

Church of England Record Society · 7

FROM CRANMER TO
DAVIDSON: A MISCELLANY

Edited by STEPHEN TAYLOR

Church of England Record Society

Volume 7

FROM CRANMER TO DAVIDSON A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MISCELLANY

This first miscellany volume to be published by the Church of England Record Society contains eight edited texts covering aspects of the history of the Church from the Reformation to the early twentieth century. The longest contribution is a scholarly edition of W. J. Conybeare's famous and influential article on nineteenth-century 'Church Parties'; other documents included are the protests against Archbishop Cranmer's metropolitical powers of visitation, the petitions to the Long Parliament in support of the Prayer Book, and Randall Davidson's memoir on the role of the archbishop of Canterbury in the early twentieth century.

Dr STEPHEN TAYLOR is Lecturer in History at the University of Reading.

FROM CRANMER TO DAVIDSON
A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MISCELLANY

EDITED BY
Stephen Taylor

THE BOYDELL PRESS

CHURCH OF ENGLAND RECORD SOCIETY

© Contributors 1999

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation
no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system,
published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast,
transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 1999
Reprinted 2002

A Church of England Record Society publication
Published by The Boydell Press
an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
PO Box 41026, Rochester, NY 14604-4126, USA
website: www.boydell.co.uk

ISBN 0 85115 742 4

ISSN 1351-3087

Series information is printed at the back of this volume

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Great Britain by
IBT Global Ltd, London

In memory of
RACHEL DAVIS
(1961–1997)

Contents

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	x
1 Thomas Cranmer and the metropolitical visitation of Canterbury province 1533–1535 <i>edited by</i> PAUL AYRIS <i>(University College London)</i>	1
2 Edward Brocklesby: ‘The first put out of his living for the surplice’ <i>edited by</i> BRETT USHER	47
3 Richard Montagu: ‘Concerning Recusancie of Communion with the Church of England’ <i>edited by</i> ANTHONY MILTON <i>(University of Sheffield)</i> and ALEXANDRA WALSHAM <i>(University of Exeter)</i>	69
4 Petitions for episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer on the eve of the civil war 1641–1642 <i>edited by</i> JUDITH MALTBY <i>(Corpus Christi College, Oxford)</i>	103
5 Bishop Edmund Gibson’s proposals for church reform <i>edited by</i> STEPHEN TAYLOR <i>(University of Reading)</i>	169
6 Samuel Horsley: ‘Thoughts on Civil government’ <i>edited by</i> ANDREW ROBINSON <i>(Eton College)</i>	203
7 W. J. Conybeare: ‘Church parties’ <i>edited by</i> ARTHUR BURNS <i>(King’s College London)</i>	213
8 Randall Davidson: a partial retrospective <i>edited by</i> MELANIE BARBER <i>(Lambeth Palace Library)</i>	387
Index	439

Preface

The Church of England Record Society was founded in 1991 with the object of promoting interest in, and knowledge of, the history of the Church of England from the sixteenth century onwards. The Society aims to do this through the publication of scholarly editions of primary material which is of significance for the history of the church. Its series of publications began in 1994 with the appearance of Kenneth Fincham's first volume of his edition of *Visitation articles and injunctions of the early Stuart church*. With six volumes published to date, that series is now well established, and Council felt that the time was appropriate to provide a forum for the publication of shorter documents which could not form volumes by themselves. This was the rationale behind the decision to publish a 'miscellany' as the Society's seventh volume.

In putting together this volume we have made a deliberate effort to include material from the full range of the Society's chronological coverage, from the sixteenth century (represented by pieces on Archbishop Cranmer and Edward Brocklesby) to the twentieth (represented by Archbishop Davidson). Much to our regret the nineteenth century has yet to feature in the Society's publications, and it is, therefore, a particular pleasure that the most substantial single contribution to this volume is Arthur Burns's edition of W. J. Conybeare's influential article on nineteenth-century 'Church parties'.

The Society's Council hopes that occasional miscellany volumes will now form a regular part in its programme of publications. To this end the general editor will be pleased to receive proposals for contributions to future volumes. Future miscellanies, however, need not take the form of the present one. Indeed, the editor would be particularly pleased to receive proposals for 'themed' miscellanies, focusing on a particular period or issue in the history of the church.

The general editor is grateful to the contributors for their efforts to meet sometimes tight deadlines and for their assistance in compiling the index. He is particularly indebted to Arthur Burns for his work in preparing the camera ready copy for his contribution.

Abbreviations

<i>Alum. Cantab.</i>	John and J. A. Venn, <i>Alumni Cantabrigienses. A biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to the year 1900. Part I. From the earliest time to 1751</i> (4 vols., Cambridge, 1922–7)
B.L.	British Library, London
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
C.U.L.	Cambridge University Library
<i>D.N.B.</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
D.P.	Lambeth Palace Library, Davidson papers
D.W.L.	Dr Williams's Library, London
E.C.L.	Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge
H.L.R.O.	House of Lords Record Office, London
H.M.C.	Historical Manuscripts Commission
L.P.L.	Lambeth Palace Library, London
N.L.W.	National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth
<i>O.E.D.</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
P.R.O.	Public Record Office, London
R.O.	Record Office
U.L.	University Library

I

THOMAS CRANMER AND THE
METROPOLITICAL VISITATION OF
CANTERBURY PROVINCE 1533–1535

Edited by
Paul Ayriss

Introduction*

The medieval background

Thomas Cranmer was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in St Stephen's chapel, Westminster, on 30 March 1533.¹ According to long-established custom, archbishops were empowered to visit the whole of the southern province, inhibiting the powers of diocesan bishops and issuing visitation articles and injunctions. This was a tremendous opportunity for any prelate, and it is hardly surprising that local bishops often resented this intrusion into their spheres of influence.

Before an archbishop of Canterbury could begin to visit the dioceses of his province, he had first to visit his own see. Late in November 1533, the archbishop's powerful administrative machine burst into life. The cathedral corporation at Canterbury was visited on 9 December and there exists at Lambeth a list of seventy-four names, headed by Thomas Goldwell the prior, which shows who was actually present at the visitation.² In keeping with medieval precedent, the new archbishop was enthroned in his cathedral church. It was an impressive display of power and authority on 3 December when Cranmer was installed in medieval splendour as the successor of St Thomas Becket in the metropolitan church of the southern province.³

During December, there are glimpses that the religious houses and deaneries in the diocese were visited by the archbishop's officials. On 4 December, a commission was issued to Richard Gwent to visit the religious houses of St Gregory, St Sepulchre and St James, Canterbury, Faversham and the collegiate church of Wingham. He was also to visit the rural deaneries of Canterbury, Westbere and Sandwich.⁴

- Earlier versions of this paper were given at the 4th annual conference of the Society for Reformation Studies at Westminster College, Cambridge, in 1997 and the Reformation Studies Colloquium at Wadham College, Oxford, in 1998.

- ¹ L.P.L., Thomas Cranmer's register [henceforth cited as C.R.], fos. 1r–5v.
- ² A copy of the archbishop's citation for visitation occurs in Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library [henceforth cited as C.C.A.L.], register T2, fo. 22v. The certificate of execution to the citation exists as L.P.L., Carte Antique et Miscellanea [henceforth cited as C.M.], 52/9. The attendance list, originally attached to the certificate of execution but now separate, is C.M. 52/10.
- ³ The evidence is taken from a contemporary chronicle from St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, which is printed in J. G. Nichols, *Narratives of the days of the Reformation* (Camden Society, 1859), p. 280. For the wider context of Cranmer's enthronement, cf. D. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: a life* (New Haven), p. 106.
- ⁴ L.P.L., C.M. XII/56. The citation addressed to the prioress and convent of St Sepulchre, Canterbury, survives as C.M. 52/6, while that sent to the prior of St Gregory, Canterbury stands as C.M. 52/3. There also exist letters of proxy issued by the prior of St Gregory's and a certificate of execution to the citation with an attached attendance list. Cf. C.M. 52/4–5. The citation addressed to the prioress and convent of St James, Canterbury, survives along with the certificate

This evidence for the diocesan visitation at Lambeth is supported by an impressive body of material in Kent. Here Cranmer's main will register survives as a testimony to the activity of his officials in the diocese during the visitation. The index to this volume is headed 'Hec testamenta fuerunt approbata in visitatione metropolitana etc.' and the tome contains wills proved by the visitors during their tour of the diocese. In two instances, the document gives the name of the official granting probate. This is Peter Ligham who acted as the archbishop's commissary and proved wills on 28 April and 16 September 1534.⁵ All this is impeccably medieval in format and, at this stage, the archbishop's officials were drawing on precedent in the archiepiscopal registry to govern the form of the visitation.

In 1534, the metropolitan visitation proper began. It was an enormous task, taxing the administrative abilities of Cranmer's subordinates to the full. Throughout 1534 and 1535, all the dioceses of the southern province were visited. In the summer of 1534, Cranmer's officials worked overtime to visit the enormous medieval diocese of Lincoln. In addition, they were present in the dioceses of London, Norwich and Rochester. The visitation was also extended to cover the south-west of England. In August and September, Cranmer and his officials were at Gloucester, Worcester and Bristol. At Kingswood Abbey in Gloucestershire, five saddles were stolen one night whilst the visitors slept. At Bristol, Christ Church records the ringing of bells when the visitors entered the church. The frenetic pace of the visitation continued into 1535. In March, the archbishop's visitors were at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Later, Chichester and Winchester dioceses were also the subject of the archbishop's attention.⁶

of execution. Cf. C.M. 52/7–8. Letters of proxy exist from the abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury. Cf. C.M. 52/11. The certificate of the reading of the archbishop's citation at Faversham Abbey survives as C.M. II/55.

