reformation was a very important factor as to why Jesuit influence in Elizabethan England would be limited only to a tiny percentage of the nobility and those who hatched plots for the overthrow of Elizabeth.

The motivating factor in driving many of the English to accept whatever change was coming out of the Tudor monarchy was loyalty to the reigning king or queen. Attachment to
religious tradition came in a close second and in some cases became the issue of prime importance when revolts against the Tudors erupted. Nicholas Sander was one of the first chroniclers to write a general history of the English Reformation, but he was also a Catholic priest, which heavily influenced his perception. Sander was one to see dramatic change in religion, and certain historians such as Eamon Duffy have agreed with him by emphasizing a "violent disruption" in the English Reformation with regards to religion.\footnote{Eamon Duffy, \textit{The Stripping of the Altars, Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580}, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 4.} Edward Hall, a member of Parliament, wrote about the reigns of successive monarchs from Henry IV to Henry VIII, with the majority of his writing concentrating on the reign of Henry VIII. Hall wrote at length about popular uprisings in the north against religious change but attributed them to the ignorance and superstitions of a minority and noted that the rebels were soon dispersed.\footnote{Edward Hall, \textit{Hall's Chronicle}. (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1809), 820.}

Official government documents throughout the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Mary mandated religious change for varying motives. Despite whatever motivation that propelled Tudor monarchs to make changes in religion, most English people accepted these changes grudgingly, enthusiastically, or indifferently. The cases of rebellion, while documented in the State Papers, were few and far between. John Foxe's \textit{Book of Martyrs} succeeded in creating a Protestant identity for England by describing the sacrifices made by the Oxford martyrs which simultaneously ensured that Catholics in England, even the majority that was essentially moderate and loyal to the monarchy, would be viewed with at least some suspicion. Along with the \textit{Book of Martyrs}, the Jesuits contributed to a negative perception of the Catholic community. The various factions of the Catholic community united against the Jesuits in the hope of somehow reversing so much negative treatment at the hands of the English monarchy, but the events preceding the reign of Elizabeth went a long way to establishing a deep and lasting
distrust of all Catholics in England. The prejudice experienced by Catholics made it all the more likely that they would seek to make some attempt at damage control by disowning the more radical members among them.

1.2 HENRY VIII AND RELIGIOUS CONFORMITY

Although it is now a truism among historians that the Reformation in England was little desired by the vast majority of English people and was uniquely political, it is useful to keep in mind the work of A.G. Dickens in *The English Reformation*. Dickens insists that the Reformation in England was very much a part of the wider continental Reformation begun by Martin Luther as there were very distinct Lutheran influences among the early English Protestants of the 1520s and 1530s such as Cranmer, Tyndale, and Cromwell. Dickens also gives credit to the Lollards for establishing a receptive audience for Protestantism since the Lollards shared many theological beliefs with Protestants. Overall, Dickens paints a picture of an old and decrepit medieval Catholic Church on the eve of the English Reformation. Dickens emphasizes how unpopular traditional medieval religion had become "because, in an age when an increasing number of men were reading and thinking for themselves, the intellectual slackness of popular medieval religion played into the hands of Protestant critics." Indeed, the average lay person in medieval England lacked opportunities to learn even the basics of Catholic faith because of the relative infrequency of sermons outside of larger towns. In the early 1500s, although print was increasingly becoming available, oral preaching was the primary way that English lay people learned the basics of their religion.
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Perhaps more crucially, for the present paper, Dickens speaks of a second sort of reformation that took place alongside the Protestant Reformation in England: "the conditioning of society to the rule of law." Dickens asserts that church historians have been too preoccupied with the conflicts between Church and State during the English Reformation when they more often than not worked with each other as they had in the wider Reformation on the European mainland. Taking Dickens's theological arguments at face value, one could argue that the vast majority of English Catholics should have welcomed the Jesuits with open arms since they represented the more modern Counter-Reformation that often opposed traditional beliefs of medieval laymen in the Catholic Church. This, however, was not the case, as later historians have conclusively proven. Dickens still makes a salient argument that the Tudor monarchy conditioned its people to have an overwhelming respect for law and authority. Geoffrey Elton also makes a valid point in his work, *The Tudor Revolution in Government*, that a more effective system of government sprang up during the English Reformation to ensure obedience to religious change. Both Dickens's and Elton's contentions help to explain the broader success of the English Reformation and why English Catholics may have viewed the Jesuits as an extremist group since they too were influenced by this separate reformation.

Christopher Haigh, taking a revisionist line of argument entirely different from Dickens's, discusses the impact of the English Reformation on the multiple aspects of religion, society, and politics in England. Haigh contends that the Reformations in sixteenth-century England had very limited success in making the people Protestant. While the Reformation on the Continent gave Henry cover for his political machinations, it was far from the same Reformation that occurred in
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England, as it followed no previous pattern set by Luther.\textsuperscript{75} Haigh identifies three separate political Reformations under Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, of which only the last was not reversed. Haigh also distinguishes between religious and political spheres when he writes of another evangelical Reformation that began in the reign of Henry in London, Cambridge, and Oxford, which made a portion of England Protestant, but the evangelical Reformation was never completed since few wanted such a movement in the first place.\textsuperscript{76}

Above all, Haigh notes that the English Reformation was at its core a political event since any and all religious changes were enforced by the government. He states that "the Reformations were begun, defined, sustained, slowed, and revitalized by political events."\textsuperscript{77} Virtually all historians who have written about the English Reformation have noted at some point that it was nearly impossible to separate religion from politics. Haigh states that the primary threat to Catholicism in England lay not with its people yearning for Protestantism, but from the competing political ambitions of church and government officials. Contrary to Dickens, Haigh contends that the Henrician schism led to the decline of Catholicism and not the other way around because the Catholic Church in England was flourishing as proven from records numerous donations to parishes to maintain features of traditional religion as well as the great number of devotional manuals.\textsuperscript{78}

Eamon Duffy has also taken notice of the strengthening of traditional religion prior to the break with Rome. Not only was there a great degree of lay involvement and enthusiasm; there
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were also standards of what constituted orthodox religious practice. Unlike Haigh, however, one of Duffy's main points of contention is that there was little difference between popular or elite as well as clerical or lay religion in late medieval England. Rituals and the use of relics among lay people that may seem exotic by modern standards were not unique to the unlearned. They faithfully conformed with conventional guidelines for exorcisms and blessings. If one accepts Duffy's argument that the Reformation was primarily politically driven at the outset thanks to the vibrancy and strength of traditional religion in late medieval England, then this has an implication for how the rest of the English Catholic community might have viewed the Jesuits. Since the Jesuits heavily involved themselves in political intrigue, they could have been seen by the rest of the English Catholic community as being just another political organization forcing their brand of Counter-Reformation Catholicism that no one really wanted because of the strength of indigenous religious traditions in England. To English Catholics, the Jesuits' desire to impose their political and religious hegemony on the Catholic community must have seemed very similar to attempts of the government in the English Reformation to impose its own religious standards on everyone.

The writer of the first general history of the English Reformation, Nicholas Sander, was convinced that the Reformation was driven primarily by politics. Sander, an English Catholic Doctor of Divinity, wrote at length of the political intrigue surrounding the divorce of Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon which he asserted was the origin of the English Reformation. He noted that Henry declared those who honored the authority of the Pope in either Ireland or England to be committing high treason. Before Elizabeth, Henry had already persecuted

---

79 Eamon Duffy, Stripping of the Altars, xviii.  
80 Duffy, xx.  
81 Nicholas Sander, De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani. (Rome: 1585), 160.
religious conservatives with charges of political treason instead of heresy. The break with Rome, however, was far from unopposed by laymen, especially in the North. The Tudor chronicler Edward Hall writes of the 1536 Lincolnshire Uprising, which he says was the work of people in the North given to popery and superstition being provoked by the suppression of monasteries and the abrogation of the Bishop of Rome's authority. The Uprising, however, failed very quickly after Henry gave his response to the rebels that they should render obedience to the Crown as they were bound to do in accordance with God's commandments and the law of nature. While the common rebels were allowed to depart in peace, the leaders of the Lincolnshire Uprising were rounded up and executed. Six days following, a new and larger insurrection led by Robert Aske and based in Yorkshire, which historians would later call the Pilgrimage of Grace, erupted. As Hall notes, the insurrectionists considered themselves on a pilgrimage in the defense of the Church which was evident from the religious imagery they used such as Five Wounds of Christ painted on banners. Bloodshed, however, was narrowly avoided as Hall recounts because of inclement weather that widened a ford to such a great degree that it became a river that neither the king's army nor the Pilgrims could pass. Then, after a brief negotiation between the Pilgrims and Henry, the king decided to grant them certain petitions they had and let them disperse in peace. In the following year, another insurrection took place under the leadership of Francis Bigod. This rebellion was very short lived and resulted in the apprehension and execution of both Bigod and Aske as well as Lord Thomas Darcy, Thomas Percy, and Robert Constable.

Historians have held differing views over what exactly caused the Pilgrimage of Grace and its associated rebellions, and why they ended so peacefully. Dickens recognizes that economic discontent did exist as one of the reasons for it, but he also admits that genuine
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religious concerns sparked the uprising, such as the fear of dissolution of many parish churches. The Lincolnshire rebels, according to Dickens, were little concerned with the Royal Supremacy. Most of the leading families of the North involuntarily joined the Pilgrimage of Grace, and there was looting done even at the expense of some monasteries. Dickens ultimately comes to the conclusion that "the Pilgrimage cannot for a moment be fairly summarised as a devout crusade to save the rights of the Holy Church, to re-edify the monasteries, to overthrow low-born heretics, to restore England to a papalist Christendom." For Dickens, the roots of the rebellions of 1546 and 1547 were decisively economic in the wake of bad harvests with little to no interest in the question of Royal or Papal Supremacy.

Not surprisingly, Eamon Duffy takes a different view from Dickens's of the Pilgrimage of Grace. He interprets the displaying of the Five Wounds of Christ on the banners of the Pilgrims as evidence of their yearning for medieval Catholicism. Duffy goes on to claim that the Pilgrims perceived the attack on the monasteries as an attack on the whole of the doctrinal, liturgical, and devotional system that the Pilgrims associated with the monasteries. Duffy observes that Henry VIII thought that the rebellion was started primarily over the reformation of traditional religious practices and because of this he ordered his bishops to travel all over England to preach the virtues of the Ten Articles. Duffy also contends that one of the results of the Pilgrimage of Grace was the writing of the Bishops' Book in 1537 which was designed to explain the reasoning behind the Ten Articles. Despite this intention, however, it was considerably more conservative
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since the Bishop's Book discussed all of the traditional seven sacraments while the Articles mentioned only three and allowed for the use of images as well but only reluctantly.\(^{87}\)

Ethan Shagan, however, has offered one of the best explanations behind why the Pilgrimage of Grace ultimately failed. The Pilgrimage ostensibly appears as the greatest resistance movement to religious change in the Reformation, but the Pilgrims themselves had a wide range of goals, from violent overthrow of the Tudor regime to peaceful petitioning. They also could not agree upon what a proper religious settlement would look like and they disagreed on exactly what type of economic solution should be proposed. The Pilgrimage ultimately failed "not because a foolish minority squandered the victory they had won, but because, in a nation so politically divided as England in 1536-7, it proved impossible even for the traditionalist Catholic majority to agree on what constituted victory."\(^{88}\)

In any case, as one can see from the these rebellions Henry showed little mercy to people who defied his authority over the English Church, but also kept up the persecution of unorthodox religious heretics at the same time. In one day on July 30 of 1540, Henry put to death three theologians for speaking out against the divorce and refusing to recognize the Act of Religious Supremacy and three heretics for following the teachings of Zwingli which conflicted with the Anglican belief on the Eucharist.\(^{89}\) One year earlier in 1539, Henry promulgated the Act of Six Articles ostensibly as a reaction against further theological reform. On first glance, the Six Articles appear as an attempt to undo theological innovations that had cropped up either as a result of the break with Rome or with Lutheran influences making their way into England before the King's Great Matter. Henry's acknowledgement of "the manifold perils, dangers, and
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inconveniences which have heretofore, in many places and regions, grown, sprung, and arisen, of
the diversities of minds and opinions, especially of matters of Christian religion” appears to take
issue with the core Protestant doctrines of sola scriptura and the priesthood of all believers
despite being the first king to authorize the printing of the Bible in English. The first of the Six
Articles reaffirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation in which the Eucharist completely became
the body and blood of Christ. It also upheld auricular confession, communion in one kind, a
celibate priesthood, and the holding of private Masses. The punishment for denying or preaching
against the Act of Six Articles was very harsh with punishment being burning at the stake for
denial of transubstantiation with no chance that recantation could save the offender while
transgression of the other Articles called for life in prison.90

Historians over the years have held differing interpretations on what the Act of Six
Articles meant for the continuing appeal of Catholicism and traditional religious practices in
England. Dickens observes that the Six Articles was enacted with the approval of a majority
Catholic House of Lords and that the persecution of Protestants for going against them was
relatively small, although they viewed it as nothing less than a disaster. In reality, Thomas
Cranmer's close relationship with the king allowed him to plan further Protestant reforms to take
place despite the Six Articles and its conservative proponents such as Bishop Stephen Gardiner.91
Christopher Haigh views the Act of Six Articles as evidence for why one should view the
English Reformation as a series of separate Reformations rather than just one grand event that
swept away Catholicism. He considers the Act of Six Articles as an unmitigated disaster for
both Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell. Although it is true that the House of Lords was majority
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Catholic, its leader, the Duke of Norfolk, must have had some approval from Henry to make the Act of Six Articles into statute. Other events that nearly coincided with the Act of Six Articles, such as the sacking of Cromwell and the termination of the marriage to Anne of Cleves as well as the execution of three leading Protestants the following year, provide further evidence for Haigh that Henry was trying to stop the religious changes wrought by the Reformation which would later pave the way for reversal.92

Alec Ryrie takes a different view of the last decade of Henry VIII's rule and what the Act of Six Articles really meant. He argues that the closing years of the reign of Henry helped to lay the foundation for a highly Protestant rule under his son Edward VI and that evangelicals were preoccupied with the ever-present tension between the king and their own religion.93 The Protestantism of Edward's reign, Ryrie contends, was made in the last years of Henry's reign as it had to adapt both socially and theologically to the situation of the time. The final decade of Henry VIII was not the period of conservative reaction and reversal as traditional historiography would suggest. The Henrician regime's religious policies were ambiguous at best and there was very limited religious persecution as well as an undercurrent of evangelical reform.94 Ryrie depicts an uncertain time for evangelicals from 1538 to 1547 but also reminds readers that it was a religiously unstable time for conservatives as well as the parties had not separated themselves into clear groups as of yet.95
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1.3 EDWARD VI AND THE MAKING OF A MINORITY

Edward VI's regency laid the foundations for a state run church in England with an evangelical theology at its base. The religious developments that occurred under Edward VI went a long way to ensuring that Catholicism would remain a permanent minority. Not only did decidedly evangelical theological developments take place, but the extreme iconoclasm that characterized much of Edward's regency made it very difficult for anything approaching a full restoration of Catholicism. Nicholas Sander makes particular note of how much further Edward went in destroying religious imagery in England. While he writes that Henry did go about despoiling the vast majority of the monasteries and shrines to fill royal coffers, he also notes that he left churches largely intact with all their ceremonial relics and images. He also shows approval of Henry for vigorously persecuting heretics despite disbelieving in the supremacy of the Pope. In reviewing the reign of Edward, however, Sander writes that nearly every image of Christ and the Virgin Mary was destroyed and replaced with secular symbols such as the king's coat of arms. The iconoclasts also appropriated chalices, crucifixes, vestments, and nearly everything else used in the traditional Mass. Further, conservative priests and bishops were forbidden from preaching while Lutheran and Calvinist evangelical preaching went unchecked. Communion under both kinds, once heavily discouraged towards the latter years of Henry's reign, was made into a law. Instead of using Latin in the liturgy, the Church of England prescribed English in all churches, even in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland which Sander claims was a step backwards since the laity and clergy in these areas little understood English while the clergy at least understood Latin well enough to explain what they were saying to the laity.96
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Dickens looks at the sweeping religious reforms of Edward VI and admits that, while they seem invasive to modern eyes, "the Edwardian government discovered a world already in decay, a world sadly in need of control, reform, and revitalizing influences." He also makes note of the fact that many laymen themselves participated in the looting of religious items from churches using the reasoning that since there was an impending seizure of ecclesiastical wealth that they might as well take part in it first.\(^97\) Dickens asserts that some of the iconoclasm was motivated for genuine religious reasons, which was especially true of the Chantries Act. He observes that the destruction of the chantries must be taken in context with the corresponding changes in official religious policy. Since people were instructed to cease to believe in the doctrines of purgatory and praying for the souls of the dead, the chantries lost the main purpose for why they existed.\(^98\)

Eamon Duffy has a less upbeat view of the English Reformation in the reign of Edward. Duffy asserts that Cranmer was preoccupied too much with worrying about the fundamentally religious conservative sentiments of the population at large. Because of this concern, the English laity would have seen too many rapid changes towards Protestantism as the work of a powerful clique manipulating the king who was still just a child.\(^99\) Duffy views the visitation of 1547 and the injunctions drawn up from it as representing a radical shift in the direction of the English Reformation although they may seem at first glance they may seem as an affirmation of the reformist measures passed in the reign of Henry VIII. Duffy considers injunction twenty-eight in particular as going beyond the precedent set by Henry. While Henry ordered the removal of paintings and pictures which he thought could be used as centers of superstition, he did not go so
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far as to suggest the smashing of stained glass windows since few at the time thought parishioners would actually venerate the images in the windows. The most dramatic change, according to Duffy, was the removal of processions on Sunday which had given a unique identity to traditional worship in England. While most English people were hard pressed to notice any dramatic religious changes with the Henrician schism, they certainly noticed a great difference as zealous iconoclasts did their worst to any and all visible reminders of England's traditional religious heritage since Cranmer gave orders not merely to remove images, but to destroy them. Some churchwardens claimed that England was severed from Catholicism not through the break with Rome but relatively early in Edward's reign when a great number of religious ceremonies were discontinued and relics were taken out of the churches. Despite all the changes, the enforcement of the injunctions was far from uniform, most notably in the north of England where it was pursued less vigorously.

Shagan takes a far less idealistic view of the Edwardian dissolution by using the Abbey of Hailes as a case study in an attempt to disprove Duffy's thesis that the English Reformation was an entirely top down and forced affair. Shagan contends that the destruction of the abbeys and monasteries must have required a degree of lay participation since it was such a massive undertaking. Despite the popular dimension of the Edwardian dissolutions, he also notes that it was primarily driven by political processes as both traditionalist and evangelical subjects involved themselves out of a desire to obey the government. In most cases, Shagan makes the argument that "it is clear that greed often trumped spiritual conviction in the minds of the men and women who participated." Advantageous plundering, rather than iconoclasm with conviction, was a clear motivation among even those with Catholic sympathies in the dissolution
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of the monasteries. While evangelicals were the driving force behind the destruction of Hailes Abbey, it was far from a clearly Protestant event. They were able to convince their traditionalist neighbors to take part in events that would have been unthinkable years before. Shagan views the pillaging of Hailes Abbey as just another interaction between reformers, the royal government, and the people.  

While Shagan sees greed as a powerful motivating factor for the dissolution of the monasteries, he also argues that the English Reformation caused the erosion of their meaning and the removal of their holy aura. The power of the early Tudor regime to enforce religious change was primitive, but the combined forces of evangelical preaching and official propaganda provided an effective impetus for religious change and bridging the gap between the holy and the mundane.

Perhaps more than the Edwardian dissolutions, the first Act of Uniformity in 1549 and the Prayer Book of 1549, as well as the 1552 Act of Uniformity and the Prayer Book of 1552 it introduced, would come to have a significant influence on the course of the English Reformation. They also went some way to define more clearly the separation between Protestant and Catholic which would have tremendous implications not only for the Protestant majority in Elizabethan England, but the Catholic community as well. The 1549 Act of Uniformity was an attempt by Cranmer to establish one authorized form of worship services in England. Even after the death of Henry VIII, there were no clear instructions on what a Church of England liturgy should look like as it was written that "where of long time there has been had in this realm of England and Wales divers forms of common prayer" which probably ranged from the very traditional to the
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radically evangelical.\textsuperscript{104} The Book of Common Prayer that the Act of Uniformity of 1549 put into practice was relatively conservative in its basic elements. It retained traditional religious rituals such as the Matins, Evensong, and called its celebration of the Eucharist the Mass but it changed the language of the liturgy from Latin to English. The punishment for not conforming to the Act of Uniformity, however, was imprisonment of six months on the first offense, one year on the second, and life imprisonment for the third offense.\textsuperscript{105}

Despite the conservative nature of the first Prayer Book, it provoked an uprising in the western counties of Devon and Cornwall. The rebels in the Prayer Book Rebellion had a degree of success since they took Norwich, but ultimately the rebellion was soon crushed when royal armies besieged Exeter which was one of the centers of the rebellion.\textsuperscript{106} The Prayer Book of 1552 was a far more Protestant book than the previous one in 1549, but it experienced only slight modifications in 1559 when it was reintroduced in the reign of Elizabeth after being suppressed by Mary. Most crucially, for the first time the 1552 Act of Uniformity compelled weekly attendance in Church of England services which was retained in the later 1559 Act of Uniformity. It is notable that the second Edwardian Act of Uniformity mentions that "a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality and living either without knowledge or due fear of God, do wilfully and damnably before Almighty God abstain and refuse to come to their parishes." This implies either widespread dissatisfaction with the Church of England among traditionalists or a tendency to assume the worst as was often the case in official visitations throughout the Reformation both in England and on the Continent. The second Act of Uniformity also gave bishops and other local ecclesiastical officials the power to
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punish by censure of the Anglican Church within their dioceses all who dared to disobey. The penalties for those who were convicted of attending alternative forms of worship or altering the official liturgy were retained from the first Act of Uniformity.\textsuperscript{107}

Historians have held differing views of the Edwardian Reformation and just how much of a break that it represented with the Henrician Reformation. Observing the moderation of the first Prayer Book, Dickens maintains, "While it did not specifically deny Catholic doctrine, its ambiguous phrases were understood by its author in a Protestant sense and intended to enable Protestants to use it with a good conscience." The most obvious innovation to the common layman was the introduction of English into the Anglican liturgy even though the appearance of the service itself with vestments and some of the same rituals remained intact. The threatened punishments of the first Act of Uniformity were severe enough to ensure the compliance of most clergy, with the exceptions being in Devon and Cornwall in the Prayer Book Rebellion of 1549. In both counties, however, disgruntlement over enclosures played a large role in its instigation.\textsuperscript{108}

The Second Prayer Book, according to Dickens, has been judged in the wrong way against its adherence to old prayer books. What its authors really sought to do was to attempt to recreate a liturgical worship service that the Apostles themselves would have approved of by closely following the Scriptures. Vestments were outlawed and the wording of the Eucharistic doctrine more closely followed a memorial service to be done strictly in remembrance. Dickens makes particular note of the fact that there was little overt resistance to the second Prayer Book from the conservative clergy, although they likely had stronger reservations than they did in 1549.\textsuperscript{109}
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Duffy has taken a contrasting view of the Edwardian liturgical reforms. Unlike most historians, he considers the first Prayer Book as a far more radical break with the past despite its retention of many traditional characteristics. While it did preserve the basic pattern of the Mass, it also went about transforming the lay experience of the Mass with the elevation at the sacring, the pax, and the sharing of holy bread were all eliminated. The calendar in the first Book of Common Prayer eliminated all feast days except for Easter, Christmas, Whitsun and some biblical saints' days. The rebellion in the West Country had an essentially religious character since the rebels not only demanded the restoration of the traditional Mass, but of all the ceremonies of medieval Catholicism. The effort to strip away devotional customs antagonized the laity even more than the introduction of the Prayer Book. The Prayer Book of 1552, however, represented an even more determined attempt to break with the Catholic heritage of England. While later Puritans could find much to complain about, for its time in 1552 it seemed a very radical departure from what most English people had ever known. The second Prayer Book eliminated all anointings in rituals and clerical vestments while replacing the altar with a communion table. There were also not even hints of prayers for the dead in the 1552 Prayer Book while the 1549 did allow for prayers for the dead at funerals.

Diarmaid MacCullough considers both the First and Second Prayer Books as part of a grand design by Cranmer and other evangelical reformers who knew exactly what kind of Reformation they wanted and how they would eventually bring it about. MacCullough observes March 1549 when Parliament ended as a watershed in the history of the English Church since "it was on the verge of adopting a fully vernacular liturgy, its clergy could legally marry, and its metropolitan had openly declared his allegiance to an unmistakeably Reformed eucharistic
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theology."

The primary goal at this stage was not to reorder theology in the Church of England, but to create a true form of worship in the churches. While the content of the Prayer Book was meant to reconcile conservative opinion, evangelical insiders knew that this conciliatory position was only meant to be temporary. Cranmer's strategy of slow evangelical change was reflected in the conclusion of the first Prayer Book when he explained why some ceremonies should be retained and others should be abolished. The restoration of the word 'mass' was meant to avoid alienating conservative bishops and putting to rest conservative fears in the House of Commons. There were, however, important evangelical developments of the 1549 Prayer Book such as the absence of the elevation of the Eucharist. There was also an insistence on the one time sacrifice of Christ and the liturgy in English which was most obvious to lay parishioners. Cranmer took the lead in responding to the Prayer Book Rebellion by offering official pardons for those who surrendered while issuing serious threats to those who were more intransigent. He gave sermons on the sinfulness of rebellion and stood by his agenda for evangelical change in the Prayer Book.

In the second Prayer Book of 1559, much discussion has centered on the changes in Eucharistic theology to make it more of a symbolic remembrance ceremony, but there were also many changes in religious attitudes towards death and funeral services. Prayers all but ceased for the dead and were confined only to the blessing of the mourners that the departed left behind. Despite the many other radical changes that the second Prayer Book wrought such as the abandonment of music, drastic simplification of vestments, and replacement of altars with
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tables, MacCullough wonders if Cranmer intended the second Prayer Book to be the final word in the advance of evangelical worship.\textsuperscript{116}

The changes in religious worship in the reign of Edward VI would come to have important implications for the condition of the Catholic community. From the outset, it was clear that Cranmer was attempting to hold true to the Anglican principle of the \textit{via media} with a delicate balance of old ritual and organized liturgy that disguised elements of Calvinist theological principles. The Prayer Book Rebellion in the western counties showed that there was still a degree of support for the traditional Mass in Latin and opposition to the Prayer Books and the Acts of Uniformity would come to form the foundations of Catholic recusancy in Elizabethan England. It is no accident that the second Prayer Book formed the foundations of the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 with a few minor revisions as she sought to wed Calvinist theology with the imagery of traditional worship. The traditional elements of the Edwardian Prayer Books would later come to divide the Catholic community on the virtues of recusancy against conformity. Indeed, many parishioners in the Church of England still considered themselves Catholic in the reign of Elizabeth despite the official view from the international Catholic Church that viewed recusancy as the ideal state. The Elizabethan Church still held many traditional elements in its liturgy despite the intentions of Cranmer to erase them as many of them as possible eventually. The incomplete work of what Cranmer sought to finish inadvertently made attending church acceptable to Catholics and traditionalists who felt no special attachment to the papacy and probably made them feel less guilty about communicating with the Church of England than they otherwise would have been.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, 511.
1.4 THE POLITICAL LEGITIMACY OF MARY I

Although the Marian Reformation was easily reversed for most part by Elizabeth, it is hard to see any sort of Catholic community in England had not a Catholic monarch reigned at some point relatively soon after Henry VIII. The attempted accession of Lady Jane Grey after Edward VI was very short lived, lasting only nine days. The Duke of Northumberland attempted to prevent Mary from coming to the throne, but found his army rapidly deteriorating due to desertion and had no choice but to surrender. The nobility forced Jane to abdicate after seeing the large degree of support for her among the people as well as the elites. Mary, then, came to power in a bloodless uprising and immediately went about reversing elements of the English Reformation that her father and brother had began. She rejected the idea of royal supremacy and worked to restore communion with Rome, which she had always believed in even at the risk of punishment from her father and brother. Upon her accession, she married Phillip of Spain, the son of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, to aid her in bringing Catholicism back to England.\textsuperscript{117} This marriage was far from unopposed throughout England because of the perception and rumors of creeping foreign influence from the Spanish. Mary attempted to defuse the rumors by proclaiming the effects of the articles of the Treaty with Spain to the people. Despite her efforts, a plot was hatched among the Duke of Suffolk, Peter Carew, and Thomas Wyatt of Kent to depose Mary and restore Lady Jane Grey and her husband to the throne. Wyatt and his forces had a degree of success, being able to capture Rochester and Cowling Castle.\textsuperscript{118} By the beginning of February 1554 Wyatt and his followers threatened London, which prompted Mary to give her famous speech at Guildhall where she declared that she desired to marry for the
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benefit of England and exhorted her subjects to assist her in suppressing Wyatt's Rebellion. As Wyatt attempted to invade London, he was captured by royal forces and soon taken to Tower Hill where he was quartered. Soon after Wyatt's capture, John Foxe claimed that the royal minister John Feckenham tried to force Lady Jane to recant her Protestant faith although he was unsuccessful. Jane was then beheaded on the scaffold several days following the Rebellion.\footnote{John Foxe, \textit{The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online}. (Sheffield, United Kingdom: HRI Online Publications, 2011), 985. http://www.johnfoxe.org}

The rise of Queen Mary, her marriage to Phillip of Spain, and the resulting Wyatt's Rebellion have been all been subject to various interpretations by historians. A.G. Dickens depicts an acceptance of Mary as queen in spite of popular religious sentiments that were often Protestant. Political obedience, again, was the primary factor in the widespread approval of Mary's reign rather than personal religious preferences. The majority of English people in the reign of the Tudors valued lawful succession ahead of religious causes for which a minority of zealots might have had them fight a civil war. Northumberland quickly became a traitor for his support of Jane Grey, who had a weaker claim to the throne than Mary despite his protests of Spanish domination.\footnote{A.G. Dickens, \textit{English Reformation}, 285.} For all the triumphalism of Mary's accession to the throne, she was quickly reminded of the Protestant sympathies of a majority of Parliament. It was clear they desired not a return to pre-Reformation England, but a return to the last years of Henry VIII. Parliament refused to abrogate the Royal Supremacy and the House of Commons appealed to her in vain to marry a native Englishman instead of Phillip. There were popular protests in Kent and Essex for the restoration of Protestant worship, but most people at the time were more concerned about foreign domination and subversion rather than religion. The English did not like Phillip simply because he was from Spain, but it was more because there would have been a general
dislike of any foreigner who tried to marry his way into the English monarchy. Dickens regards Wyatt's Rebellion as sort of a Protestant crusade in addition to a rebellion against a foreign king. Kent was a center of Protestantism and nearly all of the rebels and the leaders were avowedly Protestant. Wyatt posed a very serious threat to Mary since he struck directly at London unlike rebels of previous years whose uprisings never made it that far. Despite this, Wyatt found no support from any prominent figures in London for his rebellion.¹²¹

Christopher Haigh regards the accession of Mary as a revolution of her own doing in response to the efforts of Edward and Northumberland to exclude her from lawful succession in favor of Jane Grey. Leading figures such as the earls of Sussex and Bath rallied to her cause, but there was broad popular support for Mary as Haigh repeatedly emphasizes. The people decisively rejected Northumberland as a traitor and embraced Mary as the rightful queen. Mary's Tudor lineage meant a chance to reject the rule of Northumberland that had been in control of the regency of Edward for so long and threatened to do the same with Jane Grey. Besides political questions of succession, Haigh also attributes genuine discontent with Northumberland's recent imposition of the Prayer Book and the confiscation of church property as other reasons why most people in England supported Mary over Jane Grey. There were many sermons, particularly in London, that emphasized the danger of Mary to true religion, but this hardly mobilized evangelicals against her while conservatives in England rallied overwhelmingly in favor of Mary with Catholic nobles and gentry working to support Mary's coup. Many of Mary's supporters saw her victory as the triumph of old religious ways over the new.¹²² The serious opposition to Mary centered around her marriage to Phillip of Spain, with Thomas Wyatt's rebellion proving the most problematic of the several that failed to materialize fully. Even then, Wyatt's Rebellion
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was very small even though it reached the gates of London. During the two weeks that the rebellion lasted, the total number of rebels equaled less than a tenth of those who participated in the Pilgrimage of Grace, which is further proof that very few actually opposed Mary and her policy of restoring Catholicism.  

David Loades, one of the foremost scholars of Marian England, calls attention to the fact that Henry had placed Mary after Edward in the Succession Act, while Edward, or his advisors, sought to exclude her unlawfully. Mary proclaimed herself queen on the basis of the law, just as she sought to restore Catholicism not because of her own personal beliefs, but because she believed the Edwardian Reformation violated her father's religious settlement. As was expected, religious conservatives flocked to support Mary, but more unexpectedly Protestants divided over whether they should support her. Most people believed Mary to be the leader of her father's church, and she issued a royal proclamation of her Catholic allegiance but at the same time promised to refrain from coercion unless it was approved by Parliament. No one yet knew in 1553 that Mary was thinking of restoring papal authority and marrying Phillip. When Mary was challenged for the first time with Wyatt's Rebellion in Kent, the government chose to represent this as a Protestant conspiracy to place Jane Grey on the throne. While some Protestants were certainly involved, the primary motivating factor was hostility to the marriage between Phillip and Mary. Government propaganda against Wyatt even admitted that he did not make an issue of religion but insisted that was his secret purpose. Edward Courtenay, a Catholic, was involved in the Rebellion and Stephen Gardiner himself was opposed to the marriage at first. For Loades, the Wyatt Rebellion was purely political with no religious reasons whatsoever.
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The relative ease with which Mary came to the throne of England shows the strength of traditional English values of obedience to the law and to a lawful succession.

The primary tasks of the Marian regime were to restore Catholic rituals and practices while bringing England back to papal obedience. The Marian Injunctions of 1554 laid out directives to reverse the English Reformation as far as possible. One of the key provisions was "that every bishop and all other persons aforesaid do diligently travail for the repressing of heresies and notable crimes, especially in the clergy, duly correcting and punishing the same." Mary was very much her father's daughter in that she kept a constant vigil against heretical teaching and viewed her repression of heresy as a continuation of her father's wishes. Mary also desired a return to a celibate priesthood and deprived those priests who had married of their benefices and ecclesiastical promotions, but was noticeably more lenient to priests whose wives had died and allowed them to do penance in exchange for keeping their revenue from church property. Other provisions for the restoration of traditional religion included the Latin Mass, the reintroduction of holy and fasting days as they were kept in the later days of Henry VIII, and the reestablishment of popular ceremonies that were often used prior to the Reformation. Most conspicuously absent from the Marian Injunctions of 1554 was any reference to the Royal Supremacy which laid open the clear possibility of reunion with Rome.126

John Foxe claimed that Queen Mary was inherently opposed to any type of preaching sermons or printing of books since they all promoted evangelical theology. According to Foxe, Mary was particularly concerned with "euyll disposed persones, whiche take vppon them without sufficient authoritie to preache and to interprete the woorde of God after theyr own brayn," which compelled her to order all types of royal and local officials to enforce religious orthodoxy.
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Foxe painted a picture of a particularly repressive and backwards regime that had difficulty in enforcing its own religious settlement against an English population that was overwhelmingly Protestant and could not resist preaching their own interpretation of the Word of God and reading the Bible for themselves.\textsuperscript{127} Newer historiography, however, of Foxe's \textit{Book of Martyrs} highlights its shortcomings as a reliable source. Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas Freeman argue persuasively that the success of Foxe's Protestant martyrology was not due to market forces alone, but rather to the patronage of the Elizabethan government. Evenden and Freeman provide further proof that religious allegiances in Elizabethan England were very fluid as a thoroughly Protestant population would have ensured the commercial success of the \textit{Book of Martyrs}.\textsuperscript{128} With this being the case, it is even more likely that Foxe was more prone to exaggerating the need for the Marian regime to be uniquely harsh as both Protestants and Catholics were already likely to respect Mary's religious reforms without the need for draconian measures.