- 5 C.C.A.L., DCb/PRC/32/16. Ligham is mentioned on fos. 74v and 81. The tome is classified in the sequence of will registers for the consistory court, but stands outside the chronological run of these volumes. No corresponding consistory court act book survives for Cranmer's pontificate before 1542. In practice, rules for the probate of material were complex and certain classes of wills proved during the visitation were entered into the normal consistory court register for this period, which is DCb/PRC/32/15. For fuller details of the prerogative jurisdiction of the archbishops of Canterbury, cf. I. J. Churchill, *Canterbury administration* (2 vols., London, 1933), I, 380–423 and B. L. Woodcock, *Medieval ecclesiastical courts in the diocese of Canterbury* (London, 1952), pp. 72–5.
- 6 For Lincoln diocese, cf. Lincoln Archive Office [henceforth cited as L.A.O.], register 26, fos. 250v–3v, and Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fos. 1–4 [first numeration] and 5–7, 9r–13v [second numeration]; for London diocese, cf. Guildhall Library [henceforth cited as G.L.], MS 9531/11, fos. 59–67; for Norwich diocese, cf. L.P.L., C.R., fos. 137v–40r; for a reference to Cranmer's visitation of Rochester diocese, cf. *Miscellaneous writings and letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556* [henceforth cited as P.S., *Cranmer II*], ed. J. E. Cox (Parker Society, 1846), p. 294; for Gloucester, cf. Gloucester Dean and Chapter Library [henceforth cited as G.D.C.L.], register E, fos. 88v–93v; for Worcester, cf. Worcester Dean and

Cranmer took a prominent part in the work of visitation himself. A certain Jacobus Gislenus Thalassius from Germany spent some time as a member of the archbishop's household, and he later wrote to Cromwell that he had been present with the archbishop on visitation at London, Leicester and Worcester. Cranmer was certainly present in London for this is attested by the bishop of London's register. Cranmer's own letters show that he was visiting Rochester diocese in June. On 14 August, Cranmer arrived at Worcester on the eve of the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, when the prior wrote of 'my lord of Caunterbury[s] visitacion by his owen person'. Cranmer spent a good deal of time in the west of England, emboldened no doubt by the fact that Bishop Geronimo De' Ghinucci was an absentee. The archbishop was at Gloucester on 30 and 31 August and at Lanthony Priory, south-west of Gloucester, on 3 September.⁷

Much of the work of visitation was routine. Medieval archbishops were empowered to investigate and confirm the possessions of religious houses and corporations. Cranmer clearly did the same, as evidence for Chichester, Worcester, Gloucester and Pershore reveals.⁸ Yet this was to be a metropolitan visitation like no other, as the surviving records graphically reveal.

The bishops' protests

Medieval bishops often complained about the activities of visitors during a metropolitan visitation. Such protests usually revolved around the infringement of a bishop's own jurisdiction and the payment of procurations to the visitors. Nothing, however, could have prepared Cranmer for the revolt which greeted his attempts

Chapter Library [henceforth cited as W.D.C.L.], registers A 6 (ii), fos. 181v–3v, 187–8 and A 12, fos. 144(bis)–5; for the incidents at Bristol, cf. M. C. Skeeters, *Community and clergy. Bristol and the Reformation c.1530–c.1570* (Oxford, 1993), p. 229 n. 80; and for Kingswood Abbey, cf. P.R.O., S.P. 1/94, fo. 62v, and for both cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 127 n. 144. For Cranmer's activity in 1535, cf. Corpus Christi College, Oxford [henceforth cited as C.C.C.O.], Lease and Conveyance Registers, I, fos. 31v–2r; for Chichester, cf. West Sussex R.O., Chichester Dean and Chapter Archives [henceforth cited as C.D.C.A.], Cap. 1/17/76; and for Winchester, cf. P.S., *Cranmer II*, pp. 305–6 and L.P.L., C.M. 52/12.

⁷ For the letter of Thalassius, cf. B.L., Cotton MS Vitellius B. XXI, fos. 124–5 (damaged by fire), calendared in *Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of King Henry VIII*, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R. S. Brodie [henceforth cited as *L.P.*] (London, 1862–1910), VIII, 831; for Rochester, cf. P.S., *Cranmer II*, p. 294; for Worcester, cf. *Journal of Prior William More*, ed. E. S. Fegan (Worcestershire Historical Society, 1914), p. 391; for other notices of Cranmer's activities in the west, cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 127 n. 144; for references to the visitation at Gloucester, cf. W.D.C.L., registers A 6 (ii), fo. 185 and A 12, fos. 142v–3r and G.D.C.L., register E, fos. 88v–9r; for Lanthony Priory, cf. *ibid.*, fos. 91v–3v.

⁸ For Gloucester, cf. G.D.C.L., register E, fos. 91v–3v; for Chichester, cf. C.D.C.A., Cap. 1/17/76; for Worcester, cf. W.D.C.L., registers A 6 (ii), fo. 185 and A 12, fos. 142v–3r; for Pershore, cf. P.R.O., E 326/8961. I am grateful to Professor Diarmaid MacCulloch for bringing the Pershore reference to my attention.

to visit the dioceses of Canterbury province. The bishops of London, Winchester, Exeter, Norwich and Lincoln all protested against Cranmer's actions, as did the president and fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. What was the substance of their protests?

London diocese

John Stokesley, bishop of London, received the archbishop's inhibition for visitation on 19 May 1534.⁹ The archiepiscopal style in the citation ran 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice sedis legatus natus', a form which has firm medieval precedents.¹⁰ At the start of his visitation of the see of London, however, Cranmer issued an extraordinary protestation (**document 1A**) in which he maintained that he did not intend to do anything in derogation of the powers of King Henry VIII or of any parliamentary statutes. He claimed to exercise powers of visitation solely by virtue of his rights as archbishop and metropolitan.

Eleven days later, the bishop of London issued the first in a number of appeals and protests against the jurisdiction of the archbishop.¹¹ On 18 June, a second appeal was made, but the archbishop refused in person to include it amongst the acts of the visitation.¹² Two days later, a second attempt to visit the bishop was made. When this proved unsuccessful, the archbishop prorogued the visitation and appointed John Cockes, Richard Gwent, Roger Townsend and Hugh Coren to exercise spiritual jurisdiction in the city and diocese during the visitation. Stokesley refused to accept this and appealed to the king in chancery.¹³ As a result of his opposition to the visitation, Stokesley was inhibited from exercising further jurisdiction under pain of suspension *ab ingressu ecclesie*. Certain of his officials (but not Stokesley) were excommunicated and they were all summoned to appear in consistory on 10 July. The archbishop complained that Stokesley had admitted Edmund Close, 'virum omnino illiteratum, cui de iure aut ratione animarum cura committi non deberet', to the rectory of St George, Botolph Lane.¹⁴ More importantly, however, the bishop had empowered his officials to exercise

⁹ 'xix^a die Maii traditum erat mandatum Cant' archiepiscopi domino episcopo London' pro visitatione sua metropolitana habenda'. Cf. G.L., MS 9531/11, fo. 28.

¹⁰ Cf. R. E. Rhodes, *Ecclesiastical administration in medieval England. The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation* (Notre Dame, 1977), p. 109.

¹¹ G.L., MS 9531/11, fos. 61–2.

¹² *Ibid.*, fos. 62v–3v.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, fos. 65v–6r. The episcopal register records that the archbishop's citation named the benefice as St Gregory's Eastcheap, but this must be a mistake. Similarly, Close was by no means 'illiteratus', being a master of arts and a bachelor of canon law from Oxford. Cf. A. B. Emden, *A biographical register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501 to 1540* (Oxford, 1974), appendix of 'magistri'.

jurisdiction. John Tendering, 'an auctoritate, vice vel mandato dicti confratris nostri, an sua propria audacia vel temeritate', held sessions of the diocesan consistory court and Matthew Greston acted as registrar for the diocese.¹⁵ The archbishop's citation was executed on 29 June, but Stokesley's register shows that nothing came of the case.¹⁶

On 3 July, the bishop of London and his officers issued an appeal against the archbishop's actions.¹⁷ This prompted the archbishop to relax the inhibition until 1 September, provided that his officers retained the power of visitation. The bishop of London again protested at Cranmer's actions.¹⁸ On 1 December, John Cockes the archbishop's commissary appeared in the chapter house at St Paul's. Stokesley was pronounced contumacious and the visitation was prorogued until 18 March 1535. Cranmer, however, felt that he was batting on a sticky wicket and a note in Stokesley's register records that even in March 1535 nothing happened. Stokesley, nonetheless, issued another appeal against Cranmer's actions.¹⁹ Clearly, the bishop of London felt threatened by Cranmer's jurisdiction and appears to have been successful in fending off Cranmer's attacks. Stokesley certainly continued to perform routine diocesan functions, ordaining men in person on 29 May, 19 September, 19 December 1534 and 20 February 1535.²⁰

The substance of Stokesley's complaints can be found in two papers now preserved in the British Library. Neither of these documents is recorded in Stokesley's London register. The first (**document 1B**) comprises a list of articles against the archbishop's visitation. It addresses the king in the second person and clearly represents the substance of Stokesley's protest, which he made to the crown to defend his position. In his citation announcing the visitation, Cranmer called himself 'legate of the apostolic see', a title which was long part of the customary style of the archbishops of Canterbury. Cranmer's claim that he acted solely as metropolitan did not satisfy Stokesley. The dating of **document 1B** presents some interesting problems. It probably stems from November 1534, for it speaks of Cranmer proroguing the visitation until 1 December and clearly shows knowledge of Cranmer's actions in convocation in November when he formally put away his papal title.²¹ Cranmer's actions, however, did not satisfy Stokesley, who appealed to the king in chancery. The bishop of London claimed that if he accepted Cranmer's title as papal legate, this would be to the derogation of the

¹⁵ G.L., MS 9531/11, fos. 65v–6r.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, fos. 63v–4v.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, fos. 66v–7r.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, fo. 65.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, fo. 130r–v.

²¹ D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (4 vols., London, 1737), III, 769.

powers of the king. Such opposition was certainly a blow to archiepiscopal pride, but it was only the start of Cranmer's troubles.

A second paper (**document 1C**) widened the attack on Cranmer's powers to cover his audience court and the court of the arches, which was the appeal court for the whole of the province of Canterbury. The dating of this text is likewise something of a mystery. Not all the documents produced in this particular spat survive, for the initial attack and Cranmer's rebuttal are lost. What now remains is the response of Cranmer's attacker. The most likely author is Stokesley of London, who was determined to continue his battle against the metropolitan's powers. On internal evidence, the piece must date from early 1535.²² Behind Stokesley's protest was the continued insistence that Cranmer's powers stemmed from his position as papal legate. He claimed that no archbishop within Christendom ever had powers to keep an audience court unless he was also a legate of the see of Rome. In Cranmer's lost protest, the archbishop had claimed that he kept his audience court by virtue of the Dispensations Act of 1534. In a vicious attack on this claim, Stokesley maintained that the Act 'cannot be drawn with xx teeme of oxen' to support the continued existence of this court. In a cunning move, Stokesley introduced a new argument into the debate to widen the attack. With reference to the newly-established vicegerency, Stokesley claimed that if Cranmer's powers were granted by the king, this would derogate the powers of the vicar general. If both men continued to hold such powers, people might think that the vicar general exercised authority from the king, whilst the archbishop of Canterbury worked on behalf of the bishop of Rome. It was a clever move. If Stokesley is indeed the author of **document 1C**, it is clear that he was continuing his relentless assault on Cranmer into 1535. Such continued attacks must have taxed Cranmer to the uttermost, but his troubles were only just beginning.

Lincoln diocese

The bishop of Lincoln received Cranmer's citation for visitation on 11 June 1534. This citation summoned Longland, along with the dean and chapter of Lincoln, to appear before the archiepiscopal commissaries in the chapter house on 5 August. On 15 June, the bishop forwarded the citation to his dean and chapter²³ and also issued an appeal to the king in chancery, making explicit reference to the terms of the recent Act for the Submission of the Clergy. In his appeal, Longland claimed that his see had been immune from metropolitan visitations for seventy years and

²² P. Ayris, 'God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar: the relationship between the Crown and the archbishopric of Canterbury, 1533–53', in *Thomas Cranmer, churchman and scholar*, ed. P. Ayris and D. G. Selwyn (Woodbridge, 1993), pp. 125–6 and MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 131–2.