Nicholas Sander, however, depicted a very different religious mood in the reign of Mary at least in the Houses of Parliament. He highlighted the fact that she easily gained the approval of the first Parliament of her reign to repeal the Edwardian injunctions, to exile the leading evangelical figures, and to restore the traditional Mass in Latin. Even Sander, however, noted that Mary had her work cut out for her in restoring communion with the Catholic Church thanks to the years of schism with Rome began by Henry and continued by Edward. It was for this reason that Pope Julius III sent Cardinal Pole to aid the restoration of Catholicism in England. According to Sander, after Pole urged a return to union with Rome the two Houses of Parliament
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petitioned Mary, expressing regret for going along with the schism and their making of laws to aid it.¹²⁹

Despite Sander's and Foxe's claims of a uniformly religious society, it is much closer to reality that England as a whole was still bitterly divided over religion in the reign of Mary. Henry Machyn, a resident of London and merchant taylor as well as a Catholic, noted on many pages in his diary that someone went to the pillory for speaking "sedyssyous words" against Queen Mary which indicated that on the popular level, at least in London, Mary's religious policies were far from being embraced by everyone.¹³⁰ Machyn also wrote of some being sent to the pillory repeatedly for spreading false rumors that Edward was actually alive, which also signified a popular longing for the recent days of Protestant reform in London.¹³¹

Although Machyn made important observations that there were those in London discontented with the religious change brought on by the Marian regime, Susan Brigden has conducted important research into the English Reformation in London and concludes that there was a not insignificant group of Catholics who welcomed the return of the Mass and other traditional religious observances at the accession of Mary. Brigden shows that the Reformation in London was not as rapid as traditionally thought as there was still significant support for the return of the old religion in the reign of Mary. Catholic support did not escape the attention of Thomas Cranmer who felt Mary represented a serious threat to evangelicalism and offered disputations daily to prove the rightness of innovations in worship during the reign of Edward.¹³² As London was still divided over the Reformation as late as the reign of Mary, this shows that residual support for traditional religious worship was by no means going out of fashion in the
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later sixteenth century. Conservative religious sentiment in Marian England shows that
Catholicism already had an appeal of its own without the efforts of foreign-trained missionaries.
In spite of whatever resistance she may have met from the gentry class who made their fortunes
in the dissolution of the monasteries, Mary made an attempt at monastic revival in 1555, as
Robert Parkyn wrote, "immediattely after Easter all suche as had ben closterers before tyme, yea
as well women as men, was commandyde to tayk ther habytte or vestures unto tham agayne,
such, I say, as thay had uside in ther closters, (and yff thay were mariede to be devorcyde).”

Of course, Mary is most famous among laymen of history for her persecution of
Protestants in her perpetual efforts to root out heresy. John Foxe has forever immortalized those
who were brave enough to hold fast to their evangelical beliefs up to the point of death by
burning at the stake. When Mary began burning Protestant heretics at Smithfield in 1555, John
Rogers was the first to be condemned to death for heresy after his examination. In the
condemning sentence against John Rogers, it was made clear that he was being put to death for
believing "That the catholike churche of Rome, is the church of Antichrist: Item, that the
Sacrament of the aultare, there is not substantially or really the bodye and bloude of Christe." Bishop John Hooper, one of the most prominent Protestant supporters of the accession of Queen
Mary, was sent to the stake at Smithfield after a year of being imprisoned in spite of his support.
Like many of the other martyrs, Foxe claims that he refused to recant his evangelical faith
despite rumors to the contrary. The most famous of the martyrs, Thomas Cranmer, succumbed
to the same specific charges of heresy in spite of his recantation that the lesser known martyrs
were accused of: the denial of transubstantiation and the denial of papal authority over a
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Towards the end of Mary's reign, many of the persecuting clergy happened to die just before her in a stroke of divine judgement as Foxe wanted to believe, comparing them to past persecutors of God's people, such as Herod and Emperor Valerian. Mary passed away without an heir and her close associate, Cardinal Pole, soon died mere hours after the death of Mary. \(^{137}\)

Historians have traditionally viewed the Marian regime's attempts at restoring Catholicism as nothing less than a failure, and they have viewed her apparently harsh persecution of Protestants as one of the reasons why Catholicism in England failed to hold little influence among the vast majority of the English people from Elizabeth's reign onwards. Dickens argues that revisionist historians have been too anxious to present her as a successful ruler despite much evidence to the contrary among the House of Commons and that many people dared not oppose her by professing their true religious beliefs for fear of losing their lives. \(^{138}\) The English people in the reign of Mary lacked enthusiasm for strict Catholic orthodoxy or a sense of national peril posed by a foreign power in both domestic affairs and abroad. Generally speaking, Dickens observes. "the Tudor public felt more pity for a politically inoffensive neighbour, than, say a foreign trained seminary priest thirty years later, since the latter could be depicted by authority as a murderous traitor in the pay of Spain and Rome." The burnings themselves, Dickens hypothesizes, must have aroused a great deal of horror among observers because of the cold and wet English climate that prolonged them. Mary, rather than John Foxe, was responsible for the prejudicial behavior of Protestants towards Catholics in England that would come to be one of
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the worst legacies of the English Reformation. The most serious weakness of the Marian regime was that it bent its energies on restoring religious houses and monasteries, rather than establishing a missionary style effort since Protestantism had found a receptive audience and planted its roots firmly among a great number of the English people. The realization that a missionary style effort was needed would only be made in the reign of Elizabeth and even then had little success thanks to government repression. Marian Catholicism was fundamentally medieval and had little in common with the Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation that came out of the Council of Trent happening simultaneously.

Newer scholarship on Marian England, however, has come to take a much more approving view of Mary's reign. Eamon Duffy contends that the religious attitudes of the broader population of England were not changed very much despite years of schism and theological innovation which caused them to welcome Mary to the throne and her bringing back of traditional religion with open arms. Mary could not be blamed for failing to capitalize on the new Catholic reformist movement out of Trent since as of 1553 the Council had been suspended temporarily and would not undertake its most important work until after the deaths of Mary and Cardinal Pole. Marian Catholicism was not strictly a reactionary movement against the English Reformation. The Marian authorities consistently sought a return to traditional religion while incorporating what they saw as positive developments from the reformations of Henry and Edward. Their picking and choosing of elements from the English Refomation caused Marian Catholicism to be distinctive from pre-Reformation Catholicism. There is also a large amount of evidence that the religious agenda of the Marian regime was widely accepted in many parishes. There was also an abundance of printed devotional works which shows evidence that the Marian
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religious reforms were intended to reach a great section of the lay population.\textsuperscript{141} The Marian Injunctions had the main objective of rooting out heresy. The Injunctions were also intended to restore physically the despoliation caused by the Edwardian regime in order to conduct Mass. There were massive organizational and financial efforts to reconstruct parishes, but parishioners reciprocated by feverishly working to assist the government in the restoration.\textsuperscript{142}

On the burning of nearly 300 heretics, Duffy warns against importing modern revulsion at the torture and killing of those devoted to their beliefs. Tudor Englishmen were not predisposed to such feelings as they witnessed many such burnings before the reign of Mary. While the burnings may have caused sympathy among some for the victims, that did not necessarily imply shared religious beliefs.\textsuperscript{143} Although Mary did retain some changes wrought by the English Reformation, she also anticipated the reforms of the Catholic Reformation. The narrowing religious devotion on the redemptive suffering and death of Christ was only a result of previous destruction of the old images of saints, but of the specific directives of church officials to display imagery of the Passion of the Christ. In this regard, Mary followed the wider Catholic Reformation trend to focus piety on the redemption of Christ at the expense of minor saints.\textsuperscript{144}

David Loades sees a much more convoluted and troubled Marian restoration than Duffy and states that the Marian Church and government that it should be seen in a wider context with the English Reformations of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth and that the conformists form the most important segment of the Reformations in England. Loades makes the obvious, but insightful, remark that "the people of England in Mary's reign were the same people who had
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been there under Edward and were to be there again under Elizabeth. Unlike Duffy, Loades draws a clear difference between elite and popular religion in Marian England as Mary herself was brought up in the Humanist tradition of Catholicism. He also emphasizes that Cardinal Pole was very much in touch with the ideas of the Counter-Reformation. Leading Marian clergy such as Edmund Bonner and Thomas Watson had no illusions about the difficulty of instilling orthodox religious beliefs into the masses, which was something that the restoration of traditional religious practices did not always help. They fooled themselves into thinking that years of schism and the preaching of heretical doctrines caused a general lapse of morality. While the main function of the Catholic priest was to administer the sacraments, there was a new emphasis on the importance of preaching in order to instill discipline in the laity. A necessary regeneration of morality and spirituality had to come from below and conservatism could form as much of an obstacle as heresy and schism to that progress as it had in the rest of Catholic Europe. In the restoration of churches to their former glory, there was great difficulty not only because it was so expensive, but because there had been a shift among laymen in the culture of giving to the church as a result of the Reformation. Despite the change in patterns of donation, at the same time few people would have admitted to believing in justification by faith alone.

Loades views heresy in Marian England as a minor problem compared to other issues and asserts that it was not an issue of black or white but rather many shades of grey. At one end of the spectrum were Catholics who welcomed the return not only of traditional ways, but also the return of papal authority; they very likely formed a small minority of conformists. The prevailing religious culture, however, was largely conservative even though most conformed
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with Edward and they would again with Elizabeth. Some welcomed the Reformation but were
less eager to sacrifice themselves for it by speaking out against it for fear of persecution. The
real heretics were those who called attention to themselves by refusing to attend Mass. The main
reason why Queen Mary and the persecution of heretics are virtually synonymous was because
of the serious attention the Marian regime devoted to it, being very conscious of the years of
schism and all they had to do to repair it and also because of Foxe bringing their sufferings to life
for readers down unto the present day.\footnote{Ibid, 96.}

The reign of Mary Tudor has been seen as either a sign of strength or weakness of
Catholicism in England. It is particularly notable, however, that Wyatt's Rebellion was the only
serious uprising and that it was more a protest against the Spanish match than protest against
Mary's religion or her persecution, which had not yet begun in earnest. With the exception of
Wyatt's Rebellion, the Marian Regime appeared relatively stable but this alone does not equate to
the supposed strength and continuing vitality of Catholicism in England. Only with very limited
success was Mary able to restore the religious houses that were swept away by the Reformation.
This was because of economic difficulties of course, but it is equally clear that a new type of
Catholicism was sweeping across Marian England. It was not strictly Counter-Reformation
Catholicism, however, as many elements of the English Reformation were retained which gave
Marian Catholicism a distinct identity. The persecution of religious heretics, although done with
more enthusiasm and frequency and for slightly different reasons in Marian England, could very
well be seen as an inheritance from the Henrician Reformation as Henry often persecuted
heretics even after the break with Rome. As Lucy Wooding writes, "the reforming potential
within English Catholic thought achieved its fullest expression during Mary's reign." There was
great emphasis placed upon communicating with the mass of illiterate peasants in England and less concern with the writing of polemical works as would be common in the Counter-Reformation years of Elizabeth. Marian literature depicted Henry VIII as a great reformer and emphasized his Catholic roots as well as devotion to the Bible rather than castigating him for the schism with Rome. English Catholic thought up until Mary and well into the reign of Elizabeth had been moving towards a more biblical and reformed understanding of Catholicism until it was abandoned for the Counter-Reformation ideals of papal supremacy and tradition above scripture.  

1.5 Conclusion

The divisions among the Elizabethan English Catholics remained much the same as they did among the traditionalist majority that Shagan writes about at the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace. There were many different and competing ways to be a Catholic in Elizabethan England, just as there were many different ideas of what a proper restoration of religion should look like in the Pilgrimage of Grace. Just as the elite families and leaders had different aims from those of the lower classes in the Pilgrimage, the same could be said of Catholics in Elizabethan England. The Elizabethan gentry desired to be simply left alone and attempted to remain apolitical. The secular clergy took an activist stance in proffering their allegiance while, by contrast, the Jesuits desired a full restoration of Catholicism to England by any means necessary, even if it meant overthrowing Elizabeth.

One could see the final years of Henry’s reign and his attempted reaction against the Reformation of his own doing as evidence that religious conservatism commanded a great
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following not only among most English people but also at the highest levels of royal government. It is notable that the Edwardian, Marian, and Elizabethan regimes all saw themselves as first continuing the religious settlement of their father in the crucial final years of his reign before following their own personal religious whims and desires. With this in mind, it appears that the Jesuits, more so than the rest of the Catholic community, were in violation of this tradition of respecting established political authority by desiring a complete overthrow and restoration of papal obedience rather than following what had become tradition by the late sixteenth century. If one puts the Jesuits in their more immediate and relevant historical context in relation to the royal government, they begin to look less like ultra religious conservatives and more like radicals who espoused something that went against English traditions.

The Edwardian dissolution had tremendous implications for the future of the Elizabethan Catholic community. It was not as uniformly successful as Shagan would have one believe nor as inevitable as a result of the powerful message of Protestantism as Dickens observes. There was difficulty in enforcing the English Reformation, especially in northern and outlying areas beyond the reach of government control as Duffy has noted, but yet it still did require at least some participation by the non-committed majority and even those who were sympathetic to traditional religion in most areas of England. The fact that it did have a measure of success among traditionalists points towards a rapidly changing Catholic community in England of which the Jesuits had no real fundamental understanding. Their narrow ideas of what a restored Catholicism would look like contradicted the reality of the situation in which the majority of the Catholic community likely participated in the dissolution of the monasteries for reasons other than protecting images and relics.
The changes in religious worship in the reign of Edward VI came to have important implications for the condition of the Catholic community. From the outset, it was clear that Cranmer was attempting to hold true to the Anglican principle of the *via media* with a delicate balance of old ritual and organized liturgy that disguised elements of Calvinist theological principles. The Prayer Book Rebellion in the western counties showed that there was still a degree of support for the traditional Mass in Latin and opposition to the Prayer Books and the Acts of Uniformity came to form the foundations of Catholic recusancy in Elizabethan England. It is no accident that the second Prayer Book formed the foundations of the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 with a few minor revisions as she sought to wed Calvinist theology with the imagery of traditional worship. The traditional elements of the Edwardian Prayer Books would later come to divide the Catholic community on the virtues of recusancy against conformity. Indeed, many parishioners in the Church of England still considered themselves Catholic in the reign of Elizabeth despite the official view from the international Catholic Church that viewed recusancy as the ideal state. The Elizabethan Church still held many traditional elements in its liturgy despite the intentions of Cranmer to erase as many of them as possible eventually. The incomplete work of what Cranmer sought to finish inadvertently made attending church acceptable to Catholics and traditionalists who felt no special attachment to the papacy and probably made them feel less guilty about communicating with the Church of England than they otherwise would have been.

Just as the succession of Mary should not be taken as a sign of the strength of Catholicism, neither should the succession of Edward VI or Elizabeth be considered as signs of the vitality of Protestantism. By and large no matter their religious leanings, English people tended to support the ruling monarch against threats with English Catholics being opposed to the
political machinations of the papacy and Spain as well as Protestants being opposed to domestic disturbances that threatened the royal line of succession like Wyatt's Rebellion. English Catholics, no less than many Protestants in the beginning of Mary's reign, were above all concerned with a proper and lawful line of succession which they mostly separated from religious concerns.

Whatever kind of Catholicism existed in the reign of Mary, the fact remains that the vast majority of English people did conform peacefully, as they had under Henry as well as Edward and Elizabeth. Although there were a good number of parishioners that did conform sincerely depending on which religion was in the ascendancy, most conformed and obeyed out of fear of harsh retribution and also out of a desire to uphold the law and remain obedient to the crown. Another reason for conformism among both those of Catholic and Protestant sympathies was because the great mass of ordinary people were often unaware of what it really meant to be Catholic or Protestant and so did not pay much attention to religious change in the English Reformation. With hindsight, it is somewhat easier to draw a divide between the two religious schools of thought within Christianity based on certain requirements and varying definitions of Catholicism and Protestantism. On the whole, the state of Catholicism up until Elizabeth and especially after Henry VIII was a very confused and amorphous state and far from monolithic. It could take on the role of conservative reaction in the restoration of rituals and images as well as papal obedience to a limited degree by looking back to the medieval past, but at the same time it could also take cues from Protestantism as well as Erasmian Christian Humanism and incorporate religious instruction and Bible reading in the vernacular and insist on a more scripturally based religion. This made it relatively easy for Elizabeth to begin her Reformation mostly unopposed except for the seminarians and Jesuits who were trained abroad and had been
more exposed to the more modern currents of international Catholic thought rather than traditional English Catholic ideals. It was their insistence on following what they viewed as a purer and correct form of Catholic worship that set them at odds with the great majority of English Catholics and their traditions throughout the English Reformation and the late medieval age.

Different factions of the Elizabethan Catholic community had much more in common with their predecessors of both Catholic and Protestant leanings throughout the English Reformation than the Jesuits themselves as they all professed loyalty to the Elizabethan regime while privately holding different religious views. Just as there was a wide spectrum of Catholic practice in late Tudor England, Catholicism as professed under Elizabeth's predecessors was even more amorphous as there existed little of the stark confessional divide that the Jesuits did their best in attempting to establish in England. At times, however, some would speak out against religious innovations that appeared too firmly out of traditional practice as had Thomas More who opposed the break with Rome while steadfastly proclaiming his allegiance to Henry VIII as he did not find the Henrician Schism as a justifiable cause to overthrow the Tudor monarchy. Even after Henry's excommunication by Pope Paul III, calls for the removal of Henry VIII by those of Catholic traditionalist leanings were almost nonexistent except for a minority in the largest uprising in Tudor England, the Pilgrimage of Grace. The Pilgrimage of Grace, however, was not a movement in the vein of a sophisticated political and religious revolution as the Jesuits later advocated on behalf of the international mother Church, but rather an outburst of disgruntlement over the disruption of traditional religious practice. Furthermore, in the context of their times the Pilgrims were reactionaries to religious innovation while the Jesuits sought to
overturn the Religious Settlement in favor of Counter-Reformation Catholicism that had only a vague resemblance to traditional worship in England.

During the course of the English Reformation after Henry VIII, no one of Catholic sympathies during the reign of Edward VI or even Mary entertained the idea of following the pope's political commands ahead of the reigning monarch. The emergence of Catholic recusancy in the early reign of Elizabeth closely mirrored the behavior of those who opposed the religious changes of Henry VIII or Edward VII as they felt it was entirely possible to remain loyal to the person of the monarch while steadfastly opposing any religious innovation or the break with Rome. Even most Protestants during the reign of Mary were much closer in political behavior to the Elizabethan Catholic community as they professed their loyalty for the most part while finding distasteful the new state of religious affairs. Just as the Jesuits had little in common with those who opposed the break with Rome in the reign of Henry VIII, they also shared few commonalities with those of traditionalist sympathies during the Edwardian Reformation or even the majority of conformers in Marian England. Conformity under Queen Mary occurred out of a desire to follow the laws of the land even if it necessitated the reestablishment of ties with Rome. The first half of Elizabeth's reign would continue the general acceptance of the status quo in affairs of religion and politics even among those who elected not to communicate with the Church of England.
CHAPTER 2

CATHOLICISM IN THE EARLY ELIZABETHAN AGE AND THE EMERGENCE OF RECUSANCY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discussed how the tendency to conform and the strong sense of loyalty to the reigning monarch were deeply rooted among Catholics throughout the English Reformation, in spite of any official religious changes that may or may not have occurred. In this case, conformity need not only mean communicating with the Church of England; it also could include a willingness to respect the Church of England even while refraining from attending. It was also observed that attachment to traditional religious observances rather than obedience to the Holy See was one of the hallmarks of the English Catholic community, which makes it more conceivable that Catholicism in England need not be narrowly defined to recusancy.

The current chapter will continue to analyze the long tradition of obedience to the English monarch among Catholics which carried over into the reign of Elizabeth in spite of her parentage from Anne Boleyn and the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. During the first quarter of Elizabeth's reign, from 1558 to 1570, the English Reformation advanced with minimal disruption while Catholic loyalty to Elizabeth became firmly entrenched instead of merely reflecting a general allegiance for the office of the monarch. Catholicism in early Elizabethan England
exhibited a mild character as its leading figures in exile preferred to focus on theological debates rather than questions of political loyalty. Even at this stage in the history of the Catholic community, which most historians have viewed as a time when Catholicism in England was on the verge of dying out, recusancy was already beginning even without the aid of the Jesuits and attachment to traditional religious observances still continued to some degree regardless of royal proclamations. The Northern Rising of 1569 most clearly shows that Catholicism in England was far from a spent force. Although northern noblemen initiated the uprising for the political goal of putting Mary, Queen of Scots on the throne, the majority who participated found another means of religious expression through protesting the limited introduction of Protestant innovations in worship. In the aftermath of the Northern Rising, Pope Pius V misread the motivations on the part of the common participants in thinking they were prepared to overthrow the legitimate reigning monarch. The papal bull of 1570 absolved all English subjects of their allegiance towards Elizabeth, but did not take into account the already strong feelings of attachment that most Catholics felt towards the Queen in spite of the penal laws. Initially, the relative laxity of the enforcement of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement went a long way to winning over the acceptance of the Catholic community. The increasing severity of the penal laws caused Catholics in England to point later to the Jesuits as the main issue, rather than the government itself.

Early in the Elizabethan Age, Catholicism in England was comparatively moderate and non-confrontational, meekly preferring second-class status in order to avoid seriously challenging royal proclamations relating to religious affairs. The 1559 Act of Supremacy ensured that the monarch would once again have final jurisdiction over religious affairs. The Act of Uniformity in the same year laid down measures to enforce the ostensible religious monopoly
held by the Church of England such as recusancy fines which made conformity a necessity for many of Catholic and traditionalist sympathies who were otherwise displeased with the Elizabethan Church.

Although a large number of historians have traditionally ended the English Reformation with the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, challenges to the church establishment continued from English Catholics even before the advent of the 1580 English Mission. Nicholas Sander and John Feckenham, both Catholic exiles abroad in Louvain, appealed to writings from the church fathers in addition to acts of Parliament in Marian England to show the discontinuity between the Church of England and the medieval Catholic Church as it was founded in England. The Louvainist writers Thomas Harding and Thomas Stapleton also debated Protestant beliefs and doctrines that the Church of England came to accept such as salvation by faith and a disbelief in transubstantiation. William Allen as well came to prominence during the 1560s, even before he founded the seminary at Douai, and he wrote in support of traditional Catholic doctrine. More significantly, however, he was the first English Catholic clergyman to encourage recusancy as the only acceptable state for a true Catholic and condemned even reluctant conformity.  

Recusancy did exist early in Elizabeth's reign but it was treated more mildly as the case of Robert Southworth shows. The Bishop of London regarded Southworth as a harmless but superstitious individual whose persistence in recusancy was simply attributed to his stubborn clinging to an old and dying faith. Despite the apparent harmlessness of Catholicism prior to the arrival of the Jesuits, the Northern Rebellion of 1569 took place mainly out of an iconoclastic rage against Protestant symbols as the proceedings from the ecclesiastical courts of Durham have

shown. The Northern Rebellion, however, was short lived as the Bishop of Winton reported to Lord Burghley that even those of Catholic views in attendance at a sermon on Christmas Day were in agreement that rebellion against legitimate authority, whether Protestants rebelling against a Catholic monarch in France or Catholics rebelling against a Protestant monarch in England, was ultimately not a part of the divine plan.\footnote{Bishop of Winton to Sir William Cecil. Lansdowne MS 12/31, British Library.}

The papal bull of 1570 was certainly a turning point in the history of the Catholic community in England as it absolved Catholic subjects of their allegiance to the monarch and declared that Elizabeth was never at any point the legitimate ruler. Although Pius foresaw that such an announcement would galvanize the Catholic community against Elizabeth, in reality it forced them to make a compromise between the demands of their faith and the requirements of being a loyal subject. The moderate nature of the majority of the English Catholic community in the aftermath of the papal bull contrasted with the uncompromising views of the Jesuits and the Counter-Reformation in the wider international struggle against Protestant heresy.

2.2 THE RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT AND THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

Historians have consistently agreed that English Catholicism throughout the first few years of Elizabeth's reign and in the 1560's appears far different from that of the later years of her reign, when the Jesuits became increasingly active in the political and religious affairs of England. There was far less of a confessional divide at first, which resembled more the days of old under Henry VIII and even Edward VI and Mary. Elizabeth desired a return to the Protestantism of the Edwardian reign. Although the Edwardian reforms seemed radical to many people at the time they were introduced, they came to appear much more moderate by the time of
Elizabeth thanks in part to the rise of Puritanism, which sprang out of a more direct Calvinist influence on the Marian Exiles who spent their time abroad in centers of Reformed Protestantism on the continent such as Geneva. Puritans generally desired even further changes in theology and ceremonial rituals than were made in the reign of Edward, but Elizabeth resisted their pressure and held to a compromise between conservatives and evangelicals. What seemed like compromise to Elizabeth and the majority of the English appeared as heresy and schism to committed Catholics or as remnants of Roman corruption to Puritans. One of the first official acts of Elizabeth was the proclamation to forbid preaching among the common laity and clergy on anything relating to religion other than the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Ten Commandments. This was done in an effort to minimize criticism of the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity in 1559 from religious conservatives as well as devoted evangelicals.\(^{153}\)

The mainstream of the Catholic community generally made little disturbance over the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity in 1559. It seems certain, however, that Catholics must have felt a certain degree of displeasure when England was once again cut off from its Catholic heritage from the Middle Ages and to a lesser extent severed from communion with Rome. Elizabeth, however, viewed the Royal Supremacy as a return to tradition in that it was "restoring to the Crown the ancient Jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, and abolishing all Foreign Power repugnant to the same." Much of the wording of the 1559 Act of Supremacy contains references to "foreign powers" which reveals that Elizabeth thought of the Catholic Church as something inherently non-native and identified it with the influence of other countries, most particularly Spain. Throughout the Act of Supremacy, there are mentions of Mary and Phillip and their usurpation of political power made by repealing laws and statutes made under
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Henry and Edward. Most fundamentally, the Act of Supremacy repealed the 1554 *An Act repealing all statutes, articles, and provisions made against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of King Henry VII* which effectively restored the Royal Supremacy of 1534 as well its many accompanying acts such as the Submission of the Clergy. Priests were allowed to marry once again and the Edwardian innovation of communion in both kinds was restored, while the Marian statutes punishing heresy were revoked which signified a shift in focus from the doctrinal persecution of Mary to the gradually increasing political repression of Elizabeth. The Act of Supremacy restored the Oath of Supremacy repealed by Mary which required all those seeking secular or clerical office to swear an oath recognizing Elizabeth as governor instead of head of the church. Like the 1534 Act of Supremacy, the Elizabethan variant insisted on and explicitly forbade obedience to any foreign power that claimed to have spiritual or political authority in England.

The accompanying 1559 Act of Uniformity laid out a clearly Protestant agenda, but it lacked any new reform measures and even revoked a small number of measures from the 1552 Act of Uniformity. The Book of Common Prayer, of which the Edwardian form was left largely intact, established once again the orthodox and uniform liturgy as well as rituals for the Church of England. Harsh penalties were reimposed for any minister daring to alter the Book of Common Prayer, reviving the old preoccupation under Edward VI with the counterfeiting of the Mass. Most significantly for the Catholic community, refusal to attend every Sunday the local Anglican parish church would be punished with a twelve pence fine, which made it difficult for many people with Catholic allegiance not to attend church. The recusancy fine would go a long
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way to causing the later divisions in the Catholic community as questions arose of whether one could attend Anglican services and still be a faithful Catholic.\textsuperscript{157} The Elizabethan Injunctions largely repeated the earlier Edwardian Injunctions. At every sermon, ministers were instructed to emphasize that absolutely no allegiance was to be held to any type of foreign power since this obedience had no grounding in Scripture and all loyalty and obedience was due to Elizabeth. The Injunctions also did away with many traditional religious observances such as pilgrimages and the veneration of images and relics, which could not effect miracles as a result of these actions. The Injunctions reinforced English as the official language of the Church of England in all manners of worship.\textsuperscript{158} Despite the particularly Protestant character of the Injunctions, there were some restrictions on the interpretation of Scripture as it clearly laid out "that no man shall wilfully and obstinately defend or maintain any heresies, errors, or false doctrine, contrary to the faith of Christ and his Holy Scripture."\textsuperscript{159}

Historians have long debated the meaning of the developments of 1559. Dickens regards the Elizabethan Settlement as a "religious revolution," but at the same time comments on how weak opposition was, in his mind, to such sweeping measures. Even though Elizabeth was a traditional Edwardian Protestant, she appreciated the outward appearances of traditional worship and possibly believed in a real presence in the Eucharist. She cannot be credited with the introduction of the diversity of views that characterizes the modern day Church of England, but her religious preferences made such a thing possible. The integrity of the clerical hierarchy was left largely intact since she viewed it as an effective means to govern a largely rural and still traditional society that had not fully emerged from the Middle Ages. Despite these conservative

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid, 332.
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid, 335-336.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid, 343.
concessions, at its base the Elizabethan Religious Settlement was not meant as a compromise between Catholicism and Protestantism.\textsuperscript{160} Initially, Catholic resistance to the Settlement was generally very weak moreover, just as when the government least persecuted Catholics, the Catholic Church lost most of its influence among the English.\textsuperscript{161}

Other historians have also taken note of how little Catholics resisted the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. While all these measures were intended in theory to suppress Catholic recusancy and, to a lesser extent, Protestant nonconformity, for the first decade of Elizabeth's reign they were very little enforced. The Oath of Supremacy was easily evaded, and the fines for recusancy were often left uncollected. There was little hostility in general between Catholics and Protestants in the first years of Elizabeth's reign since there was little awareness of the religious divide in comparison to the later years in the 1570s and beyond. Recusancy itself was even rarer among the laity prior to the arrival of the Jesuits. Many people who were otherwise faithful Catholics saw nothing wrong with being present at Anglican worship but not actually participating in order to comply with the law while going to Mass in secret. Despite whatever changes the Elizabethan Settlement wrought, most lay people were hard pressed to notice any real changes. The Elizabethan Church kept the buildings as well as the hierarchical structure of the pre-Reformation church intact and religion was very much intertwined with the political and social order. Most people belonged to the same church as they had prior to the Reformation as it still played a vital role in the social, political, and religious life of a community. Leaving the church that one had attended since infancy and childhood for an underground sect that retained
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the Latin Mass and communion with Rome could seem a much greater break with the past than did the religious changes of 1559.\footnote{Pritchard, Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England, 3-4.}

More so than other historians, Duffy associates dramatic change with the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and particularly takes note of the reluctant acceptance of the Act of Uniformity among the English people. Even in London at St. Paul's Cathedral, parishioners continued to celebrate Mass up until the last moment before it became illegal amid a wave of iconoclasm. Even after the passing of the Act of Uniformity, traditionalists still hoped for yet another change back to the old ways which they made clear in the wills they drew up. The modifications made to the Edwardian Prayer Book disguised its starkly Protestant features to make conservatives feel more comfortable in attending the Anglican liturgy. The Injunctions preserved some rituals such as the Rogationtide procession and bowing at the name of Jesus, but they also commanded the orderly removal of all images and altars. Marian exiles were put in charge of the Visitation of 1559 required to carry out the Injunctions which ensured a radical shift in the suppression of any visible reminders of England's Catholic past. Duffy asserts there was a wide effort among Catholics in England to hide relics, vestments, images, and other religious material from the clutches of the Elizabethan regime as well as delayed compliance from many parishes which signifies that genuine sympathy towards the old faith was still alive and well in England despite whatever religious changes imposed by the government. The most important reason why Tudor Englishmen complied with the Elizabethan authorities was due to the culture of obedience and a respect for the law rather than any genuine enthusiasm for Protestantism.\footnote{Duffy, Stripping of the Altars, 566-573.}
Christopher Haigh draws particular attention to the Parliamentary opposition to the Elizabethan Religious Settlement in the majority Catholic House of Lords. This caused a far less Protestant Reformation than Elizabeth and her advisors wanted and produced an ambiguous Book of Common Prayer which used wording that could be interpreted in the traditional Catholic way, which made it easier for priests to counterfeit the Mass and implement as few changes as possible. The Elizabethan authorities faced tremendous obstacles to the progress of the Reformation they wanted to impose since "the accession of Queen Elizabeth and the political struggles of 1559 had given Protestants the leadership of the Church of England, but not control of the parishes, where Catholic priests and traditionalist laity were in large majorities." It was actually possible to maintain a somewhat diminished Catholic worship service within the parish framework thanks to the ambiguity of the Religious Settlement. Catholicism was far from destined to being a permanent minority status in 1559. Many people with Catholic sympathies behaved exactly as they had in the reign of Edward, expecting another religious change in the near future. English Catholics considered possibilities that never occurred such as another premature death in the Tudor line of succession or the chance that Elizabeth could be overthrown by rebellion.

Lucy Wooding sees an overall transformation of English Catholicism due to the terms of the Religious Settlement. In addition to changing Catholic thought in England, the Settlement borrowed heavily from the reformist strains of Catholicism in England with their emphasis on moderation and biblically based doctrine. By appropriating core elements of the Tudor policy of the 1530s, the Settlement was a defeat for Catholics who sought to make such policies their own. The 1560s saw the emergence of a new debate in ecclesiology in regards to the claims of the
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apostolic continuity of the Church of England against the claims of the Catholic Church and debates around the nature of the Eucharist became less important. The Elizabethan Settlement made the assertion that it was the true Church which went beyond arguments of the nature of the Sacraments and ceremonies in prior religious debates in England. The Bishop of Salisbury, John Jewel, constantly repeated the conservative nature of the Church of England and its links with the Christian past. The tradition of martyrdom and persecution made the Church of England resemble more the early Church. Jewel characterized English Catholics as blindly loyal to Rome and tolerant of corruption. Jewel also argued that the devotion to Church authority above Scripture among Catholics and the emphasis on scriptural authority in the Church of England was further evidence that the Church of England was far more conservative. In effect, Jewel presented a Church of England based on apostolic succession but also cognizant of the primacy of Scripture.166

Although the Elizabethan Religious Settlement has been often viewed as the final stage of the English Reformation, in reality it was merely another step in its long and ambiguous path. Religious diversification continued among Protestants largely unhindered. There was much displeasure among Puritan elements of the Elizabethan Church with the Settlement, regarding it as only a half-measure in bringing about the godly society they truly desired. Puritans, however, were far from being separatist in Elizabethan England, as they were actually very much the establishment as Peter Lake has decisively shown.167 The evolution of Protestantism in England was far from finished with the Settlement. It made conceivable varying strands of Protestant theology from William Laud's high church movement of the seventeenth century and the Oxford
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Movement of the nineteenth century to the antinomian sects of the seventeenth century and John Wesley’s Methodism of the eighteenth century.

Just as Protestant identity shifted in many directions after the Settlement, so did Catholicism in England. Many Catholics did conform to the Church of England and attended just to comply with the law, but passively resisted whenever they could. There were also a great number of Catholics who were not sure if they were in grave sin by communicating thanks in part to the lack of any definitive statement from the Catholic Church regarding church attendance as of yet. A tenacious minority of recusants refused to go to Church even though recusancy was relatively rare before the inauguration of the seminary at Douai, but nevertheless recusancy still existed because of a degree of displeasure with the Settlement. Even among recusants, they were still divided on how much obedience they should render to the government. The Jesuits were sent into England as a missionary movement to reverse the Elizabethan Religious Settlement and to seek a remaking of the realm into the Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation with its emphasis on papal obedience that necessitated the overthrow of Elizabeth, which was something very radical compared to previous disgruntlement among segments of the Catholic community.

In the reign of King Henry, there was much discontent aimed mostly at the Dissolution of the Monasteries, but even in the Pilgrimage of Grace very few thought of overthrowing Henry to restore England to papal obedience as the Jesuits later did. The Prayer Book Rebellion in the reign of Edward VI was much more about the restoration of the traditional Mass than an outburst of displeasure against the Anglican schism and the complete reversal of all religious innovations that came with the English Reformation. Even Marian Catholicism was guided by what Mary interpreted to be the wishes of her father in what he wanted as official religious policy thanks in part to what she perceived as increasing conservatism that would have inevitably led back to
reconciliation with Rome. The Jesuits, however, had little respect for any religious precedents that had been set by any English monarch, Elizabeth most of all.

2.3 THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC COMMUNITY IN EXILE AND THEOLOGICAL DEBATE

Although the 1560s have been traditionally seen as a time of drift and decay for English Catholicism, there began to emerge several important trends that would more starkly draw a confessional divide and lay the foundations for the more famous days of the seminary-trained and Jesuit priests. Most importantly the center of gravity for English Catholicism shifted to Louvain on the Continent which profoundly changed the elite conception of Catholicism in England thanks to more pervasive international influences. The Elizabethan exiles formed yet another part of the Catholic community, one more noticeably militant and defensive as well as preoccupied with strict religious orthodoxy than their counterparts in England proper.168

The best known of the Louvainists was Nicholas Sander who wrote many polemical works against the Elizabethan government and Protestantism, one being The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism. He was also famous for A Treatise on the Images of Christ and His Saints, in which he defended the veneration of images and papal authority while simultaneously attacking Protestantism. One can see in Sander's work clear justifications for the primacy of the Holy See over the Church of England as he makes allusions to Scripture to justify this stand. Sanders wrote that "Such an one Saint Peter was, to whome Christ before his ascension comended his shepe and lambs to be fed and ruled of him more then of any other: euen as he loued more then the other, accordingly as Christes words do signifie." Sander went to describe the Catholic Church as a government of all the faithful committed by Christ to one man above
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the others and the Holy See as the one true shepherd of the flock.¹⁶⁹ Most of the Treatise, however, involves justifying the veneration of images. Sander used the iconoclasm of Protestants in the Low Countries as an opportunity to compare them to the ancient enemies of the orthodox Catholic Church. He reminded readers that Diocletian and Maximian ordered churches to be destroyed and Scriptures to be burnt, which was similar to what took place at the Franciscan monastery at Antwerp around the time he was writing. He also spoke of the Arians who burned the baptisteries and the baptismal founts used to christen children, which formed another parallel with the sacrilegious deeds of Protestants. The iconoclasts also used the wood of images as fuel for the fire to burn Scriptures, drank up all the wine, pulled down candlesticks, and burned the tapers to give themselves light so they could thoroughly despoil churches. Again, like the Arians, Sanders said the reason they did such things was the impiety of their doctrines caused the impiety of their deeds.¹⁷⁰

John Feckenham, a deprived Benedictine Abbot of Westminster Abbey, used arguments derived from Biblical, patristic, and tradition to justify recusancy. He wrote his treatise in prison, and likely had outside help in the writing of it or access to a hidden private library since he cites a wide array of sources with accuracy.¹⁷¹ Feckenham claimed that the Book of Common Prayer was unlawful at its core since its author, Thomas Cranmer, was burned at the stake according to the laws of the realm and that the book was declared heretical by an act of Parliament in 1553.¹⁷² Feckenham also asserted that the Church of England had no real continuity with Apostolic Succession, as it was written in the Book of Acts that "in the primitive church, Christes Apostles and their successors were cheife governours of the belevers." Since
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there were no appointments of the successors of the Apostles, then the Church of England could not rightly be considered continuous with the primitive church. Many of the customs that the church fathers witnessed, the Church of England did not continue and also added innovations that the church fathers would have not approved, as Feckenham asserts. The mixing of wine with water was not done in the primitive church as many church fathers never said anything about this practice. Baptism was done with immersion three times as affirmed by St. Basil instead of the sprinkling of water upon the forehead as was the common practice in the Church of England. Feckenham went on to write that the Church of England could not be considered a true church since it stood upon only the negation of all tradition that went before it in the denial of ceremonies, the sacraments, the earthly visibility of Christ's church, the merit of good works, and many other beliefs that defined traditional Christianity.