²³ L.A.O., register 26 [part of John Longland's register], fo. 250v; for the dean and chapter's receipt of the citation, cf. L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fos. 1–4 (first numeration).

more; nor was it customary for the archbishop to receive procurations, payments due to the visitor from those being visited. Faced by the threat of Cranmer's jurisdiction, Longland placed himself at the king's mercy.²⁴ The bishop of Lincoln had put down a marker to protect his see and he now proceeded to build on these foundations. Between the end of July and the middle of August, Longland sent his registrar John Frankish to his manors at Holborn and Liddington 'pro antiquis libris concernentibus visitationem reverendissimi patris domini Cant' archiepiscopi'.²⁵ The episcopal research clearly provided Longland with the ammunition he needed to build on the case he had already made. On 29 July, the bishop issued a protestation (**document 2**) against Cranmer's actions²⁶ which he included in the certificate of execution to the archbishop's original citation. In his protest, Longland insisted that he intended to do nothing to derogate the rights of the king; nor would he accept that Cranmer possessed any jurisdiction over him. At the same time he appointed the dean, sub-dean, chancellor, treasurer, precentor and vicar general as his proctors in the visitation.²⁷

On 4 August, Richard Gwent appeared in the chapter house as the archbishop's commissary to begin the visitation. Following a sermon from Richard Hoore, John Rayne showed his letters of proxy from the bishop of Lincoln and issued a protest at Cranmer's attempted visitation. He also exhibited a certificate of execution for the archbishop's citation, along with a list of the names of those cited. The dean likewise issued a protestation, whereupon Gwent recited the terms of his commission and examined the bishop's proctor and the dean and chapter.²⁸ Following this on 7 August, Gwent prorogued the visitation until 1 December, allowing the bishop and the dean and chapter to exercise accustomed jurisdiction, provided they did nothing to impede the metropolitan visitation. Rayne protested at this and refused to pay procurations, but the dean and chapter spent 66s 8d.²⁹ The prorogation of the visitation did not really clarify matters in either the city or diocese of Lincoln. On the one hand, it is clear that Cranmer's visitation did proceed. Letters of institution from the dean and chapter to a chantry in Alford parish church are marked as being exhibited in the visitation.³⁰ Longland, however,

²⁴ L.A.O., register 26, fos. 250v–1v.

²⁵ L.A.O., Additional register 7 [Bishop Fuller's transcripts], pp. 17–18 (at rear of the volume).

²⁶ L.A.O., register 26, fos. 251v–3r; Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fos. 5–6 (second numeration); P.R.O., S.P. 1/85, fos. 101r–v, 107–8, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 1044 (i–ii); S.P. 1/91, fos. 12–13, calendared in *L.P.*, VIII, 312.

²⁷ L.A.O., register 26, fos. 253–4; Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fos. 6–7.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, fos. 11, 12r–13v.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, fos. 11v–13r. The text of the prorogation deed does not survive at Lincoln, but two copies can be found in P.R.O., S.P. 1/85, fos. 103v–4r and 111r–v.

³⁰ L.A.O., Dij/64/1/33. The letters of institution appear to have been exhibited in the visitation for they are endorsed: 'In visitatione metropolitana reverendissimi patris Thome archiepiscopi Cant' apud Alford archidiaconatu [sic] Lincoln' anno 1534'.

continued to provide for the spiritual welfare of his flock at the same time. During this period, ordinations were held on 19 September and 19 December 1534, and 20 February, 13, 26 and 27 March 1535.³¹ The ordination on 19 September was even performed by Longland in person, as if to underline his own position in the diocese. His register carefully notes that the ordinations were performed '*pendente visitatione metropolitana*'. Indeed, as late as April 1535 routine diocesan administration continued to be performed '*pendente visitatione metropolitana*'.³²

Longland clearly prized his rights as diocesan and initiated another spat with the archbishop on 20 August by drawing up a further appeal concerning Cranmer's visitation. He complained that Hugh Coren, the archbishop's commissary, had admitted and instituted John Gyldon to the vicarage of Ewerby in Lincolnshire and another clerk '*cuius nomen ignoro*' to the benefice of Etton in Northamptonshire. Longland protested that such powers belonged to him and appealed to the king in chancery.³³ Clearly, such a challenge could not go unanswered and a show-down was arranged at high noon in Gainsborough parish church by the banks of the Trent on 31 August. John Pryn appeared before Coren, Cranmer's proctor, and delivered the bishop of Lincoln's appeal. Coren, however, would not give way. He said that the appeal, and the method of its delivery, were '*frivolas, inanes et inutiles*' and refused to accept it. Nothing further survives concerning Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation at Lincoln. It can scarcely be called a success and this pattern was repeated elsewhere in the dioceses of the southern province.

Further protests

Stokesley and Longland provided Cranmer with a determined challenge to his authority, but the metropolitanical visitation continued into the autumn of 1534. Reflecting the earlier episcopal opposition, however, Richard Nykke harried Cranmer and his officials when they turned their attention to the diocese of Norwich (**documents 3A-C**). This is all the more surprising because even Cranmer's registrar described the bishop as a man of eighty years and more, broken by old age. Nykke and his officials absolutely refused to acknowledge Cranmer's powers as visitor. True, the papal title '*legate of the apostolic see*' does not appear in the documents Cranmer issued during the visitation. Nykke, nonetheless, refused to appear before the archbishop's officials and appealed to the king as supreme head of the church, duly recognized as such in both convocations

³¹ L.A.O., register 26, fos. 40v-4v.

³² The '*pendente*' clause appears in L.A.O., register 27, fo. 193v against an institution in the archdeaconry of Oxford as late as 23 April 1535. On 13 May, however, a commission from Longland to Matthew Mackarell, abbot of Barlings, as suffragan bishop of Chalcedon contains no such '*pendente*' clause. Cf. L.A.O., register 26, fo. 258v.

³³ For this and what follows, cf. L.A.O., Dvj/26/4, which is endorsed '*Instrumentum in causa appellationis etc.*'.

of the realm. Nykke continued to exercise powers of administration in the diocese, and on 18 and 19 September the suffragan bishop of Chalcedon held an ordination on Nykke's authority. Cranmer's officials refused to be daunted by Nykke's actions and suspended the aged bishop from exercising sacerdotal functions.³⁴

The metropolitanical visitation continued into 1535, but the New Year brought no end to Cranmer's troubles. In the spring, he extended his visitation to Winchester diocese. The certificate, which records the execution of Cranmer's citation, has recently been retrieved by Lambeth Palace Library. It is in the name of Nicholas Harpsfield, official of the archdeacon of Winchester. Harpsfield received the citation on 23 April 1535 and drew up a book containing the names of those cited. Bishop Stephen Gardiner himself received the citation near Winchester on 20 April as he came to Court. He immediately protested at Cranmer's powers, claiming that the archbishop's use of the title 'primate of all England' was in derogation of the king's position as supreme head of the church (**document 5**). Gardiner was himself visitor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and this probably explains why in March 1535 the president and fellows there submitted to Cranmer only as far as they would not harm the rights of the king or of the bishop of Winchester (**document 4**).³⁵

Why did the bishops issue protestations?

The nature and scale of the bishops' protests at Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation were remarkable. Why did they offer such stout resistance to procedures which were themselves a standard part of an archbishop's administrative activities?

Personal animosity certainly has a part to play. Gardiner himself must have wanted to succeed William Warham as archbishop of Canterbury, but his stout defence of church liberties against the king in 1532 probably cost him the primatial see. Henry never trusted him completely again. Up to 1532, both Cranmer and Gardiner had followed similar patterns of church preferment. 1532 marks a watershed in their careers, with Cranmer being elevated to the highest office of prince bishop.³⁶

The protests, however, were prompted by far more than thwarted ambition. It can be no coincidence that the men protesting at Cranmer's powers – Nykke, Stokesley and Gardiner – were amongst the staunchest conservatives on the episcopal bench. They must have hated Cranmer and his increasingly evangelical views. A reflexion of Cranmer's visitation sermons can be seen in the letter of

³⁴ L.P.L., C.R., fos. 137v–40r and Norfolk and Norwich Record Office, ORR/1A, fos. 22v–3r.

³⁵ For Winchester, cf. P.S., *Cranmer II*, pp. 305–6 and L.P.L., C.M. 52/12; for Oxford, cf. C.C.C.O., Lease and Conveyance Registers, I, fos. 31v–2r.

³⁶ Cf. D. MacCulloch, 'Two dons in politics: Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner, 1503–1533', *Historical Journal*, XXXVII (1994), 1–22.

Thalassius to Cromwell already mentioned.³⁷ Thalassius records that he heard the archbishop preach at London, Leicester, Worcester, Croydon and elsewhere. In these visitation sermons, Cranmer exhorted the people to piety, advised monks, bishops and priests to leave their deceits and avarice, and to adopt brotherly love and care for the people's salvation instead of gain. In one sense, these exhortations are standard fare for an episcopal visitation. The phrase 'salus populi' in Thalassius's letter, however, clearly puts down a marker for Cranmer's evangelical credentials. Another piece of evidence which underlines Cranmer's evangelical appeals at this time can be found in his *Commonplaces on the canon law*. Whatever the date of the collection in its present form, there is no doubt that the work on which it is based predates Cranmer's appointment as archbishop. Some of the themes which Cranmer used in his visitation sermons, for example the need for bishops to display brotherly love, are to be found in these extracts, which are strongly antipapal in tone and outlook.³⁸ A final pointer to Cranmer's evangelical credentials can be found in his visitation injunctions for Worcester priory, which are dated 1535. Cranmer demanded that the text of Holy Scripture should be interpreted according to its literal sense. This sounds very much like Cranmer's exhortation to Latimer, when preaching before the court, to take a text of Scripture and 'the same to expound and declare according to the pure sense and meaning'.³⁹ Cranmer's evangelical outlook in this exchange is clear for all to see.

The main reason for the bishops' protests, however, lies in the relationship between the crown and the episcopal estate. Did the government use the papal title 'legate of the apostolic see' in a cunning way to force the bishops to appeal to the royal supremacy in the face of such an attack? After all, the immediate response of the bishops was to withdraw support from Cranmer's visitation and to express their loyalty to the king as supreme head. Whilst superficially attractive, the theory does not hold up to close examination. The surviving evidence shows that the offensive papal title did not form the substance of the bishops' complaints in *every* diocese. In addition, Cranmer was using the title elsewhere in his administration with no apparent difficulty. The archbishop confirmed the election to sees of two new bishops at this time. The newly-appointed prelates were Thomas Goodrich of Ely and John Salcot of Bangor. In both sets of *acta*, the records ascribe to Cranmer the papal title 'apostolice sedis legatus' and there is no indication that this caused any offence. It was not the government which precipitated the clash

³⁷ B.L., Cotton MS Vitellius B. XXI, fos. 124–5, calendared in *L.P.*, VIII, 831.