While Feckenham was concerned with making his own arguments showing the discontinuity of the Church of England from true Christian belief and practice, much of the scholarly output from Louvain came as a response to the earlier claims by Richard Jewel that the Church of England was a continuation of the true Church that Christ established. Thomas Harding, like Sander, also entered into this debate on the Catholic side from Louvain. Harding attacked the Protestant doctrine of faith alone in a similar way that Sanders criticized Protestant iconoclasm, writing that "S. Augustine auouched that the beleefe of yᵉ Pelagians was not sufficient, although they touched not the Manichees maladies." The Donatists did believe in the Trinity, Baptism, the Gospel, and celebrated the feasts of the martyrs as well as Easter. The Donatists held many points of doctrine in common with orthodox Christianity, but the few points they diverged on made them heretics and not of the true Church. Harding asserted that "If not of
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the Churche then haue ye not parte with Christ, whose Passion worketh the effecte of saluation only vpon the membres of the Churche." Their disbelief in the transubstatiation made belief in the Trinity in vain as Christ said of the Eucharist, "This is my body."\textsuperscript{175}

Thomas Stapleton also wrote against the errors of Richard Jewel and he was most concerned with his incorrect interpretation of Scripture and the Church Fathers, declaring, "...you have falsifyed and Misalleaged the Doctours and holy Fathers of Christes Church, the Decrees, of Councelles, the lavves of Emperours, the Ecclesiasticall Histories, the Schoolemen, and other good VVriters a numbre. You havfe falysifyed and mangled the very Text of holy Scripture, namely of S. Paule..."\textsuperscript{176} Despite Louvanist writers' stalwart defense of Catholic orthodoxy, they could not help but be influenced by residual elements of the English Reformation and Marian Catholicism which was evidenced by writing their treatises in English instead of Latin. The use of the vernacular went against one of the recent decrees of the Council of Trent that mandated against not only the writing of Scripture in the vernacular but also the publishing of theological works in the vulgar tongue as well. Harding and Sanders thought it necessary to communicate their ideas in English and sought an exemption from Cardinal Morone since England was so thoroughly infected with spiritual disease that they wanted to get their ideas across to as many people as possible. They also noted that a false interpretation of the Bible was at the root of heresy in England and they opined that a careful translation of the Vulgate would do much to combat heretical doctrines. The eventual writing of the Douay-Rheims Bible was a direct legacy
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of Marian Catholicism, of which the Catholic writers and polemicists of the 1560s were still very much influenced.\textsuperscript{177}

Even though Richard Jewel sought to move the debate into which church was the true Church, Catholic writers were also still interested in debating the finer points of theology. Although William Allen is more famous for his establishment of the English college at Douai and his later sponsorship of the English mission, his writings in the 1560s dealt with the problem of occasional conformity and theological issues. His treatise \textit{Certain Brief Reasons Concerning Catholic Faith}, which circulated widely in Lancashire as well as the rest of England in 1564, immediately set about correcting the mistaken belief that occasional conformity might somehow be tolerated. The writing had such a profound effect in Lancashire that it caused many of the inhabitants not only to become recusants, but to form the majority of Allen's followers in the seminary at Douai. It made such a disturbance and aroused such hostility from the government that he was soon advised to leave England.\textsuperscript{178}

Allen's writing career was far from finished when he left England. His published book from Antwerp defended the doctrine of purgatory and prayers for the dead in 1565. Not only was Allen concerned with upholding the necessity of belief in purgatory, he also wrote at length about the sacrament of penance, which to him was necessary for eternal salvation, and he characterized the core Protestant doctrine of \textit{sola fide} as "vayne praesumption to everlasting damnation."\textsuperscript{179} Despite the much needed sacrament of penance, however, even after sins were forgiven there often remained unpaid debts in sin that needed to be remitted. The constant theme that runs throughout Allen's \textit{A Defense and Declaration} is the need for works to assure salvation,
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which affirmed traditional Catholic doctrine and drew a contrast with the theology of the Church of England that followed the Lutherans and the Calvinists that faith alone was sufficient.\textsuperscript{180}

Allen wrote a third publication entitled *A treatise made in defence of the lawful power and authoritie of the Priesthood to remitte sinnes* published in 1567 in which he justified the need for priests to hear the sacrament of confession. He states that Christ did not only forgive sins through his power as God, but also by his ministry as a human and argues that Christ could be considered as a priest by looking purely at his human aspect. Allen reasons that since Christ was a priest and the head of the church, "upon that ground the Priest's power in remitting sinnes in the Church doth stand."\textsuperscript{181}

For the early Elizabethan Catholics, the question of the authority of the pope over the monarch was not as central as it later became as a result of the influence of the Counter-Reformation. Most written works in the 1560s that came out of Louvain centered on interpretations of Scripture in accordance with biblical and patristic authority. Still, there were discussions of authority which concerned the visibility of the Church and the authority of the papacy, although these themes did not yet predominate. The writers from Louvain in the 1560s still thought they needed to defend doctrinal points more than they needed to give a statement of the orthodox opinion backed by the authority of the pope. They lacked a sense of any conflict between Sacred Tradition and Scripture, and Protestants and the English Catholic writers out of Louvain still shared the same sense of authority that the Scriptures held in defining the Christian faith.\textsuperscript{182}
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Gradually in the 1560s, however, Catholic writers had to approach the question of papal authority no matter how reluctant they might have been in approaching the matter. Like the Marian Catholics, they recognized papal supremacy as the most effective way to bring about Christian unity. The Louvainists conceded that popes could be as vulnerable to sin like everyone else, but their post guaranteed a strong defense against heretical doctrines and beliefs. In any case, there existed a dramatic divide between the Catholic community in exile during the 1560s and the Jesuit priests in the latter part of Elizabeth's reign. The Jesuits had a different and more radical view of the nature of authority, one that more directly denied the legitimacy of Elizabeth as queen. It was one thing to debate the finer points of theology based on Scriptural and early patristic justification and to concede reluctantly that the pope was necessary for Christian unity, but it was quite another to proclaim the values of the Counter-Reformation. The Jesuits insisted on the supremacy of Church Tradition above Scripture and emphasized that the pope was the rightful leader of all Christendom above any monarch who would pretend to lead a church.

While the Louvainist writers had an important role in preserving the intellectual justifications of English Catholicism, they were little involved in the day-to-day realities of the situation on the ground in England. In these days of limited persecution, the Catholic faith was in the most danger of dying out, as Arnold Oskar Meyer rightly notes. From 1563 to 1570, the years between the Council of Trent and the excommunication of Elizabeth, Catholicism lost most of its adherents. The religious legislation of Elizabeth no doubt hastened the increasing obscurity of Catholicism and the subsequent increase in membership of the Church of England, but more importantly the genuine likability of Elizabeth and the competence of her regime in keeping the peace gradually lessened the attraction of remaining within the Catholic Church.
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The attraction of the liturgy in the vernacular as well as the Bible was also appealing to the vast majority of the English people. It was an inherent desire to remain loyal, rather than fear of persecution, that was the fundamental reason behind the decline of Catholicism in the 1560s.  

2.4 THE DIFFICULTY OF ENFORCING THE RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT

Despite these developments, there lay some reasons behind the continued survival of Catholicism, otherwise the Jesuits would have had an almost impossible uphill battle. In outlying areas, the task of Catholic clergy was made much easier thanks to the ineffectiveness of the administrative aspects of the state-run church establishment. The compromise of the Elizabethan Settlement left many dissatisfied people among both traditionalists and evangelicals, and poor roads made communication difficult in many places throughout England. The social conservatism of Sussex presented a large obstacle to the enforcement of the Religious Settlement, with local governors of the mind that social stability should take precedent over religious uniformity. While the English Reformation is often thought to have ended in 1558, the message of Protestant reformers was delayed in the first generation and more so in Sussex than in most parts of England. English society, for the most part, still centered around the county in the reign of Elizabeth, and the economic situation in Sussex favored the leadership of the gentry since they held control over the local iron industry. A number of crypto-Catholic and openly Catholic gentry were able to hold positions of influence and patronage as the gradual elimination of Catholic nobility from office proceeded. The lenience of the government on Catholic office holders contributed to the decline of Catholicism among the untitled gentry and assured the loyalty of this same group. The Elizabethan government distinguished between varying degrees

of Catholicism. The most intransigent of recusants among the gentry, while a minority, were nonetheless dealt with very severely and by 1580 most of their leaders were either imprisoned or exiled. More compromising recusants were still subject to fines and confiscation of their property. Church papists among the gentry were often drawn away from religious dissent by the promise of holding office.¹⁸⁵

During much of the 1560s religious change in Sussex came slowly and was dominated by a struggle for the parishes to accept the Religious Settlement. Although the vast majority of parishes, except for a few isolated ones, accepted the Book of Common Prayer by the end of the decade, most of the gentry abandoned their parishes and found it much safer to worship in the privacy of their households. The Religious Settlement generally found more resistance in rural parishes than in towns but even in the 1560s, Protestantism was confined to a minority of towns in east Sussex. Not only is the evidence for the extent of Protestantism in Sussex lacking, but a reading of last wills and testaments provides abundant proof of the persistence of Catholic beliefs.¹⁸⁶ It can also be seen from the assessment of Bishop Barlow in 1564 that there was a great lack of clerics educated in the ways of Elizabethan Protestantism. The direct consequence of this was that there was no significant popular support for the Reformation besides a reluctant conformity and acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer. Even by 1569, efforts were being made to maintain traditional religious practices with an altar still visible at Arundel and other articles necessary being held at the ready in case of an official restoration of the Mass.¹⁸⁷ Not only had the Reformation failed to take any serious root among the laity, but there was a serious lack of effective leadership among the clergy in Sussex because of the high turnover rate of
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bishops under Henry and Edward and a general reluctance of educated clergy even to support religious changes that never seemed to last very long.\textsuperscript{188} While the Elizabethan government could sanction the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity, enforcing them was quite a different matter. Funds were needed for a strong enforcement of the Religious Settlement, and for this reason continuity in episcopal leadership was disrupted upon which the enforcement of uniformity mostly depended. After Bishop Barlow had acquired authority in his diocese, he found a nearly impossible task in enforcement of the Religious Settlement without a supply of educated clergy that was needed to overpower the religious conservatism of Sussex in the 1560s.\textsuperscript{189}

Although Manning has shown that Catholicism was able to survive in Sussex in a gradually diminishing form, there remains the fact that there had to have also been a Catholic faction responsible for taking advantage of the relative weakness of the Elizabethan government in its enforcement of the Religious Settlement throughout England in the 1560s. In Lancashire, Haigh notes similarities between Sussex and Lancashire in that "the task of recusant priests and seminarians was relatively simple, for the established Church offered little serious competition." The refusal to attend the local parish church was not a natural reaction to the Settlement of 1559 since the parish church was at the center of social life and not merely religious profession. Recusancy could mean not just withdrawal from the established church, but withdrawal from the local community.

Some historians, such as John Bossy, have stressed the discontinuity from Catholicism in the 1560s and before to the recusancy of the 1570s of which the Jesuits and seminarians formed
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the core. Therefore it is not all that surprising that there was very little recusancy in the first
decade of Elizabeth's reign. In the early stages of Elizabethan England, however, Protestantism
made little impact on the county level and the relaxed standards of Bishop Downham as well as
the many difficulties he had in controlling his diocese allowed the counterfeiting of the Mass to
take place on a massive scale in Lancashire. The continuation of Catholic practices within
Anglican parishes went on to such a degree that there was actually very little need for any
recusancy. There were, however, a number of clergy who withdrew from the established church
and became chaplains to conservative gentry and went back to secular occupations. Some
among the resigned clergy, however, chose to become recusant priests at large among the
community.

It follows that in order for there to have been lay recusants, there must also have been
recusant clergy as well. Well before the establishment of the seminary in Douai there were
people in Lancashire aware of a decree from the Council of Trent that proclaimed no true
Catholic could communicate with the Church of England. In 1566 Lawrence Vaux circulated
this information among the gentry after obtaining it from Nicholas Sander in Rome. The written
directive provided by Sander stated that all who are "present at the communion or service now
used in churches in England, as well as the laity as the clergy, do not walk in the state of
salvation; neither we may not communicate nor sociate ourselves in company with schismatic or
heretic in divine things." Vaux's letter had an immediate effect among the gentry, adding outright
recusancy to conservative opposition.190

Early recusancy in Lancashire was due largely to the ability of clergy to be able to work
with little restrictions. Many former clergy in Lancashire, however, became unemployed since
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the Elizabethan Church required fewer rituals and sacraments, and the laity were able to provide them with money and refuge in exchange for the Sacraments. Devoted Catholics felt the Sacraments of the Catholic Church would bring them ultimate salvation instead of the pale imitation of the Mass that conformists performed only half-heartedly in Lancashire. Recusancy was far more widespread than it may have seen in the 1560s since it was very difficult to detect in large northern parishes with dispersed settlements. Recusancy, by its very nature, was a secret rather than public activity which made it hard to observe. Detection of recusancy in the 1560s was not a very high priority for the Privy Council, since members assumed that it would soon disappear once the Marian clergy had died out. A confluence of events, however, would soon change this perception just at the close of the decade which set the stage for a more militant and confrontational English Catholicism. 191

The mindset of the Jesuits was entirely different from the thinking of the recusant clergy who refused to take the Oath of Supremacy as well as Anglican clergy who still continued Catholic practices to a large extent within the parish system of outlying areas. Neither the recusant nor crypto-Catholic priests, as personally opposed as they were to religious change, ever seriously sought to challenge the status quo and upset the Religious Settlement and make new converts to Catholicism. The same could be said for the gentry as well, who often desired above all to be left alone to practice their faith as they saw fit. The relatively benign character of early Elizabethan Catholicism is one of the factors explaining why the government did not seriously push to enforce religious uniformity throughout the 1560s in provincial England, in addition to simply being incapable of it due to a lack of trained clergy and strong sentiments of popular religious conservatism. Fears of a possible revolt from the nobility also played a part in the
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moderate approach that the Elizabethan government took in relations with the Catholic community. The later years, however, of Elizabeth's reign with the 1570 papal bull and the arrival of the Jesuits left her little choice but to make greater attempts at enforcing her Religious Settlement.

The Bishop of London wrote to Lord Burghley on his meeting with John Southworth, a Catholic recusant, on August 1569 just before the Northern Rebellion that would take place the following November. This letter provides a case study in just how difficult it was to enforce the Religious Settlement in the hearts of the most intransigent recusants and is also further evidence of the relatively peaceful state of affairs in religion in the first half of Elizabeth's reign. The Bishop complained that it was no use in changing Southworth's mind on religious matters and he also noted that other Anglican clergymen had met with him in an attempt to bring him into the Church of England. He tried to rationalize his unwillingness to convert to Anglicanism by describing him as an uneducated man blindly believing in what he did not understand. Family tradition played a large role in his unyielding adherence to the Catholic Church, as the Bishop of London stated that "he wille followe the faythe of his fathers: he will dye in the faythe wherein he was baptized." At this juncture, there was less hostility towards Catholic recusants as the political situation remained somewhat stable. The Bishop of London even extended a gesture of goodwill towards Southworth as he invited him to his court to employ him in some service.¹⁹²

No such feelings, however, were shown later to recusants and even more so towards foreign trained Catholic clergymen. The Jesuits and the few supporters they had drew attention away from the majority of the Catholic community, even among recusants such as John

Southworth, who did not share their revolutionary goals of reestablishing the Catholic Church in England. As Southworth claimed, his main reason for remaining within the Catholic Church was to follow the faith of his fathers and the traditions of his family. His viewpoint on religion is representative of the vast majority of the Catholic community even after the upheavals caused by the Northern Rebellion as well as the papal excommunication of Elizabeth. Southworth had little use for the new brand of Counter-Reformation Catholicism that was somewhat at odds with native forms of Catholicism in England that the Jesuits as well as seminary priests were bringing into England.

2.5 THE NORTHERN REBELLION AND POPULAR RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT

The Northern Rebellion of 1569 went a long way to shattering the relative peace and quiet once enjoyed by English Catholics in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign compared to later years of harsh persecution and repression. The claims of Mary, Queen of Scots, to the English throne provided the impetus for aristocratic leadership of the rebellion. Two northern noblemen, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, stormed Durham Cathedral and forced the celebration of the Latin mass which sparked a general uprising in favor of the return of traditional religious practices. Catholics engaged in a sort of iconoclasm all their own, as one Roland Hixson "rent and burnt all the bokes that belonged to Sedgefielde church." Just as Protestants smashed or removed images in the English Reformation which appeared as grave sacrilege to Catholics, Hixson destroyed books which could be equally offensive to a religion based entirely on the literate reading of the Word. In a last ditch effort to preserve the holy water

stoup just before the dispersal of the short lived rebellion, Hixson hid it in the midden of the church covered with straw saying "Dominus vobiscum."\textsuperscript{194}

It is particularly notable that the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland did not blame Elizabeth directly for their grievances. Keeping in traditional reasons for most rebellions in England, they wanted to depose evil counselors surrounding her for subverting the ancient faith, the status of the nobility, and the rightful succession. Like the Pilgrimage of Grace, the rioters marched carrying banners showing the Five Wounds of Christ. The rebels had a degree of success in capturing the port of Hartlepool and besieging Barnard Castle while those that stayed at home went about the business of dismantling Protestant innovations in worship and restoring traditional religious iconography. Elizabeth and her military advisors mustered up an army of 14,000 strong to send it north in order to quell the northern insurrection in response to panicked letters from county officials warning of imminent rebellions in their own principalities.\textsuperscript{195}

The rebellion, however, quickly ended as 12,000 of the army from the south arrived in December. The earls intended to fight back, but when Leonard Dacre refused to aid them and royal ships arrived at Hartlepool they gave up and fled north to Scotland. The earls intended to revive the Northern Rebellion in Scotland even with most of their men being left behind in the custody of the Crown. They attempted to recruit both Scottish and English people in the border region to continue the fight to restore the true faith. Additionally, a number of Scottish lords became interested in cooperation since they wanted recognition of Mary, Queen of Scots, as an


heir to the English throne and its rightful claimant.\textsuperscript{196} English armies invaded Scotland in pursuit of the rebels, causing much pillaging and destruction while negotiations proceeded for the turning over of the rebels. By September, Scottish lords agreed to a truce in which they would abandon the English rebels. After the September agreement, rebels began fleeing to the continent in large numbers, adding to the numbers of English Catholics in exile since the accession of Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{197}

The significance behind the Northern Rebellion has been a matter of debate among historians. Traditionally, it has been interpreted as strictly a baronial revolt against the breakdown of ancient privilege and the expanding power of the Crown. The barons of the north conspired to place Mary on the throne who, they believed, would be more accommodating to their rights instead of promoting the rise of the gentry. The participants in the rebellion responded to their call out of old loyalty to their feudal overlords and not for any genuine religious reasons.\textsuperscript{198} Phillip Hughes is of the strangely contradictory opinion that the Northern Rebellion was not really a Catholic rising, although the restoration of Catholicism would have followed if it was successful. Hughes characterizes the Rebellion as a mainly feudal rebellion of Catholic lords and their Catholic tenants. He points to the fact that there were Catholic lords on the other side who were indispensible in putting down the rebellion.\textsuperscript{199}

More recently, however, historians have begun to challenge these views. Christopher Haigh agrees that the initial cause for the revolt probably owed little to religious reasons. Elizabeth rejected the northern nobility for office and generally ignored them because of suspicions of where their true loyalties lay, so the northern nobles turned to plotting with their
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gentry confederates. The earls used religion as a means to incite their followers against the Queen when they entered Durham Cathedral to force the celebration of a Catholic mass. Haigh, however, diverges from traditional historiography by stating of the followers that "at least 80 per cent joined the rising for reasons of their own, and religious loyalty was one of the strongest."200

Eamon Duffy sees the Northern Rebellion of 1569 as an instance where the physical remnants of traditional religion could inspire the reversal of the Reformation and a brief restoration of Catholic piety. Massive crowds flocked to celebrate Catholic masses in November 1569 and participated enthusiastically in the ritual burnings of prayer books that often went with them because of the altar stones and holy water stoups being taken out of hiding to be reused once more. The holy water stoups played a particularly important role as people were very much interested in securing sacramentals such as holy water and bread, just as women always sought the traditional churching from their clergymen whether recusant or conformist. The Elizabethan regime made sure to discover the whereabouts of the altar stones and the holy water stoups as they were well aware that such things could provoke further unrest as people longed for the old days of more traditional observances and rituals.201

Nearly all historians have agreed that the cause of the Northern Rebellion was for fundamentally aristocratic reasons, but the fact remains that there was large scale participation by common people. K.J. Kesselring writes that while aristocratic leaders can call for a rebellion, they need popular support for it to materialize as the earl of Wessex discovered in 1601. The Northern Rebellion was put into motion by elite political action which also legitimized it for its participants, but also "the rebellion's popular and religious elements were integral to its causes,
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course, and consequences.\textsuperscript{202} The participants in the Northern Rebellion used iconography and decorations that marked them not as rebels, but as the heirs of a tradition of crusading. They carried banners with the images of saints as well as the Five Wounds of Christ and wore large crucifixes with red crosses painted onto their clothing. The participants in the Prayer Book Rebellion as well as the Pilgrimage of Grace wore very similar decorations which underlines the fact that the participants in all these disturbances were clearly motivated by religious discontent in general, although individuals may have varying personal reasons for embarking on such disturbances. It is no accident as well that the favorite targets of violence among the rebels were married clergy and Protestant fittings to churches. What began as an aristocratic scheme to gain more political influence morphed into a golden opportunity for religious traditionalists to exact vengeance on the symbols of Protestantism such as prayer books and communion tables in an effort to reverse as much of the Reformation as possible.\textsuperscript{203}

By bringing into context the very real religious motivations of common participants in the Northern Rebellion, it suggests that the English Reformation was still far from finished and that traditional religious loyalties played a very important psychological role for the participants. It is very unlikely that any of them had any knowledge of the workings and machinations of the Council of Trent and the papacy, being more motivated by a primal hatred of any new evangelical religious innovation that came about at the expense of traditions that had been kept since time immemorial. Despite the common aim among participants of reversing the English Reformation, what Ethan Shagan says about the ultimate reason behind the collapse of the Pilgrimage of Grace could apply to the Northern Rebellion as well. It is clear that the rebels had short term goals, such as overturning Protestant fittings of worship and intimidating married
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clergy, but their long term objectives remain murky at best. Some, no doubt, wanted nothing less
than a complete overthrow of the Elizabethan regime and the total restoration of Catholicism as
well as papal authority, but it seems more likely that they represented an extreme minority.

Most, however, probably shared the sentiments of the aristocratic leaders that it was evil
counsel to the Queen that lay behind the subversion of the true faith. Although all the attention
has been given to those who participated in the Northern Rebellion, it must be remembered that
the majority of Catholics in England did not participate in the uprising for various reasons,
loyalty to the Crown being the foremost among them as it would continue to be the decisive
factor in why Catholic uprisings against Elizabeth remained limited and ineffective. The Bishop
of Winton recalled a sermon given on Christmas Day and remembered that "to the good liking of
all the papists wherein he took occasion to speake of the rebels in the northe and concluded with
this wordes: The protestants in france rebel against a papist prince: And the papists in England
rebel against a protestant prince: will ye have me to say what I think? They doo bothe naught." The
Northern Rebellion, at least on the part of the majority of the participants, was an inherently
conservative reaction that looked backwards to the English Reformation influenced Marian
Catholicism. Many of the rioters hesitated to burn English Bibles, but also looked even further
still to the then distant medieval past by undertaking a holy and armed pilgrimage of their own to
defend the faith against infidels.

The same, however, cannot be said of the seminary movement of the 1570s and beyond. The
Jesuits imported radical ideas on the nature of authority compared to the rest of the Catholic
community. They did not simply seek a restoration of traditional observances, but rather sought
to remake England into a culture steeped in the new Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation
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which was a goal entirely different from the leaders as well as participants of the Northern Rebellion. The Jesuits, far from being the common conservative reactionary element that characterized resistance to the Reformation thus far, had a modern vision of what Catholicism should look like in England.

2.6 THE PAPAL BULL OF 1570 AND THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

The papal excommunication of Elizabeth was motivated in large part by the Northern Rebellion, despite the little support that could be found for the papacy in the sentiments of those who participated. One of the first acts of the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland was writing a letter to Pius V pleading with him for aid. The letter did not make it to Rome until February 17, 1570, although it was written on November 7, 1569. The pope, however, did not wait for official news of the rebellion to begin laying the groundwork of the excommunication. The trial of Elizabeth had already begun a week before with a number of English exiles in Rome testifying of the suppression of the Catholic clergy with the Oath of Supremacy and the infiltration of heretics to high positions of influence in the English Church.205

Pius V saw the rivalry between Mary Stuart, for whom the Northern Rebellion was primarily started, and Elizabeth as an opportunity issue the excommunication in order to support the Catholic Mary over her cousin Elizabeth. Just as the Northern Rebellion had finally been crushed in February 1570, in that same month Pius decided to issue Regnans in Excelsis. In it, Pius lamented the abolition of the mass and other Catholic ceremonies as well as the removal of faithful Catholic priests and bishops from their parishes. Most especially, he condemned the abjuration of papal authority in England and the punishment of those who refused to recognize
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Elizabeth as the leader of the Church of England. Pius justified his excommunication by feeling he had no other possible choice after seeing the imprisonment of Catholic prelates and parsons as well as the promotion of heretics to high positions of influence in the government. In addition to her excommunication, Pius declared Elizabeth deprived of her pretended title as Queen of England and all privilege that went with it. Most significantly, the fifth article of the papal bull declared all sworn oaths of loyalty to Elizabeth abrogated and commanded "all and singular the nobles, subjects, peoples, and others afore said that they do not dare obey her orders, mandates, and laws." Those who insisted on complying with the political dictates of the crown, Pius declared, would be included in the sentence of excommunication.\footnote{Crosignani, Questier, and McCoog, eds. \textit{Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England}, 88-89.}

The papal bull never once referred to Elizabeth as a legitimate ruler of England, but styled her as the pretended queen of England before any sentence of excommunication was pronounced in the document. In the wording of the deposition, the pope deprived her not of her legitimate right to rule over the kingdom, but her pretended right. Fundamentally, the bull did not call for the deposing of a rightful queen, but rather that Elizabeth never was the rightful occupant of the throne because of her illegitimate birth.\footnote{Arnold Oskar Meyer, \textit{England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth}, 80.} In the country at large, there was a widely shared sentiment of resistance on the attack of Elizabeth's legitimacy. Although Pius had the intention of encouraging Catholics to rise up and overthrow Elizabeth, the very opposite happened. He made a grave miscalculation that the majority of England was really Catholic at heart and that they needed a bit of a shove to set them in the right direction. The excommunication of 1570 burned long in the memory of English people, justifying later bigotry against the Catholic Church and warnings against any ideas of toleration for Catholics in
England. The excommunication failed in its ultimate aim since Pius had been misinformed by partisans as to the number and extent of Catholics in England.\textsuperscript{208}

Even among many Catholics in England, there was a sense of disgust with the actions taken by the nobility in the Northern Rebellion, as shown earlier in the Bishop of Winton's sermon in London. The papal bull of excommunication caused a great deal of consternation among English Catholics as they gradually became aware of it thanks to the work of the missionaries who generally desired to remain as apolitical as possible and simply to be left alone. Most crucially, it set the political context of why the Jesuits launched the English mission. From 1570 on, the Elizabethan government began to take a much harder look at Catholics in England, despite whatever protestations of loyalty they may have made. In particular, the Jesuits were singled out as enemies of the state as they took a direct oath of loyalty to the Holy See that pronounced the sentence of excommunication and were very much a part of the Counter-Reformation that battled the spread of Protestantism throughout Europe. Indeed, the Elizabethan government took very literally Ignatius Loyola's famous declaration in his \textit{Spiritual Exercises} that "we ought always to hold that the white which I see, is black, if the Hierarchical Church so decides it."\textsuperscript{209}

Although the Jesuits and a number of the Catholic clergy took the papal bull seriously, most English Catholics wanted to remove themselves as distantly from the proclamation as possible. As a result of the papal bull, examinations of Catholics increased due to greater anxiety on the part of government officials that there was going to be an imminent uprising among the Catholic population. The interrogators put several questions to Catholics concerning their
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personal opinions on the state of political affairs between the papacy and the crown. For the first question, it was asked if they were merely aware of the proclamation that absolved subjects of their allegiance to Elizabeth, to which the examinees responded that they were always faithful subjects but still Catholic ones. The examined Catholics insisted they were wrongfully punished just for practicing their religion by not coming to church and for the sheltering of seminary and Jesuit priests. It is interesting to point out that although the Jesuits and a few seminarians had different ideas on political obedience to the pope, lay Catholics did not consider it an offense against the crown to shelter them since they performed the central duties of administering the Sacraments, which was and still is vital to the Catholic faith. Then it was asked whether the pope had any authority to absolve subjects of obedience to Elizabeth, to which they responded that Catholic priests did not encourage them to be rebellious subjects and claimed that their priests told them that although the Bishop of Rome could err as a man, he could not err as pope.

According to the examination, when it was asked if the papal bull itself had any force in proclaiming that Elizabeth was no true queen of England, the examinees tended to divide on this question. Some responded "that it is a doubtful question, tnot to be answerd uppon a sodayne, and some of theym hathe sayd plainly that the poop e hathe authorytie to depose hir majestie, and no one of theym that have dyed for treason wold deny the poopes authorytie in this case." To the examiner, this was all the evidence he needed to proclaim that this ostensible disloyalty was not only the result of the Catholic clergy instructing recusants that attending church was to be in schism with the institutional Catholic Church, but also that it must have meant that the priests were teaching that all true subjects to the Queen were in turn schismatics. He goes on to recommend that "it most please hir majest to subvert and supplante this traytorous recusancye, so farre as partayne to the obedience to hir supreme government against poopishe treason."\(^\text{210}\)

\(^{210}\) "Prevarications and Pleas of Popish Recusants, when Questioned at their Examinations." Lansdowne MS 97/10,
It is clear from this document that one can see a marked shift in the perception of English Catholics, but there is also evidence that the influence of the newly arrived Jesuits and seminary priests began to have a subtle effect on the attitudes of the Catholic community at large regarding recusancy. Although the recusants regarded themselves as following true religion by not attending church and by keeping foreign-trained priests safe, they did not consider themselves disloyal subjects. Even though some may have admitted that the pope had authority to depose Elizabeth, that did not necessarily mean they were prepared to enforce such a decree either out of residual loyalty to the crown that trumped whatever orders that came from Rome or simply because they felt it would be too dangerous to follow on the papal bull. While the examiner paints all recusants as treasonous subjects egged on by foreign priests and church hierarchy, in truth the majority of nonjuring laymen made sort of a compromise between the commands of their clergy and those of the Elizabethan regime. They agreed not to attend church and give shelter to Catholic priests, but at the same time they chose not to obey the political decrees of the papacy despite the best attempts of some of the seminary priests and the Jesuits to persuade them to do otherwise.

Historians have often noted the dramatic effect the papal excommunication had on the treatment of Catholics in England as well as the effect or lack thereof it had on the nature of recusancy and loyalist sentiments of English Catholics. Phillip Hughes writes of the liberating effect that the excommunication had on the English Catholic who was anxious to know what the Pope thought of Elizabeth or those who were tormented with reconciling obedience to the crown with their faith. It made a clear statement to Catholics in England who wished to rise in arms against the queen that they were free in conscience to do so, although in reality very few were
willing to go beyond recusancy because of the fact that the Northern Rebellion had been put down.²¹¹

Dickens observes the visitation records in Yorkshire of Archbishop Thomas Young in 1567 and argues that "the evidence of these years points, not in the direction of actual recusancy, but towards a vague conservatism, an uncertainty in the popular mind regarding the reformed religious practice of the established church."²¹² Dickens admits for a handful of recusants, but he stresses the fact that they were very rare and they were not part of a coherent movement adamantly opposed to communication with the Church of England. There was no widespread recusancy in York in the late 1560s, but there was an acute lack of enthusiasm for evangelicalism and a general reluctance to adhere to the Elizabethan Religious Settlement as well as the survival of old medieval religious traditions.²¹³ Not until between 1575 and 1577 was there a sudden increase in the number of recusants, which Dickens ascribes to the presence of Henry Cumberford and several other seminary priests.²¹⁴ It was only when seminary priests made people aware of the excommunication that recusancy came to exist on any large scale, Dickens implies.

In Lancashire, however, Christopher Haigh shows that recusancy was already well-established and increasing before the excommunication. A combination of the Northern Rebellion and the papal bull pressed the Elizabethan authorities into a more thorough detection of recusancy as they began to view it as a more urgent threat.²¹⁵ Diverging from all past historiography, Stefania Tutino argues that the papal bull had no real immediate effect on a
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political level on the Catholic community. Only in 1585 did Elizabeth declare the Jesuits and missionary priests traitors and subject them to execution upon capture, which in turn implies that the mission of the Society of Jesus, which started at the end of 1580, was the main cause. Despite this, the excommunication did have a real and immediate theoretical effect on how Catholics approached the relation between religion and politics. An observant Catholic could no longer refuse to swear the Oath of Supremacy while still feeling that he was remaining loyal to the Queen as an earthly monarch and was also further constrained by having to prove his faith by denying the political legitimacy of the Queen. In other words, from 1570 and onwards "'non-conformism' and 'loyalism' somehow changed meaning."\textsuperscript{216}

2.7 CONCLUSION

The Elizabethan Settlement attempted to settle religious matters once and for all, but as it produced a Puritan faction displeased at its moderate nature it also provoked the disapproval of religious conservatives. The displeasure that Puritans and Catholics shared, however, did not alone equate to traitorous intentions. Catholic polemicists of the 1560s were more interested in debating theological issues and demonstrating how the current English Church was not continuous with the medieval church in England. On the whole, they never questioned Elizabeth's legitimacy to rule the realm as the Jesuits would later come to doubt.

The Northern Rebellion signaled an opportunity to Pius VIII who had been looking for an excuse to bring England back into the Catholic Church. Pius attempted to stir up popular resistance among English Catholics to Elizabeth's rule by issuing her excommunication, but in reality he only made a difficult situation even more convoluted for Catholic laymen and clergy in

England as they sought ways to reconcile their faith with remaining loyal subjects. Mass participation in the Northern Rebellion was largely motivated out of sympathy for traditional religious rituals and practices, but the papacy used the whole episode as a cover to launch its own project of bringing England firmly in line with the Counter-Reformation.

The excommunication of Elizabeth was engineered in Rome, unlike the outburst of religious discontent that characterized first the Pilgrimage of Grace and then the Rising in the North for the majority of the participants. After the excommunication, all English Catholics, fairly or not, were viewed as a potentially dangerous sect awaiting orders from Rome to begin another upheaval aimed at overthrowing Elizabeth and reversing all religious progress made during the sixteenth century. In reality this was far from the case, although Rome and London would have liked to see it this way. The later arrival of the Jesuits and foreign trained seminary priests confirmed the worst fears of the English government that there really was a Catholic conspiracy aimed at nothing less than fulfilling the directive of the papal bull by bringing the Counter-Reformation to England. Considering the non-revolutionary nature of Catholicism in England during the 1560s and the efforts that Catholics made to compromise with the Elizabethan government as well as the Catholic Church in the aftermath of the excommunication of Elizabeth, it is clear that the foundations were already laid for a Catholic laity unreceptive to the ideas of the Jesuits that the pope's political directives should be obeyed.
CHAPTER 3

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SEMINARY AT DOUAI AND THE ENGLISH MISSION OF 1580

3.1 INTRODUCTION

As seen in the previous chapter, there was hardly any direct political confrontation between English Catholics and the government in the first quarter of Elizabeth's reign. Leading figures of the Catholic community, mostly in exile, scarcely questioned the legitimacy of Elizabeth and preferred to focus on questions of continuity between the medieval and post-Reformation Church of England. The Northern Rebellion, on the popular level, was motivated out of hatred towards Protestant developments in religion rather than any animus towards the person of the Queen. Pope Pius V completely misjudged the situation and issued the excommunication of Elizabeth as he was ignorant of a long tradition of obedience to the monarchy throughout the English Reformation no matter what displeasure occurred over religious changes.