³⁸ *L.P.L.*, MS 1107, fos. 1–76; printed in J. Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer* (4 vols., Oxford, 1848–54), III, Appendix and Addenda, 744–871. For a discussion of the dating of this collection, cf. P. Ayris, 'Canon law studies', in *Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Ayris and Selwyn, pp. 316–18 and MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 54.

³⁹ P.S., *Cranmer II*, p. 308; J. M. Wilson, 'Wolsey's and Cranmer's visitations of the priory of Worcester', *English Historical Review*, XXXI (1926), 418–23.

between the archbishop and the provincial bishops. Rather, it was the conservative episcopate in England who seized on the ambiguities in Cranmer's *rôle* to force the government to clarify the situation. Each of the protesting bishops chose to attack a different facet of Cranmer's *rôle* and administration to maximum effect. When Stokesley of London objected to Cranmer's use of the term 'legate of the apostolic see', he protested that if he accepted Cranmer's authority, this would be to the derogation of the powers of the king. In 1530, writs of *praemunire facias* were issued in the king's bench against fifteen clerics for having acknowledged the jurisdiction of Wolsey as papal legate. Stokesley both wished to avoid the repeat of such a charge and to challenge the government to clarify Cranmer's position. One of the fifteen clerics mentioned in the *praemunire* suit was Nykke, bishop of Norwich. When Nykke issued his protest, he claimed in effect that he could not accept Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation without admitting that Cranmer's authority stemmed from his papal bulls of provision. This was also true in Lincoln diocese, where John Longland objected to Cranmer's *rôle*. The conservative episcopate seized on ambiguities in Cranmer's activities and invited the government to re-consider his position.⁴⁰

The royal supremacy

In one very important way, Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation was to be a visitation like no other. 1533 had seen the passage of the Act in Restraint of Appeals which can be said to mark the formal rejection of papal supremacy in England. Having achieved this much-prized goal, however, the government was faced with the staggering task of securing conformity in the country to the jurisdictional revolution which the act symbolizes. It was essential to win public support for the political changes introduced by Thomas Cromwell and the government adopted a number of strategies to ensure the success of its programme.

One of the measures centred on the use of oaths as a means of ensuring conformity. The first, and the most important, was the oath of succession which was designed to secure public approval to Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn.⁴¹ In the spring and summer of 1534, a conscious attempt was made to swear all males in the kingdom – a tremendous undertaking. It was Thomas Audley as lord chancellor who was responsible for ensuring that the oath was duly administered and commissioners were appointed to cover the whole country. Cranmer himself

⁴⁰ L.P.L., C.R., fos. 81r–7v and 157–63. The government's campaign concerning Wolsey's office of legate is described and analysed in J. J. Scarisbrick, 'The pardon of the clergy, 1531', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, XII (1956), 25–8.

⁴¹ For a general description of the enforcement of this oath, cf. G. R. Elton, *Policy and police. The enforcement of the Reformation in the age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 222–7.

was one of Audley's officials and correspondence from the archbishop to the lord chancellor survives describing Cranmer's activities in this regard.⁴² In this context, the archbishop was involved in the celebrated case of Sir Thomas More, who refused to swear before commissioners at Lambeth.⁴³ Surviving documentation concerning the actual oath taking is rare, but there was no general opposition to the government's policy. In May, Stephen Gardiner reported success in Hampshire, where a mix of clerical and lay people swore the oath.⁴⁴ By the end of the summer of 1534, it seems that the oath of succession had been administered throughout the kingdom.

At the same time as the administration of the oath of succession, the government decided to cast its net wider. Cromwell and his colleagues were particularly concerned about the two convocations of Canterbury and York, the universities, the religious and the clergy of the kingdom – all people who might be considered to possess particular allegiance to Rome. For the government's programme to succeed, it was crucial that these classes explicitly repudiate any acceptance of Roman supremacy. A number of measures were adopted to achieve this end and, in essence, it was the declaration of the southern convocation which formed the ideological justification for all the actions which the government took. On 31 March 1534, the convocation of Canterbury rejected the authority of the bishop of Rome. However, this is not quite the whole story because the document, which was drawn up, contains signatures from clergy in the provinces of both Canterbury and York. Senior clergy from the whole kingdom put their names to a statement explicitly renouncing their adherence to the bishop of Rome. The list of names, headed by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, has signatures from eleven bishops and ninety-one others to the statement that '*Romanus episcopus non habet maiorem aliquam iurisdictionem collatam sibi a Deo in sacra Scriptura in hoc regno Anglie quam alius quivis externus episcopus*'. Signatures were collected in the Canterbury convocation and, during April, the declaration was sent out for the northern bishops and others not present in the south to insert their names. By the end of April, the collection of names was over and this momentous document testifies to the clergy's adherence to the new order in church and state. As if to make doubly sure, the northern convocation made a declaration of their own and the archbishop of York sent it to the king in June.⁴⁵

⁴² Cf. P.S., *Cranmer II*, pp. 291–2; for Cranmer's work in swearing the members of parliament, cf. S. E. Lehmberg, *The Reformation parliament 1529–36* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 199.

⁴³ For Cranmer's description of events, cf. P.S., *Cranmer II*, pp. 285–6, which is analysed in MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 124–5.

⁴⁴ *The letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. J. A. Muller (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 56–7.

⁴⁵ B.L., Add. MS 38656, fos. 3r–4v. The texts of the submissions from both provinces are printed in Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 769, 782–3. Cf. also *Documents illustrative of English church history*, ed. H. Gee and W. J. Hardy (London, 1896), pp. 251–2 and Lehmberg, *Reformation parliament*,

Where the convocations of Canterbury and York led, others dutifully followed and the two universities also made the requisite declaration concerning papal supremacy. The government took pains to secure favourable results by having preachers tune the pulpits in favour of the king's cause. In Cambridge, this preaching campaign was countered by the conservative prior of the Blackfriars who 'of all other most indiscreetly preached against the king's grace's great cause, and most defended the authority of the bishop of Rome'. As a result of his efforts, 'a great number of the best learned in the same [university] is much offended'. Nonetheless, Cambridge voted in the government's favour on 2 May. At Oxford, one of the main protagonists was William Tresham, who acted as commissary of John Longland, bishop of Lincoln and chancellor of the university. Tresham preached on the royal supremacy and tried to ensure that others, including the university proctors, did likewise. In May 1534, the king asked the university to inform him of their views on the question of papal power. So successful was Tresham's management of the proceedings that Oxford voted in favour of the king's supremacy on 27 June. The declaration is in the name of John Longland as chancellor and all masters of the university, both regnent and non-regnent.⁴⁶

At the same time, the government turned its attention to the appointment of new bishops. In the spring of 1534, new regulations were enshrined concerning their promotion.⁴⁷ Following the passage of this statute, Goodrich of Ely and Lee of Coventry and Lichfield both swore oaths of obedience to the Crown. Lee promised to sustain the king's honour, to take no further oath contrary to his oath to the Crown, and to recognize the king as supreme head of the church. Having undertaken to maintain the statutes against papal provisions, Lee swore to uphold all acts passed in favour of the succession.⁴⁸ Not content with this, the government then turned its attention to the clergy and the religious at large. The friars were singled out for special treatment because they were seen to be part of an international organization with a special loyalty to the pope. Friars were exempt

pp. 213–14. For a fascinating discussion of the crucial B.L. manuscript, cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 121–2.

⁴⁶ For Cambridge, cf. J. Strype, *Ecclesiastical memorials* (6 vols., Oxford, 1822), I, 260–1; Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 771–2 and P.S., *Cranmer II*, pp. 295–6. For Oxford, cf. P.R.O., S.P. 1/83, fo. 191, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 565; Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 775–6 and *Epistolae academicae 1508–1596*, ed. W. T. Mitchell (Oxford, 1980), pp. 339–44.

⁴⁷ *Statutes of the realm*, ed. A. Luders, T. E. Tomlins, J. Raithby and others (11 vols., London, 1810–28), III, 462–4.

⁴⁸ For Goodrich's oath, cf. P.R.O., S.P. 1/83, fos. 59v–60r, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 427. With minor verbal variations, this oath is similar to that sworn by Lee. Cf. G. Burnet, *History of the reformation of the Church of England*, ed. N. Pocock (7 vols., Oxford, 1865), VI, 290–1. Lee swore as bishop elect, which means that he must have taken the oath before 16 Apr., when his election was confirmed. Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fos. 149–56. For the chancery warrant authorizing the wording of the oath, cf. P.R.O., C 82/690 no. 2, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 1379 (1).

from episcopal control, but Cromwell hit upon a solution which was to be used very effectively. On 13 April, George Browne and John Hilsey were issued with a commission to visit all houses of friars throughout the country and to ascertain their loyalty to the king. The visitors were empowered to call on the secular arm to help them, should the need arise, and were instructed to draw up instruments signed and sealed by the friars which would be enrolled in chancery. A separate list of instructions to the visitors was drawn up and the swearing of oaths began. All friars were to be bound by an oath to obey Henry VIII, his wife Anne and their offspring, and to preach and persuade the people to do likewise. The king was to be acknowledged as head of the church. Friars were to admit that the bishop of Rome had no greater authority in England than any other bishop outside his diocese. Scripture was to be expounded in its natural sense and, in sermons and prayers, the king was to be commended as supreme head of the church, then Anne and her offspring, then the archbishop of Canterbury and the other clergy. Not all the relevant records survive, but in April and May 1534 the royal supremacy was acknowledged by convents of friars in London, Kings Langley, Aylesbury, Dunstable, Bedford, Ware and Hitchin. Throughout the country as a whole, there was resistance from the Observants who refused to conform.⁴⁹

The mechanism of visitation was to prove a useful model for the future. The government had issued a commission and instructions to Visitors, who were required to obtain a declaration under seal to the king's supremacy and to the new order in church and state. The work of Browne and Hilsey did not extend to the parochial clergy, nor to houses of monks and nuns, but it was clear that such groups needed to be tackled and won over to the cause. As far as the province of Canterbury is concerned, it was to be Thomas Cranmer as metropolitan who would implement the government's plans. Archbishops of Canterbury had long been able to conduct metropolitical visitations of the dioceses of their province. Cranmer's metropolitical visitation, however, was to be a visitation like no other because it was by means of this device that the clergy's adherence to the new political and religious order was forged.

The campaign effectively began on 27 April 1534 when the king issued a mandate to the archbishop enjoining all secular officials to help Cranmer in his forthcoming visitation. In an astonishing lapse, the king's officials themselves

⁴⁹ P.R.O., C 66/663, membrane 6d (numeration in round brackets); P.R.O., C 54/402, membrane 9d and C 54/403, membrane 15d; B.L., MS Cleopatra E. IV, fo. 14r-v, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 587 (18), 590, 665 (i-ii); D. E. Knowles, *The religious Orders of England* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1948-59), III, 177-8, 209-11; T. Rymer, *Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque generis acta publica* (20 vols., London, 1704-35), XIV, 487-90; *D.N.B.*, sub 'Browne' and 'Hilsey'. For a recent discussion of the resistance of the Observant John Forest, see P. Marshall, 'Papist as heretic: the burning of John Forest, 1538', *Historical Journal*, XLI (1998), 361-8.

addressed Cranmer as a 'legate of the apostolic see'.⁵⁰ There is little wonder, therefore, that Cranmer got hot under the collar at Stokesley's actions in the diocese of London. Despite the offensive form of papal address, there is no doubt that Cranmer used this mandate elsewhere in his visitation, for it is recorded in his visitation acts amongst the dean and chapter of Lincoln and in the register of the priory of St Peter at Gloucester.⁵¹ Then in June, a circular letter was issued to the archbishop's officials which announced the government's policy and explains why the extraordinary mandate of 27 April was necessary. Two registered copies survive at Lincoln and Gloucester; even more dramatic is the survival of an original in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.⁵² The Lincoln and Gloucester copies are addressed to Richard Gwent, royal chaplain and the archbishop's dean of the arches; the Oxford letter is addressed to Peter Ligham. Although the evidence does not now survive, it is likely that further officials in the archbishop's retinue were also issued with copies of the same letter.

The terms of the missive leave little doubt that Cranmer's officials were to be entrusted with extraordinary powers for the duration of the visitation. The reason for using Cranmer's staff in this way is stated with blunt simplicity:

forasmuche that you shall exercyse the vysytatyon of my lorde of Cantorbury in dyvers partes of his provynce, by reason wherof you shall have a great apparaunce of the clergy of this realme before you together at ons [i.e. once] and shall coome in to dyvers abbayes and other collegyall ande cathedrall churches.

What were Cranmer's officials to do when all these clergy were gathered together? They were to procure the chapter seal, and the signature of every member of the chapter, to a declaration devised by the king. Furthermore, they were to obtain the signature 'of every prieste by you vystede to the artycle concernynge the bisshopp of Roome, his authoryte within this realme'. Reflecting the language of the king's mandate of 27 April, this letter of 25 June empowered Cranmer's staff to call on secular officials to help them in their allotted task. The date of the letter is odd, because Cranmer had already begun his visitation in certain dioceses of the province. It may well have been Stokesley's stubborn resistance in London which convinced the government that the mandate of 27 April needed added bite.

From the terms of the king's letter in June, it is clear that Cranmer's visitation was a central plank in the government's programme to ensure conformity to the

⁵⁰ P.R.O., C 66/664, membranes 24–5, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 589 (7).

⁵¹ L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fo. 10; G.D.C.L., register E (register of Abbot William Parker *alias* Malvern), fos. 90v–1r.

⁵² L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fo. 10v; G.D.C.L., register E, fo. 90; Bodl., MS Ashmole 1729, fo. 2, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 876. All quotations from this crucial letter are given below from the text at Oxford.

new order in the church. Having obtained an oath from every male in the kingdom to the succession, Cromwell now turned his special attention to the church. He used Cranmer's powers to extract an oath or signature to a declaration, which explicitly denounced the supremacy of the bishop of Rome in favour of the king's supremacy over the church. The class E 25 in the Public Record Office is known as the 'Acknowledgements of Supremacy' from the Treasury of Receipt in the Exchequer. Not all the declarations there stem from Cranmer's visitation, for this is now a composite class of material of different dates. Nonetheless, well over 100 declarations, signed and sealed by bishops, cathedral chapters, monasteries, priories, abbeys and collegiate churches survive as a testimony to the work of Cranmer's officials during the metropolitical visitation in 1534–5.⁵³

That Cranmer's officials were responsible for collecting these declarations can further be shown. Where the date of Cranmer's visitation of a diocese is known, it tallies with the date of the cathedral clergy's recognition of the royal supremacy.

Table 1. A comparison of the earliest date for Cranmer's metropolitical visitation, where known from diocesan or local sources, with the date of the recognition of the royal supremacy by cathedral clergy.⁵⁴

Diocese	Visitation of see	Recognition of supremacy
Chichester	7 July 1535	5 July 1535
Lincoln	4 August 1534	5 August 1534
London	18 June 1534	20 June 1534
Norwich	28 July 1534	28 July 1534
Rochester	9 June 1534	10 June 1534
Worcester	17 August 1534	17 August 1534

Of what did the declarations consist? The major clergy were to swear obedience to Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn and their offspring; that the king was head of the church; that the bishop of Rome had no more jurisdiction in England than any foreign bishop; that the name 'pope' should no longer be used, but simply the term 'bishop of Rome'; that the king should be commended in sermons and prayers as supreme head of the church, after whom Queen Anne, her children by

⁵³ The existing declarations are calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 665, 865, 921, 1024, 1121, 1216, 1347, 1594; VIII, 31.

⁵⁴ The sources used are: C.D.C.A., Cap. I/17/76 and Cap. I/3/0, fo. 72r–v for Chichester; L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fos. 11r–v, 9r–v for Lincoln; G.L., MS 9531/11, fos. 59–60 and P.R.O., E 25/82/1 for St Paul's London; L.P.L., C.R., fo. 137v and P.R.O., E 25/94/1 for Norwich; P.S., *Cranmer II*, p. 294 and P.R.O., E 25/104/1 for Rochester; *More's journal*, p. 391 and W.D.C.L., register A 6 (ii), fos. 182v–3r and P.R.O., E 25/122/3 for Worcester.

Henry and the archbishops of Canterbury and York were to be remembered. It was a comprehensive statement of the new order with no claim omitted.⁵⁵

How did the major clergy take the oath? Material which survives in capitular archives for the province of Canterbury shows what was involved on the ground. On 1 June, the archbishop's registry at Lambeth sent a citation for visitation to the abbot and convent of Gloucester.⁵⁶ The abbot and his fellow monks were summoned to assemble before the archbishop and his officials in the chapter house on 31 August. The abbot duly cited his brethren to appear and returned the requisite documentation to Lambeth. When the visitors reached Gloucester, the king's circular letter of June was presented to the brethren. All members of the monastery were to subscribe to the article concerning the bishop of Rome. Secular officers were to aid the visitors should anyone refuse to subscribe. The monks duly swore the oath, for the terms of this declaration are recorded in the register as the form of the oath sworn by the archbishop of Canterbury and all the clergy of the realm to the king. The king's circular letter of June was not the only stick used to beat the monastery. The abbot's register shows that the king's licence of 27 April, addressed to the archbishop, was also produced. This mandate enjoined all secular officials to aid the archbishop in his work during the visitation. Faced with such pressure, the monastery had no option but to comply with the king's wishes and to subscribe to the declaration. Only when the oath of supremacy was sworn by the whole community did Cranmer's officials confirm the monastery's ownership of churches and other spiritual income such as tithes and pensions. The letters of confirmation, in the name of the archbishop, are dated 3 September at Lanthony Priory, just south-west of Gloucester. Given Cranmer's presence in the south-west at this time, there is little doubt that he was present at Gloucester in person and took an active part in the whole proceedings.

Gloucester presents the fullest picture of activity during Cranmer's visitation, but the same pattern can be seen in lesser detail throughout the province of Canterbury. At Worcester, the prior and convent received the archbishop's citation for visitation on 26 July 1534. All members of the cathedral were cited to appear before the archbishop and his fellow visitors on 17 August. On that day, the prior and chapter duly swore to the royal supremacy. Uniquely among the surviving records of the metropolitanical visitation, the Worcester material then records that the prior and chapter swore the oath of succession, whereby they bound themselves to Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn and their offspring. They promised

⁵⁵ Transcripts of the submissions of the dean and chapter of St Paul's in London (P.R.O., E 25/82/1) and for Oriel College, Oxford (P.R.O., E 25/102/8) can be found in Rymer, *Foedera*, XIV, 493–5. Cf. Elton, *Policy and police*, pp. 228–9.

⁵⁶ For this and what follows, cf. G.D.C.L., register E, fos. 88v–93v.

to obey the statute for the succession and to forsake all oaths to foreign potentates. Only then did the archbishop confirm their spiritual possessions and revenues. Although such corporate bodies made the requisite renunciation concerning the supremacy, many must have done so with misgivings. Evidence of widespread resistance does not survive, but the master and fellows of Balliol College, Oxford, may well have given voice to the reservations of others. When they swore the oath, they bravely added that they did not intend anything against divine law, the rule of orthodox faith, nor the doctrine of our mother, the holy catholic church.⁵⁷

The parish clergy signed a much simpler declaration, namely that the bishop of Rome had no greater jurisdiction in this realm than any other foreign bishop. The evidence survives in two composite subscription books and it is clear that they both stem from the archbishop's metropolitan visitation.⁵⁸ The cover of one volume is inscribed 'To Maister Robert Colyns, official of Caunterburye, this be delyveried with spede'.⁵⁹ The second volume contains, amongst others, names collected on 2 July 1534 'in visitatione metropolitana Cantuariensi'.⁶⁰ An instruction contained in this book shows that each successive section of signatures was to be put with the rest in a box.⁶¹ The collection of signatures for the archdeaconry of Bath is perhaps the most elaborate, since a separate booklet with lines ruled specifically for names was prepared in advance.⁶² The full Latin declaration stipulated that the bishop of Rome had no greater jurisdiction given to him by God in the realm of England than any other foreign bishop. The Latin form runs: 'Romanus episcopus non habet maiorem aliquam iurisdictionem a Deo sibi collatam in hoc regno Anglie quam quivis alius externus episcopus'. As such, it is similar to the seminal declaration by the convocation of Canterbury, save that the phrase 'in sacra Scriptura' is missing from the text used by the parish clergy. The form of subscription is very simple, consisting of the name of the subscriber and a description of his office. Hundreds of signatures survive and no resistance is recorded, save perhaps from Dr Edward Feld in the archbishop's deanery of the arches in London. Feld remitted himself to the opinion of the archbishop of

⁵⁷ W.D.C.L., register A 6 (ii), fos. 181v–5r. Cf. register A 12, fos. 142v–3r. The oath sworn by the master and fellows of Balliol College, Oxford, is to be found at P.R.O., E 25/102/3, and in Rymer, *Foedera*, XIV, 498. I am grateful to Dr Peter Marshall for drawing this reference to my attention.

⁵⁸ P.R.O., E 36/63–4, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 1025 (i–ii).

⁵⁹ P.R.O., E 36/63.

⁶⁰ P.R.O., E 36/64, p. 7.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, [i] before p. 73.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 84–[91].