The present chapter offers a new interpretation of the English Mission of 1570 by keeping it in the context of the earlier English Reformation. By the time Edmund Campion and Robert Persons undertook the mission to England, they had to contend not only with hostility from the government, but also with a largely unreceptive audience among English Catholics who did not share Campion's or Persons's belief that the Catholic Church must be restored at any cost.
Small numbers of English Catholics did give shelter to foreign-trained missionaries and sympathized with their sufferings, but even among these most zealous Catholics few supported the ultimate goal that Campion and Persons had in mind. The emergence of a public sphere of the printed word in which Campion and Persons debated their Protestant opponents William Charke and Meredith Hanmer gave the Jesuits a way to agitate for the reversal of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. The polemical works of Campion and Persons provide a stark contrast to the culture of obedience that ran strongly throughout the English Catholic community. While imprisoned, Campion performed admirably, perhaps heroically, in the face of unrelenting torture and a series of forced disputation in unfavorable circumstances with multiple Protestant opponents debating him at the same time. Campion displayed unparalleled bravery in his martyrdom but also defiance and separation to the last as he refused to pray with any Protestants. Historians have traditionally seen Campion as a very inspiring figure to the whole of the English Catholic community.\(^{217}\) The fact remains, however, that Campion failed to motivate a groundswell of popular support for the Catholic Church and the reversal of the Elizabethan Settlement. Campion's inspiration was largely confined to the Jesuits, as he inspired successive waves of Jesuit missionaries to continue the struggle for the restoration of the Catholic Church in England while the vast majority of English Catholics remained steadfast in their loyalty to Elizabeth.

The inauguration of the English College at Douai and the infiltration of Jesuit priests into England in conjunction with the papal bull marked a new phase in the English Reformation. Instead of Catholicism and Catholic practice coming into conflict with the Elizabethan Settlement, the Catholic Church became personally involved in a direct confrontation with the

---

English government of the late sixteenth century. It was one thing to deny the legitimacy of Elizabeth from safety in Rome, but it was quite another to undermine her right to rule in England itself. Edmund Campion and Robert Persons were the two Jesuit priests chosen for the dangerous mission to England in 1580. Ostensibly, they went to England strictly for religious purposes and were instructed by Everard Mercurian, then the Superior General of the Jesuits, to stay out of political subversion entirely. Yet as the very text of Campion's "Challenge to the Privy Council" called for the reestablishment of the Catholic Church in England, this was a not so thinly veiled threat to the rule of Elizabeth as her legitimacy was inextricably bound with the Church of England, thanks to her parentage from Anne Boleyn. The "Challenge to the Privy Council" provoked a response from preeminent Church of England ministers such as Meredith Hanmer and William Charke who pointed to Campion and the Jesuits' direct associations with the papacy as evidence that he and Persons were there to stir up Catholic subjects into an open revolt. Robert Persons disputed Hanmer and Charke's claims that the Jesuits were primarily a political organization by pointing out that the Jesuit order was founded primarily to follow the Catholic faith more strictly which, to him, would necessarily preclude any meddling in political affairs. Charke responded to Persons that his insistence of strict adherence to the Catholic Church caused him to follow the dictates of the pope over Elizabeth, which was contrary to biblical commands to obey secular authority. Hanmer believed that the Jesuits were prideful in calling themselves Jesuits and stated that the move to identify themselves with Jesus was an attempt at hiding their essentially political motivations.

Campion was not yet done with stirring up controversy, however, as he turned to publish *Decem Rationes* which was more focused on pointing out what he saw as errors in Protestant belief while defending Catholic doctrine instead of criticizing the Reformation in England as
begun by Henry VIII and continued by Elizabeth. In particular, Campion defended the final authority of the Catholic Church to interpret the Bible and stressed the ecclesiological doctrine of Apostolic Succession. William Whitaker quickly responded to Campion this time, saying that the Catholic Church had no right to decide the meaning of Biblical passages and that Apostolic Succession was not necessary for the legitimacy of a body of Christian believers.

Campion, however, was not the only figure to stir up controversy. Robert Persons, in his *Reasons of Refusall*, restated the argument that William Allen had made earlier that recusancy was the only acceptable state for a faithful Catholic, but this time he based his reasoning on earlier arguments made by John Wyclif and Martin Luther, who both believed that following one's conscience was more important than obeying laws against religion. Allen, too, wrote in defense of the Jesuits' mission to England, stating that they were there not to instigate an armed rebellion, but rather a peaceful reconversion of England to the Catholic Church. Peaceful reconversion, however, was still alarming to government officials as they saw the ending of the Church of England as revolutionary.

Campion's ministry in England was relatively short-lived as he was imprisoned and interrogated under torture. Campion was made to submit to a long series of disputes over three days with the best Protestant theologians that the Church of England could muster. The disputation between Campion and his opponents in the Tower of London covered many topics of Christian theology as Campion echoed his beliefs in the "Ten Reasons" that the Catholic Church was the final authority in all religious matters and that it was the only true Christian church because of Apostolic Succession. After the government saw that Campion could not be defeated in a theological debate, Campion and six other priests were put on trial, accused of plotting to assassinate Elizabeth as well as to reestablish the Catholic Church in England and to
destroy the Church of England. In his defense, Campion responded that he was there only to preach and administer the Sacraments, notwithstanding his friendly remarks towards the participants in the Northern Rebellion. He rejected the "guilt by association" tactic that the Elizabethan authorities used to convict him, saying that he never directly participated in any plot, although admitting that he did have incidental contact with those who were involved in political intrigue. Despite what Campion said, his show trial came to a predictable end with his sentencing to death at Tyburn. Campion's martyrdom was put to full use by Catholic authors such as Robert Persons and Thomas Alfield. Conversely, Protestant opponents like Anthony Munday and then most famously Lord Burghley sought to portray his execution as a traitor's death.

3.2 THE JESUIT CHALLENGE TO THE TRADITION OF CONFORMITY

It was not Cardinal William Allen's original intention to build a seminary that would serve as the launching point for the spiritual reconquering of England. It was initially planned as one sanctuary among many others in the exiled English Catholic community, as a college for theological study. Gradually, however, Allen came to realize that not only should it be a place where "our countrymen scattered abroad in different places might live and study together more profitably than apart," but a place where theological training of new priests might take the place of the Marian clergy that would surely die off with no hope of replacements. It is notable, however, that Allen originally planned to train priests not to send them into England while Elizabeth still reigned, but to hold them back in anticipation of another Catholic restoration that might follow the end of Elizabeth's reign.²¹⁸ Not only that, Allen thought that the Elizabethan Religious Settlement weakened the overall state of learning among both Protestant and Catholic

clergy and wanted to use the new seminary as an opportunity to fill in the void. The idea of an English mission was due more to Allen's new recruits rather than himself, since Allen was more a part of the old Marian establishment. Men like Gregory Martin, Robert Parsons, and Edmund Campion were all very much products of Elizabethan England and were therefore more open to new methods even though they rejected its theological foundations. Allen became increasingly under the influence of the Jesuits until he was persuaded of the need to transform the college into a seminary. He fell under Jesuit influence so much that he introduced Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* as required reading and discipline for all students at the seminary. The first missionary to England was dispatched in 1574 with the English College in Rome being founded shortly thereafter, whereas the English Jesuits came to England in 1580. Allen later became an enthusiastic proponent of the missionary movement to England and insisted on sending priests to England instead of waiting for better times; as he stated, "better times were achieved by working, not by waiting."  

The excommunication of Elizabeth in 1570 was certainly an important milestone in the history of the Catholic community, but the Jesuit mission to England in 1580 could be seen as the first stages of the attempted fulfillment of Pope Pius V's injunction to conscientious Catholics to undermine the Religious Settlement and ultimately overthrow Elizabeth. Edmund Campion and Robert Persons were chosen for the mission by the Society of Jesus with little debate, according to Henry More. They were the most experienced and best known of the English Jesuits since the remaining English people who had entered the Society of Jesus either had not completed their training or were sent to other and more distant places to minister.  

---
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Campion had returned from Prague and joined Persons in Rome, they set out with instructions from Everard Mercurian that they should not have anything to do with the political affairs of England either in the spoken or written word. Campion and Persons left Rome with a small company of twelve and made their way to Rheims. More, however, uses an interesting choice of words to describe this ostensibly apolitical mission to England. He writes of Allen receiving them with elation since "The company which was to strike fear into the enemy could only be a source of pride to the generals in the campaign, and a spur to imitate them as companions of their perils." The Elizabethan authorities were well aware of the English mission from its very inception in Rome, thanks to an elaborate intelligence network of spies in Rheims and even Rome. They drew up a registry of names and even posted pictures of Campion and Persons nearly everywhere in England. In order to confound the pursuivants, the company of priests decided to land in different places at different times.222

Although Campion did his best to remain secret, he performed his duties as a priest almost too well. He administered the Sacraments in a very decorous and impressive way borne out of his devotion which attracted unwanted attention from hostile observers. On the feast of Saints Peter and Paul, he gave an impressive sermon on the rightness of the Catholic Church and the iniquity of those who persecuted it. In a precursor to his declaration in his Challenge to the Privy Council, in the sermon he declared that the Protestants would never succeed in destroying the Catholic Church in England. As Campion moved about and preached sermons and celebrated Mass, it was impossible to keep from the attention of the Privy Council indefinitely
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because his exact location was not known for certain at the time. In part inspired by Campion, new priests began infiltrating England in Campion's wake.\textsuperscript{223}

During the English Mission, the seminarians and the older Marian priests entered into a conference, in which Campion and Persons was present, on the details of what Catholicism should look like in England. They soon entered into one of the first arguments out of many that would come to define the nature of Catholicism in Elizabethan England. The new priests who entered into England, firmly influenced by customs in continental Europe, were very mindful that England once had more feast days as well as fast days than anywhere in Christendom. The Marian clergy wanted to hold fast to the older customs of Catholicism in England while the newly arrived seminarians wanted to enforce conformity to the Counter-Reformation. Not only that, the debate on recusancy versus conformity was revived. While it was noted that people were required by law to communicate regularly with the Church of England on Sundays, More claims that the prevailing view at the meeting was that it was impermissible for any faithful Catholic to attend Anglican worship services. The reasoning was that communication with the Church of England was against proper Catholic doctrine. Additionally, in the eyes of the government, attendance indicated the acceptance of Protestant beliefs and conformity which prevailed over private misgivings. While some Catholics could still attend Church of England services and be sufficiently strong enough to resist the heretical preaching of Anglican ministers, most ordinary Catholics would inevitably succumb and lapse into heresy from the temptation of immunity to fines, lax moral behavior, and a pale imitation of the true faith. The meeting between the Catholic clergy in England reinforced the decrees of the Council of Trent and also the later declaration on the matter by Cardinal Toledo who proclaimed that communicating with

\textsuperscript{223} Ibid, 81.
the Church of England was not only detrimental to worship of true religion but also implied acceptance of Protestant theology.\textsuperscript{224}

While Campion and Persons were working within England, William Allen continued writing in defense of the missionary efforts. Allen was determined to show that English Catholics were not plotting an overthrow of Elizabeth. In his \textit{Apologie and true declaration}, he attempted to shield the English College in Rome as well as Rheims against charges of treason. Allen justified the reason having English seminaries abroad by claiming that English Catholic clergy were often harassed and persecuted at every turn, which made it necessary to relocate outside of the country in order that they "might haue the exercise of our religion, and freedom of conscience from constrainte to any other contrarie vnto our profession."\textsuperscript{225} Allen did not see the mission to England as part of a forcible overthrow of the government, but rather as peaceful "scholastical attempts, for the conversion of our Countrie and reconcilement of our brethren to the Catholike Church." Allen vigorously denied the charges that he traveled to Rome in order to associated with rebels or traitors against the Queen and stated flatly that he never saw writings that were mentioned in the 1580 Proclamation of July that detailed an alliance between the Pope, the king of Spain, and other Catholic powers to invade England.\textsuperscript{226}

By July 1580, Campion decided to withdraw with Persons from London to a small village on the outskirts in order to avoid increased surveillance. It was there that Thomas Pounde, a fellow Jesuit, had warned Campion and Persons that the government was spreading slanderous charges and that something must be done to prevent them from being believed. Pounde made the suggestion that both Campion and Persons write responses to charges leveled by the Elizabethan
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government by outlining the reasons behind the Jesuit mission to England. They agreed to do so, and Persons wrote “A Confession of Faith addressed to the Magistrates of London,” while Campion wrote “To the Right Honourable Lords of Her Majestie’s Privy Council.” Campion’s pamphlet received far more attention than Persons's.227

The Elizabethan authorities saw the publication of Campion's “Challenge to the Privy Council,” better known as “Campion's Brag” as it was called by Protestants, as an ominous threat to the Religious Settlement and consequently the legitimacy of Elizabeth as queen. “Campion's Brag” started out innocently enough, as he proclaimed that the reason he traveled back to England in the first place was “to minister the Sacraments, to instruct the simple, to reforme sinners, to confute errors -- in brief to crie alarme spiritual against foul vice and proud ignorance, wherewith many my dear Countrymen are abused.” In effect, Campion echoed the claims of the other Jesuits that they were being persecuted for the simple act of spreading religious beliefs. Campion also proclaimed upfront that he was forbidden to meddle in any political affairs since they did not relate directly to his vocation in England of administering the Sacraments. Campion, however, did issue a challenge to any Protestant who would dare to debate him on matters of religion in order to show errors in Protestant theology and doctrine as well as prove the rightness of the Catholic faith. Most alarmingly to the Elizabethan authorities, Campion proclaimed the inevitable triumph of the restoration of the Catholic Church in England to its previous position of dominance. Campion stated emphatically that the Jesuits would be relentless in their pursuit of the hegemony of the Catholic Church in England as long as all of them were willing to endure torture, imprisonment, and execution for the sake of the ancient faith. Campion claimed that God had predestined the eventual triumph of Catholicism in

writing, "The expense is reckoned, the enterprise is begun; it is of God, it cannot be withstood. So the faith was planted: so it must be restored."228

Campion’s "Challenge" went far from unanswered by Protestant polemicsists. Immediately, Meredith Hanmer took it upon himself to refute Campion. Hanmer contested Campion’s claim that he was there simply to preach the Gospel by drawing a political link between his preaching and the papacy. He claimed that it was by the vestment of the pope that Campion was a preacher. Hanmer leveled the charge against Campion that he was really there to preach the political supremacy of the pope and to emphasize the merits of human tradition and works above the Scriptures and faith. Hanmer concentrated upon the direct link between the Jesuits and the papacy to emphasize that they were obeying the dictates of a foreign power against the will of the queen which equated to treason, and also stated that Campion should look to his own church to confute errors first since they numbered infinitely in the church of Rome. Hanmer also made particular note that the wandering abroad of Campion’s fellow Jesuits was comparable to the heretics of old such as the Donatists who sought to spread their heretical doctrines to as many people that would listen.229

William Charke also felt compelled to reply to Campion but was very suspicious of Campion’s offer for a disputation. Charke claimed that although Campion and his allies call for a debate, “their forerunners, and fathers in poperie refuse the same.” He saw a disputation begun by the Jesuits as an opportunity for them to deceive people who may not be particularly knowledgeable about religion through false arguments and deceptions. While Campion and his
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confederates wanted a disputation, Charke says it was they who refused a lawful debate. Charke views the Gospels as the very bedrock of loyalty to the English state, and he fears that the Jesuits sought to “withdrawe many of her Maiesties subiects from the loue of the Gospel, whereby they are taught to their owne saluation: and consequently from regard of themselues, & from obedience to her Maiesties most noble and godly proceedings.” For Campion’s claim of preaching the Gospels and ministering the Sacraments, Charke says that he preaches against the Gospel in following the commands of the Pope, and the Sacraments he wanted to minister had no foundation in Scripture. The few quotations of Scripture that Campion did make were ultimately corrupted through using the interpretation of human tradition. Charke conflates the Jesuits’ obedience to the Pope with obedience to the enemy of the Queen and therefore an enemy of God who rightfully ordained Elizabeth to rule over England.

The debate, however, did not end with Hanmer’s and Charke’s responses, as Robert Persons took it upon himself to defend Campion immediately in A brief censure. Persons took special umbrage with William Charke’s characterization of the Jesuits as “a blasphemous sect.” Persons defined a sect not by political loyalty, but by separation from the religious beliefs of the Catholic Church. He also stated that Jesuits “lead a different and more strayte lyfe in those poyntes, then the common sorte” which could delineate themselves as a sect, just as biblical figures such as John the Baptist could be called sectaries if defined in that way. Persons compared Hanmer’s dislike of religious orders such as the Jesuits to the Donatist heretic Petilian’s slandering of monasteries and monks. The church fathers had all written favorably of religious orders and it was decidedly unchristian for Hanmer to have such a base hatred for them.

---
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Persons also countered Hanmer’s claim that the Jesuits have little legitimacy since they were founded only thirty years ago by saying there was little difference between Jesuits and Protestants in that they both came into being around the same time. While the Protestant belief began but thirty years ago, Jesuits resolved to follow the ancient faith of the Catholic Church in a more disciplined way than any previous religious order by preaching freely and without meddling in state affairs. Persons noted that Hanmer and Charke contemptuously viewed their founder, Ignatius Loyola, as a soldier, but Persons emphatically stated that Loyola lived a life of exemplary Christian charity and virtue, while the founder of Protestantism, Martin Luther, spread false and blasphemous doctrines that tended toward “al libertie and carnalitie.”\(^{233}\)

It is curious that Persons chose Martin Luther to compare against Ignatius Loyola over Henry VIII, who was more directly responsible for the religious state of affairs in England. This was possibly in an effort to win over the common English reader who felt a deep residual loyalty toward the Crown no matter the religious or political situation of England. Persons additionally sought to depict Protestantism in England as something foreign by identifying it with Martin Luther despite the majority view among both Protestants and many Catholics that the Jesuits were the foreigners. Persons then addressed the ostensible paradox of being an enemy of the state while embracing religion not officially sponsored by the state. He observed the Protestants under Mary were not considered traitors as well as Protestant minorities in other countries. Persons also mentioned that religious doctrine from Luther, Wycliffe, and Calvin could be potentially more dangerous than Catholic teaching since they taught “that subiects are not bound
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to obey their Princes for conscience sake, but that if the Prince rule amisse they are free, to
restraine and punish him at their pleasure.”

Not long after Persons defended Campion, Charke replied to his defense of Campion.
Charke insisted that the Jesuits had a politically disloyal agenda and found it very hard to believe
that their seditious sentiments in their preaching were done in the name of freedom of conscience
and religion. Charke also claimed that although Persons hardly ever mentioned the pope in his
Censure, that he was “your lorde and father, and to you nearer and deerer, then either the Prince,
or the loue of your countrey.” Charke also disputed Persons’s definition of sectary by saying
that he had it confused with heresy, because all heretics are sectaries but not all sectaries are
heretics. According to Charke, a sect was a group of people that differ from everyone else in
religion in the matter of profession, and the fact that they followed special rules that
differentiated them from everyone else made them to an even greater degree sectarian. Charke
addressed the accusation from Persons that their faith began with Martin Luther and instead
asserts that the majority religion in England was handed down from the Jews of the Bible and
built upon by Christ and the Apostles. It is clear, however, that Charke respected Martin
Luther a great deal since “the Lord opened his eyes to see, and framed his heart to withstande the
kingdome of Satan and Antichrist.”

Charke's reply to Persons insists that true religion teaches submission to national secular
authority, which made him closer to the political views of the Catholic community than Persons,
despite holding contrary religious beliefs. The Jesuit brand of Catholicism emphasized the
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obedience of subjects to a foreign power in the person of the Pope. It was not Calvin, Wycliff, and Luther who formulated potentially traitorous doctrines against secular rulers as they taught submission at all times. Luther, according to Charke, placed obedience to the magistrate next to obedience to God, and Calvin described the magistrate’s authority as “most lawfull and holy.” The injunction “it is better to obey God then man” allows for no rebellion at all, but rather instructs subjects to offer submission to the magistrate and obey the state with patient suffering. The Jesuits, on the other hand, encouraged disobedience and sedition for the sake of conscience and rebellion with papal bulls and condemnations.²³⁹

Meredith Hanmer, though a Protestant, also viewed the Jesuits like many English Catholics in his short treatise, *The Iesuites banner*. Hanmer claimed that the Jesuits should rather be named Ignatians or Loyolans rather than Jesuits, although their vain pride caused them to identify themselves as the Society of Jesus. Their idolatrous nature caused the Jesuits to identify their founder Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier with the biblical prophets. Hanmer makes a curious parallel between the Jesuits and the Family of Love, by saying that both groups believe that God dwells within them and that they held a perfect union with God, declaring, “This socieitie of Iesu, is chiefly ordained for the offices of loue and charitie to be performed towards al men.” Hanmer, like Charke, views the Jesuits as incessantly prideful and contrary to the humble nature of Jesus. Far from being Christ-like, they used the name of Jesus as cover for their political machinations.²⁴⁰

Campion’s *Challenge to the Privy Council* had a highly significant influence on the political and religious situation of early modern England. The dialogue between Campion and
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Persons and their Protestant adversaries Hanmer and Charke showed how much the Jesuits differed from the traditional practice of English Catholics to stay as apolitical as possible and even go to some lengths to conform as far as their consciences would allow. Michael Questier and Peter Lake see the discourse between Persons, Campion, Charke, and Hanmer as the inauguration of a distinctly political character of the 1580 English mission. Campion and Persons repeatedly claimed that they had no desire to meddle in political affairs and that they were only there to administer to the already existing Catholic community. Even though there is no direct evidence that Campion and Persons engaged in political subversion, in *Campion's Brag*, Campion went beyond reaffirming the spiritual nature of the English mission. He issued a direct challenge to the privy council to allow him freedom of discourse on religion and even wished that the queen would attend to at least convince her to relax her persecution of Catholics. The responses of Campion and Persons to Hanmer and Charke called into question the nature of the mission. It had become "no longer a purely pastoral attempt to provide instruction, counsel, and sacramental grace to English Catholics (of the sort originally envisaged by Mercurian), the mission had become a full frontal, public challenge to the Elizabethan state's construal of the Catholic issue in terms of secular obedience and treason."\(^{241}\)

The publishing of the *Challenge to the Privy Council* made Campion’s task that much more difficult as he was forced to go into hiding while he began his ministry to the Catholic community of England. Campion's message, however, was considerably well received in the North, as More claimed. Many people in the North long remembered Campion's sermons and they flocked to them in such great numbers and men of noble families often attended. Campion's preaching, however, fell on deaf ears among the common people with Protestant sympathies as

they interpreted it as an empty boast meant to pave the way for an invasion of England by seducing subjects to the Catholic faith. Campion, however, was not concerned with their opinion as his discourse was addressed directly to the leaders of the realm and the universities.242

While he traveled about the country, Campion published his *Decem Rationes* addressed to the university theologians and professors which outlined what he saw as the fundamental flaws with Protestantism while simultaneously defending Catholicism from criticism and accusations by Protestants. The *Decem Rationes* was an exposition of points first raised in the *Challenge to the Privy Council*. He repeated his initial challenge and criticized his opponents for slanderous attacks on the Society of Jesus as well as the Catholic Church instead of actually agreeing to a debate. It was not from prideful arrogance that Campion thought he would win a debate, but from strong and compelling reasons on which his arguments were built.243 Campion's main objective in writing the *Decem Rationes* was to show how Scripture, Apostolic Succession, and Church Councils along with the Church Fathers justified the existence of the Catholic Church.244 It took very little time for Campion to elicit a response from William Whitaker, the Master of St. John’s College at Cambridge and a leading Protestant divine. Whitaker took it upon himself to attempt to confute each of Campion’s reasons. In refuting Campion’s arguments, Whitaker was primarily concerned with showing the continuity of the Church of England with the early Christian Church. At the same time, he sought to prove that
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Campion and the Catholic Church represented a break with Scripture and the teachings of the Church Fathers.\textsuperscript{245}

The \textit{Decem Rationes} and Whitaker’s response could be seen as the fulfillment of Campion’s \textit{Challenge to the Privy Council} in which he offered to have a disputation with the most learned university theologians and scholars. Most writers in the Catholic community, including at least Allen at this time, were not interested in undermining the theological reasoning behind Protestantism and the Religious Settlement. Rather, most Catholic apologists prior to Campion sought to justify recusancy as a matter of principled conscience while shying away from going on the offensive against Protestant theology in a disputation. It is notable that throughout the \textit{Decem Rationes}, Campion made very little actual reference to the English Reformation and the Church of England’s repression of the Catholic faith, preferring instead to concentrate on the continental Reformation, possibly in an effort to keep up the appearance of remaining a loyal subject to the Crown.

Such academic debates held little relevance to the Catholic community in England at large, but Campion stayed true to Jesuit form by engaging in learned disputation with Protestant opponents. It is very likely that many English Catholics were unfamiliar with the finer points of the \textit{Decem Rationes}, such as that concerning the legitimacy of councils or questions of which books in the Bible were canonical and which were apocryphal. Campion represented an extreme minority of Catholics in England, but for better or for worse he came to represent the popular image of the seditious papist in the English imagination. Although Campion could be considered very radical in his views on religion in England, even among the Catholic laity and clergy, it is

\textsuperscript{245} William Whitaker, \textit{Ad rationes decem Edmundi Campiani Iesuitae quibus fretus certamen Anglicanae ecclesiae ministris obtulit in causa fidei, responsio Guilelmi Whitakeri}. (London 1581) \textit{Early English Books Online}. 
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arguable whether or not he improved the station of Catholics in England. While it is true that he emboldened a great number of Catholics to remain steadfast in the profession of their religion, either through recusancy or subversive conformity, he simultaneously made daily life much more difficult for the majority of Catholics as they came to be viewed with even greater suspicion that they were questioning the reasoning behind central Protestant beliefs.

Although Campion loomed a much larger figure than Persons in the English mission, Persons did not stop writing his own polemical attacks against the church of England. Persons, however, was more concerned with elucidating the reasons why Catholics should refrain from communicating with the Church of England. His insistence on recusancy mirrored that of Cardinal William Allen's in his 1580 treatise *Reasons of Refusall.* It is clear throughout the tract that Persons paid lip service to being a humble and loyal subject, despite the very fact he was encouraging Catholic recusancy which the government viewed not only as unorthodox and superstitious, but, more importantly, dangerous political subversion because of cold relations with the Papacy. He even went so far as to dedicate this writing to Elizabeth herself, "the Queenes most excellent Maiestie."\(^{246}\)

Not far into the treatise, it is evident that Persons had an intimate familiarity with Protestantism as he himself had passed through a phase of Protestant conviction.\(^{247}\) He uses leading Protestant figures' arguments against the persecution of Catholics in England in an ingenious method. He cites John Wycliff who once stated "that a prince if he rule euil or fal into mortal sinne, is no longer Prince, but that his subiectes may rise against him and punishe him at their pleasures" as well as Martin Luther who proclaimed "That Christians are free & exempted


from al Princes lawes."  He also draws a direct parallel between the situation of Huguenots in France and Catholics in England by quoting Calvin "That Princes lawes binde not subjects to obedience, but only for external and temporal respect." 248

Taking the offensive, Persons also made an argument, one that would be taken more seriously by the later Stuart dynasty, that Puritans represented a bigger threat to the crown than did Catholics. Persons stereotyped all Puritans as having the final goal of having no ruler or governor at all in faith, while the refusal of Catholics to attend church was ultimately harmless. 249 Persons took a very low view of forcing men to act against their conscience. He stated, with little basis in historical fact, that all secular rulers in the past had never forced their subjects to act against their consciences in religion. He did note, however, with a degree of accuracy, that among "the very Turkes at this day, no man is compelled to any act of their religion, except he renounce his owne." Persons also observed that in the New World, where Indians were subject to Spain and the Catholic faith, that they were not held to perform any religious act against their consciences. Persons reasoned that participating in religion against conscience is a sin unto itself and those who enforced the breaking of conscience were committing a more grievous sin. 250

Persons's emphasis on recusancy as being the only state for conscientious Catholics, however, obscured the fact that around 1580 there were many Catholics who did conform to the Church of England for a multitude of reasons, as Alexandra Walsham makes clear in Church Papists. English Catholicism in the late sixteenth century was far from a solid group of non-conformists and more like an amorphous group not unlike the Puritans. Church papistry made
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249 Persons, 11.
Catholicism much more accessible to a broader section of the populace instead of being strictly confined to an elite non-conformism of the upper classes. Additionally, while church leaders such as Robert Persons attacked conformity in print, in private priests tended to condone it. The leaders of the mission engaged in a sophisticated print propaganda campaign to deny the legitimacy of compromise with the Church of England, but they also began to see conformity as another way to get their message out to parishioners and were careful not to reveal this tactic to their Protestant adversaries. There was far more ambiguity and confusion about conformity among missionary clerics than historians have previously contended, and consensus about recusancy was probably an invention of Jesuit propaganda and polemic. While conformity could be used as a way to reconcile loyalty to the English state with a religion politically defined as treasonous, it could also be used as a vehicle for clandestine and subversive political action, with a number of conformists secretly waiting to come to the aid of an impending invasion aimed at restoring the Catholic Church in England. While the term "church papist" was frequently misapplied by Puritan polemicists, they were nevertheless a real and potent force in late sixteenth century England.251

While Walsham is correct in pointing out that church papistry was a very real and meaningful form of religious expression for Catholics, it remains doubtful that the Jesuits were willing to go so far as to recognize occasional conformity as a legitimate form of Catholic worship. Jesuits such as Robert Persons made it firmly clear that recusancy was the only option for conscientious Catholics and that anything less than outright refusal to attend church was to live in mortal sin. This attitude placed Jesuits clearly out of the mainstream of the Catholic community in England, as many Catholics had little choice but to attend in order to avoid

251 Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists*, xii-xv.
prohibitive fines that made recusancy very difficult for most except for the gentry and the nobility.

Although there was controversy on how much conformity should be tolerated in the Catholic community, recusancy and church papistry should be seen as complementary aspects of English Catholicism and not necessarily opposing views of spirituality for lay Catholics. Church papists would have found it difficult even to hold out the remote hope of the possibility of the future restoration of Catholicism had there not been a visible group of recusants who withdrew entirely from the established church. The Jesuits, however, usually failed to recognize the necessity and usefulness of church papists. By contrast the secular missionaries, such as Thomas Bell, often made concessions and were more practical in their demands of the Catholic laymen in England because the pressure they must have felt from their patrons and protectors. The rift between seculars and Jesuits was growing steadily at the outset of the English mission, as the secular clergy, both Marian and missionary, were more in touch with the mainstream of the Catholic community and its needs rather than the uncompromising and radical views of the Jesuits.

3.3 EDMUND CAMPION AND THE UNDERMINING OF THE RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT THROUGH DISPUTATION AND MARTYRDOM

Campion soon ran afoul of the Elizabethan authorities after he published Decem Rationes. George Eliot, a lapsed Catholic and a government pursuivant, attended Campion’s sermon at Lyford and secretly waited for his chance to capture Campion. With a company of deputies, Eliot searched the house where Campion was reportedly hiding, and found the priest-hole where Campion and two of his fellow priests, Thomas Ford and John Collington, were

---
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hiding. They were soon transported to the Tower of London, where Campion was put on the rack for excruciating torture while being interrogated.\textsuperscript{253}

Nearly a month after Campion’s imprisonment, he appeared in the Tower chapel before the general public to engage in a debate with learned Protestant theologians, although with heavy restrictions that made it more like a private interrogation than a public debate. Campion was restricted to the use of the Bible for consultation while he debated multiple opponents at once. Despite the Elizabethan regime's best efforts to stack the odds against Campion, the debates in the Tower of London between Campion and his Protestant disputants ended after it was seen that neither side could really prevail against the other.\textsuperscript{254}

Richard Simpson, the first biographer of Edmund Campion, wrote admirably of Campion's performance in the debates. He noted that Campion had already endured long periods of torture only to be confronted with multiple opponents at one time in debating theological issues. Simpson argues that the debates made Campion seem like a heroic figure, contrary to earlier rumors that he had betrayed his friends and that he might appear at Paul's Cross to deliver a recantation sermon. Simpson also argues that the disputes were "attempts to disparage Campion's religious and moral character," which ultimately failed.\textsuperscript{255}

More recently, Thomas McCoog largely agrees with the assessment that Campion did more than enough to hold his own, despite having very little time to prepare. Even though the government attempted to paint the disputations as a victory, tales began circulating from the observers that Campion appeared to have debated them to a draw. McCoog, however, states that
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although Campion and Persons got their wish for a public disputation, it was not the kind they had hoped. They asked for immunity from penal laws while debating, but Campion remained a prisoner forced to debate under stressful circumstances. Campion's admirable performance in the debates shifted attempts to depict him as a religious heretic to putting him on trial for political treason.  

Michael Questier and Peter Lake build upon previous arguments and say that not only it is impressive that Campion performed so well in the debates, "but surely what is really remarkable is the fact that this extraordinary event should have been allowed to take place at all." Questier and Lake interpret the controlled debates as a sign of a clear success for Campion as he insisted for a public debate to take place despite the heavy restrictions on the one that did occur. Although it is true that the debates really were unprecedented, in the end they benefited his cause to only a limited degree. The disputations firmly signaled to the government authorities that a new type of Catholicism from the Jesuits had arrived in England that they had not seen before, one that was not merely content to obey the status quo but rather was more ready for confrontation even in the face of merciless torture and apparently impossible odds. Campion did win the admiration of the observers and contributed to a growing confessional divide between Catholics and Protestants in England. Despite his outstanding performance, Campion's disputations failed to win over any committed Protestants as he was essentially preaching to the choir of his opponents in his debates. Campion's dreams of the reconversion of England through open debate fell woefully short of his goal, but he did nevertheless inspire recusants to hold fast in their proscribed religion. No matter how well Campion or Persons

performed in debates over theological issues, they failed to motivate a groundswell of popular support for the Catholic Church that could lead to the overturning of the Religious Settlement and consequently the overthrow of Elizabeth.

The trial of Edmund Campion soon followed the debates in the Tower of London. On November 20 Campion and six other priests were tried in Westminster Hall. Sir Christopher Wray was the presiding judge while lawyers, witnesses, and 12 members of a jury were present. They were accused of plotting abroad in Rheims and Rome to assassinate Elizabeth and to wipe out the Church of England to pave the way for a restoration of the Catholic Church in England. Additionally, they were accused of drawing away "allegiance" from Queen Elizabeth to the Holy See. Campion steadfastly denied any such intentions, citing God as his witness. On the first charge, the attorneys of the Crown automatically assumed that there could be no other reason for Campion's coming to England than to fulfill the injunction of Pope Pius in his papal bull of excommunication. They also reasoned the secretive nature of Campion's mission was further evidence that he was plotting all along to bring to fruition the dark designs of the papacy, and they used his silence on matters of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth or the pope as an additional condemnation. The fact that Campion and his companions were English made them doubly suspect since this made it easier for them to disguise their true intentions.258

Although the attorney admitted that they were there to administer the Sacraments and preach the Gospel, he repeated the charge that it was merely a means to an end in leading astray political loyalty and he pointed to the more explicit accusation that Campion had praised the courage of the northern earls in the Northern Uprising and for extolling the virtues of John Story and John Felton, though Catholic martyrs still traitors to country and crown. When it came time

for Campion to give his defense, he rejected the attorney's guilt-by-association reasoning that he was automatically predisposed to being guilty of treason because of the papal bull and the Northern Rising that took place independently of Campion's mission. Campion demanded hard proof that he had worked to overthrow the government. Even though he did admit to reconciling people with the pope, he claimed that he was bringing people back to peace with God and the fold of the original church instead of agitating for rebellion. Campion reiterated that he was there only to perform the normal duties of a Catholic priest and that he had nothing to do with the papal proclamation that had been published even before he went to Rome, despite the fact that his mission to England was financed by the pope.\textsuperscript{259}

On his association with Cardinal William Allen, Campion claimed that they did not speak at any time of political affairs in England since that was forbidden to him. Campion excused the need for secretive methods by claiming that he was following the example of St. Paul who did not avoid the light of truth, but rather looked for suitable times and places to spread the Gospels while confounding his pursuers. Campion rationalized his loyalty to both Elizabeth and the Pope as the fulfillment of the Biblical injunction to render what is due to Caesar and to what is owed to God. Most famously, he addressed the question of whether the pope has the right to absolve subjects of their allegiance by saying that "those who ask that kind of question are not looking for a man's religion but his blood." Campion also mentioned the rumored pact of 200 priests that vowed to restore religion, in which Campion failed to see anything treasonable. He also made a reference to Eliot repeating Campion's mention of a day to bring fear to heretics, of which he claimed that he was not referring to a Catholic invasion, but the last day of judgement.\textsuperscript{260}
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One of Campion's final arguments in his defense was to cast doubt on the credibility of his witnesses, saying they were given to no true faith at all and untrustworthy since they sometimes pretended to be Catholics and at other times professed the established faith of the Church of England, depending on where their love of money brought them. Campion stated that the witness could not swear to seeing him at any time doing something to bring harm to the person of the Queen or subverting the political order. Campion admitted only to saying Mass and hearing Confession which concerned the salvation of souls and not political subversion. On the question of why Campion and his associates chose not to respond to whether they would support Pope Pius's excommunication of Elizabeth, he said that it was because even among the most learned men of the universities there was no clear answer.261

In spite of Campion's defense, the jury pronounced guilty all those priests who had capital charges brought against them that day. When the judge asked Campion if he could think of any reason why they should spare his life, Campion replied that he had no fear of death since he believed "it is obvious to everyone that we have been found guilty not for offence against the throne, but simply for our religion" and therefore there was no more nobler cause than to die for religion. Those who were condemned to execution with Campion displayed much the same sentiments, as they met with one another in a congratulatory manner and looked forward to their deaths as the most optimal outcome. Along with Campion, Ralph Sherwin and Alexander Bryant were led to the place of execution at Tyburn, and on their procession they were subject to all sorts of verbal abuse as well as repeated attempts by Protestant ministers to sway them from their religion at the last minute. In a show of support, a number of Catholics followed Campion on his way to Tyburn and asked him for advice despite angry looks from guards and threats from

261 Ibid, 120-121.
onlookers. When Campion arrived at the place of execution, he stood fast in confessing no crime of treason against the Queen and instead reemphasized that his only reason for coming into England was to spread the Catholic faith and that he would gladly die for such a cause. His two final acts were the recitation of the Apostle's Creed with Catholic witnesses to his martyrdom and silent prayer before he was hanged and his body cut into pieces and spread to the four corners of London.262

While Henry More highlighted Campion's excellent performance during his trial and martyrdom, Anthony Munday, the English playwright and poet, wrote at length of the indictment of Campion and his companions and constantly reminded the reader of the political intentions behind the Jesuit mission of 1580-81. Munday wrote of Campion and his associates that they vowed absolute allegiance to the Pope, "and for this intent and purpose, they were sent ouer, to seduce the hearts of her Maiesties loouing Subiects, and to conspire and practise her Graces death." Although the Pope had little to do with the causes behind the Northern Rebellion, Munday cited it as an example of papal treachery against the Queen, in which the Jesuits played a key role. After hearing the indictment read to them, the band of priests replied that it was impossible for the court to prove themselves guilty in such matters. Munday, however, inevitably returned to the Papal Bull and told of its placement on the Bishop of London's door, in which the pope excommunicated Elizabeth and dispossessed her of her realm while absolving her subjects of obedience.263 Although Campion steadfastly claimed to come to England only for religious purposes, Munday saw his coming as part of a sinister conspiracy against the Crown. To Munday, the spread of Catholicism in England was only the first step for the Jesuits
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as he said, "The people must first be reconciled from their religion, to imbrace the lawes & decrees of the pope, then they must be perswaded to forsake their duety and allegeance to her Maiesty, because she is excommunicated out of the Popes church."^264

Munday depicted the seminary priests as a whole as unthinking servants of the Pope. Despite them being English, they were sworn to the Pope in all political matters and did whatever their Superiors commanded of them. If they dared to disobey the Pope, then they too would suffer excommunication from the Church. Munday said these threats, as well as reputed miracles and supposed relics, kept English Catholic clergy enslaved to the Catholic Church as did promised indulgences and the salvation of souls from Purgatory.^265 Munday noted that Campion said there was no way to prove that he came over with the intent of harming the queen and he was there only to save souls which his conscience compelled him as he was very concerned with the religious state of affairs in England. Munday, however, spoke of George Eliot and the evidence he provided that showed Campion and his followers to have ulterior motives for the mission to England. Eliot, according to Munday, gave witness to Campion's association with a priest named Payne who admitted to knowledge of a plot against the Queen. An armed company would be prepared against Elizabeth which would murder her in favor of placing Mary, Queen of Scots on the throne. Eliot questioned Payne on how they could even think about committing such an atrocity, and Payne responded that the assassination of Elizabeth would not be an offense to God "but that they might lawfully doo it, as to a brute Beast, and him selfe would be one of the formost in executing this vilainous and most traiterous action."^266
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When Campion himself was questioned about his loyalty to Elizabeth, he responded that he considered her as his lawful and rightful sovereign and queen and that he would obey her. When it was asked of Campion if he would obey the pope when he gave out the commandment to disobey Elizabeth, Campion replied that he would not answer that question outright since it touched his conscience too deeply. Munday saw this as deception and proof of his traitorous intentions in the guise of guiding souls to salvation and reconciling them to the Catholic Church.

In spite of all his prejudices towards Catholics, Munday could not help but notice the inherent contradiction that the Catholic seminarians faced. If they denied the Queen to be their lawful sovereign, then they would be condemned by her laws. On the other hand, if they broke their vows made to the pope and denied his authority, then they would find themselves condemned by the pope as well. For Munday, he saw this as an all or nothing choice; one could not be loyal to Elizabeth and the pope at the same time. Indeed, he saw such a thing as nearly impossible given the political situation at the time. In the face of mounting evidence against Campion and his followers for plotting to sway the allegiance of Elizabeth's subjects so that they might be more ready to aid a Catholic invasion aimed at overthrowing Elizabeth, they were given a death sentence. The manner of execution would be one fit for traitors:

that they should depart to the places from whence they came, and from thence to be drawne on Hurdles to the place of execution, where they should be hanged tyll they were halfe dead, then to be cutte downe, their priuie members to be cutte off, and theyr entrayles taken foorth, and to be burned in the fire before their eyes: then theyr heads to
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be cut off, their bodies parted into foure quarters, to be disposed at her Maiesties pleasure, and the Lord God to reciue theyr soules to his mercie.\textsuperscript{268}

Thomas Alfield, a Catholic priest, wrote \textit{A true report of the death of M. Champion Iesuite and Preist} to counter Protestant propaganda surrounding the death of Edmund Campion. Alfield wrote that Campion as well as Rudolph Sherwin and Alexander Bryan were martyred for the Catholic faith under the pretense of treason. He emphasized that these innocent men suffered only for the offense of following the ancient faith of England and not for conspiring against the Queen to bring about her death. Alfield noted the similarity between St. Paul and the Jesuit martyrs, "who beeing charged before the ciuill magistrate, of conspiracy, and il demeinour towardses his countrey, protested that he was iudged concerning the resurrection, a question in religion, and not for sedition or concourse in tumults." In Alfield's judgement, the evidence to convict Campion was sorely lacking, as the court relied on solely on testimony from "three of foure lewde Apostates, vnlawful persons, and notoriously infamed."\textsuperscript{269}

Although many in the government were wary of Campion's travels abroad, Alfield considered them in a positive light as he was able to represent England honorably through his learning and became an example to young and old alike. On Campion's demeanor at his execution, Alfield wrote that he submitted so bravely and with great deference that he was able to win the admiration and sympathy of onlookers at the execution site. Not only that, Alfield reported of Campion's great stoicism as he faced unspeakable torture on the rack and his self-imposed mortification while imprisoned by fasting for five days and his steadfast prayer and refusal of sleep for two nights. As Campion was being transported to the site of his execution, he
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spoke with a strong voice saying, "We are made a spectacle, or a sight unto God, unto his Angels, and unto men: verified this day in me, who am here a spectacle unto my lorde god, a spectacle unto his angels, & unto you men." Just as Campion was about to continue speaking, Francis Knowles and the sheriffs escorting him to his place of execution urged him to confess treason against the Queen and acknowledge his guilt. Campion, however, insisted upon his innocence and denied involvement in any plot against Elizabeth and repeated that he was in England only to perform the normal duties of a Catholic priest in saying Mass, preaching, and administering the Sacraments.  

Alfield, like Anthony Munday, noted that Campion refused to give any opinion on the papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth and when asked if he would renounce the Pope, he would only reply that he was a Catholic. His questioner drew the connection that since he was a Catholic, he therefore must have been a traitor because of his loyalty to the Pope. Despite his predicament, one of Campion's last acts, according to Alfield, was to pray for Elizabeth whom he considered his sovereign queen, but he never asked her for forgiveness as he protested to the last that he never offended her. Campion's companions died in a similar manner, with Rudolph Sherwin also protesting his innocence to the last despite being urged to confess to treason and refusing to give his opinion concerning the papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth. Sherwin died an orthodox Catholic and not a Protestant since he meditated on the Christ and his passion at the time of his execution which Protestants tended to deemphasize. The third martyr, Alexander Brian, came immediately after Sherwin in the cart to Tyburn. Although Alfield viewed him as less learned than his counterparts, he was just as patient and humble as he went through unspeakable tortures in prison. When asked to confess his treason, Brian replied that he never
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was at Rome or at Rheims. Unlike Campion and Sherwin, he admitted to taking the papal bull of excommunication seriously as he thought any Catholic should, and he proclaimed that he would die a faithful and true Catholic.\footnote{Ibid, 10-15.}

In a short response to Anthony Munday's account of Campion's martyrdom, Alfield called into question Munday's character, noting that he had been disproven in several past writings. Munday's account of the Catholic martyr Everard Hanse conflicted with the observations with another Protestant witness. As for the capture of Edmund Campion, Alfield claimed that George Eliot confessed that the main reason that he handed him over was for monetary gain and not out of loyalty or religious conviction.\footnote{Ibid, 17-18.} Although William Allen relied upon Alfield's account of Campion's execution to a large extent, he made additional observations of the event taken from other eyewitness accounts. Allen wrote that Campion was interrupted in prayer by a Protestant minister, wishing that he would join him in prayer as well. Campion, however, replied that since they were not of the same religion, he would rather pray to himself. There were some onlookers who also wanted Campion to pray in English to which Campion responded that he would use a language that he understood well.\footnote{William Allen, \textit{A briefe historie of the glorious martyrdom of XII. reverend priests.} (Rheims, 1582). \textit{Early English Books Online}, 31.}

Anthony Munday, Thomas Alfield, Henry More, and William Allen all made valid observations about Campion's martyrdom. Campion's martyrdom was at once a genuine form of religious expression as well as a type of political subversion, however much he wanted to be seen as being martyred solely for his religion and not executed as a traitor. From the perspective of the Catholic Church, martyrs died for defending the unity of the Church and papal authority in the English Reformation. To the Catholic Church, Thomas More and John Fisher died for the
same cause as did Campion and those who followed in their footsteps well into the seventeenth century. Those Protestants who perished in the reign of Mary Tudor, however, were seen by Catholics as unrepentant heretics who were horribly mistaken in their religious beliefs and the saying that "the cause, not the suffering, makes genuine martyrs" explicitly applied to the Marian Protestants. 274 Traditionally, those who have written about Campion have viewed his activities as essentially blameless and almost totally innocent concerning the meddling in the political affairs of England, as opposed to Robert Persons who has often been cast as the mirror image of Campion. Evelyn Waugh compares the two in his biography of Edmund Campion and says that while Persons's secretive and inconclusive work contributed to his dubious character, by contrast Campion's glorious end as a martyr for all the world to witness gave him a triumphant reputation. 275

E.E. Reynolds, however, has observed that historians have made the mistake of confusing Persons during the later stages of the Jesuit invasion with the Persons of the Jesuit mission of 1580. Reynolds sees very little to suggest that Persons had any ulterior political motives in the English mission just as many historians have believed Campion to be innocent. 276 Peter Holmes has written of the English Mission as a whole and describes it as essentially political but enthusiastic non-resistance since he takes at face value the claims of Persons and Campion who proclaimed almost immediately upon their landing in England that they came not as political agents to stir up sedition. Despite their assertions, Persons showed a new willingness before unheard of in the Catholic community to discuss political issues in order to use them as material for Catholic propaganda in his Confessio Fidei, the accompanying treatise to Campion's

As a number of historians have often stated, Mary's persecution was doctrinal, while Elizabeth's persecution was ostensibly political. The Elizabethan martyrs, however, were not simply powerless victims of political persecution. Forming the backbone of the Catholic martyrs, the Jesuits willingly sought out martyrdom, as they felt a connection with the ancient Christian martyrs of the Early Church in the Roman Empire. Indeed, Campion was very enthusiastic about the prospect of becoming a martyr, as he wrote in his *Challenge to the Privy Council* that every Jesuit anticipated "cheerfully to carry the cross you shall lay upon us, and never despair your recovery, while we have a man left to enjoy your Tyburn, or to be racked with torments, or consumed with your prisons."  

The ulterior motives behind the martyrdom of the Jesuits, however, were quite different from earlier Catholic martyrs such as Fisher and More. Both men in the reign of King Henry VIII sought to maintain Christian unity and protested the Henrician schism and divorce. Also, both More and Fisher lived in a much more religiously fluid time, when Protestant and Catholic identities were not as hardened as they were in Elizabethan England. Upon their execution, it took quite some time for them to be recognized as martyrs by the Catholic community, as the English Reformation only gradually became better in the sixteenth century. Most importantly, they were executed in 1535 a few years before the excommunication of Henry VIII by Pope Paul III in 1538, unlike the Jesuits who worked in the aftermath of the 1570 excommunication of Elizabeth. Although Catholics (those who refused the recognize the Royal Supremacy) were executed for treason in the reign of Henry as they were under Elizabeth, it remains very
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questionable if any approached martyrdom with the same mindset and motives of the Jesuits in using martyrdom as a political tool and an advantage to win converts over to the Catholic faith.

While a number of other secular clergy and lay people were martyred for the ostensible crime of treason to the Elizabethan state, martyrdom in the Catholic community was the exception instead of the norm. The Jesuits encouraged such behavior which ran counter to the traditional values of the Catholic community to profess their unconditional loyalty to whatever monarch was in power, Protestant or Catholic, in addition to simply getting along with their neighbors regardless of their religious preferences. Catholicism in England, if anything, discouraged martyrdom but at the same time reluctantly accepted a sort of second class status that was still preferable to overt resistance against the English crown. Campion exemplified the religious ideals of the Catholic Church, but his form of spirituality was foreign to most English Catholics since he did not follow the traditional social norms of Catholicism in England. Even at Campion's last moments, he insisted on complete separation from Protestant heretics as he insisted on praying by himself and in Latin, as William Allen has written of him. This kind of attitude contrasted with the day-to-day concerns of the Catholic laity in Elizabethan England.

Traditionally, historians such as John Bossy have viewed the uncompromising ideology of the Jesuits and their brand of Catholic spirituality as the defining aspects of English Catholicism. For Bossy, Campion is one of the most visible examples of the new missionary ideal that required an educated clergy to reform behavior. It was not just about believing in the correct doctrine for the missionaries, but for showing the best example of Christian living since "the spirit, for them, was active, and conveying it to others was the supreme task of the active
For Bossy, nothing less than a full restoration of Catholicism was the ultimate objective for the English Catholic community. He characterizes Campion as "excessively optimistic" in his assessment that the old religion would inevitably be restored although Campion agreed in substance with Allen and Persons for the necessity of the full triumph and the reestablishment of the Catholic Church hierarchy in England.\footnote{280}{John Bossy, The English Catholic Community, 17.} \footnote{281}{Bossy, 19.}

As more recent historians have noted, however, the majority of English Catholics were first and foremost concerned with getting along with their neighbors and did very little to express their hopes for a full restoration of Catholicism whether through martyrdom or through disputation or even armed insurrection. Often, English Catholics did not live in secluded areas or behaved secretively as the Jesuits and missionaries did. Although they were marked off by their religious beliefs and suspected in times of international crisis, they still had to live in the larger English community and found out only gradually by the middle of Elizabeth's reign that they were recusants.\footnote{282}{Norman Jones, The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), 141.}

Whether most of the English Catholic laity were hiding their true sentiments or genuinely believed in the legitimacy of Elizabeth remains very difficult to say, but they certainly had no use for the radical confrontational ideology of the Jesuits despite the appreciation they must have felt for their administering the Sacraments and the preaching the Gospel. Although the Jesuits and the secular missionaries often had the same primary goal of providing emergency relief for Catholics in England early on in the establishment of the English mission, divisions began to make themselves more apparent in the later reign of Elizabeth as international political affairs increasingly played a prominent role in domestic enforcement of the Religious Settlement.
3.4 CONCLUSION

The English Mission of 1580 as a whole, while unsuccessful in causing a mass conversion of England to the Catholic Church, opened up a public platform of debate which, as Questier and Lake argue, was incredible in of itself.\(^{283}\) Prior to the English Mission, Catholics were already viewed with some suspicion thanks to the Papal Bull of 1570 as well as the failed Northern Rebellion. The theological debates in the Tower of London and the high profile execution of Campion, in addition to his "Challenge to the Privy Council" and the "Ten Reasons," undermined the Religious Settlement even more profoundly than the dictates of the pope as Campion provided a heroic example of conviction for not only religious conservatives but those of evangelical inclinations as well. In spite of Campion winning the admiration of observers on both sides of the confessional divide in England, his conduct as a saintly martyr was not enough to win over Catholics in supporting a full restoration of the Catholic Church in England.

At the same time, Campion's example provided a model of behavior for the Jesuits that would follow in his footsteps. In effect, Campion ensured that the Jesuits would become isolated from the rest of the Catholic community as he represented an uncompromising view of religion in England. Although it is correct that Campion and Persons initiated a debate in the public sphere over the necessity of a full restoration of the Catholic Church, even disputing the claims of the Anglican Church to be the rightful ecclesiastical body of England was seen as inherently treasonous not only by the government and Protestants, but also by many in the Catholic community. Catholics had no desire to become embroiled in a disputation over the

legitimacy of the Church of England as it was tightly enmeshed with questioning the right of Elizabeth to be Queen of England.
CHAPTER 4

ENGLISH CATHOLIC RESISTANCE TO THE JESUITS AND THE SPANISH ARMADA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter showed that the 1580 English Mission not only encountered an unwelcome reception from the Elizabethan government, but also found very little support from the Catholic community. Campion and Persons created a public sphere to contest the legitimacy of the Church of England as they held a dialogue through printed pamphlets with Protestant adversaries. The Elizabethan public sphere, however, was very limited as most English Catholics were already conditioned to respect the establishment of the Church of England even if they did not agree with its theology. Campion's heroic behavior during his torture, forced disputations, and execution won the admiration of both Protestants and Catholics, but he failed to convince a significant portion of the Catholic community to agitate for the restoration of the Catholic Church. Campion remained highly inspirational for the Jesuits as they followed his uncompromising example, but there is no evidence that he inspired English Catholics more generally.

The current chapter will show the effects of the 1580 English Mission in the years leading up to the attempted invasion of the Spanish Armada as successive Jesuit missionaries followed Campion's example in infiltrating England to work for the reversal of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. William Weston travelled in the path already laid out by Persons and
Campion by becoming the newest participant in the public sphere of confrontation between the Jesuits and the Elizabethan government, although the Catholic community hardly showed him support. After the English Mission firmly demonstrated the political aims of the Jesuits, English Catholics already began to contest the Jesuits and a small fringe element that plotted against Elizabeth.

The Jesuits did seek a full restoration of the Catholic Church, but they also sought to dominate the new ecclesiastical order by establishing the values of the Counter-Reformation that found itself at odds with traditional religious practices. English Catholics saw Spanish rule as Jesuit domination as they supported the Elizabethan state in the face of a hostile invasion. Regardless of whether William Allen or Robert Persons actually authored *An Admonition to the Nobility*, its injunction to the Catholic community to support the Spanish in a holy crusade against the heretical Elizabethan state fell largely on deaf ears. The relative lack of any major Catholic uprising preceding the Spanish Armada reveals that the majority of English Catholics chose to defy the Jesuits by not acting on their orders. Even before 1588, English Catholics resisted the Jesuits both passively and actively.

The English Mission in combination with the rumors of a Spanish invasion made the 1580s in England an especially tumultuous decade. William Allen wasted no time in making Edmund Campion and his associates into martyrs for the cause of the restoration of the Catholic Church in England in his tract, *A Breife Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of XII Reuerend Priests*. Lord Burghley, however, in his famous treatise *The Execution of Justice*, sought to deny that certain English Catholics had been executed for religion and insisted that their deaths were for treasonous behavior. Burghley was careful to avoid antagonizing the Catholic laity or the surviving Marian clergy as he considered them loyal subjects. He reserved his negative
judgement for all foreign trained priests whether Jesuit or secular, ignorant of the fact that there would come to be great divisions among both types of Catholic clergy.

While Burghley dealt with the secular and Jesuit priests coming into England from abroad, he also wrote in detail about the Catholic laity as he advised Elizabeth on how to deal with them in *A Treatise Against Papists*. Burghley counseled a generally mild treatment of the majority of English Catholics. He warned against the killing of the Catholic clergy, unless as a last resort, as he well knew that intense persecution would encourage the growth of an underground resurgence of Catholicism. Allen, however, immediately set out to defend against Burghley’s charges that the government executed Catholic priests for treason by arguing that their acts of martyrdom were not seditious in nature, but rather signs that England had not fully turned away from the Catholic Church. He also argued that it was more important for Catholics in England to obey the law of religion before the laws of secular government, which he conflated with the Catholic Church.

Robert Persons, like Allen and Burghley, wrote of the persecution of Catholics in the years following the English Mission. He took a much more hard-line stance than the other two in his *Letter of Consolation* to his associate John Gerard, expecting that most Catholics in England would feel that death would be preferable to conformity and made no allowance for those who might have done so outwardly for fear of the laws. He also began to complain of increasing isolation in the Catholic community, noting that Catholics who he thought were sympathetic still did nothing to aid his cause.

In the year of the Spanish Armada, Allen abandoned any previous notion of lip service to being a loyal subject to the Queen and exhorted all Catholics in England to take up arms in
support of the invasion. *An Admonition to the Nobility and people of England* appeared such a departure from Allen's previous tone towards the Elizabethan regime that some contemporaries and historians believed that Persons may have been the true author. It clearly abandoned any pretense of respect for Elizabeth as a legitimate monarch and even cast Phillip of Spain as the prime example of a pious Catholic king. Allen viewed the impending Spanish invasion as a holy crusade and condemned even those who wished to remain neutral if the Spanish managed to invade.

4.2 CARDINAL ALLEN AND LORD BURGHLEY DEBATE THE PURPOSE OF THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES

The mission of 1580 set the precedent for Jesuit activism in the political and religious affairs of England during the next two decades. Not only did the Jesuits seek to overturn the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, they also sought to become the dominant faction in English Catholicism. Their efforts, however, were ultimately unsuccessful regardless of the failure of the attempted Spanish invasion of 1588 because they were increasingly marginalized by the Catholic community. The secular and Marian clergy and the Catholic laity often associated them with Spanish interests and were by no means immune to a nascent sense of national consciousness that grew among Protestants as well. The arrival of the Jesuits made life more difficult for Catholics as a whole as persecution became more intense and the laws against recusancy more strictly enforced.

The apparent failure of the English mission had a profound impact on the thinking of Robert Persons, who managed to escape to France after evading arrest three times. The fruitless outcome of the disputations in the Tower of London and the execution of Campion caused
Persons to become disillusioned with the original approach of theological debate and discussion and turned his thoughts towards political and military designs to force the overthrow of Elizabeth and the subsequent conversion to Catholicism. Persons became more obsessed with questions of political allegiance rather than the finer points of religious orthodoxy. Although the restoration of Catholicism remained the primary goal for Persons, he began to discuss more openly more drastic measures to achieve an already radical goal such as the elimination of certain advisors to the Queen, the use of military force to free the imprisoned Mary, Queen of Scots, and ultimately the deposition of Elizabeth, to be replaced by Mary Stuart.  

In the aftermath of the English mission, William Allen wrote *A Briefe Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of XII Reuerend Priests* which lionized the efforts of those priests, including Campion, executed at Tyburn for treason. In effect, this small pamphlet could be seen as a miniature version of John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. Just as Foxe had contributed to a Protestant identity by cataloging the suffering of the Marian martyrs, Allen did his best to craft a separate identity for English Catholics as a whole but was far less successful. Allen immediately compared the persecuting Protestants to past heretics such as the Arians who were more inclined even than heathens and apostates to persecute members of the true Catholic Church. Julian the Apostate, though not a heretic, used similar methods in attempting to purge Christianity from the Roman Empire through false charges of sedition in order to persecute Christian clergy for religious reasons. One can detect a newer and more hostile tone throughout Allen's pamphlet as he refers to those who spread libellous propaganda of the martyred Thomas Cottam as "the Ministers of Satan." Allen's stated goal in his account of the twelve martyred priests was to show the rest of the world how cruelly Catholics suffered for trumped up charges of treason as

---

the basic practices of the Christian faith suddenly became traitorous. Not only does Allen write at length about the execution of Catholics for their faith, he also mentions the increasing divide among English Catholics which was caused by

the pretence of other crimes, specially of the invasion of the realme, bringet the zelous Catholikes and namely Gods Priests into great hatered not onely amongst the protestants, but among others wel affected in religion, though not so strong to stand to the losse of their life and goods: whereby they subtily seeke to make a diuision betvvene the tvvo forts of weaker and stronger Catholikes, for the easier ouerthroww of them both, in deede hating and fering no lesse the closse dissembler, then open professor.285

Even at this early stage in the mission to England, it was already eliciting a backlash among certain members of the Catholic community who viewed loyalty to the government as a higher priority than identifying themselves with the seminary movement and following the dictates of the hierarchical Catholic Church. It is clear that the government used the high profile of the Jesuit mission as an opportunity to weaken the solidarity of the Catholic community despite its intentions to strengthen the position of the Catholic Church in England, and Allen admits that the Elizabethan regime had a degree of success. Allen, however, does not show overt hostility to the government itself as of the writing as he repeats the claims of the Campion and Persons that there were no plots hatched at Rheims and Rome which had the death of the Queen as their objective. Allen goes on to state that the martyrs "were charged only vvith other mens faults," referring to the rebellion in Ireland and the Northern Uprising. He insisted that the
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martyred clergy had no connection with at all since the government had no proof of their reputed association.\textsuperscript{286}

Although Allen would come a long way in political thought from the immediate aftermath of the Jesuit mission to the invasion of the Spanish Armada, the martyrdom of the Catholic missionary priests helped to push him into an increasingly uncompromising view of what Catholicism in England should look like. Catholics in England did not share the institutional Catholic Church's view on who exactly was a martyr, because the Jesuits appeared as foreign to them as the impending Spanish invasion. Despite the fact that the Jesuits were English in origin, they had spent much time abroad in centers of international Catholicism and drank deeply from the sources of the Counter-Reformation, just as the Marian exiles who would later become the core of the Puritans who spent much time in centers of Reformed Protestantism on the Continent. Anne Dillon writes, "some of the most important influences on the construction of Catholic martyrdom in text and image derived from the fact that those English Catholics who composed and produced this material lived and worked in exile on the continent and were necessarily dependent upon and, ultimately, much influenced by their hosts."\textsuperscript{287}

Most English Catholics, as is common knowledge, ignored the papal bull \textit{Regnans in Excelsis} because they desired to remain loyal subjects. Edmund Campion had even discussed in the early 1570s removing the implications of the bull so Catholics could recognize the queen as their lawful sovereign and queen without fearing excommunication. Persons and Campion asked Pope Gregory XIII to rule on this issue and Gregory responded with the necessarily vague \textit{rebus sic stantibus} stipulation that stated Catholics were not bound to the papal bull until conditions
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were more favorable for Catholics to carry out the political machinations of the papacy. With knowledge of this clause, Elizabeth saw the arrival of the Jesuits and missionary priests as the first stage of a Catholic invasion. The government was selective in choosing whom it would prosecute for treason as they were more often than not key figures in the new missionary movement. The Elizabethan authorities shied away from targeting the Catholic laity with a few notable exceptions. The training that Jesuit and missionary priests received abroad and the direct vow of allegiance to the pope by the Jesuits represented the worst fears of the Elizabethan regime which necessarily meant reversal of the Religious Settlement and overthrow of the Queen.\footnote{Dillon, 15.}

As a reaction to the growing threat of the international Catholic Church and a pushback towards the newly established martyrology of the Elizabethan Catholics, William Burghley published his landmark treatise, \textit{The Execution of Justice in England}. Burghley was careful to avoid labeling Catholicism in England as an inherently treasonable religion, but rather called to attention the fact that "certaine persons naturally borne subiects in the Realme of England and Ireland, who hauing for some good time professed outwardly their obedience to their soueraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, haue neuerthelesse afterward bene stirred vp and seduced by wicked spirites, first in England sundry yeres past, and secondly and of later time in Ireland, to enter into open rebellion."\footnote{William Cecil Burghley, \textit{The execution of justice in England for maintenaunce of publique and Christian peace.} (London, 1583) \textit{Early English Books Online}, 2.} Here, Burghley was making an implicit statement is that Catholics in England and Ireland would have been loyal subjects left to their own devices, but the political aims of the Catholic Church was the fundamental cause behind the insurrections in Ireland and England. Despite papal involvement in the Irish Rebellion, Pope Gregory VIII did not order such a rebellion to occur and neither was he involved in the planning or the execution of the
Northern Rebellion. For Burghley, however, these incidents provided the perfect evidence that the Gregory was attempting to fulfill the political aims of his predecessor, Pius V.

The seminaries, according to Burghley, were the next step in the nefarious designs of the Catholic Church. The pope could not readily find secular rulers to invade England militarily, so Burghley reasoned that the pope had to resort to creating the seminaries to recruit those who followed his political dictates seriously. Even among the priests infiltrating England, Burghley made a distinction between "Seminaries for some of the meaner sort, & of Iesuites for the stagers and ranker sort & such like," which indicates that he viewed the Jesuits as the driving force behind the mission to England with the secular clergy from the seminaries their willing accomplices. Burghley referred to the seminarians as a whole, regardless of rank, as "seedmen" who were practiced in the art of sowing sedition just as a farmer sows seeds. They secretly labored to convince English Catholics to take seriously the papal bull of excommunication and the pope's political authority over all nations. It was then that Burghley sought to counter Allen's newly created martyrology by defending the apprehension of the seminarians. Burghley asserted that the seminarians were captured and charged with high treason instead of heresy and they received a just condemnation as traitors. Burghley then made a fundamental contention that the newly martyred priests were not unjustly condemned by any new laws suddenly established whether for religion or against papal supremacy. He looked back to laws enacted under the reign of Edward III against the authority of the pope such as the Statute of Mortmain, Praemunire, and Provisors. Despite the traitorous intentions of many of the Catholic clergy making their way into England from abroad, Burghley claimed that many of the offenders were spared from execution
after renouncing their former political convictions which reflected the mercy of the Queen not to have any blood spilled.\textsuperscript{290}

The real threat, according to Burghley, was the leaders of the Jesuits abroad who commanded their followers to come into England to preach against royal authority and for papal authority since they took an oath against the crown and to reform men's consciences in religion in order to prepare them secretly to join an invading Catholic force. Burghley then returned to mention Catholics in England, more specifically the Marian clergy, who professed their loyalty to Elizabeth and were not charged with any crimes or treason despite their difference in religion. Not only did the Marian clergy remain loyal to the Queen, but there also was "a great number of others, being lay men of good possessions and lands, men of good credite in their countries, manifestly of late time seduced to hold contrary opinions in religion for the Popes authorities, and yet none of them haue bene sought hitherto to be impeached in any poyn[t] or quarrel of treason."\textsuperscript{291}

In effect, Burghley repeated the legal reasoning with which the Jesuits and seminarians were punished as traitors. Throughout the \textit{Execution of Justice}, Burghley made a clear distinction between those priests who sought to stir up sedition and the Marian clergy who were inclined to be somewhat rebellious only after being provoked to act in such a manner. Burghley depicted the Catholic laity as largely blameless for the current state of political affairs and reserved his accusations of treason exclusively for the seminarians and the Jesuits who, though unarmed, came into England for the express purpose of seducing the Catholic laity into open rebellion at the request of the Pope. He cited Persons and Campion as the foremost examples of
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traitorous Catholic priests which was no coincidence since they were also Jesuits and were the most visible face of the Jesuit mission.

Burghley also wrote a lesser known but equally important tract known as *A Treatise against Papists*, specifically addressed to Queen Elizabeth. Unlike the *Execution of Justice*, Burghley discussed the mainstream of the Catholic community that was not as fanatical as the Jesuits in obeying the political commands of the pope. He advised Elizabeth to reframe the Oath in these words: "That whosoever would not beare Armes, agaynst all forreigne Princes and namely the Pope, that should any way invade your Majesties Dominions, Hee should bee a Traytor." In this phrasing, Burghley stated that the Oath would not offend the religious sensibilities of English Catholics and that it would further drive a wedge between the Catholic hierarchy and the laity. While Burghley viewed English Catholics with suspicion, he did not view them as such a danger that they needed to be executed or driven into exile whatever the cost. Instead, he proposed a relatively mild treatment by reducing their numbers through means other than martyrdom. Burghley proposed that the number of English Catholics "may be easily lessned, by the means of carefull, & diligent Preachers in euery Parish to that end appointed, & especially by good Schoolemasters, & bringers up of their youth; The former by conuerting them after their fall, the later by preuenting their falling." Burghley realized that while there were divisions among the different religious orders such as the Jesuits and the Dominicans, the divisions were only superficial as they formed a united front when it came to obedience to the pope. Burghley, above all, cautioned against killing any of the Catholic clergy or laity comparing them "like Hydras heads, vpon the cutting off one, seuen growes vp; Persecution being euer accounted the Badge of the Church." Burghley ended in saying that it would be
reasonable for the relaxing of the Oath and to execute only those Catholics who had proven themselves "Traytors, in all means Constructions, and opinions."\textsuperscript{292}

In Burghley's missive to Elizabeth, he deployed a pragmatic and mild tone when discussing how the Catholic community as a whole should be treated because he realized that most English Catholics were reluctant to rebel against their queen. He also realized that much of the Catholic youth were attending Anglican churches with their parents and thought it useful to appoint preachers specially trained in conversion. The lenient stance that Burghley took regarding the treatment of the Catholic laity indicates that he believed the sentiments of the Jesuits and the leadership of the seminary at Douai were unpopular in the Catholic community.

Immediately after the publishing and circulation of the \textit{Execution of Justice}, William Allen gave utmost importance to issuing a response to disprove Burghley's claims that all executions and persecutions thus far were reserved for seditious activists sent by the Catholic Church. Allen's \textit{Defense of English Catholics} contested most of Burghley's assertions that religion had nothing to do at all with the targeted persecution of some members of the Catholic community and stated that it was full of "manifest vntruthes, open slaunders of innocent persons, and namelie with immodest malediction and seditious motions against the cheefe Bishop, the Prince of Gods people."\textsuperscript{293}

Not only did Allen seek to defend English Catholics in England and abroad, but he also sought to defend the papacy and the Catholic Church as a whole from accusations of a conspiracy to dethrone Elizabeth. Allen, however, wrote that Catholics were bound to obey the
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law of Christian religion more than any earthly authority or any obligations they held to secular rulers. In defense of the spiritual, it was still important not to offend secular authority and the recording of the martyrs deaths was not meant to be seditious, but rather to recall their heavy sufferings and expose their innocence to get an admission of wrongdoing from the persecuting authorities. Allen writes he and all English Catholics had no intention of dishonoring prince and country but rather wanted to honor the nation through examples of Christian martyrdom in order to show that England had not wholly turned away from the ancient faith in favor of the new religion.  