Canterbury as his ordinary.⁶³ For London diocese, the signatures of 356 priests survive; more may have subscribed but the evidence does not survive.⁶⁴

The task facing Cranmer's officials was huge. Table 2 shows the tremendous scale of the operation which Cranmer and his officials were forced to mount in order to meet the requirements of the government's political programme.

Table 2. Thomas Cranmer's metropolitical visitation in England and Wales: an analysis showing the earliest recognition of royal supremacy in each county, as recorded in the 'Acknowledgements of Supremacy' from the Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt, kept in the Public Record Office. The details are taken from a modern class listing which updates the evidence given in Public Record Office. 7th Report of the Deputy Keeper (London, 1846), Appendix II, pp. 279–306.

County	Institution	Date	Reference
Bedfordshire	Bushmead Priory	30 Sept. 1534	E 25/12
Brecknock	Brecon Priory	8 Aug. 1534	E 25/15
Buckinghamshire	Snelshall Priory	2 Sept. 1534	E 25/105/2
Cardiganshire	Llanddewi-Brefi College	4 Aug. 1534	E 25/73
Carmarthenshire	Carmarthen Priory	24 July 1534	E 25/23/1
Cornwall	St Germans Priory	11 Aug. 1534	E 25/57/2
Denbighshire	St Asaph Cathedral	21 Aug. 1534	E 25/4/1
Devonshire	Hospital of St John the Baptist, Exeter	13 July 1534	E 25/48/2
	Ottery St Mary collegiate church	13 July 1534	E 25/102/9
Essex	Walden Abbey	1 July 1534	E 25/112/2
Glamorgan	Llandaff Cathedral	5 Sept 1534	E 25/72/1
Gloucestershire	Winchcombe Abbey	25 Aug 1534	E 25/120/1
Hertfordshire	Royston Priory	1 July 1534	E 25/104/2
Huntingdonshire	Huntingdon Priory	14 July 1534	E 25/66
Kent	Rochester Cathedral	10 June 1534	E 25/104/1
Leicestershire	Leicester Abbey	11 Aug 1534	E 25/77
Lincolnshire	Newstead Priory by Stamford	21 July 1534	E 25/91
London	Hospital or Priory of St Thomas Martyr of Acon	13 June 1534	E 25/80
Monmouthshire	Usk Priory	11 Sept 1534	E 25/111/2
Norfolk	Norwich Cathedral	28 July 1534	E 25/94/1

⁶³ P.R.O., E 36/63, p. 102.

⁶⁴ Cf. S. Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1989), p. 226 and n. 56.

County	Institution	Date	Reference
Northamptonshire	Chacombe Priory	13 Aug 1534	E 25/29
Oxfordshire	Osney Abbey	23 July 1534	E 25/99
Pembrokeshire	St David's Cathedral	18 July 1534	E 25/84/2
Somerset	Wells Cathedral	6 July 1534	E 25/119
Suffolk	Mettingham College	28 Sept 1534	E 25/86
Sussex	Chichester Cathedral	5 July 1535	see Table 1
Warwickshire	Stratford-on-Avon		
	collegiate church	20 Aug 1534	E 25/106
	St Mary's collegiate church, Warwick	20 Aug 1534	E 25/115
Worcestershire	Worcester Cathedral	17 Aug 1534	E 25/122/3

The archbishop was careful to keep the government fully informed of his progress. Well might Cranmer write to Cromwell, 'I intend (God willing) to be at Rochester in my visitation, where if ye have any special matters to be inquired of, I will be glad to do my endeavour in the same.'⁶⁵ In Wales, remote from central government in London, the visitors took no chances and some corporations both swore the full declaration and signed the simpler text offered to parish clergy.⁶⁶ Not all signatures survive for the country as a whole, but it is more likely that some records have perished rather than people were missed out. In fact, Cranmer's officials could not cope alone and lay officials were drafted in to help them when required. The king's mandate of 27 April 1534, already described, enjoined all secular officials to help Cranmer in his visitation. This was clearly done with a view to ensuring that the enforcement of the royal supremacy was achieved with all speed. Professor MacCulloch has shown how this stipulation worked in practice. In certain parts of the country, secular officials from the archbishop's household were appointed to commissions of peace. There can be little doubt that the reason for this was the need to secure recognition to the royal supremacy in the country at large.⁶⁷

Whilst corporate bodies swore the long form of declaration already noted, the bishops were treated differently. It is true that the bishop of St David's recognized the royal supremacy in the form offered by corporate bodies, but this was unusual.⁶⁸ The bishops as a whole (including Rawlins at St David's) were expected

⁶⁵ P.S., *Cranmer II*, p. 294.

⁶⁶ The precentor and chapter of St David's cathedral, for example, swore the full declaration on 18 July 1534; their names also appear in the listings collected from the parish clergy. Cf. P.R.O., E 25/84/2 and E 36/63, p. 1.

⁶⁷ MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 130–1.

⁶⁸ P.R.O., E 25/85.

to make a separate recognition of the new order. A draft oath in Latin shows what the government expected. Each bishop or archbishop was to appear before the king, to renounce their oath of loyalty to the pope and to confess that the bishop of Rome had no greater jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop. In two ways, however, the draft proved unacceptable. It got into a tangle by trying to distinguish between papal bulls copied into registers, which could not easily be handed over, and original bulls, which could. More importantly, the draft went beyond the case used hitherto in the government's campaign by making the bishops request that the king re-grant all privileges contained in the papal bulls on his own authority. In this way, it would be seen that such powers came from the king alone and not from the pope.⁶⁹ This was heady stuff and beyond the immediate needs of the campaign. The draft was not used and a fuller oath was adopted instead which addressed the immediate needs of the government's programme. Seventeen renunciations survive, eleven dating from February 1535, four from March, one from April and one from June. Cranmer (Canterbury), Gardiner (Winchester), Clerk (Bath and Wells), Stokesley (London), Goodrich (Ely), Longland (Lincoln), Kite (Carlisle), Lee (York), Salcot (Bangor), Sherborne (Chichester), and Lee (Coventry and Lichfield) made the renunciation in February; Tunstall (Durham), Veysey (Exeter), Nykke (Norwich) and Booth (Hereford) swore the oath in March; Rawlins (St David's) in April and Standish (St Asaph) in June.⁷⁰ Cranmer was one of the first to swear on 10 February 1535. He undertook to offer neither obedience nor fealty to the bishop of Rome and confessed that the Roman primacy was simply an institution set up on human authority. He swore to defend the laws of the realm enacted against the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction and promised to surrender all papal bulls to the crown.⁷¹ So thorough were the government's actions that even those bishops appointed in 1534 after the break with Rome swore to the new order. The episcopal declarations do not explicitly mention the king's marriage to Anne, but in the context of the government's programme of 1534–5 there can be little doubt that the bishops' oaths implicitly acknowledge the new order in church and state. When Cranmer swore to uphold the 'quarrel and cause' of the king against all manner of persons, he accepted in principle the jurisdictional revolution of the early 1530s.

Cranmer's visitation seems to have ended by the summer of 1535. The protests of the diocesan bishops at the exercise of his powers rendered much of his activity

⁶⁹ P.R.O., S.P. 6/3, fos. 63–4 (printed numeration).

⁷⁰ *L.P.*, VIII, 190, 311, 494, 803.

⁷¹ P.R.O., E 25/26/3. With minor variations, the text is the same as that sworn by Rowland Lee which is printed in Rymer, *Foedera*, XIV, 549–50 and Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 781–2. An English translation of the Latin renunciation sworn by Stephen Gardiner is given in J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. J. Pratt (8 vols., London, 1877), V, 71–2 and Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 780–1.

useless, but there is little doubt that his *rôle* in enforcing the royal supremacy provided the single most important reason for Cranmer to continue his work into a second year. The visitation seems to have come to an end in August, for a letter to Cromwell from one of his agents talks of 'Lammes [1 Aug.] ... tyll my lorde of Cant' have fully finisshede his visitacion'.⁷² The task facing Cranmer's officials was huge, but by the middle of 1535 they seemed to have pulled it off. The enforcement of the king's supremacy in the church is the single most prominent achievement of the archbishop's metropolitanical visitation.

Conclusion

How should Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation be judged? In terms of enforcing the royal supremacy, it was an administrative success. Once the episcopate, corporate bodies and all the parish clergy had been sworn to the supremacy, the king's control over the church was immeasurably stronger. Whilst little outward resistance is recorded, however, many must have sworn the requisite declaration reluctantly. Nonetheless, the protests of certain bishops at Cranmer's visitation were not protests against the king's supremacy. Rather, the government used Cranmer's metropolitanical powers to force the bishops to conform to the new realities in church and state. The task of collecting thousands of signatures was immense. Cranmer's officials must have worked overtime to obtain the names from every parish in every diocese of the southern province. It may well be the sheer scale of the operation which convinced the government not to use oaths so comprehensively again. In future, they were used selectively as a means of enforcing conformity. It was to be statute law, and notably the Treasons Act of 1534, by which the new order was henceforth maintained.

In terms of the archbishop's own authority, his metropolitanical visitation of 1533–5 was a fiasco. Following Stokesley's protest at the continued use of the title 'legate of the apostolic see', Cranmer appeared in convocation in November 1534 and renounced this style in favour of the title 'metropolitan'.⁷³ In answer to the protests of Longland at Lincoln and Nykke at Norwich, Cranmer and all the other diocesan bishops surrendered their papal bulls of provision to the crown, even those prelates appointed after the break with Rome. The government was forced to realize that it must re-define the nature and source of authority in the church. The Act of Supremacy passed parliament in November 1534. Whilst recognizing what had in effect been achieved by Cranmer's visitation, it also gave

⁷² B.L., MS Cleopatra E. IV, fo. 56 (pencil foliation). I am grateful to Professor Diarmaid MacCulloch for drawing my attention to the importance of this reference.

⁷³ Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 769.

Henry powers to 'visit, repress ... and amend' errors which should be reformed.⁷⁴ Here, in essence, is the birth of the vicegerency which Thomas Cromwell would use to such telling effect.⁷⁵ The government now saw that it could no longer control the church through the archbishop of Canterbury alone. The events of 1533–5 did not destroy the power of the archbishops of Canterbury to undertake metropolitanical visitations. The Stuart archbishops continued to exercise authority in this way, but Cranmer's experiences in the 1530s served to underline the new relationship in church and state which the mid-Tudor government was determined to forge.

These are the results of Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation. The crown used Cranmer's powers to enforce obedience to the royal supremacy. Paradoxically, the protests of the diocesan bishops at Cranmer's powers convinced the government that it must define more closely the nature and *locus* of authority in a church cut off from Roman jurisdiction. In 1533, Cranmer began his visitation as a prince bishop in the medieval mould. By mid 1535, when the visitation ended, he was a prince bishop in name only. With the creation of Thomas Cromwell as vicar general in the same year, Cranmer could no longer be called the principal minister of the king's spiritual jurisdiction.

⁷⁴ *Stat. realm*, III, 492.