In his most hostile statement yet towards the Elizabethan church and state, Allen asserted that the English government had only itself to blame for the situation it found itself in since its separation from the true Church and its rejection of the Holy See were the main reasons that the Elizabethan regime felt embattled. To resist the Catholic Church, according to Allen, was to resist God, which necessitated feelings of anxiety and unrest and "who so euver despice her and her gouernours, despice Christ himself: who so euer refuse her regiment and superiority, specially for matter of Faith and Religion, and would rather have a King ouer them to lead both their body and soules; doe not so much refuse to be ruled by Gods Preists, as they reiect Christ himself, being not contented that he should raigne ouer them." Allen concluded that the only thing holding back God's righteous judgement upon England was the sufferings of its holy martyrs and the heroic actions of priests who continuously came into the realm to administer the Sacraments and preach the Gospel so that they might bring about the salvation of their beloved country. Indeed, Allen stated that the people of England should be grateful rather than hostile to the Catholic Church because it never gave up on the recovery of true religion. While those
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opposed to the Catholic Church in England accepted the fact that the priests who came into the
country on its behalf were at the root of their problems, Allen stated that they were "the onely
hope of Gods mercy, their owne pardon, and our Countries saluation." 296

The dialogue between Allen and Burghley at the critical juncture of the aftermath of the
English mission shows two different perceptions of the Catholic community. Burghley identified
the Jesuits as the root of the problem while Allen conflated the persecution of the Jesuits with the
persecution of the Catholic community as a whole. It was not a simple refutation of Catholic
martyrdom as previous historians have interpreted on the part of Burghley. Allen neither
intended to only defend English Catholics that he claimed suffered only for their religion. 297 The
Execution of Justice was meant mainly for a foreign audience, being translated into many
different languages such as French and Italian in order to prevent the people of the Catholic
nations that surrounded England from gaining sympathy for the cause of the English mission. 298
Although Allen countered Burghley's accusations as best as he could, it is significant that he had
no real rejoinder against Burghley's observations that a significant number of Catholics in
England may have not been satisfied but grudgingly accepted the religious status quo. Even with
the commencement of the expedition to reclaim England for the Catholic faith, the sufferings
endured disproportionately by the foreign-trained Catholic clergy were not shared by the vast
majority of the Catholic laity in Elizabethan England. As Meyer notes, "Of the catholic priests
who came into England in Elizabeth's time, every second or third was put to death; while of the
catholic laity, only one in every two thousand suffered." There was some truth to Burghley's
observations of the relative mildness of political persecution under Elizabeth compared to the
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enforcement of religious orthodoxy with the reign of Mary since nearly 300 died in the five years of Mary's reign for unorthodox religious views while the Elizabethan martyrs numbered 250 in 45 years. As Meyer observes, Catholic priests warranted different treatment not just from the laity, but from the most intransigent Puritans who refused to conform to the state religion. Puritans often were punished with banishment, while the Catholic clergy were more often executed. To the Elizabethan regime, Catholic priests represented a far more sinister threat because of increasingly strained political relations with the papacy. In order to avoid making too many martyrs which would potentially add fuel to the fire, Wisbech Castle was chosen as a prison for the foreign-trained Catholic clergy in the latter half of Elizabeth's reign. Most English Catholics were not affected by the increasing severity of the penal laws that threatened death, banishment, or imprisonment for holding seditious opinions against the Queen. While there were a few instances of Catholic laity being executed for questioning the legitimacy of Elizabeth, most suffered death for aiding the seminary and Jesuit priests that gradually infiltrated England.299

It is clear that Allen's *Defense of English Catholics* actually applied only to a minority of the Catholic community, though still an important one because the foreign trained Jesuits and seminarians were indispensible in keeping the Catholic faith alive in England. Burghley wrote *The Execution of Justice* to illustrate his view that the small number of Catholics who were unfortunate enough to be imprisoned and/or executed by the government suffered punishment because of treason, but Allen's refutation of Burghley's explanation could be seen as evidence of an increasingly foreign strain of Catholic practice with which most English Catholics would have fundamentally disagreed. Allen claimed to be writing simply in defense of Catholics that did

suffer for their faith. At the same time, however, he was attacking the Elizabethan Religious Settlement by defending an extreme minority of the Catholic community accused of treason.

4.3 THE CONTINUATION OF THE JESUIT MISSION TO ENGLAND

While Allen and Burghley engaged in a polemical war of words over whether the seminarians and Jesuits could be considered traitors deserving of death or Christ-like figures guilty of only spreading religion, a new wave of Jesuit priests began entering into England, in part inspired by what they saw as the heroic martyrdom of Campion. Persons still remained in charge of the English mission in 1582 after the death of Campion, and at this time he began to take an interest in translating the Bible into English. He also sent priests into Scotland in order to begin the work of keeping it for the Catholic faith. Persons, however, withdrew from England after being convinced by the Catholic nobility and gentry that he should inquire to the Catholic hierarchy about the possibility of establishing a place for the study of theology and philosophy in England itself. Persons went to Rouen where he wrote a number of printed works, including the Letter of Consolation on which he too addressed the subject of persecution of some Catholics in England as did Allen and Burghley, but in a letter to his associate Father Gerard. 300

Persons set out to reassure Gerard that the persecution of Catholics in England was very real and that he had first-hand knowledge of it after being so near to where it took place and from hearing of it continuously in letters and reports. Persons, however; feared to make such things public since he felt it was dangerous merely to complain about the sufferings of Catholic since it was a habit of the Elizabethan government to take further revenge on the complaints of its actions. Persons wrote to Gerard that he thought it unseemly for Catholics to repay injustice

---
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with bitter invective or to pay back injury with injury since he left judgement and vengeance to God, who would presumably punish the persecutors of the true faith. Unlike Allen who sought to present the myth of a united Catholic front against Protestant persecution, Persons confided to Gerard that they sustained such hardship "in the midst of our brethren, in sight and hearinge of other Catholiques rownde about vs, they lookinge on, and takinge litle compassion of our case, nor helpinge vs with their worde, when as perhaps they may."\(^{301}\)

In his *Letter of Consolation*, Persons took a hardline stance against outward conformity, which would have been very foreign to the majority of the Catholic community in England. He went so far to suggest that death would be preferable to being compelled to profess new and strange beliefs that went against one's conscience. Persons took a differing view of what traditional values meant in England by asserting that the Crown itself was opposed to them by singling out those who worshipped in the manner of their ancestors for punishment. Persons distinguished between the two types of punishment for dissenting Catholics in England: penal laws punished through confiscation of wealth and capital laws enforced on pain of torture and execution. Those who refused for the sake of conscience to attend Protestant church services were often punished with the penal laws and for this reason they were urged to attend church regularly on Sunday despite whatever misgivings they may have felt. Whoever refused to go would be punished with a fine of twenty pounds each month and those who fell behind on payments were imprisoned until they somehow came up with the money owed. As for those who heard Mass, even in secret, the punishment was mandatory imprisonment for at least a year

and even longer if the imprisoned Catholic failed to pay a hundred marks. Priests had to pay twice as much to be let out of prison for celebrating Mass.\textsuperscript{302}

Persons noted that while all Catholics suffered persecution, it was the more knowledgeable and learned ones who were often singled out for imprisonment and torture because they were more able to contest the theological principles of the Elizabethan church. The Bishop of Lincoln as well as the Abbot of Westminster were both thrown into a noisome dungeon where they had to endure endless disputation with distinct disadvantages. They lost access to all their books and they were not allowed to consult with one another in order to prepare for debating religious matters. They were each questioned separately by several disputants, similar to the manner of questioning which Campion endured in the Tower of London. Although notaries were called in to record the disputes, Persons alleged that they were often misreported to serve the agenda of the adversary or they were interpreted in such a way to mean that the captured Catholics were confessing to treason.\textsuperscript{303}

In addition to treason, Persons mentioned accusations of witchcraft made against certain Catholics which he dismissed as works of fiction and superstition that fit the constructed narrative of the adversaries who depicted Catholics as being closely associated with the Devil. He recounted the tale of St. Paul's steeple being struck with lightning, causing a fierce conflagration. Protestants blamed Catholics for conjuring up such an unnatural blast of lightning and not long after they discovered certain charms and reagents used for witchcraft wrapped in pieces of parchment hidden in the ground. This incident was seized upon as further evidence that Catholics really were plotting to injure the person of the Queen, this time through the
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supernatural means of witchcraft. It was soon discovered, however, that the chief author behind this apparent Catholic plot was actually a Protestant minister. Once this became common knowledge, his associate preachers decided to keep silent on the matter except for some of them who claimed "that this minister had perhaps dissembled his religion and was a verie papist in his hart."\textsuperscript{304}

Persons ultimately saw the sufferings of Catholics as signs that they were the true Christians because Christ foretold that such a time would come when "that euerie one that killeth youv, thinke he doeth a seruice to God." Persons believed that the number of Catholics in England was increasing daily since he also saw that the Elizabethan regime was redoubling its efforts in persecution.\textsuperscript{305} Concerning Queen Elizabeth herself, Persons began to have a change of attitude towards her. While he wants to think that Elizabeth would not approve such extreme laws aimed at impoverishing Catholic families, he also wrote that it was very likely that she was firmly convinced of the traitorous nature of Catholics after hearing about it daily through false tales and deceptions with no one saying a word in defense of Catholics which made it highly possible "that not onely these extremities, but greater allso, and farre harder extremities may be permitted against vs."\textsuperscript{306}

In the years leading up to the attempted invasion of the Spanish Armada in 1588, the Elizabethan regime's persecution of foreign-trained seminarians and Jesuits continued unabated. In 1581, Father Thomas Cottam was among one of the six priests declared guilty with Edmund Campion. Cottam, however, remained imprisoned for far longer than Campion until around May 30 of the following year. During his time in prison, he endured torture on the rack and was
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subjected to the same bloody questions that all Catholic priests were forced to hear on the matter of the papal bull of Pius V. He attempted to avoid giving a direct answer by stating in reply to all questions that "I think in all these things as the entire Catholic Church thinks." He was also forced to hear Protestant sermons as was the usual lot of imprisoned priests in an attempt to make them renounce Catholicism and adopt Protestant beliefs. Their attempts, according to More, ultimately failed and Cottam even made it a point to approach John Nichols, the infamous apostate from the Catholic Church, when he reminded him and everyone else present of their duty towards the Catholic Church. 307

Cottam was ultimately accused of conspiring with Campion abroad to eliminate Queen Elizabeth because of the simple fact that he came over with Campion at the same time. It was also found on in his backpack at the time of his arrest a book authored by Aspilquete of Navarre on cases of conscience. Cottam wrote certain notes in the margins that indicated he doubted the legitimacy of Elizabeth’s Royal Supremacy when it conflicted with personal conscience. Cottam, however, denied knowledge of ever having such a book and claimed that it must have been planted on him. Then in May 1582 along with several other priests, Cottam was hung, drawn, and quartered. More wrote of his exceptional meekness in accepting his lot as a Christian martyr, praying for everyone involved with his death and when his executioners came to tear apart his chest they discovered a hair shirt which he had worn himself to add to his sufferings. Cottam’s demeanor at his execution won the admiration of Protestants while Catholics venerated his actions as those worthy of a saint. The cruel treatment and execution of imprisoned Catholic priests held the approval of the most powerful members of the Privy Council as Henry More claims. While they might have seen the torture and gruesome executions as useful deterrents,

Queen Elizabeth saw them as unnecessarily cruel and excessive. Her motives, however, were not due to compassion but rather to avoid the displeasure of Henry III of France and to make it more possible to sign treaties with him since he took seriously the injunction from Canon Law that it was impermissible to sign treaties with heretics and especially those who so savagely punished and executed priests. In 1585, extreme measures against the Catholic clergy were relaxed temporarily and 70 priests were sentenced to exile.\textsuperscript{308}

One among them, Gaspar Haywood of the Society of Jesus, temporarily acted as the superior in England of the Jesuits in the absence of Robert Persons. Haywood proved himself to be even more of a radical and out of touch with indigenous Catholic practice in England since he disagreed withPersons on the question concerning feast days and fast days and wanted them to fall in line with the more recent canons of the international Catholic Church. More, however, downplays any disagreement between Persons and Haywood in an attempt to show a united front of Jesuits against the Protestant adversary.\textsuperscript{309}

Although Haywood and a number of other priests suffered exile, there still remained a not insignificant number of Catholic clergy who avoided detection thus far and were indispensable to the survival of the Catholic Church in England. William Weston is one such priest, who came into England around 1584 and was the prime example of the isolation of the Jesuits from the rest of the Catholic community in England.\textsuperscript{310} Weston was able to visit Haywood in the Tower of London just before his exile which, was done without much difficulty. Because of his impending exile, Haywood was granted more freedom to converse with his associates. Although Weston labored to keep his arrival in England a secret, Haywood informed
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Weston that it was already known to him through the Earl of Northumberland, and he added that it was likely the Privy Council was informed of Weston's arrival in England. Almost as soon as Weston set foot in England, he was pursued by government agents and spies. After he finished preaching in the home of a Catholic gentleman not long after his arrival, he noticed a suspicious person near the entrance who appeared to be waiting for someone, although he did not clearly recognize Weston since he let him safely pass.\textsuperscript{311}

In 1585, Parliament was able to get royal assent to a severe act against all Catholic priests entitled "A Bill for the utter extirpation of Popery, against Jesuits and others," which commanded all priests to leave England in forty days or suffer a traitor's death.\textsuperscript{312} Weston described the days that followed the passage of this act as a time of "immeasurable suffering" for all Catholics. He lay the blame chiefly on the Earl of Leicester and William Cecil Burghley rather than Elizabeth herself like virtually all other Catholic priests and laymen during the time of Weston's ministry in England. Weston painted a very bleak picture of England at this time, a picture that was unrecognizable to the majority of the Catholic community. His perspective as a Jesuit, however, figured largely into his depiction of Elizabethan England in the 1580s as a highly inhospitable place for anyone who identified as a Catholic, as he described spies being around almost every corner and reported on fabricated rumors that the Queen's council was ready to decree the massacre of all Catholics.\textsuperscript{313}

Despite the apparent harshness of the persecution, Weston was able to travel in relative secret through the countryside of England, celebrating Mass covertly in the houses of the Catholic gentry and the nobility just as other Jesuit and seminarian priests had managed to do.
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He was able to meet with Father Henry Garnet, the new Superior General of the English Mission, as well as Father Robert Southwell, the Jesuit poet who accompanied Garnet. Together they stayed for a time at the home of a Catholic gentleman, who was a close friend of Weston, nearly thirty miles from the city of London.\textsuperscript{314} As Weston continued his ministry, he returned to London at the request of two Catholic gentlemen of distinction in order to serve the Catholic community there, a point that Weston felt compelled to make in view of what would soon happen. As he approached the house in London where he was going to stay, a pursuivant caught up with Weston and arrested him despite not having Weston's name on a warrant of Catholic priests he was sent to arrest.\textsuperscript{315}

Rather than ending his career, Weston's imprisonment gave him an alternate way to pursue the ultimate goal of bringing England firmly in line with the Counter-Reformation Catholic Church. During his imprisonment at the Clink, he was sent to a house where he went through an examination by officials questioning him on mainly what he thought of the Elizabethan Royal Supremacy as well as the authority of the pope. The officials asked Weston whether he thought if it was the proper role of a subject to swear upon an oath to a magistrate appointed by warrant of the Queen to answer questions. They also asked Weston if he intended to withdraw subjects from their obedience to the Crown. Weston, however, responded that he was not sure if a loyal subject should answer the questions that they were going to put to him. Since the laws of England were hostile to the Catholic faith, he was bound only some of the time to answer. He refused to answer upon an oath, as the official record of Weston's examination states that "because he is a priviledged person, and hath vowed the gouernment of his bodye, and direction of his soule, to the disposition of his superior generall named Cladius Aqua viua, an
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Italian, And therefore cannot be drawne to externall Courtes.” Weston himself, however, said that he refused to take an oath according to the pre-Reformation legal tradition of immunity of clergy in which priests could not be tried by secular judges unless they had been defrocked by ecclesiastical authorities.

By both accounts, it is clear that Weston, like the other Jesuits, viewed his status under the law as consistent with pre-Reformation ideals of being judged first and foremost by church laws as a clergyman. This kind of reasoning, while it may appear eminently traditional and medieval by looking at it in the long term, appeared quite radical at the time to most people in England who were used to seeing all clergy members being treated the same as laymen under the law ever since the Reformation had made religion and state one and the same. Weston’s refusal to answer under oath to the court subverted a central value in English society. Jonathan Gray notes that the use of oaths were not only meant to coerce subjects, but were also used for negotiation and as a means of ensuring compliance with the law. There was a great deal of respect for the law in England even among those Catholics who refused to go to church and constantly sought to reconcile their proscribed faith with being a loyal subject. Weston essentially claimed himself not subject to the same laws as the laity which was unheard of in recent memory.

The interrogators questioned Weston on the excommunication of Elizabeth as they did virtually all captured Catholic priests, asking him if the Pope had any authority to excommunicate her and to absolve subjects from obedience by actively or passively resisting the

Queen until she did acknowledge papal supremacy in England. Weston replied that he did not remember teaching anyone that the pope did have the right to excommunicate Elizabeth, but he divulged his own personal opinion that the pope did have jurisdiction over all things spiritual, of which excommunication was one part and could therefore use it against any secular ruler for certain causes.\(^{319}\)

In his autobiography, Weston also mentioned that the examiners questioned him on the Spanish Armada and whether he would support it or counsel other Catholics to do so. Weston only responded "that in an emergency such as this I should do nothing that conflicted with my religion."\(^{320}\) If the official record of Weston's examination is taken at face value, it reveals that Weston did believe in the excommunication and its effects laid out in the papal bull which set him sharply at odds with the majority of Catholic community. It is also notable that Weston chose not to deny that he was reconciling people with papal authority, something which held little importance with most Catholics in England. In his necessarily vague answers, Weston sought to avoid giving a direct answer to where his true political loyalties lay. His reticence suggests that he was not simply obeying the reputed orders by Jesuit superiors not to get involved in politics. Although he had no knowledge of the inner workings of the Spanish invasion as he claims in his autobiography, it is likely that he would have done nothing to resist such an invasion had it taken place. Most Catholics immediately professed that they would have fought to the death against such an invasion, but Weston sought to obfuscate and answer only that he would take actions that did not conflict with his faith. Aiding the government, in the radical Counter-Reformation ideology that the Jesuits brought over, equated to aiding the spread


of heresy and this would conflict with Weston's brand of faith that was quite different from the very people he was sent to minister.

4.4 ANTHONY TYRRELL AS CHURCH PAPIST

Although Weston remained uncompromisingly committed to the cause of the Catholic Church in England, Anthony Tyrrell, a seminary priest, took a much different approach to questions of religion and loyalty that continuously plagued the English Catholic community. Tyrrell has been traditionally seen by contemporaries as well as historians as an example of a lapsed Catholic priest who, while in prison, recanted and became a Protestant before becoming a Catholic again. He changed his religious identity several more times before finally reconciling himself with the Catholic Church, as Weston relates in his autobiography. 321

Despite traditional interpretations, it is more the case that Anthony Tyrrell was making attempts to reconcile his faith with his loyalty as did the vast majority of English Catholics had to do at some point, no matter how apolitical they may have regarded themselves. Anthony Tyrrell wrote at length about his reasoning and justifications for his falling away from the Catholic Church. It is particularly notable that Tyrrell gave little to no mention to theological justifications for his separation from the Catholic Church, but rather political reasons as he proved an effective propaganda tool for the Elizabethan regime that constantly claimed it was punishing certain Catholics for political and not religious reasons. Tyrrell protested his love for the Queen's person to Burghley while in prison as would have nearly every English Catholic and even those among the Jesuits including Persons although it was more of an obligatory function among more radical spirits. Tyrrell felt it necessary to proclaim that he did "bear as humble and

dutyfull mynde vnto my gratious Q. soveraigne as any subiect may or can for besydes the
naturall dutie with I doe owe vnto her majestie bothe before god and in contrey..."\textsuperscript{322}

Going even further, Tyrrell expressed his desire to uncover traitors hidden in the Catholic
community and he also claimed to renounce all political obedience to the pope. Tyrrell promised
to Burghley that he was able "to discover a number of treasonable parties that haue bene divertly
comytted against her" and also expressed gratitude "for my self to be delivered from the
tyrranical bondange of her ... enemie the pope."\textsuperscript{323} Burghley must have realized the great
opportunity he had for a weapon of propaganda in the person of Tyrrell which compelled him to
show clemency by releasing him. Tyrrell in turn thanked Burghley for his newfound freedom
and made a vow that he would devote himself in the future to the service of the Queen.\textsuperscript{324} While
it may appear at this stage that Tyrrell was being opportunistic or spineless, he did keep his vow
to serve the Queen as he played an important role in disrupting the Babington Plot. This allowed
him to reconcile the demands of being a loyal subject with his religion because he never gave up
or altered his beliefs as a Catholic.

Tyrrell went on to become an Anglican clergyman being licensed to preach from the
archbishop of Canterbury after he could no longer operate as an undercover informant on
developing plots and possible traitors to the Crown. Tyrrell, however, was far less than a sincere
Anglican priest as he began to feel remorse about his supposed conversion and fled back to the
continent while renouncing his membership in the Church of England in 1587. Tyrrell wrote a
detailed confession which came into the possession of Robert Persons, but suddenly he decided
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to go back to England and put himself at the mercy of his former captors once again. He prepared to make a public recantation of his separation from the Church of England at St. Paul's Cross on January 1588, but in the presence of the large crowd he began to speak in the opposite direction against Anglican Church after which he was violently removed and imprisoned. Tyrrell continued on as a faithful Catholic for six months until he returned to the Church of England after professing to Burghley a true conversion. At the end of the year on December 1588, he delivered the sermon he was supposed to give earlier at St. Paul's Cross. He then once again became an Anglican priest and took a wife, but a number of years later in 1595 he was imprisoned yet again for keeping company with people of questionable reputation and he tried to escape back to the continent. Tyrrell only served two months in prison in the Marshalsea at the request of his wife and also because he desired to continue on with his preaching. In 1602, Tyrrell gave testimony regarding the exorcisms performed by William Weston and the involvement of Anthony Babington in a plot to overthrow Elizabeth in 1585. Weston, however, related that Tyrrell passed through one more change. Near the end of his life, Tyrrell's brother convinced him to settle down in Belgium, where he died reconciled to the Catholic Church.\footnote{325 T.G. Law, "Anthony Tyrrell," in Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 57, ed. Sidney Lee. (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1885), 438-439.}

The repeated lapses and relapses into the Catholic Church and Anglican Church hardly escaped the attention of Robert Persons. He wrote The Fall of Anthony Tyrrell and prepared it for the printing press but never actually published it since Tyrrell's actions after he wrote the manuscript would not have fit into his narrative of a resurging Catholic Church in England.\footnote{326 John Morris, ed, The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers Related by Themselves, vol. 2. (London: Burns and Oates, 1877), 287.} Persons originally had the intention of using Tyrrell's case as a teachable moment as he wrote, "What Catholic priest is there that will not look more diligently unto himself, and have a more
attentive care to conserve the rigour of holy discipline, both towards his body and his soul, when he shall consider the dissolution that crept into this man by little and little, and brought him at length to so dangerous a shipwreck?"327

At the very outset of the narrative, Persons chose to make Tyrrell's reconciliation with the Anglican Church more about his lapse into Protestantism and heresy. For Persons, Tyrrell's indecisiveness is all about religion, and he downplayed the more important feelings of allegiance to the Queen that Tyrrell certainly felt. Persons wrote that Tyrrell resolved to deny his religion against his conscience as he recounted that Tyrrell confessed that "the devil thought that he would work surely with me, which was to overthrow the very tower of my soul, and utterly to undermine me at the very root and foundation, and so persuaded me altogether to forsake my religion and to become on the sudden a zealous Protestant." He further claimed that Tyrrell confessed that he did agree that all Catholics were traitors and that his very religion was an offense to both God and the Queen. According to Persons, Tyrrell lamented that although he was able to erase his reputation as a traitor and a papist, in turn he betrayed Christ as he became a Protestant heretic.328 Persons also wrote that Tyrrell showed a degree of regret for revealing John Ballard's role in the Babington Plot to Burghley, as he described his revelations of Ballard's involvement in the plot to kill Elizabeth as "slander." To Persons, Tyrrell had conspired to frame Ballard and other conspirators in the Babington Plot which was tantamount to a betrayal of his religion.329

Historians have come to see Anthony Tyrrell in much the same light as Robert Persons, as a fallen and apostate priest. Michael Questier, however, has a more nuanced view of the case
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of Anthony Tyrrell. He correctly sees Tyrrell's case as a complex one and argues that religious uncertainty as well as conflicting loyalties contributed to Tyrrell's dissimulation. He also suggests that Tyrrell may have believed that a degree of temporary cooperation with the Elizabethan regime may have been permissible if it made possible future missionary actions which could explain his behavior.330

It is more likely that Tyrrell always viewed himself as both a faithful Catholic and a loyal subject to the Queen. Like the majority of the English Catholic community, he had wanted nothing to do with those who plotted to overthrow Elizabeth, but unlike most, he used his position as a Catholic cleric as a means to prove conclusively his loyalty by implicating John Ballard and others in plots to overthrow Elizabeth. Tyrrell had a much more fluid understanding of religious and political loyalty than did Jesuits such as Robert Persons, who took a very black and white view on questions of recusancy and participation in the Anglican Church. Walsham has argued persuasively that there were many who considered themselves faithful Catholic laymen but went to Church of England worship services to avoid government scrutiny and supposed renegade priests such as Anthony Tyrrell could be seen in very much the same way. His personal statements to William Burghley seem not at all inconsistent with his religious beliefs as a Catholic, but on the other hand they are entirely opposed to the line of reasoning that the Jesuits took in regards to political obedience to the pope.

---

4.5 THE IMPACT OF THE SPANISH ARMADA ON THE JESUITS AND THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

Meanwhile with the advent of the impending Spanish invasion of England, Allen began to take a much more hostile tone not only to the Elizabethan government, but also to the person of the Queen as well. Just the title of Allen's famous pamphlet, *An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England concerning the present wvarres made for the execution of his Holines sentence, by the highe and mightie Kinge Catholike of Spaine*, informed the reader immediately what Allen truly thought of the Papal Bull's pronouncement upon Elizabeth. His flattering description of the Spanish king was one most Catholics in England would not have been inclined to agree with. English Catholics rather considered King Phillip II as another political tool being used by the papacy. The threats of invasion alienated the Catholic laity of England that felt just as much loyalty to Elizabeth as did their Protestant countrymen. Allen took an extreme view of the powers of the papacy in comparison to most English Catholics as he refers to Sixtus V not only as the foremost spiritual authority for Christians on earth, but "our chefest magistrate and master in earthe, to whom our Sauior hath giuen Apostolike power to take vengeance vpon disobedience."331

Allen considered the coming invasion as entirely the fault of Elizabeth and her subjects for turning away from the old religion of time immemorial even in the face of repeated censures and warnings from successive popes. He refers to Elizabeth as "the wicked Iesabell" and thought it eminently blasphemous to call herself the Supreme Governor under God and to force Christians to partake of the heretical Church of England services with its false communion.

service. The usurpation of papacy's spiritual authority in England went against Christ's established church on earth and the state became a sort of national idol that subjected both body and soul. The new unholy church and upstart religion caused the people of England to blaspheme against the rightful church as foreign power or even the Antichrist which was punishable by death in pre-Reformation England.\textsuperscript{332}

Yet the pope, in his great largesse, was willing to issue indulgences to all who previously followed the state religion if only they should "pursue the actual deprivation, of Elizabethe the pretensed Queene, eftstones declared and iuditialy sentensed, by his Holines predecessors, PIVUS QVINTVS and GREGORIE the XIII. for an heretike and usurper." Not only Elizabeth, but her father King Henry VIII equally deserved to be deposed as he was lawfully excommunicated by Clement VII for his rebellion against the universal church and the cold-blooded murder of holy saints such as Thomas More and John Fisher. Allen also repeated the charges of an incestuous relationship between Anne Boleyn and Henry which produced an illegitimate heir incapable of ascending to the throne. Not only was the Queen illegitimate, but the Parliament was as well since the Lords of the Clergy were deposed. Allen also gave examples of English kings who needed to have papal approval in order to be considered legitimate rulers such as Henry II, who sought papal absolution for the martyrdom of Thomas Beckett and confirmation for his lawful status as monarch, and King John, who submitted to the papal legate Pandulph.\textsuperscript{333}

Elizabeth's crimes against the Catholic Church were numerous, not the least being that she was an avowed heretic and continued the rebellion against the Church. Her persecution of
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Catholic priests, the seizure of lands and wealth from recusant gentlemen and nobility, and the
despoliation of churches figured as well in the litany of charges Allen brought against her.334
Allen made note of Elizabeth's alliance with the Turk and thought it abhorrent that she would
ally with the ancient enemy of Christendom who was always threatening to invade against the
most Catholic king of Spain. This went against everything English kings traditionally did as they
often fought against Muslims throughout the Middle Ages instead of entering into an unholy pact
with them. He also lambasted the fact that secular observances were blasphemously taking the
place of proper holidays. Allen was well aware of Elizabeth's attempts to de-Catholicize
England. He saw that Elizabeth made the annual day of her coronation far more sacred and
solemn than any saints' feast days. She also abolished the feast day of the Nativity of the Virgin
Mary, substituting instead her own birthday to be observed. Allen saw these changes as
evidence of her prideful vanity and gave a warning that she should repent. He drew a parallel to
Herod's exultation in the adoration of his people which in due time he was suddenly struck down
by an angel and died, which implied that Elizabeth was in danger of sharing the same fate.335

It was clear to Allen that whoever was declared to be in rebellion against the Catholic
Church must be resisted militarily. As they broke with Christ's church on earth, it was important
to defend his honor and break with them in return. In the early church, Allen reminded English
Catholics that orthodox Christians in the early Church often defended with arms their bishops
against pagans and especially against heretical emperors, just as Christians defended the Church
of Antioch against Emperor Galerius. While previous kings of England such as John and Henry
II persecuted the Catholic Church, they were soon driven to do penance afterwards for their
crimes. It was far different with Henry VIII as he surpassed his predecessors on a level not seen
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since Julian the Apostate and was justly excommunicated by Paul III. Elizabeth followed in her father's footsteps by waging war against the Catholic Church and was justly excommunicated and her subjects were rightly loosed from any obedience.\textsuperscript{336}

Allen regarded Phillip II as a most honorable king whose duty to the Catholic Church was an example to all monarchs. Being so moved by the unjust murder of Mary, Queen of Scots, Phillip undertook a liberation of England from the tyranny of Elizabeth on the behalf of the Holy See as well as the embattled Catholics of England. Allen sought to reassure Catholics in England that Phillip was indeed a noble and just king. If a battle would have taken place in England had not Elizabeth yielded, he would have restrained his forces after the victory from pillaging and sacking the whole of England. In the ultimate act of fulfilling the execution of the papal bull, Allen urged Catholics in England "to joine to the said army, with all the powers and aydes they can make, of men, munition, and victuals, to helpe towards the restoringe of the Catholike faithe, and actuall deposinge of the vsurper, in suche sorte and place, as by the chefe manegers of this affare, and the Generall of this holye warr shall be appointed, for the best advuancement of the cause." If the majority of England followed God's will to depose Elizabeth, there would be little to no bloodshed. If anyone chose to aid the usurper or even if they chose to remain neutral and fight for neither side, they would be cursed by the Church and forsaken by God, being guilty of their own damnation and having the blood of the martyrs on their hands.\textsuperscript{337}

Although Allen was overtly hostile towards Elizabeth in \textit{An Admonition to the Nobility and people of England}, historians have reacted to it in various manners. Arnold Oskar Meyer writes that it "exceeds in freedom of speech all similar writings against Elizabeth, including even
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the bulls of Pius V and Gregory XIII." It was so belligerent and such a departure from Allen’s previous writings counseling peace that some thought Robert Persons was the true author. The style of the treatise makes it very likely that Persons played at least some part in its composition, according to Meyer. Meyer draws the conclusion that only English Catholics who had lived for such a long time on the continent, such as Cardinal Allen and his associates, could have authored such a book. Allen was very much out of touch with the general sentiments of loyalty towards Elizabeth in England which Catholics felt just as strongly as Protestants. While she may not have been beloved by English Catholics, even many among the Catholic clergy in England felt at least some attachment as they often joined in praise of her even while living their last moments on the scaffold.338

Allen's biographer, Martin Haile, states emphatically that Robert Persons was the actual author of *An Admonition*, because it was very much different from anything that Allen had written before. He also notices that Persons did not deny the charges from secular priests that it was "penned altogether by the advice of Father Persons." No matter who wrote it, it was signed by Allen as "the Cardinal" which he had used also in later letters. It was also clear that by this time, the influence of Persons, which had gradually affected the views of Allen, had gained complete ascendancy as evidenced by the writing of *An Admonition*.339

Some historians, however, have attempted to justify the writing of the treatise in a way that does not reflect the radical political ideology of the Jesuits and the Catholic community in exile. John Hungerford Pollen states that *An Admonition* was written in the scenario that the Spanish Armada would be victorious in overthrowing Elizabeth and reestablishing Catholicism.

Pollen believes that since the Armada failed, the goals of the treatise could not be taken as true insight into the intentions of the exiled Catholic community.\textsuperscript{340}

Thomas McCoog, by contrast, says that Allen made a serious miscalculation that his newly printed book would not fall into the hands of the Elizabethan government before the invasion and he could not be considered innocent just because his work was released ahead of its time. He was not compelled to write \textit{An Admonition} at the command of the Catholic hierarchy, and it could be taken more as a reflection on his own position on loyalty towards the Queen. While Allen had claimed to profess loyalty earlier, he now revealed his true sentiments. McCoog makes an interesting observation in asking, "But was Allen's \textit{the} Catholic position or simply \textit{a} Catholic position?" Even Catholic prisoners were asked of their allegiance and overwhelmingly they responded that they were ready to fight for Elizabeth in the case of a Spanish invasion.\textsuperscript{341}

The defeat of the Spanish Armada did not give a chance for English Catholics to prove conclusively their loyalty to Elizabeth, but it is clear that the position taken by Allen and Persons was reflective of a political ideology unique to the Counter-Reformation. What seemed like a holy crusade for the Catholic Church to Allen seemed much more like a hostile foreign invasion to the English Catholic community. Allen had the benefit of not being on the receiving end of a threatening and hostile takeover and could write in relative safety from the Catholic seminaries abroad on the continent. More practical concerns among Catholics in England caused them to align with the English government since they had no clear idea of whether the Spanish would treat them justly as fellow Catholics or unjustly as defeated subjects. Additionally,
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Catholics in England thought it more prudent to take a conciliatory tone with the government in exchange for more personal freedom of religion which would later become a repeated theme in the Archpriest Controversy.

Taking the opposite approach from Allen, Thomas Blum, a lay recusant from Lancashire, humbly petitioned Elizabeth for freedom of conscience instead of calling for her overthrow. Blum immediately apologized for Allen's recent invective against the Queen and also other past hostile sentiments from other Catholics such as Persons which, he stated, made him afraid even to approach her dominions, much less her Court. Despite whatever they may have done, Blum felt that after searching the corners of his conscience that he could not be justly imprisoned for any crime against the Queen. Blum felt that the current laws against Catholics in England were unfair and nearly impossible to avoid. He instead urged "that youre magnificence desyre to not give punyshment of poore Catholycks, for theyre zeale and profession, but for theyre synes and vices."  

4.6 CONCLUSION

Although Blum and Allen were of the same opinion when it came to penal laws against Catholics, they took two totally different approaches to solving the problem that reflected a divide that would only grow between the Allen as well as the Jesuits and the rest of the Catholic community in England. It follows that Catholics in England aligned with the government not just out of a sense of loyalty, but more importantly out of a sense of identity with the wider English community which gives strength to recent arguments that the Catholic community in England may not have been as isolated as some historians, such as John Bossy, have previously
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342 “The humble petition of Mr. Thomas Blum to Her Majesty from Lancs. For Liberty of his Conscience.” A Certificate of Seminary Priests and Recusants in the prisons in and about London, 1588. Lansdowne MS 58/13: 1588.
implied. The position taken by Allen and Persons in regard to the Spanish invasion was very radical and proved they did not truly understand the situation on the ground in England in the run up to the attempted invasion of the Spanish Armada.

The Jesuits expressed even more overt hostility towards the Elizabethan government in the years between the English Mission and the Spanish Armada. The death of Edmund Campion provoked a lengthy debate on whether certain Catholics in England were dying for the political cause of regime change or being slain for merely professing their religion. As debate continued, Jesuits such as William Weston entered into England in order to propagate Counter-Reformation Catholicism. During his imprisonment in the Clink, he showed a noticeably recalcitrant attitude as he refused to state definitively what side he would support in the event of a Spanish invasion of England.

The tensions between the Jesuits and the Elizabethan regime reached its zenith in the lead up to 1588, but even then there were also examples of Catholics who were ready to support the government. Anthony Tyrrell acted as an informant in the already impressive Elizabethan intelligence network, disrupting possible Catholic plots against the Queen. Although Tyrrell would not fit into traditional narrow definitions of being Catholic since he also served as an Anglican clergyman, his repeated reversions and conversions from the Catholic Church to the Church of England reveals that he was more conflicted over being a loyal subject than any sympathy towards evangelical doctrine as none of his personal statements revealed a friendliness towards Protestantism. Widespread passive resistance in choosing not to support the Spanish Armada indicated decisively that Catholic opposition against the Jesuits began sooner than most historians have come to realize as Allen or Persons condemned even positions of neutrality in An Admonition to the Nobility. Thomas Blum exemplified the sentiments of the vast majority of the
Catholic community, preferring to work within the system to negotiate better treatment instead of colluding with foreign powers to plot its overthrow. After 1588, more Catholics among the secular clergy would come forward to make their voices heard more clearly in the wake of the failure of the Spanish invasion after it became clear that there would be no full restoration of the Catholic Church.
CHAPTER 5

THE FINAL REPUDIATION OF JESUIT IDEOLOGY FROM THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter demonstrated how the Catholic community reacted against the Jesuits in the years between the English Mission and the Spanish Armada. The Jesuits continued on their quest for the full restoration of the Catholic Church despite the failure of the 1580 English Mission. Jesuit William Weston found himself in opposition not only to the Elizabethan state, but also to the Catholic community when he entered into the public sphere of debating the legitimacy of the Church of England. William Allen and Robert Persons raised the stakes for the Catholic community further by condemning those English Catholics who refused to support a Spanish invasion. Their efforts proved fruitless, as English Catholics resisted demands to overturn the Elizabethan Settlement both actively and passively. Anthony Tyrrell played a critical role in disrupting the Babington Plot by acting as a government informant while the Catholic community resisted calls for aiding a possible Spanish invasion by choosing not to revolt against the Elizabethan regime.

The present chapter will explain how resistance to the Jesuits in the Catholic community carried over from the 1580s into the 1590s. During this time the Jesuits had to contend not only with the Elizabethan regime, but also with firmly established traditions among the Catholic
community of obedience to the monarchical state no matter what theological beliefs may have been officially sanctioned. The failure of the Spanish Armada inspired English Catholics to become more bold in their denunciations of the English Jesuits even as the Jesuits remained convinced that the restoration of the Catholic Church was at hand. Christopher Bagshaw, the leader of the secular priests at Wisbech Castle, contested the claims to leadership that William Weston asserted over all the Catholic clergy and laymen imprisoned at Wisbech. The rivalry between the secular priests and the Jesuits increased to such a degree that Bagshaw and others would claim that the secular priests received more respectable treatment from their supposed Protestant adversaries than the Jesuits. The Jesuit mission to England continued unabated with John Gerard’s entry as he showed a sincere belief that a Catholic restoration was around the corner while Robert Persons anticipated what a Counter-Reformation Catholic Church in England would look like in the *Memorial for the Reformation of England*.

As the Jesuits and secular priests continued to fight among themselves, the Elizabethan government increasingly played both sides against each other to further marginalize the Jesuits. Priest-hunters such as Richard Topcliffe and Richard Partridge continued their relentless pursuit of all Catholic clergy, which further drove the secular clergy to seek dramatic measures to leave no doubt where their political loyalties truly lie. Archpriests in the Catholic Church during the sixteenth century took on managerial roles over several parishes, or in the case of England an entire realm. The Archpriest Controversy that soon erupted after the disturbances at Wisbech Castle involved an argument over whether there should have been an extra layer of Catholic Church hierarchy to govern over the secular priests to ensure discipline and strict obedience to the dictates of the Catholic Church. When taken into its greater historical context, the Archpriest Controversy shows greater continuity as another phase of the conflict between the
Jesuits and the Catholic community, with which the secular priests were more firmly in step. The institution of the Archpriest was an alternate means, short of invasion by the Spanish, for the Jesuits to establish their dominance over the Catholic community by bringing it more firmly in line with the Counter-Reformation and the international Catholic Church. During the Archpriest Controversy, the Jesuits' personal attacks on the character of the rest of the English Catholic clergy marginalized them more effectively than the Elizabethan government could have ever hoped to accomplish. Although the Jesuits ultimately emerged as the victors with the pope reaffirming the legitimacy of the Archpriest George Blackwell, the secular priests turned to their natural allies against the Jesuits in the Elizabethan government.

Leading scholars of the Archpriest Controversy have interpreted the Protestations of Allegiance as a dramatic pushback against the Jesuits with no real precedent. Arnold Oskar Meyer describes the Protestations of Allegiance as the victory of the secular state over competing claims of the Catholic Church to political authority. John Bossy, however, argues that the Archpriest Controversy was a sudden aberration in the views of the secular clergy on political authority. Bossy claims that the Archpriest Controversy was not a true indicator of the secular priests' views on allegiance to the Crown but rather an attempt to reassert their status in the Catholic hierarchy that they felt the Jesuits threatened. Stefania Tutino contends that the Appellants, the secular priests who appealed to Rome over the Archpriest, represented the more modern faction of English Catholics as they advocated a more primitive version of religious tolerance. She also argues that the Appellants did have a very real ideological confrontation with the Jesuits as the Appellants clearly identified the Jesuits with the Spanish. Contrary to traditional interpretations of the Archpriest Controversy, it did not mark an unprecedented or temporary reversal of Jesuit political influence. The ideological confrontation in the Archpriest
Controversy was not just between the secular priests and the Jesuits, but rather between the Jesuits and the English Catholic community.

Essentially, the Jesuits and the secular clergy debated the definition of being a true Catholic. The Jesuits were prepared to go far enough to destroy the Elizabethan state in order to establish what they viewed as a purer form of Catholicism, while the secular priests held fast to tradition in upholding the status quo while asserting they could make advances in securing religious toleration for Catholicism. The Jesuits saw the Appellants as being little better than the Protestant establishment, while the Appellants, much like the rest of the Catholic community, viewed the Jesuits as dangerous radicals who threatened political anarchy through their relentless pursuit of religious purity. The resulting Protestations of Allegiance in 1602 not only clarified the position of the Appellants regarding the pope as a strictly spiritual leader, but was also consistent with the position that the English Catholic community had taken in regards to political obedience ever since pre-Reformation England.

The last decade of the sixteenth century and the first few years of the seventeenth century was a period in which the Jesuits gradually realized that their political influence was not as great as they had assumed previously. The documents that chronicle the Wisbech Stirs show the disturbances in Wisbech Castle, which had been turned into a prison for apprehended Catholic clergy, from both the Jesuits' point of view and from the secular clergy. Christopher Bagshaw, a secular priest, wrote at length on the Archpriest Controversy, of which he regarded the Wisbech Stirs as the prelude. Bagshaw claimed that just as William Weston sought to rule over all the Catholic clergy at Wisbech, Robert Persons thought he could give orders to the secular clergy in England through the appointment of an Archpriest, William Blackwell. The pope officially weighed in on the Archpriest Controversy in 1599 by confirming the authority of the Archpriest
but reprimanded both sides for stirring up conflict and ordered that there be no further challenges to Blackwell. The Jesuits had triumphed over the Appellants, but at a great political cost. Bitterness towards the Jesuits continued from the secular clergy as William Watson wrote a tract denouncing them as worse than their Protestant opponents and went so far to claim that he suffered far more at the hands of the Jesuits than the Elizabethan government. Anti-Jesuit sentiment among the Catholic community culminated with the Protestations of Allegiance in 1602 which was signed by thirteen secular priests and Catholic laymen which put in writing the assurances of loyalty that the English Catholic community had long given to the Elizabethan state even before the arrival of the Jesuits.

5.2 THE JESUITS CONTINUE THE MISSION TO ENGLAND

The year 1588 had incredible ramifications and not just for the long-term political situation between Spain and England. While it has often been repeated that the Spanish Armada helped to create a Protestant identity for England, it was also instrumental in creating a decidedly English identity among the mainstream Catholic community in opposition to the Jesuits. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, English Catholics already viewed the Jesuits as somewhat foreign and on the margins of English society, but this trend was accentuated as English Catholics shared in the growing national pride felt by their Protestant counterparts. The silent majority of English Catholicism suddenly found a voice in the secular clergy who were increasingly at odds with the Jesuits as embodied by the looming Archpriest Controversy. While the secular clergy out of the seminaries abroad were subject to much the same persecution as the Jesuits, they began to chafe under the Jesuits' perceived dominance of the English mission and called for obedience in all matters political to the government even if it meant defying the decrees of the papacy and the institutional Catholic Church. Although radicals and extremists
within the Catholic community were by no means defeated at the end of Elizabeth's reign, as evidenced by the Gunpowder Plot, by 1603 the Jesuits as a political force in England were utterly spent.

The failure of the Spanish Armada made the situation worse as a whole for the Catholic community in England. Robert Southwell, the Jesuit poet, knew that since the danger of Spanish invasion had passed, the government would renew its persecution of Catholics with a vengeance. In a familiar pattern, many Catholics were brought before court and were not only tried for past offenses, but were asked "Bloody Questions" about whether they might commit future crimes. Southwell wrote to Claudio Acquaviva that the conversion of England was not to be accomplished through military invasion but through prayer and dedication of ministry. Henry Garnet, then the Jesuit Superior in England, despaired at the situation and wrote that even those Catholic priests still not imprisoned might as well be because in London they could venture out only at night and even then only on pressing business. After the Armada's defeat, the government administered an oath to all Catholics to determine their loyalty. The recusants imprisoned before the voyage of the Armada were all owed to go free if they recognized Elizabeth as the lawful sovereign of England or if they conformed to the Church of England. In the oath, they were obliged to dismiss the excommunication as well as any past or future deposition of Elizabeth and to deny the spiritual authority of the pope in England. Catholics, however, drafted their own version of an oath independent from the government's. They recognized Elizabeth as their lawful queen and explicitly declared their allegiance. They also swore to protect Elizabeth from all those who wished to harm her in anyway no matter who they were. As Catholics in England were renewing their vows of obedience to Elizabeth, two new
Jesuits entered into England, John Gerard and Edward Oldcorne, to resume the English mission.\textsuperscript{343}

John Gerard's autobiography shows the unrelenting pursuit of the Jesuits to reverse the Elizabethan Settlement as they continued to live in an alternate universe from the rest of the English Catholic community. Gerard came from a Catholic family that involved itself in political intrigue as his father was imprisoned in the Tower of London for participating in a plot to rescue Mary, Queen of Scots, and to place her on the throne. His father, however, was soon released after paying a heavy fine and placed Gerard under the care of a Catholic tutor to ensure that he was brought up in the ancient faith. From this radical background, it is easy to see why Gerard joined the Jesuits as they aspired to end the persecution of English Catholics by reversing the Religious Settlement through any means necessary.\textsuperscript{344}

During Gerard's ministry, he began to notice an ever increasing divide between the different types of Catholic clergy in England. Gerard wrote that persecution was directed mainly against seminary priests and ignored the old Marian clergy ordained before Elizabeth came to the throne. The government, however, began to distinguish between secular priests and Jesuits as it came down much more harshly on Jesuit priests and those who aided them. Gerard thought the main reason behind this distinction was because of a growing argument between the secular clergy and the Jesuits, which made the government more inclined to stamp out the more intransigent group of Catholics.\textsuperscript{345}

\textsuperscript{343} Thomas McCoog, Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541-1588, "Our Way of Proceeding?," 256-258.
\textsuperscript{345} Gerard, 28.
It is clear, however, that there were still people in the Elizabethan regime who regarded seminary priests to be just as dangerous as their Jesuit counterparts, such as Richard Topcliffe, a particularly notorious priest-hunter, torturer, and investigator. Topcliffe refuted some common assumptions in an address to the Privy Council. He addressed the notion that for the most part recusants did not harbor priests by responding that it was a very common practice among the principal recusant families, as they kept a priest close at hand for the education of their children. He also identified recusant women as a serious threat because they heavily contributed to the raising of their children in recusancy and recommended for the children that they be placed "vnder some wise matron well affected in religion" and for the recusant women to "be placed in seruice where they might be better example and otherwise enstructed." Topcliffe was especially concerned that some of the worst recusants were young adults under the age of 30 and thought it wise to have them placed under close watch in the care of their parents who presumably were church-going Anglicans. Topcliffe also said with certainty that the fugitive recusants, or Catholic priests, were the most dangerous and should be taken into custody and for those who were in the realm secretly an award should be posted for their apprehension in order to induce loyal subjects to turn them.\footnote{Mr. Topclyffe, to the Council; discovering the haunts of several dangerous Seminary Priests, 1592. Lansdowne MS 72/40, British Library.}

Richard Partridge also insisted that Jesuits and seminary priests would never become loyal subjects and should be considered domestic enemies of the state. His reasoning was that they would not fight in defense of Elizabeth or their country against foreign enemies and the Pope. Partridge saw the English Catholic clergy as a whole as the root of the problem since they made "rebellious persons undetected styrred vpp to be lynked in confederation with the pope &
forreyne enemyeis against her majestie." Topcliffe and Partridge kept up continued pressure on Jesuit and secular priests which contributed to already deepening tensions among the English Catholic clergy. The secular clergy began to accept the reality of the situation that the Catholic Church would never be fully restored in England and sought a way to reconcile themselves overtly with the English government while securing some degree of toleration for their faith.

The failure of the Spanish Armada may have fully convinced the secular clergy of their initial impressions that the future of Catholicism in England lay in toleration rather than full reconversion, but the Jesuits clearly stuck to the original plan for the English mission. This is firmly evidenced in Robert Persons's *Memorial for the Reformation of England*, first written in manuscript by Persons in 1596 and printed nearly 100 years later by Edward Gee as a useful propaganda tool against Catholics in the wake of the Glorious Revolution. William Allen never put down in writing what his vision of a restored Catholic Church would look like in England. He apparently saw this as representing a much smaller problem than their struggle with the Elizabethan government. Persons, however, expressed his own dream of what a fully restored Catholic hierarchy in England would look like a year after the death of Allen in 1596.

Although Persons admitted that he may not live to see the day of the triumph of the Catholic Church in England, he wanted to put down his intentions and thoughts of what a reestablished Catholic Church would like as a sort of a guide to the people who would go about the business of restoring it at the opportune time. Persons also saw the contents of this treatise as applying to Ireland as well. Like Campion, Persons remained convinced that the restoration of the Catholic Church in England was inevitable and would be appointed by God at the correct
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time. He also foresaw the conversion of England as providing a model example of faith to the Catholic countries and churches surrounding it.\(^{349}\)

Persons thought that England would achieve the ideal of a perfect Reformation of religion for several reasons. He saw that out of many nations that endured the stain of heresy, England had received the most aid to resist heresy which was evident from the many Catholic martyrs and the constant support from seminaries abroad. Persons also felt that the reign of Queen Mary was a missed opportunity to begin a perfect Reformation and was the reason behind the loss of true religion in Elizabethan England. Persons saw that England was being used as a scourge by God to infect surrounding nations with heresy, but foresaw such a complete Catholic Reformation that England would transform itself from a scourge into a shining example of the Catholic faith to other nations.\(^{350}\)

Persons also believed that the English were truly Catholic at heart for the most part and would receive well his intended Reformation of England, declaring, "We are not like to find, I say, (the infinite mercy of our Saviour be blessed for it) either backward Bishops and dissolute Priests, or Licentious Religious Men and Women to oppose themselves against so Holy a designment as this our Reformation is." Finally, Persons noted that a large material part of the old Catholic Church had been preserved in England through Providence unlike other nations that had been overrun with heresy. There were cathedral churches and bishoprics still left standing as well as other benefices left intact. The only thing they really lacked were pious Catholic men to fully restore the buildings to their former and true purpose.\(^{351}\)


\(^{350}\) Persons, 45.

\(^{351}\) Ibid, 47-48.
Persons foresaw a newly restored Catholic Church in England superior to those where the faith continued to exist unbroken through the Reformation. He likened his intended English Reformation to a gardener setting a brush fire to cleanse a garden of weeds and thistles, after which time he could grow herbs better than before. It was only logical for Persons "that the Reformation of England, after this long and sharp Persecution, ought to be very perfect, full and compleat, not respecting so much what some cold Catholicks use to do in other Countries, where Spirit is decay'd, and Corruption crept in." Persons thought the Council of Trent was constrained in a way since it had to accommodate itself to the decayed state of Christianity in many countries. England, however, was going to be a much more receptive ground for the decrees of the Council of Trent and could effect a more thorough "Reformation of Manners."\textsuperscript{352}

Persons saw the reign of Queen Mary as being entirely superficial and woefully inadequate to establish a lasting and fruitful Catholic Church in England. He noted with disdain that the married clergy from the reign of King Edward were allowed to the altar only on the condition of hiding their spouses, and they were not even made to confess before they were able to say Mass again. Some who had formerly preached against Catholics were suddenly allowed to preach for Catholicism; likewise, those who were commissioners and visitors against Catholics continued their work under Mary's reign except against Protestants. Persons compared the overall situation to a stage play in which though actors changed their acting identities, they did not change their true feelings or affections. What was really needed, according to Persons, was a true reconciliation with God on the part of the clergy and the laity to reestablish a deep and lasting pious atmosphere in England. He also thought it necessary for the clergy and the laity to realize fully that both were in need of each other in a symbiotic relationship in which the laity

\textsuperscript{352} Ibid, 51-52.
provided the defense and maintenance of the clergy while the clergy provided the laity assistance with the goal of attaining salvation. Perhaps most controversially among the more traditionally minded members of the English Catholic community, Persons did not find an urgent need to restore monasticism. He reasoned that England had much more pressing needs, which made it impractical for a complete restoration of the monasteries to take place so quickly. He thought it more useful to redirect funding towards universities, seminaries, and colleges that contributed more towards preaching and the salvation of souls.  

Persons’s vision of a restored Catholic Church in England provoked negative reactions from the secular priests. According to Christopher Bagshaw, one of the leaders of the Appellants in the Archpriest Controversy, Persons wrote the *Memorial* along with *The Declaration of the king of Spains intention* in order to advance his standing in clerical hierarchy and possibly become a Cardinal if the Catholic Church should be restored in England.

Historians have held various reactions to Persons’s last major manifesto. John Bossy characterizes *A Memorial for the Reformation of England* as "a genuine attempt to mediate between the ecclesiastical and contemporary world." Bossy views Persons’s proposals as not counter-revolutionary, but forward thinking and innovative and more influenced by the English Renaissance that Persons lived through rather than the medieval age. While Persons’s *Memorial for the Reformation of England* could be considered pure fantasy, Anglican bishops and Puritans also imagined separately their ideal Reformations although it was the Anglican bishops and Puritans who were theoretically in power.
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Arnold Pritchard regards Persons's visionary treatise as "a sort of enlightened ruthlessness" and as something very revolutionary, whereas Bossy characterized the *Memorial* as being influenced by Elizabethan England and more conventional than radical. Persons was no less determined than Queen Mary to restore Catholicism as the one true faith of England but was willing to proceed less quickly in establishing external conformity in order to build a lasting foundation on popular religious consensus.\(^{356}\) Pritchard, however, writes that Persons "wants radical changes in the whole English structure of power and influence, not because he is a political or social radical on principle, but because of his desire to subordinate all institutions to his religious purpose." Persons held little regard for traditional political and social relations. On nearly every issue, the social and political must be subordinate to the pursuit of religious truth. Even if Persons was correct in his wishful assumptions that the majority of people in England were Catholic at heart, it was unlikely that they would have embraced enthusiastically the subordination of their material interests to Persons. Catholics who had proven their loyalty to the Catholic Church also held loyalty to other institutions as well and many of them held differing ideas on what constituted true Catholic practice.\(^{357}\)

Peter Holmes views the *Memorial for the Reformation of England* as the last word of overt Catholic resistance. Unlike Bossy and Pritchard, Holmes sees a subdued political tone from Persons and notes that he avoided having it printed or circulated widely, which suggests that he was not as committed as before to the ideas of political resistance to the Crown.\(^{358}\) Holmes notices more similarities than differences to Puritan and other Protestant programs of reform, other than the increased amount of power that the Catholic clergy would enjoy in matters

\(^{357}\) Pritchard, 34-36.
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of state. Belligerent language against the Crown inciting subjects to disobedience and rebellion was largely absent, and assertions of papal privilege were nowhere to be found. Persons wrote as if he believed the day of Catholic restoration would come after his death and only wrote what would happen if, rather than when, it took place.\footnote{359} Regardless of whether Persons's desires for the restoration of the Catholic Church were radical or conventional, it is obvious that they never came to pass and were later looked upon by the government as proof of the treachery of Catholics as a whole. Persons's enemies existed not only in the Elizabethan regime, but among the majority of the Catholic community which was growing steadily in power after the debacle of the Spanish Armada. They largely rejected Persons's vision of a reestablished Catholic Church in England because his scheme was not mindful of traditional religious practices in England. Persons brought with him all the institutionalism and hierarchy of the Catholic Church and the Counter-Reformation focus on discipline of the laity. Persons, however, proposed little in the way of pre-Reformation rituals and traditions that many in the English Catholic community still wanted to preserve. At the same time, Persons did not share with the Catholic community the tradition of remaining loyal to the established government no matter what the official religion of the land may have been.

Although one can observe a marked shift in the language of Allen and Persons coinciding with the Spanish Invasion, the Jesuit faction with which Allen so strongly identified always desired to contest and reverse the Elizabethan Settlement, whereas the majority of English Catholics simply desired to be left alone. The mainstream views of the Catholic community in England among the secular clergy and laity as well as the older generation of Marian clergy remained mostly silent in the prelude to the Spanish invasion in order to see which

\footnote{359} Holmes, \textit{Resistance and Compromise}, 163-164.
way the wind was blowing before speaking out against the Jesuits in England. The antagonism against the Jesuits among most Catholics in England did not simply show up overnight in the 1590s but rather had always existed from the moment they had landed ashore in England. This attitude became more pronounced as the English wearied of their confrontational attitude towards the government.

5.3 ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH JESUIT DOMINANCE OVER THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY IN THE ARCHPRIEST CONTROVERSY

A conflict known as the Wisbech Stirs brought to the surface the tensions between the Jesuits and the rest of the Catholic community. At the center of the controversy were William Weston, the leader of the Jesuit faction at Wisbech Castle, and his antagonist Christopher Bagshaw, the head of the secular priests in the makeshift seminary. Weston spoke only passingly of the Wisbech Stirs in his autobiography and even then he mentioned it as he was being taken from Wisbech to the Tower of London. He recalled that the guards told him that he had been summoned by the Queen since he took the side of the Spanish and defended the Spaniards’ right to the English throne both privately and publicly. They also added that there was a split among the Catholic prisoners at Wisbech over support of conflicting claims to the throne from Scotland and Spain. It was the accusations of Christopher Bagshaw that informed the guards of such intrigue, even though Bagshaw himself was the one to incite such talk of succession among the prisoners at Wisbech.

Bagshaw, however, put much greater emphasis on the split among the Catholic clergy in *A true relation of the faction begun at VVisbich by Fa. Edmonds*, which palpably showed how
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much the Jesuits alienated themselves from the rest of the Catholic community. Bagshaw made it clear in the title that the Jesuits were bringing in ecclesiastical innovations alien to the ancient traditions of England since the Jesuits sought to govern the secular priests. Bagshaw wanted to set the record straight against "such as are infected with our English Iesuitisme, do ascribe all the blame in that behalfe vnto vs, that are secular Priests: in that we could not be brought to alter our old orders for the aduauncement of Fa. Weston a Iesuite to become our Gouernor or Agent; as his faction tearmed him."362

Weston was brought to Wisbech Castle along with thirty other priests, according to Bagshaw, for his involvement in the Babington Plot and for spreading rumors of the impending invasion of the Spanish Armada. Prior to the arrival of Weston, none of the secular priests assumed an air of superiority over the others and there was little disturbance among the Catholic prisoners of Wisbech. Within a week after Weston's imprisonment, he sought to find ways to place himself above the rest of the secular priests. Weston wanted to instill greater discipline in the secular priests by appointing the seminarian Father Dryland to have oversight of everyone and to report all lapses in discipline to him. He found no approval for his scheme among the other priests and waited three more weeks until he attempted again to insist upon greater discipline in the ranks at Wisbech. Weston reasoned that he ranked ahead of the next two experienced priests, Father Bluet and Metham, and because of this believed the rest of the secular priests should have chosen him to take leadership over them.363

The episode at Wisbech, however, was only the beginning of the bitter divisiveness between the Jesuits and the secular clergy as it quickly became evident that the Jesuits had
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indeed alienated themselves from English Catholics with their ambitions to dominate politically the Catholic community. Father Garnet followed Weston's example at Wisbech in seeking to govern over all priests in England and Robert Persons set about to prolong what was started at Wisbech.\textsuperscript{364} Persons thought it necessary to have one person in charge of all the Catholic clergy in England, but he dared not to name a Jesuit since that would have made too obvious their designs; he had to appoint a secular priest instead. He named George Blackwell his candidate for Archpriest of England since he was a close associate of the Jesuits, though not one himself. Bagshaw did not believe that the pope was involved with the Jesuits' schemes for an Archpriest regime in England since it was likely "that his Holynes being throughly acquainted with these plots, would euer haue ben drawne to haue yeelded, that his Clergie of England should be ouertopt and controuled by the new vpstart Iesuites." Bagshaw and his fellow secular priests resolved not to conform to such a new order envisioned by the Jesuits until they saw written approval from the pope himself for such a plan. There was such bitter division between the seculars and the Jesuits that "One Lister a Iesuit writeth a booke to proue vs al schismatikes" in which he wrote that those who opposed the Archpriest regime "haue incurred the sentence of excommunication."\textsuperscript{365}

By looking at the rules set out for the new Archpriest regime it is not very difficult to see why secular priests were opposed. The Jesuits seemed exempt from all the rules that the rest of the English Catholic clergy had to follow as the \textit{Instructiones pro office Archipresbyteri in Anglia melius exequendo} stated "All faculties of subdelegation are cancelled except those of the Archpriest and the superior of the Jesuits." More glaringly unfair was the provision that "The Jesuits are not subject to the Archpriest" and that the Jesuits could overrule all decisions of the
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Archpriest as it provides that "Garnet is praised -- the Archp. must consult him in impt. Matters."\textsuperscript{366}

A number of secular priests decided to appeal to Rome against the Archpriest scheme, but the Archpriest and his associates forbade lay Catholics from hearing them say Mass or execute any other spiritual function and declared that those who did so were committing great sins. Bagshaw claimed that the Jesuits sought to discredit him by saying he did not verbally attack the Protestant adversary in his writings, and he gave several reasons why he chose not to lash out against the Elizabethan regime. The topic he was mainly concerned with did not afford an opportunity to attack the Elizabethan government as it strictly concerned the internal affairs of the Catholic community in England. Bagshaw also went so far as to claim "that the Jesuiticall persecution begun against vs, is much more grievous vnto vs, then that which we are subiect vnto from the State." He also reasoned that the Jesuits had done far more to hinder Catholicism in England than advance it as their railings against the Queen caused a negative public perception of Catholics. Bagshaw also pointed out that they would have to come to rely on the good favor of Elizabeth in order to obtain relief from persecution. He made it clear that although they differed from the government in religion, they still remained the Queen's subjects and emphasized that they, unlike the Jesuits and their followers, would not withdraw their allegiance or seek her overthrow.\textsuperscript{367} Bagshaw attributed Robert Persons's main motivation for his efforts in restoring Catholicism to his ambition of becoming a Cardinal, as did many other contemporary sources writing about Persons. He also associated the beginning of the seminaries in Spain with

\textsuperscript{366} \textit{Instructiones pro office Archipresbyteri in Anglia melius exequendo} 7 Mar. 1598 in \textit{Kenny Papers Vol. LXXIV, Documents on the Archpriest controversy and essays on Robert Persons as rector of the English College.} Add MS 74880, British Library.
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Robert Persons as he viewed Persons and the Jesuits as an utterly foreign import and stated "that father Parsons did build upon his foundation of his fals pretensions of loyalty to Queen Eliz."  

John Mush in *Dialogue Between a Secular Priest and a Lay Gentleman* sought to defend the secular priests against accusations of causing schism and disruption in the Catholic Church while simultaneously delegitimizing the Archpriest regime. The Jesuits charged the Appellants with disobedience since they would not recognize the validity of the Archpriest, but Mush made very much the same argument that the Elizabethan government had often suspected of Catholics in general of serving two masters. Just as Christ had preached against serving two lords, "it is impossible to be obedient to the See Apostolick, but that by necessary sequele, the same observant must disobey Master Blackwell the Archpriest."  

Mush's argument shows that English Catholics were influenced politically more by their own government than by any argument the Jesuits could have made in support of following the decrees and bulls of the Holy See.

The Appellants would not yield to any new organization or authority in the ecclesiastical structure of the Catholic Church unless it had the express approval of the Holy See in a Papal Bull. It was Blackwell's supposed authority which lay in opposition to the apostolic order of the Church and obedience to the papacy necessitated no acceptance of Blackwell as the lawful superior of all clergymen in England. Not only were the Appellants obeying the Pope in resisting the Archpriest, they were also being obedient to the Queen by resisting the nefarious designs of the Jesuits through their representative the Archpriest. Mush also took offense at the slanderous labels applied to the secular priests from the Jesuits and described such behavior as
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368 "Some MSS Authorities supplying the defects of all accounts yet given of Robert Parsons Jesuite who died in 1610" Lansdowne MS 983/63: 1610, British Library.
unique to the Jesuits because no Catholic before their arrival would have dared to call any anointed priest such blasphemous descriptions as idolater, libertine, or even atheist. Mush went so far as to make common cause with Protestants as he stated, although probably very wishfully, that "our common adversaries even of their owne humanitie, and for civilitie sake shewing a more reverent esteeme and respect to be had of priests (at least for their learning, scholarisme, morall vertues, and other good abilities noted in most of those, had by that faction in disgrace) than any these new pestiferous Puritancal Iesuiticaall Sectaries will eyther acknowledge, or give any signe to bee had of them." Mush also writes that the Jesuits falsely imagined that the secular priests were government spies seeking only to exile the Jesuits and to turn all Catholics against them.370

Although Mush was very much opposed to the Archpriest, he excused Blackwell by saying Blackwell did not know what his office really meant or the treasonable practices that the Jesuits expected out of him. Mush, however, disparaged the laity and the less experienced priests who seemed predisposed to be persuaded by the Jesuits. Mush claimed that the Jesuits thought they were closest to perfection in morals, virtue, and knowledge and warned against following them since humankind is inherently imperfect. Mush cited the doctrine of Original Sin and the writings of pagan philosophers on the imperfection of humans and foretold that the pride of the Jesuits would lead to their ultimate ruin and downfall. He stated instead that the Jesuits' accusations they hurled against the Appellants were sinful and frail. Mush made a direct parallel between the Puritans and the Jesuits since both groups were hypocritical and thought themselves above all people.371
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As Mush and Blackwell wrote books against the establishment of the Archpriest in England, the other leaders of the Appellants added their voices to the Archpriest Controversy in a letter sent out from Wisbech in January 1601. They accused Blackwell of causing nothing but further division among Catholics in England. The Appellants claimed to be in desperate need of funding from the Catholic hierarchy while Blackwell prevented money getting to the Appellants and accused them of being greedy. Blackwell wanted to settle the dispute between himself and the Appellants in Flanders, but the Appellants knew well that the Spanish Infanta held sway in Flanders and that Persons considered her a legitimate heir to the English throne. The Appellants sought to remain as apolitical as possible and used this as a reason for appealing their case to the Pope.\(^{372}\)

While the Appellants continued to write against the Archpriest, they also used diplomatic measures as they went out to France to meet with the Papal Nuncio Ottavio Mirto Frangipani. They were able to obtain letters from Frangipani which urged peace above all else, but they interpreted them as being in their favor. Interestingly, the Appellants borrowed a technique used by Protestants in the Church of England and referred to the Archpriest as a Spaniard not only to depict him as a foreign invader but also to gain support from the king of France and to use his endorsement in Rome. The Appellants, like the rest of the Catholic community, clearly opposed the power of the papacy to depose political leaders and considered the Archpriest a traitor whom they believed held to this line of thought.\(^{373}\)


Richard Hall, the canon of St. Omer on the continent, wrote to Frangipani on the goals of the Appellants. Hall's letter to Frangipani shows that the Appellants were drawing on pre-Reformation legal traditions as the wider Catholic community instinctively obeyed the English government out of cultural tradition. He presented their main grievance as being that the Archpriest was instituted without their representation. On the contrary, they agreed beforehand that two among them should become Archbishop and Bishop, splitting England between them. They fell back on the Statute of Praemunire to nullify the pope's influence in deciding their own clerical affairs, just as Henry VIII used it to justify legally his schism from the Catholic Church. One of the Appellants' main concerns, according to Hall, was Catholic parents sending their offspring to countries such as Spain or Rome which, though Catholic, were still foreign. The Appellants viewed the Spanish king's generosity towards English Catholic exiles with great suspicion since they saw it as merely a way to win the English throne. The Appellants flatly considered Persons and the rest of the Jesuits as traitors, and stated that if a Catholic monarch should happen to invade England, even with the Pope's approval, all Catholics at home were bound to support Elizabeth against the invasion.374

On the other side of the Archpriest Controversy, Robert Persons simultaneously attacked the secular priests for being insubordinate and defended the reputation of the Jesuits in England. Persons wrote to Frangipani against the Appellants and said they were really worse than they appeared. They were not after peace at all because they wrote against the king of Spain, whom Persons considered a valuable Catholic ally. Persons also saw the Appellants as coming dangerously close to holding heretical beliefs because they wrote against the political authority of the pope. According to Persons, they were gradually getting more rebellious everyday and

---

374 Richard Hall to Frangipani, 6 February 1602 in Kenny Papers Vol. LXXIV, Documents on the Archpriest controversy and essays on Robert Persons as rector of the English College. Add MS 74880, British Library.
strong disciplinary measures needed to be taken against them for working with Protestants, or they would never stop.375

Persons then asserted that the priests who refused to follow the new regulations for daily conduct set down by William Weston were being factious and defied the wishes of the majority of Catholic prisoners at Wisbech who also desired stricter rules. The secular faction caused Weston to be transported to the Tower of London through defamation of his character to the Elizabethan authorities. Such malicious slander by some of the secular priests was untrue as many in England knew him to be a wise and learned man. He also had a great reputation not only among his fellow prisoners, who were Catholics, but also among Protestants for being humble and pious as he endured nearly 15 years of incarceration because of his religion. Persons heard reports of Weston's extraordinarily pious behavior from a priest and wrote that "F. Edmunds perseverance both day and night in prayer, was such, as he never saw him in bed all that time, except only a little, when he was sick, nor ever slept, but either standing or sitting at his prayers, in which he would often fall downe but ordinarily sit downe upon some resting place, while the force of sleep did overcome his and then return to his prayer againe." Persons thought it unimaginable that such a holy man would seek to assert his dominance over his fellow Catholics in prison and held him up as the ideal example of a Jesuit that practiced such rigorous piety.376

As Persons held Weston up as an example of a most pious Christian, he simultaneously denounced the moral failings of not only the secular priests opposed to Weston at Wisbech but also seminary priests at the English College in Rome. Persons wrote to Father John Bennet on
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an appalling scandal concerning seminary priests in Rome visiting taverns and brothels around the same time the Wisbech Stirs were taking place in England. Persons deeply regretted this debacle and wrote furiously against them demanding that the Catholic Church should "apprehende all Seminarians who went to taberns and brothels" and felt it necessary for "a reexaminnacion to be made of all the folley... from the beginning."\textsuperscript{377} The scandal of the seminary priests at the English College in Rome and the refusal of the secular priests at Wisbech to follow extra rules concerning morality were evidence to Persons that the Jesuits were superior to other Catholic clergy in regard to living a moral life. These separate incidents served only to reinforce the divide between the Jesuits and nearly everyone else in the English Catholic community both on the continent and England.

In writing about the appointment of the Archpriest, Persons claimed that the pope himself was moved to create an ecclesiastical hierarchy under the direction of an Archpriest and twelve assistants after he heard of the disorder at Wisbech. This claim contrasted with Mush's and Bagshaw's assertions that the pope could not possibly be behind the creation of more church bureaucracy in England since they saw no official letters or heard any decrees from the Holy See. According to Persons, the pope was deeply involved in the creation of the Archpriest regime as he consulted the Cardinals for several months on the best type of government necessary to quell insubordination in England. The pope also asked the opinion of priests who labored on the ground in England and together they decided to appoint George Blackwell as an Archpriest. The office of the Archpriest was no recent innovation in the Catholic ecclesiastical structure, as the secular priests had so often implied, but rather an ancient position in the Church. The Appellants often cited the absence of any official documents from the papacy approving the

\textsuperscript{377} Letter from Robert Persons to Father John Bennet on the scandal of seminary priests at the English College in Rome who have been caught visiting taverns and brothels, 18 Oct. 1597. RP 2968/4, British Library.
Archpriest regime as justification for their resistance, but Persons claims that he initially held back from writing any official Apostolic Letters and decided instead "to commit rather the Institution of the matter by special order to the Protector to be done in his name."\footnote{Robert Persons, An appendix, 118-120.}

Persons viewed the institution of the Archpriest as sort of a punishment that the secular priests brought upon themselves. Until recently the Catholic clergy in England showed humility, obedience, and unity, so there had been no need of a superior clergyman. It was due to an increase in the numbers of priests in England and a corresponding decrease in piety which led to discontent against the Jesuits. Some priests freshly coming out of seminaries, despite being under the instruction of the Jesuits, had drawn others to join them in their disobedience. It was necessary in the opinion of many Catholics that the best solution to the divisions among the clergy would be the subordination of the secular priests in England as a whole. Persons claimed that the desire for an Archpriest in England came not only from the Jesuits and himself, but from many of the secular priests themselves as evidenced by a number of letters.\footnote{Ibid, 120-121.}

Curiously enough, the Appellants wrote that they did acknowledge Blackwell as their superior, but yet they sought to discredit his authority. The Appellants identified the Archpriest as being a foreign potentate that was illegal to obey according to the Statue of Praemunire. They added that the Pope could not appoint an Archpriest without their consent. The Appellants also accused the Archpriest of holding a heretical position on the matter that priests in England could not appeal over his authority to the Pope directly.\footnote{Ibid, 129.} Persons, however, emphasized the teachings of the Doctors of the Church which counseled ready obedience to church authority. He quoted Thomas Aquinas as saying that subjects are bound to obey their superiors in almost every
matter, except in those of which the superior did not have adequate knowledge or if the order was contrary to Christian precepts or the command of a higher Church authority.\footnote{Ibid, 134.}

Although the Jesuits were Blackwell’s main supporters, he was not without a following among the lay nobility. In a letter to the pope, several unnamed lay nobles in February 1602 wrote on behalf of Blackwell. They believed that the Appellants went to Rome only to accuse the innocent of betrayal not only to England but to the Catholic Church. The three principal goals of the Appellants, according to the anonymous nobles, were ”the abolition of the Archpriesthood, the withdrawal of the Jesuits, and the devastation of the seminaries.” It appeared to the nobles that the Appellants were almost apostates to the Catholic faith as they condoned taking the Oath of Supremacy and accused a number of their fellow Catholics of treason to the Crown. The nobles claimed the Appellants initially opposed the Archpriest since it would obstruct any possible promotions in the Catholic hierarchy. Even though the Appellants bitterly opposed the Archpriest, the nobles claimed that Blackwell still found it within himself to forgive them as they continued in their resistance. They found it unthinkable that Catholic priests would work together with Protestants against other Catholic clergymen. The nobles urged the pope not to listen to the Appellants, whom they characterized as ”a few disobedient priests.”\footnote{Several lay nobles to the Pope, 2 February 1602. est in \textit{Kenny Papers Vol. LXXIV, Documents on the Archpriest controversy and essays on Robert Persons as rector of the English College}. Add MS 74880, British Library.} It is worth emphasizing, however, that these nobles remained anonymous in the letter which calls into question how reliable this particular piece of correspondence remains in gauging support among the laity for the Archpriest. Their sentiments towards the Archpriest and feelings on the Oath of Supremacy appear far from the norm if one defines Catholicism in England more
broadly than the recusant nobility who could often afford to pay recusancy penalties, as fairly recent historiography has pointed out so often.