⁷⁵ Cf. Ayris, 'God's vicegerent', pp. 125–30.

Editorial Conventions

The documents below are arranged chronologically. Each one is assigned a number and a modern heading for ease of identification. Where the document is in Latin, the heading has been expanded into a summary of the original in English. Changes in foliation in each manuscript are given in square brackets in the footnotes. In the transcripts, the spelling of the original has been maintained; the use of capitals has been restricted and a modern usage adopted. All abbreviations have been expanded, where this can be done with confidence, and a modern system of punctuation used. Editorial corrections in the text are indicated as such in the footnotes; text which is unclear in the original is indicated as such in the transcript by an ellipsis (...). A complete reference to the classmark and relevant foliation of the manuscript follows each heading, along with a note of earlier printed editions of the text where these exist. Footnotes are as full as possible and deal with both textual and historical matters arising out of the text. Personal names, however, which occur in the *D.N.B.* are not noted further in the footnotes unless the transcribed text calls for extended comment. In the case of documents 2 and 4, the nature of the surviving evidence demands detailed analysis of the existing manuscripts. In the case of document 2 from Lincoln, an extended treatment of the surviving manuscript evidence precedes the heading to the document. For document 4, which concerns the archbishop's visitation of Corpus Christi College in Oxford, a textual note is given as footnote 1.

Thomas Cranmer and the metropolitan visitation of Canterbury province 1533–1535

1. DIOCESE OF LONDON

1A

Protestation by the archbishop of Canterbury before the start of his visitation in the diocese of London. The archbishop insists that he is visiting John Stokesley, bishop, and his diocese by virtue of his rights as metropolitan and that he intends to do nothing in derogation of the king's powers or of the statutes of the realm. G.L., MS 9531/11, fo. 66v.

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN.¹ Nos Thomas permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus protestamur palam, publice et expresse quod per hanc nostram visitationem in ecclesia cathedrali domini Pauli London' et diocesis eiusdem iure metropolitico exercendam, non intendimus nec volumus per eandem quicquid facere aut exercere in derogationem aut enarvationem potestatis regie aut aliquorum statutorum huius regni in ea parte editorum, sed eandem visitationem nostram iure archiepiscopali et metropolitico solummodo exercere.

1B

Articles against the visitation of the archbishop of Canterbury.

B.L., Cotton MS Cleopatra F. II, fos. 124–7, calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 1683 (i); Strype, *Cranmer*, I, 355–60.

Furst,¹ that tharchbisshopp of Canterburie in all his monitions and writings sent to the bisshopp, abbates, priors, and archdeacons of London concernyng this his visitation called hym self *apostolice sedis legatum* and that therefor the bisshopp of London with the chapitre did not oonlye advertyse tharchbisshopp thereof by their letteres before the day of the visitation, but also that same day of the commencement thereof in the chapitre house of Powles the saide bisshopp and

¹ The entry bears the following heading: 'Protestatio facta per archiepiscopum Cant' ante inchoationem visitationis sue in ecclesia cathedrali Sancti Pauli'.

¹ 'Contra visitationem archiepiscopi Cant' appears as a heading in a later hand.

chapitre before the delyvery of his certificate to tharchbisshopp made there openlye a protestation reding it in wryting, signyfyng that they wolde neither accepte hym as suche a legate nor admytte or obeye his visitation, iurisdiction or any thing that he wolde attempte by the preteuxe or colour of that name of legate or otherwyse agaynste the crowne of our soveraigne, his regaltie, statutes or customes of his realme, and required the said archbisshopp to commaunde his registre (there present) to enacte the said protestation, which he refused utterlye to doo, shewing hymself not willing to admitte the said protestation.²

Item, that tharchbisshopp in his said monition to the bisshop³ did expreslye intymate and signyfy to hym that he wolde in this his visitation suspende all the iurisdiction of the bisshopp, the deane and archdeacons from the begynnynge thereof to thending in soche wise that the bisshopp nor his officers, deane nor archdeacon shulde or myght all that tyme (which he wold not determe⁴ howe longe it shulde endure)⁵ use noo iurisdiction whate soever causes or necessities shuld chaunce of correction, institutions of benefices, confirmations of elections, consecrations of churches, celebration of orders or probation of testaments, with many other thinges moo apperteynyng *ad forum contensiosum*, but all and every of thise the archbisshopp and his wolde have, and suffre noon other to use and exercise the same unto thende of his visitation which he hath nowe contynued untill the first day of Decembre, pretending that then he may likewyse contynue it other six monthes and soo forthe without ende at his pleasur during his life from tyme to tyme, soo that by this means he oonlye and noon other shuld be bisshop but *titularis* in all his province during his life, but at his pleasur which were an inconvenient, intollerable and suche as never was redde nor herde of that ever any metropolitane, priuate legate or bisshop of Roome in his most tyranne had usurped the semblable.

Item, that all men lerned and bookes of the cannon lawe dothe agree that noo metropolitane or primate may thus by any lawe written suspende all the iurisdiction of the bisshoppes for the tyme of their visitations or exercise the premysses during the same *iure metropolitico* and this the counsaill of tharchbisshopp doth not denye nor cannot.

2 These acts are recorded in John Stokesley's London register as G.L., MS 9531/11, fos. 61r–3v. Cranmer was present in the chapter house at St Paul's in person and, in a temper, bluntly refused to record Stokesley's protest or to mention it in any of the written acts of the visitation. Stokesley was deeply offended and, refusing to yield any ground, issued an appeal to the king.

3 The text of the archbishop's citation appears in *ibid.*, fos. 59–60 and certificates of execution of the monition are registered on fo. 60r–v. Stokesley first received the citation on 19 May 1534; cf. *ibid.*, fo. 28.

4 'determe [fo. 124v] howe' in ms.

5 'whate sooever cause' struck through in ms.

Item,⁶ where the said archbisshopp dothe pretende that his predecessours tymes past hath put in use or exercise all the premysses and soo though the common lawe doth fayle hym, yet he may leyne to prescription. First it is to be considred and remembrid that the suspension of all iurisdiction of all the bisshoppes in maner aforesaid semyth to be against Holy Scripture and thauctoritie given unto theym by God; and as it was said before that suspencion were a thing perniciose, not redde nor herde of to have be attempted by the most tyranne of all the bisshoppes of Roome without the greate offence of the bisshopp; and as for the reste, considring that none of his predecessours this hundred yeres did visite thus his province and therfor noo man lyving canne knowe this by experience, it had byne necessarie for tharchbisshop to have shewed bookes for the profes of thise his seynges and pretenses which he and his officers being ther unto desired aswell before the visitation as sithens ever did refuse and deferre to doo.

Item, it is to be remembred that in case it shall appere in any booke of tharchbisshopp that his predecessours have attempted any of the premysses, first that his predecessours were legates and though they did visite *iure metropolitico*, yet they myght peradventure as legates attempte somme thinges which they had had no right nor colour to doo if they had be oolye metropolitans and primates.

Secundarily⁷ in this behalf and case it is to be remembred that many of those archbisshoppes of Canterburie were not oonlye legates but also chauncellers of Englonde, by the which auctoritie they peraventure did enforce and maynteigne many thinges attempted against the lawe as the late cardinall did,⁸ and therfor it is to be⁹ disseverd what they did as legates and whate as metropolitans, and whate by force after repelled and whate by right peasiblye enioyed, and not to knytt now *iure metropolitico* soche thinges as were doon by his predecessours as legates, nor to callenge prescription nowe [*sic*] the auctoritie of the see of Rome repelled¹⁰ and here extinguisshed in soche thinges as were attempted oonlye by the pretexte of the auctoritie of that see or else after were appealid, repellid or resisted.

⁶ '[fo. 125] Item' in ms.

⁷ '[fo. 125v] Secundarilye' in ms.

⁸ The allusion here is to Cardinal Thomas Wolsey who was papal legate *a latere*. In 1530 and 1531, indictments under *praemunire* were brought first against Wolsey, then against fifteen clerics and then against the whole clerical body. The initial cause, the exercise by Wolsey of legatine jurisdiction, was transformed into an attack on the whole spiritual estate. Both convocations were required to pay a subsidy, in truth a fine, to excuse their actions by an Act of Pardon (22 Henry VIII, c. 15); cf. *Stat. realm*, III, 334–8.

⁹ 'considred' struck through in ms.

¹⁰ 'repelled' added as a contemporary correction in the right-hand margin of the ms; 'expelled' struck through.

Thirdelye, in this case it is to be remembrid that it apperith by the auncient registres of the bisshops and¹¹ their chirches that when the predecessours of tharchbisshopp did attempte any of thise cases aforesaid, the bisshops and their clargies did appeale to the see of Roome (and dyvers tymes they obteigned sentences and executions agaynst hym, and some remaigned undecided by the reason of the dethe of tharchbisshop or bisshopp complaynant)¹² for remedye and redresse of the same in like maner as we your faithfull subiectes have nowe for this our grife appeled unto your maiestie.

Item, it is to be considred whedre any metropolitane in odre Christen realmes, being noo legate, dothe exercise the premysses after the fourme nowe here pretended in his visitation. And encase they doo not,¹³ as it is said they doo not attempte any suche thinges, but oonlye in their visitations provinciales useth that the common lawe giveth theym, then here to be repelled and extinguisshed forever, to thentent that the bisshoppes of Roome hereafter shall have no colour to maynteigne and iustifye that they kepe here yet and contynuallye the possession of their auctoritie, and of our subiection by their legate. Saying that although tharchebisshopp doo relinquysse the name of a legate, yet neverthelesse he exerciseth soche iurisdiction as the lawes never gave to metropolitane, nor noo archbisshopp in Christendome dothe exercise (legates of the see of Roome onely excepted). And therefor it is to be provided that noo sparckes remaigne whereby he myght susutate any suche flame, if the matier shuld comme in question.

Finallye it is to be remembred that the bisshops nor¹⁴ their clergies doo not refuse to accepte and obey the visitation of tharchbisshopp as metropolitane and to pay to hym proxies due and accustomed, but where the bisshops hath not oonlye the commne lawes but also bulles and sentences executed against his predecessours, and that longe before the makynge of the statutes against provisions, declaring whate sommes he shall not passe for his proxies of their chirches, thofficers of tharchbisshopp demaundeth moche more, neither shewing the lawe (for their is noon to bere theym) nor yet president or example in any auncient bookes wherby they myght be satisfied, which doon he shulde without difficultie or grudge have forthwith all his proxies upon the conclusion of his visitation, unto the which tyme it is not due in moneye. Many other thinges and considerations there be to be alleged concernyng the premysses which may be spokyn in tyme and place as the debatynge of the matier shall require.

11 'and' added as a contemporary correction in the right-hand margin, followed by 'that', which is erased in ms.

12 'bisshopp [fo. 126] complaynant' in ms.

13 'then' struck through in ms after 'not'.

14 'bisshops [fo. 126v] nor' in ms.