Eventually, William Bishop and Roger Charnock, the leaders of the Appellant faction, went to Rome to appeal directly to the Pope's authority against the institution of the Archpriest. As they arrived in Rome, however, they were arrested on the orders of the pope and detained at the English College where they were questioned on the late controversy over the Archpriest in England. 383

Charnock's and Bishop's true intentions were eventually revealed through the writings of William Watson as they thought they might be made archbishops themselves on their return to England while at the same time suppressing their enemies, the Jesuits. 384 In light of this new evidence, the Pope and the Cardinals conferred together to pass their judgement on the Archpriest Controversy. They entreated that Charnock and Bishop return to Paris and to Lorraine but not to England unless they had the special approval of the Pope or the Cardinal Protector. In a new brief on April 6, 1599, the Pope confirmed the authority of the Archpriest and the authenticity of the Cardinal's letters and ordered that there be no more contention or strife among the clergymen of England. 385 The brief, however, was not totally favorable towards the Jesuits and the Archpriest as Persons had implied. It made some concessions to the Appellants by condemning Thomas Lister's incendiary book and reproving the Archpriest, but it also prohibited any further writing or renewed controversy on the Archpriest. The orders of the Pope,
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however, did not bring a definitive conclusion to the Archpriest Controversy as both sides continued to write against each other with no less bitterness than before.\footnote{Thomas Graves Law, \textit{The Archpriest Controversy: Documents Relating to the Dissensions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, 1597-1602}, vol 1. (London: Camden Society, 1896), xxi-xxii.}

While it seemed that the Appellants had ultimately failed in their goal to remove the Archpriest from ecclesiastical office and that the Jesuits had won a victory, in reality the Archpriest did far more to harm the cause of the Jesuits in England than it did to aid them. While they did seek to enforce their standards of discipline and political loyalty on the rest of the clergy, their overreaching pushed the Appellants all the more into allying with the government against the Jesuits. The Elizabethan government was well aware of the growing rift between the seculars and the Jesuits and did everything in their power to support the Appellants in an effort to keep the divisions among the clergy alive and well.

William Watson's letter to the attorney general illustrates the level of mutual support that the Appellants and the government had for each other. During the conflict between the Jesuits and the Appellants, Watson reminded the attorney general that he held "loyalty, love & duety, to god, my prince, countrey & yorselife in autority" which contrasted with the seditious behavior of the Jesuits who felt no such respect for authority.\footnote{Law, 210-211.} Watson makes it a point to say that in his stay at Marshalsea he was one of the priests who condemned Babington's plot and that he and other seminarians fought "togither against the ruine of or poore country wche we greately feared by that Spanified league." Watson states he had repeatedly spoken out against the Jesuits against their intermeddling in political affairs and their vain presumptions of them being above the rest of the Catholic clergy in England. He even wrote letters to his contacts and associates dissuading them from entering into the Society. Watson goes so far to claim that he suffered
heavier persecution from the followers of the Jesuits for speaking out against them than he otherwise felt at the hands of the magistrate. Although Watson could have moved out of England as positions in schools and churches in other countries opened up to him, he decided to remain in England despite the persecution because of the great love he felt for his native country although he did admit to rethinking his opposition to the Jesuits as he wearied of their constant harassment.388

The Jesuits accused Watson of holding secret meetings with Robert Cecil, one of Elizabeth’s chief spymasters, which he denied and wrote with frustration that everyone under the influence of the Jesuits believed these slanderous rumors to be true. Although the Jesuits believed Watson to be a spy in the pay of the government, his fellow seminarians refused to believe such a thing; even if he did have dealings with Cecil it was for the good of the country and English Catholics as a whole. Not only were a great number of the secular priests were in arms against the Jesuits, but the Catholic nobility of northern England, especially Westmoreland and Dacre, were opposed to the designs of the Jesuits. Watson wrote at length against the Spanish inheriting the throne of England and favored the Scots ahead of them which caused the Jesuits to accuse Watson that he was an apostate as he preferred a Scot to inherit the throne ahead of a Spanish Catholic.389

Watson wrote the letter primarily to assure the attorney general and the Queen that not all Catholics were of the same mind as Persons whom Watson referred to under his pseudonym as Doleman. The secular priests wanted Persons's desires for the English succession to be known in order "to cleare the inocent as also to abate the peoples fond affection to that Span. title."
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Watson wished for a truce between himself and the Elizabethan regime in which he promised that writing would be limited to the refutation of Persons and no inflammatory works would be published against Protestantism. Also, no further polemical works would target the Queen or her council as the Jesuits so often did. In return, Watson defended against all attempts at imprisoning him for this service he had done for the Queen but he still feared retaliation from the Jesuits for hindering them in their disloyal enterprises. Watson hoped that the attorney general would well consider these promises and to persuade the Queen and her royal council to at least alleviate the persecution that Watson suffered.\textsuperscript{390}

The Jesuits in their efforts to exert further control over the English mission through the Archpriest had succeeded in alienating the secular clergy who began to realize increasingly that their goals for the mission to England were far different than that of the Jesuits. The Appellants constantly expressed in their writing that they often felt less persecuted and harassed by the government itself than by the Jesuits because the latter threatened them with excommunication and publishing slanderous works against them. Although the Jesuits continued to perform valuable services for the Catholic community and inspired a minority to resist the government, in effect they turned the majority of the Catholic community against them through their political activities.

The final and most visible rejection of Jesuit political ideology came with the Protestations of Allegiance in 1602 signed by thirteen secular priests who desired to put to rest any questions about where their true political loyalties lay. Not only did priests sign the Protestations, but laymen did as well as they promised all due loyalty and obedience to the Queen. They also swore simultaneously that they would not support in any case any prince or

\textsuperscript{390} Ibid, 223-225
power other than Elizabeth. Although the Jesuits swore ostensibly to do the same in most cases, the Protestations of Allegiance diverged significantly with the political practice of the Jesuits by stating that they would not under any circumstances obey the pope if he happened to make another bull or other pronouncement against the authority of Elizabeth. They also promised to resist actively any foreign invasion of England that had the aim of overthrowing "the religion now professed and established by her Majesty's laws and ordinances, whether it be under colour of the restitution of the Romish religion, or under what other pretence so ever it be."\textsuperscript{391} The Protestations of Allegiance put on paper what most Catholics in England felt about allegiance to the Queen as most were nothing but traditionally minded on this issue.

Historians have tended to depict the conflicts between the seculars and the Jesuits as involving not only questions over discipline and ecclesiastical jurisdiction but also competing visions between securing toleration for Catholicism in a Protestant state as advanced by the seculars and the reconversion of England as a whole to Catholicism as the Jesuits advocated. Arnold Oskar Meyer writes that the divisions between seculars and Jesuits began at Wisbech and states that the secular priests' fears of Jesuit domination over the rest of the Catholic clergy and church in England was the product of "party feeling and malicious exaggeration, and yet, on the other hand, they undoubtedly contain a nucleus of fact." Meyer states that the bitterness between seculars and Jesuits had broken out before the visible strife began in the aftermath of the Spanish Armada. Persons, however, remarked that such rivalry between secular and regular clergy was by no means unique to England and had existed since the early middle ages which shows the

unshakable belief of Persons in the Jesuit mission and the final victory of Catholicism over Protestantism in England. 392

The disturbance at Wisbech over seemingly minor issues of discipline was the spark that set ablaze the coming conflagration over larger issues of how the church was to be governed in England. The seculars wanted a bishop in England not because they wanted to set up a competing hierarchy with the Church of England, but rather because they needed someone who could exercise important episcopal functions such as the ordination of new priests and the confirmation of the laity. By contrast, the Jesuits wanted to bring back the Catholic hierarchy as it was before Elizabeth. True to their Counter-Reformation background, the Jesuits desired an English church with stricter rules of hierarchical discipline and a church closer in union with Rome. The seculars wanted a more independent organization more closely adapted with local customs and circumstances, while the Jesuits desired centralization of church authority in Rome over England. 393

Cardinal Enrico Caetani, the Lord Protector of England and predisposed to supporting the Jesuits, had appointed George Blackwell as Archpriest of England for the ostensible reason of keeping the peace between the Jesuits and the seculars, when in fact the very opposite turned out to be the case as a result of this ecclesiastical innovation. Meyer finds no evidence suggesting that the Cardinal did not wish to make the seculars subordinate to the Jesuits as the English mission was supposed to have two leaders from then on, the Archpriest for seculars and the superior of the Jesuits in England. The close relationship between Blackwell and the Jesuits, however, was a cause of alarm for the secular priests who immediately saw a conspiracy that
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meant to enslave them to the will of the Jesuits.\textsuperscript{394} After the Appellants lost in their appeals to Rome to overturn the Archpriest regime, they decided to turn to the English government in an effort to restrict the power of the Jesuits by making "an effort to turn the English laws against catholics into laws against Jesuits."\textsuperscript{395}

The Protestation of Allegiance was the most visible attempt of the seculars to gain favorability with the government by aligning themselves firmly against the Jesuits as outlining the authority of the Pope as strictly spiritual. The Appellants finally answered the bloody questions so often put to Catholic prisoners and favored secular power while rejecting the previous notions of Counter-Reformation thought that the pope was able to depose a secular ruler. Arnold Oskar Meyer considers the Protestations of Allegiance as an unmitigated victory for the Crown as he proclaims that in one fell swoop, "the submission of the thirteen priests is the proclamation of the victory of the modern secular state over the claim of the medieval universal church to political power." Meyer further concludes that there was no Catholic party of considerable strength in England needing but only a few events to occur in their favor to bring England back to the Catholic Church. A growing sense of national identity was not to be found exclusively in Protestants, but also in the majority of Catholics.\textsuperscript{396}

John Bossy, however, views the Jesuits as much more in the mainstream of the Catholic community than does Meyer. He names Meyer as the "most influential interpreter" of the Archpriest Controversy. Despite this, however, Bossy fundamentally disagrees with Meyer's interpretation of the Archpriest Controversy as more of a political affair than ecclesiastical argument. Bossy criticizes Meyer for characterizing the Catholic community in England as too
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monolithic and failed to draw a clear distinction between the laity and the clergy. Bossy states that the problem of allegiance belonged primarily to the laity and that questions of allegiance did not figure prominently in the Archpriest Controversy as there were more general problems on the relationship between clergy and laity in the background.\textsuperscript{397}

As early as 1585, the foremost families of the gentry had already offered their own declaration of allegiance in an effort to prevent harboring Catholic priests a crime. Bossy regards the 1585 declaration composed by Thomas Tresham as an attempt to reconcile the Catholic gentleman's loyalty to the Queen and his obligations to his priest. The gentry could find no Catholic priest that could answer for their salvation if they decided to conform occasionally and wanted this to be understood not as a refusal of service due to the state but a genuine religious concern. The Catholic gentry, for the most part, refused to admit that their priests were counseling them to abandon their allegiance and the gentry claimed that all of their priests recognized the authority of Elizabeth. First the gentry and later the Appellants came to share similar goals in getting rid of the Jesuits although they differed on the means since "while the gentry proposed to get rid of the Jesuits as a means of affirming allegiance, the priests offered declarations of allegiance in the hope of getting rid of the Jesuits." While the Appellants signed a protestation declaring that they would remain loyal and defend the realm against all enemies, they did not sign an oath of allegiance and still insisted on continuing their priestly functions under full communion with Rome which was unacceptable to the government.\textsuperscript{398}

Bossy makes the claim that the Appellants were far closer to the Jesuits than they realized since they made only one unsuccessful attempt to reconcile their priestly profession with
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political allegiance. Bossy sees far more unity than disunity in the Catholic community as the Appellants later refused to take an oath required by the government of James I in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot. The Protestation of Allegiance was an aberration for the Appellants rather than a central belief. One of the central quarrels between the Jesuits and the secular priests was that of continuity. The secular priests believed that the Catholic Church in England never died at any point and did not subscribe to the notion of the Jesuits that England needed to be approached as a blank slate similar to the missionary situation in Japan. The Appellants were also obsessed with hierarchical order and made common cause with Church of England clergy who were being challenged by Puritans in much the same way the secular clergy felt threatened by the Jesuits. The idea of the Jesuits being the Catholic counterpart to the Puritans began as a slur at the Wisbech Stirs but eventually became more of a reality for the seculars who opposed the Jesuits.  

The seculars sought Roman confirmation for a hierarchy of their own choosing but were ultimately rejected as Rome sided more with the Jesuits in disbelieving any claims to the continuity of the Catholic hierarchy in England. Although the pope expressed his approval for the institution of the Archpriest, the Appellants won an important concession in which the Archpriest would not collaborate with the Jesuits. The Appellants also eventually ended up joining with the Archpriest regime as they became the majority of the twelve assistants. By 1607 they were able to elect George Birkhead as the successor after Blackwell had been removed by the pope for taking the new Oath of Allegiance. With the election of Birkhead, the secular priests were able to push for the elimination of Jesuit influence and the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy. Political allegiance, for Bossy, played little if any role in the Archpriest
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Controversy for the Appellants as "they thought of it less as an instrument for running the
mission than as a convenient base from which to pursue their campaign of ecclesiastical
restoration." 400

In a more recent interpretation of the Archpriest Controversy, Stefania Tutino emphasizes
the ideological aspect of the confrontation between the secular priests and the Jesuits like Meyer,
but also disagrees with Bossy and Meyer by characterizing the Appellants as being more
visionary than the Jesuits. 401 Both sides felt the reign of Elizabeth was fast approaching its end,
and as early as the mid 1590s Persons had already put forth his ideal successor as the Infanta of
Spain. Tutino sees a clear and distinct break up of factions in Catholicism starting in the 1590s
between the Jesuits and the secular priests. She notes, however, that there were dissenting voices
against the administration of the Jesuits as early as the 1580s although it is difficult to draw the
line where collaborationism with the government began and in cases in which contrary opinions
against Person were merely expressed. The discontent expressed from the seculars towards the
Jesuits exploded with the Wisbech Stirs over seemingly minor issues of conduct on certain
appointed fast days. Weston's attempted censure was rejected by Thomas Bluet which he saw as
a Jesuit attempt to take control of the Catholic priests imprisoned at Wisbech. 402

The Wisbech Stirs folded into the later Archpriest Controversy in which the Jesuits
secured nomination for George Blackwell as Archpriest while the seculars viewed him as a front
man for the agenda of the Society of Jesus to dominate the English mission. The Appellants
went to the pope several times to appeal for the removal of the Archpriest with no success and
consequently they turned to the government to offer total loyalty and a clean break with the
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Jesuits in exchange for tolerance which also failed. The traditional Whig historiography of the Archpriest Controversy emphasizes the progressive nature of the Appellants as they represented a forward looking vision of English Catholicism that would clear itself of any involvement in politics. This contrasted with Persons and the Jesuits' claims that the pope did have the power to depose sovereigns which irreparably mixed religion and politics. Bossy argues against this interpretation by stressing the ecclesiastical nature of the argument instead and by claiming that the Jesuits and Appellants were actually far closer in political ideology at the time of the Archpriest Controversy as the Jesuits also began to abandon any notion of resistance starting with Persons' *Memorial for the Reformation of England*. Bossy sees the Appellants as the true conservative faction while the Jesuits and the government argued for the inextricable link of politics and religion although on opposite sides.\(^{403}\)

Tutino, however, argues that Persons's conciliatory tone in his later years should not be overestimated, as he never clearly rejected ideological resistance against the English Crown. There is also documentation that Persons did have further negotiations with Spain near the beginning of the seventeenth century for further intervention in English affairs. Above all, Persons did not want to secure toleration for Catholicism in England but rather a Catholic England. Because of Persons's negotiations with Spain, Tutino argues that the Appellants did have a certain ideological tone of resistance towards the Jesuits whom they closely identified with the Spanish after the defeat of the Armada. While the secular priests condemned the Jesuits, they faulted the government only in failing to distinguish loyal Catholics from political traitors.\(^{404}\) Tutino regards the Appellants as the forward-looking faction because they advocated a primitive degree of religious freedom although in the short term they were unsuccessful in

---

\(^{403}\) Ibid, 67-68.
\(^{404}\) Ibid, 69.
bringing about such a vision. She clarifies, however, that they wanted merely to practice their faith without the prospect of martyrdom. The Appellants did not misconstrue the nature of interdependence between religion and politics, but rather wanted to create a new understanding of the interdependence by incorporating elements of English Catholic thought since 1559 which would open the path for further development of ideology in the seventeenth century starting with the Oath of Allegiance in 1606.\textsuperscript{405}

5.4 CONCLUSION

While Meyer, Bossy, and Tutino have argued over whether the Jesuits represented a modernizing or conservative force in the English Catholic Church, they agree that the Jesuits represented a mode of thinking that was quite alien and radical to English people, both Catholics and Protestants. The Jesuits were a modern force within English Catholicism, as Bossy claims, but this did not make them by any means the mainstream of the Catholic community which, like the rest of England, was very conservative in its views regarding loyalty to the sovereign of England. Their views on the nature of religion and politics may appear as decidedly backward and conservative to a modern audience, but for their time the Jesuits represented a different vision of modernizing the English Catholic Church to make it more internationally based, more centralized, and less insular, similar to the different intentions that the Catholic King James II had for modernizing England in the mold of absolutist France.\textsuperscript{406}

The Jesuits' ideas on the nature of authority held no wide acceptance among English Catholics as was proven by the sentiments of the Catholic community at large ever since the accession of Elizabeth who had no desire other than to remain faithful subjects in spite of

\textsuperscript{405} Ibid, 73.
\textsuperscript{406} For more on James II's attempted program of modernization prior to the Glorious Revolution, see Steve Pincus 1688: The First Modern Revolution.
whatever punishment they may have endured for their beliefs. Except for perhaps a minority of recusants, the divide on the Archpriest Controversy did not affect much the average lay Catholic, but it was also just as much an argument about politics as it was over the nature of ecclesiastical organization of the Catholic Church in England. The repeated identification in the Appellants' writing of the Jesuits with the Spanish is particularly significant as it shows a clear element of political antagonism between the seculars and the Jesuits.

The divide between the Jesuits and the secular clergy, however, did not suddenly break out in the 1590s nor did it begin in the 1580s. The very concept of an English mission to Rome as begun by Allen was bound to create divisions in the Catholic community over whether it would be better to reconvert England to a Catholic nation or to secure merely toleration for English Catholics to practice their faith without fear of martyrdom. Robert Persons was no less political in his later years. Though he may have toned down his rhetoric slightly, he never renounced his views on the best course of action to take in regard to the overthrow of Elizabeth. It would be most helpful to view the Archpriest Controversy in the future as two contrasting visions for the future of the Catholic Church in England. The Jesuits favored the Catholic Church in England being more subject to authority in Rome. Conversely, the Appellants wanted the Catholic Church in England to follow its more traditional pre-Reformation predecessor in having a closer affinity with the local religious culture. The Appellants also favored following previous patterns of a certain independence from Rome as exhibited by the pre-Reformation English Church and the Marian Catholic Church.
CONCLUSION

It is clear from the present study that the Jesuits found themselves politically isolated among their co-religionists in Elizabethan England due largely to traditions of loyalty to the reigning monarch. Although historians have often pointed to the 1590s as the starting point of the discrediting of the Jesuits' ideas on political adherence to the papacy, it remains difficult to find any point in the history of the Catholic community that the Jesuits enjoyed much popular support in England. In legal tradition, the laws of the land in England had long considered the authority of the papacy to be primarily spiritual in nature; this was true even during medieval times. The Statute of Praemunire, which forbade allegiance to a foreign power, had already outlawed any conception of the pope being able to influence secular affairs in England. The pope calling for the deposition of Elizabeth was far too much to ask of Catholics in England because the laws of England were already hostile to the idea of following political orders from a foreign authority. Even though Catholic recusancy in England was essentially an illegal activity as laid out by the 1558 Act of Conformity, most recusants justified their refusal to attend services by separating political demands from religious conscience which is something that the Jesuits failed to do as they inherently equated politics and religion as one and the same just as their sworn enemies had in the Elizabethan government.

In the traditional Whig historiography of English Catholicism prior to John Bossy, it was assumed that a sense of nationalism among Catholics in England had predisposed them to work against the Jesuits. For this reason the Jesuits in England had been seen as a backwards group
within Catholicism in the way of progress towards a state that firmly separated religion and politics from each other. Bossy, however, has rightly pointed out that the Jesuits were a modernizing force within English Catholicism that had sought to bring the English Church more firmly in line with the cutting edge of Counter-Reformation practice and theology in the international and institutional Catholic Church. Bossy, however, presupposes that all English Catholics had thought that the medieval English Church had ceased to exist, which to him forms the most important prerequisite for the emergence of a viable Catholic community. He argues forcefully that the starting point of the English Catholic Church was in 1568 with the founding of the English college at Douay by William Allen. 407 Although it was Allen who founded the English college originally to provide a sound education to rival the Protestant universities in England which Allen saw as inadequate, Bossy identifies the real beginning of the English Catholic community with the idea of the English mission as envisioned by new recruits to the English college such as Robert Persons and Edmund Campion. 408

Bossy, however, overstates how much Persons and Campion were influenced by Elizabethan society despite the fact that they grew up in it. It is clear from the writings of Persons that he regarded himself as first and foremost a Catholic in the unyielding service of the pope, as he took the papal bull very seriously in addressing Elizabeth as "the pretended English Queen." Campion also made explicitly clear his desire to reconvert England in his infamous Challenge to the Privy Council as he announced the inevitable restoration of Catholicism as the religion of the land. These sentiments would have appeared very foreign and confrontational to the majority of English Catholics who often had no interest in politics and desired above all to be simply left alone. A community built around such political ideology would have been even more

407 John Bossy, English Catholic Community, 11-12
408 Bossy, 14-15.
suspect than it already was in Elizabethan England. Although Bossy is correct in stating that the Jesuits went a long way to ensure that the Catholic community would not die out, the beginning of a Catholic community in England did not lie with their conception of a mission to England aimed at its reconversion. Catholic practice in England continued on regardless of whatever monarch in England may have existed throughout the tumultuous religious changes of the sixteenth century. Even after the Jesuits enjoyed their greatest moments of publicity in the late sixteenth century, the Catholic community still existed precariously but survived nonetheless. Bossy also states that Campion and Persons opposed the Act of Supremacy "not so much because it was in conflict with traditional belief and practice, but because they felt it an affront to the high ideal of the clerical vocation which they held." Rather than viewing the Act of Supremacy from a political angle, they were more concerned over social aspects such as the growing power of the secular aristocracy over the English Church. They were not, however, simply concerned with defending a priestly class but with reforming Catholicism in England to be more spiritually based than was the Marian brand of Catholicism.  

Bossy, however, downplays the very real political dimension that motivated the Jesuit mission to England. It was unacceptable for Campion and Persons to admit that Elizabeth could ever be the legitimate ruler of England as she was born out of an unrecognized union between Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. Although Jesuits preferred to answer the "Bloody Question" with silence, their lack of an answer indicated that they would do nothing to stop an armed invasion of England aimed at overthrowing Elizabeth since she was only a pretender. Person wrote an entire tract on which he concerned himself with the politics of the next succession after Elizabeth. He believed that kings may lawfully be deposed by their subjects if they did not follow the laws of

---

409 Bossy, 15-17.
the land; yielding too much to a secular authority would invite tyranny. Pretenders, however, may be deprived much more quickly as he stated, "And if this might be so in Kings lawfully set in Possession, then much more hath the said Common-wealth power and authoritie to alter the succession of such as do pretend Dignitie, if there be due reason and causes to the same."\(^{410}\)

Rather than seeing the Jesuits as being central to the identity of the Catholic community in England, the modernist view they espoused of the Catholic Church in England did not sit well with either the gentry or the nobility who overwhelmingly professed loyalty to Elizabeth far earlier than did the secular clergy. Among lay people of modest means, strict non-conformity was out of reach which made them identify even less with the Jesuits who advocated more often than not being absent all the time from Church of England services.

Christopher Haigh, on the other hand, argues against Bossy's thesis of Catholic survivalism being located firmly within the Jesuit vision for a Catholic England. Instead, he gives much of the credit to the surviving Marian clergy for laying the foundations that the secular and Jesuit missionaries built upon. In peripheral areas of England such as Lancashire, the Elizabethan government could do little to enforce the Religious Settlement.\(^{411}\) Indeed, traditional religion ran most strongly in Tudor Lancashire as Haigh finds "that the tenets and practices of late-medieval Catholicism still retained their hold in the county while disillusionment was spreading in the south." Part of the reason lay in the fact that such devotion to religion lagged behind the rest of the country in medieval times as the first monastery did not arrive in Lancashire until as late as 1084. The increasing wealth that people in Lancashire acquired in the reign of Henry VIII made it easier for them to construct additional buildings and

\(^{411}\) Christopher Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire*, 1.
provide extra endowments to ensure the continuance of traditional religious practices.\footnote{412}{Haigh, 74-75.} These developments ensured that the Church of England in Lancashire would not experience an easy time of reforming the county in such a way to conform to the Religious Settlement. The Edwardian regime made thorough efforts to convert the populace to Protestantism but met with little success and there were few people in Lancashire that held any sympathy for the new liturgy and theology of the church establishment.\footnote{413}{Ibid, 225.} Since the Anglican Church could offer little resistance to Catholic practice in Lancashire, the agenda of the recusant and seminarian priests was relatively simple compared to other counties and areas of England. Anglican clergymen were in short supply in Lancashire and the few who served there were highly conservative and lax in enforcing conformity.\footnote{414}{Ibid, 246.} Haigh further concludes that by the middle of 1578 recusancy had already existed on a wide scale which predated the hardest efforts of the missionaries to strengthen the Catholic faith. Very few seminarians had ever found their way into Lancashire and much of the north for that matter as they preferred to focus their efforts on the south where they could minister to the gentry and nobility who were more ready to support them by giving shelter and other material aid. It was the local recusant priests who were more instrumental in preserving Catholicism in Lancashire as they found an environment favorable to work in with little obstruction to their efforts of preserving traditional religious practices.\footnote{415}{Ibid, 264-266.}

Although Haigh characterizes Lancashire as being an especially stalwart Catholic county in England, the Catholic laity in Lancashire resisted religious change as much as they resisted the Jesuits who emphasized the authority of the Church in Rome. Those who lived in Lancashire displayed a general contempt for any enforcement of religion and it is unlikely that they would...
have taken kindly to attempts by the seminarians, the Jesuits in particular, to enforce the new trends of the Counter-Reformation that were often in direct opposition to traditional religious practices that many in Lancashire still felt great attachment towards. By the time Campion and Persons embarked on their famous mission to England in 1580, the recusant clergy had already done most of the heavy lifting in Lancashire in regards to the maintenance of Catholic practice in the county. The comparison of Jesuits to Puritans by secular clergy, such as John Mush and William Watson, was not simply an insult thrown with little thought because the Puritans and the Jesuits were both modernizing forces in different respects and on different sides of the confessional divide in England. The Puritans showed dangerous criticism towards the church establishment in the name of desiring a more modern Protestantism following more closely the trends in the major centers of Calvinism on the European mainland. The Jesuits tried to enforce obedience to the Holy See and conformity with the wider Counter-Reformation for the sake of a more modern of Catholicism with little regard to local customs and traditions as well as a degree of autonomy that so often characterized traditional Catholicism in England from the medieval period up to the reign of Mary. In effect, Puritans and Jesuits had very contrasting visions of what modern religion should look like. Puritans tended towards decentralized religion and less emphasis on church hierarchy, while the Jesuits favored a more tightly regulated and centralized religious program of worship with Rome firmly at the center. Both groups, however, thought of themselves as adhering to a more pure form of Christianity.

The Reformation begun by Henry VIII affected Catholics in England in a more profound way than did the later Counter-Reformation. The Catholic Reformation in which the Jesuits developed their way of proceeding held no wide appeal to the majority of English Catholics that preferred to somehow reconcile their religion with their political loyalty. The centralized form
of the Catholic Church more firmly identified with Rome than traditional practice that the Jesuits had in mind was something distasteful to the majority of English Catholics. The most recent historiography has called to attention that it is rather difficult to conceive of a separate and isolated Catholic community in England that shut off all contact with Protestants for the sake of remaining doctrinally pure. Alexandra Walsham has contributed much to this perception of English Catholicism in Elizabethan England by rightly pointing out that there was a significant portion of Catholics in England who conformed not only to satisfy the law, but to engage in covert proselytization of less than committed soft Protestants in the Church of England. Outward conformity should not be seen as a sign of surrender among Catholics to the Protestant status quo, but rather a temporary state of affairs until better times arose.416

It is disputable, however, that church papists in England were secretly and anxiously awaiting an international invasion that would restore Catholicism as the religion of the land. It is certainly the case that probably a number of church papists conformed as an alternative means to resist religious change, but it seems more probable that church papists conformed out of a healthy respect for the law and saw this as a way to reconcile their obligation to authority despite their inward conviction that they found the Church of England less than satisfying for their religious needs. Church papists remained as loyal as their committed Protestant counterparts who found spiritual fulfillment in the Elizabethan Church as they essentially agreed with the Religious Settlement out of pure respect for authority. Most discontent from church papists came from the whitewashing of traditional ritual and practice rather than being separated from the international Catholic Church. The Counter-Reformation emphasis on papal authority exemplified by the Jesuits alienated the majority of church papists who already had enough

416 Alexandra Walsham, Church Papists, xiii-xiv.
respect for the laws to conform to the Church of England. Although Walsham states that the church papist existed primarily to resist the Protestant establishment and not to surrender to it, the 1570 papal bull threatened excommunication to any Catholic who dared to follow the laws of Elizabethan England and the warnings of Catholic priests who could not guarantee their salvation if they even chose to countenance a Nicodemite path of religion. Instead of an outright surrender or an assault on Protestantism in England, occasional and unenthusiastic conformers could be seen as making a hopefully temporary truce with the Protestant establishment holding out hopes for a legal and orderly Catholic succession instead of a hostile takeover by a nation which would have been foreign much more than it would have been Catholic. It is this ideology of the majority of conforming Catholics held that would have appeared distasteful to the Jesuits who had a specific and narrow vision of what Catholic practice in England should look like. In Persons's *Reasons of Refusall* written in the midst of the Jesuit mission to England in 1580, he saw recusancy as the only state for a conscientious Catholic in England and any attempt to satisfy the minimum requirements of the law would be considered apostasy from the Catholic Church. Persons used the reasoning of many leading Protestant figures on the continent to support his claim, but he ignored the fact that both Martin Luther and John Calvin emphasized obedience to the magistrate as a Christian duty. Likewise, Campion's insistence that England would inevitably one day become a Catholic nation no matter the cost in lives of Jesuits and missionaries would have seemed needlessly and dangerously confrontational to Catholics in England who conformed to the Church of England as they went extra lengths to avoid attracting attention to themselves as potentially disloyal subjects of the Queen.

In even more recent studies of English Catholicism under Elizabeth, some historians have suggested that the entire social and religious construct of a Catholic community should be
rethought. Norman Jones points out that "Catholics and other dissenters in England did not withdraw into fastnesses and retreat to mountain tops to survive." Catholics in England lived side by side with their Protestant brethren and communicated normally with their neighbors regardless of religion. Catholics, however, were still suspected in times of national crisis and they suffered certain restrictions such as not being able to sit in Parliament or attend a university. This did not stop them from living among the community with everyone else although they were occasionally persecuted and fined. The only real distinctive quality of Catholics in England was their steadfast refusal to attend Anglican communion. Families often split along religious lines and this was even more the case among the upper classes who often had to explicitly swear allegiance to the Elizabethan Settlement. Despite attempts at enforcement of the Settlement, Elizabethan England could be best described as a "world of unofficial religious plurality." While harsh rhetoric was often used against Catholics, this did not reflect the reality of the situation. Kinship networks and community values often trumped religious divisions and made a much more bearable climate for Catholics to exist in than the one prescribed by the Elizabethan regime.\footnote{William J. Sheils more directly questions the very existence of an English Catholic community. The only aspect separating Catholics from Protestants in England was their religion which their priests attempted to maintain and it reflected the way they organized their devotional practices. There was little else that Catholics held in common, however, as they held a wide range of views on how to deal with the government, whether they should become recusant or conform, and more practical issues of how they should approach their neighbors and marriage arrangements. Although the official rhetoric coming from the Catholic clergy espoused}

\footnote{Norman Jones, \textit{English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation}, 141-142.}
withdrawal from Elizabethan society, in these cases complete separation was not always the best option. There were a wide range of opinions among the Catholics of Elizabethan England and the boundaries between Protestants and Catholics were far more indefinite than it would appear.\textsuperscript{418} Sheils uses Anthony Browne as an example of the moderate impulse of English Catholicism. Browne never actively supported Catholic resistance against the government and had no involvement in any plots against the Queen unlike some of his immediate associates in Sussex. He also encouraged occasional conformity to the Church of England as opposed to outright recusancy as he himself was a church papist. Browne played an active role on the national scene in politics despite his admitted Catholic beliefs and shows that moderation did not necessarily mean withdrawing entirely into the confines of the household manor. Robert Persons, on the other hand, represented the other extreme of Catholicism in England as he saw English Catholicism as being necessarily opposed to the government and part of the international Counter-Reformation struggle against Protestantism. Persons came to symbolize the subversive nature of Catholicism for the Elizabethan regime as he was perceived as being behind every plot aimed at the overthrow of the Queen. On the 1580 Jesuit mission to England, Persons spoke out against occasional conformity to satisfy legal requirements and after he fled to the continent he continued to work for a Catholic restoration of England. Persons sought to enlist the aid of a number of foreign Catholic powers such as Spain and France to invade England while he continued to write against the Elizabethan regime. His insistence on recusancy not only earned him everlasting enmity from Protestants, but also caused further division among Catholics just at the time the Archpriest Controversy was developing.\textsuperscript{419}

\textsuperscript{418} William Sheils, \textit{Catholic Community}, 267.
\textsuperscript{419} Sheils, 262-264.
Although both Jones and Sheils have questioned the usefulness of even referring to a Catholic community as they were very divided and at the same time lived among their Protestant brethren more freely than the Catholic Church establishment would have liked, Catholics in England were more unified than they give them credit. With the exception of a very small minority of conspirators, the Catholic community was largely united around their profession of loyalty towards Elizabeth whether they were church papists or recusants. At the same time, however, if one accepts the fact that Jones has called to attention that Catholics in England lived a far more integrated life with Protestants than officially realized, it would make Jesuits seem even more foreign since they often called for complete separation and withdrawal from their heretical neighbors. Although Sheils is correct in pointing out that there were divisions among Catholics in England, he overestimates just how divided they were on matters of loyalty to Elizabeth. He rightly identifies the Jesuits as radicals, but then goes on to state that their ideas of confrontation and complete separation from Elizabethan society held sway over a significant enough portion of Catholics in England to divide them seriously over this question. The Catholic community in England proved far more resistant to Counter-Reformation ideals of struggling against a Protestant enemy as they had to reconcile their faith with somehow remaining loyal subjects.

The Jesuits did represent a radical faction in English Catholicism, but by no means did their ideals have any influence at large in the Catholic community. Even among recusants, the Jesuits were often despised as nothing symbolizes this better than the numerous tracts written against them by the secular priests in the Archpriest Controversy. Historians have previously overestimated the influence of the Jesuits among the Catholic community in England. The presence of the Jesuits, like the invasion of the Spanish Armada, went a long way to driving most
Catholics in England to a more firm declaration of loyalty to the English state rather than the other way around. The Jesuits, then, accomplished the exact opposite of what they wanted to happen in England as they wanted to bring the Catholic laity and the rest of the clergy into a firmer alignment with the international Catholic Church. Traditional values of loyalty and obedience to the law, however, doomed the Jesuit mission even before it began.
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