And for a conclusion, it may please your maiestie to be advertised that if my lorde of Canterburie canne shewe by auncient presidentes that any his predecessours have used peasibly the premysses without interuption and soo have enjoyed the same, those presidentes shewed and brought in presens allowed also¹⁵ by your lerned counsaill of the lawes spirituall¹⁶ to be presidentes sufficient and of auctoritie in this behalfe, we shall then immediatlye in all the premysses obey the said archbisshopp without any further contradiction. In this our soo doing, whether we offre hym reason or not, we referre us oonly to your maiestie and unto your gracious iugement, humble beseching the same that forasmuche as all the lawes be for us and this hunndred yeres past, and nowe also in our daies we have not herde nor seen the contrarie used to the said lawes, we nowe most lowlye as your power and true subiectes desier your maiestie that with your gracious favour and licence we may use suche defence as your lawes and your high courte of your parliament hath politikelye provided for us and other your subiectes.¹⁷

1C

Paper against the archbishop of Canterbury's court of Audience.

B.L., Cotton MS Cleopatra F. I, fos. 93–4; Strype, *Cranmer*, I, 366–70.

To the firste,¹ hys protestations sheweth no more but that he is not to be suspected to kepe that courte of hys audience by the authoritie of any legacy from Rome, as by the name of legate of Rome. But forasmoche as no archebisshop within Christendome hathe nor never hadd any aucthorytie to kepe any suche courte by the reason of hys archebisshoprike, but only legates of the see of Rome; whiche legates what vexations and oppressions they have doon by the pretense therof not onely to ordynaries but also to the layfee,² by calling of poore men from the farthest parte of the realme to London for an halfpeny candell or for a litell obprobriouse worde, as was declared and proved playnely in this parliament,

¹⁵ 'allowed [fo. 127] also' in ms.

¹⁶ 'and' erased in ms.

¹⁷ The present paper is endorsed on fo. 127v: 'The articles agenst the visitation of the archebisshop of Cant' within the dioc' of London'. *L.P.*, VII, 1683 (ii) links a collection *De officio archidiaconi* on fos. 128–9 with the present paper. The two collections, however, are not in the same hand and are concerned with different topics. The present paper makes no special mention of the rôle and office of archdeacons and it therefore seems unlikely that the extracts on fos. 128–9 stem from Cranmer's metropolitical visitation of the diocese of London.

¹ 'Touching the court of Audience' added as a heading in a later hand.

² 'lay fee' is an expression for the laity over against the clergy. For another example of this phrase, cf. B.L., MS Royal 17B. XXXV, fos. 3v–4r, where it claims 'Ignorance breedeth in the lay fe'. I am grateful to Professor Diarmaid MacCulloch for bringing this reference to my attention.

which was a grete cause of making of a statute to remedy that, before the statute of thabolishment of the bisshop's of Rome auctoritie within this realme;³ in somoche that this execution of legacies in other iurisdiccions and realmes hath ben on of the gretest and the intolerablest usurpations of the bisshope of Rome thies many yeres emonges the comonaltie, and therfore a thing moost necessary of reformation. In consideration of the premisses, no archebisshop can exercise this auctoritie except he implieth to all the worlde (thoughe he speke it not nor write it not) that he ys a legate of the see of Rome. And in case it shall please the kinge's grace to gyve like auctoritie not withstanding so many incommodities to his grace's subiectes proved by the use therof and not oone commoditie at all to abydenby, yt shuld seme better to gyve yt to⁴ some other by speciall commission at hys grace's pleasure, wherby yt shalbe knownen certeynely to⁵ com fro hys grace rather then to yoynе it to tharchbisshop's see, wherby tholde poyson myght still lurke and breke out on day agayne, if yt shuld chaunce some to be archebisshop of Canterbury that wold chaunge theyr copie as hath ben in tymes past.

And more over if his grace shuld make hym his legate, it shuld peradventur derogate the powre of his grace's generall vicare.⁶ And if both shuld occupie then shall the people somoche the rather take occasion to think and say that his grace's

3 The identification of the incidents alluded to here presents some difficult problems of interpretation. There are three separate cases to consider. The declaration before parliament is probably the Commons' supplication against the ordinaries of 1532, where that document complained amongst other things of trivial cases promoted by the ordinaries against lay people. For the text of the supplication, cf. *Documents*, ed. Gee and Hardy, pp. 145–53. A number of statutes resulted from the complaints in the supplication. One of these (23 Henry VIII, c. 9) prohibited bishops from citing people outside their diocese except in certain specified cases and is the statute alluded to here; cf. *Stat. realm*, III, 377–8. The most difficult incident to identify is actually the act abolishing the authority of the bishop of Rome. The Act extinguishing the authority of the Bishop of Rome (28 Henry VIII, c. 10) of 1536 does not actually stem from the Reformation parliament. The writer of the present paper, however, is clearly writing whilst that parliament is still sitting, for the discussion of the supplication against the ordinaries is said to have taken place 'in this parliament'. When the writer talks of the statute for the abolition of the bishop of Rome's authority, he is probably alluding to one of the catena of Reformation statutes passed after 1532. It might be the Act in Restraint of Appeals (24 Henry VIII, c. 12) of 1533 with its famous preamble, which is the single most important statute passed by the Reformation parliament; it might also be the Act of Supremacy (26 Henry VIII, c. 1) of 1534, which Edward Hall identified as the statute 'by the whiche the Pope with all his College of Cardinales ... was vtterly abolished out of this realme'; cf. *Stat. realm*, III, 427–9, 492 and E. Hall, *Chronicle: containing the history of England during the reign of Henry the Fourth and the succeeding monarchs to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth*, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1809), p. 816.

4 'to' interlined as a contemporary correction.

5 'k' erased in ms.

6 Cromwell's commission as vicegerent probably dates from 21 Jan. 1535. Cf. F. D. Logan, 'Thomas Cromwell and the vicegerency in spirituals: a re-visitation', *English Historical Review*, CIII (1988), 658–67; S. E. Lehmberg, 'Supremacy and vicegerency: a re-examination', *ibid.*, LXXXI (1966), 225–35.

vicare exerciseth the power of a legate by hys grace's auctorite and the archebisshop of Canterbury by auctorite of the bisshop of Rome.

And wher tharchebisshop sayth that he seith no cause whye he shuld not kepe that courte at the lest by auctoritie of thact of parliament,⁷ as al others enioy by that acte all thinges that they hadd before from the see of Rome, it semeth that he never redd thesaid acte, nor yet can dyscerne bytween a thing absolute that may endure without a dependence, as an advouson in grose, and a thing⁸ that standeth in a contynuall dependence, as service to the seignorie. For exemptions and dispensations and suche others be absolutes, depending nothing of the grauntor after his grant, but legacyes be but respectyves. And as no longer lorde, no longer service, so no longer bisshop of Rome lorde here, no longer hys vicare which was but hys servante, as appereth by the text of hys legacy, wherof thees be the wordes in the chaptre 'Qum non ignoretis de officio legati, qui in provincia sua vices nostras gerere comprobatur'.⁹

And the act of parliament which he allegeth is so pleyne to every redar that it cannot be drawn with xx teeme of oxen to stretche to the contynuanance of this courte of his audience. It is in the xxist chaptre of the session *anno* xxv¹⁰ and in the xxvith lefe in the later ende. The wordes therof ther be thees: 'Provided always that this acte or any thing therein conteygned shall not hereafter be taken nor expounded to the derogation or taking away of any grauntes or confirmations of any liberties, privileges or iurisdictions of any monasteries, abbies, priories or other houses or places exempte, whiche before the making of this act hath ben obteigned at the see of Rome or by thauctoritie therof'. Loo this act speketh onelie of exemptions which is a thing absolute, and that onelie of houses exempte, and of their iurisdictions whiche might be sufferd uppon their fewe parochianes and neighbors as prebendar...¹⁰ hath in cathedrall churches. But this acte speketh not of noo iurisdiction universall of archebisshop, bisshop or other person; [blank] legacye ys of that other sorte, an universall iurisdiction depending of hym that usurped an universall auctorite through¹¹ the worlde.

⁷ The act alluded to is the Dispensations Act of 1534; cf. *Stat. realm*, III, 464–71, where it is stressed that all grants before 12 Mar. 1534 shall be of force 'as they mought have byn afore the makynge of this acte'.

⁸ 'thing [fo. 93v] that' in ms.

⁹ The reference is to a text from the Roman canon law, which was still being enforced in the church's hierarchy of courts where it had not been annulled by Reformation legislation. The quotation is a conflated text from the Decretals of Gregory IX, where the point at issue is the ability of the archbishops of Canterbury to hear appeals from bishops of the province. Cf. *Corpus Iuris Canonici. Editio Lipsiensis secunda post Aemilii Ludovici curas*, ed. E. Friedberg (2 vols., Graz, 1879), II, col. 183.

¹⁰ Reading unclear due to the tight binding of the ms at this point.

¹¹ 'though' in ms.

And consydering that the bisshop of Canterbury besydes all the courtes within hys own diocesse kepith in London a courte of tharches sufficently auctorized to hier and determyn all causes and complayntes apperteynyng to a metropolitane, why shuld he require this other court of his audience to kepe yt in London within the churche and iurisdiction of an other bisshop, except he mynded to call other bisshops' obedientiaries out of their iurisdiction contrarie to thacte, orels at the lest forasmoch as this courte is kept within the church and iurisdiction of London, and tharches courte within the citie but not within the iurisdiction, if he may not vex the citizens and diocesanes of London at tharches without an appele first from hys ordynary ymmediatly because of the cannon lawes, yet he might pull theym to hys audience at Paules, as he dyd hertofore by hys legacie, and yet offende not that act made *anno* xxiii^o that no man shalbe called out of his own diocesse.

And wher the¹² archebisshop sayth that the kinge's grace badd hym contynue that court still, yt ys to be mervelled that he then¹³ hath not in his citations and other writings of that courte expressed or signified the same, as he dyd call hymself in all his writings 'legatum apostolice sedis' longe after that act¹⁴ of the abolisshing.

2. DIOCESE OF LINCOLN

The protest of John Longland as bishop of Lincoln survives in several manuscript collections. His episcopal register records this important document in L.A.O., register 26, fos. 251v–3r. Another copy survives amongst the dean and chapter muniments in L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, II, fos. 5–6 [second numeration]. There are three copies of the text at the P.R.O. S.P. 1/91, fos. 12–13 (calendared in *L.P.*, VIII, 312) emanates from the bishop's registry and the whole collection in fos. 8r–15v is taken from Longland's register. S.P. 1/85, fo. 101r–v (calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 1044i) also contains a copy of Longland's protest and the whole collection, fos. 101r–14v, is based on material from the dean and chapter records at Lincoln. The third instance of the text of Longland's protest at fos. 107–8 (calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 1044ii) is a copy of fo. 101r–v.

¹² 'the [fo. 94] archebisshop' in ms.

¹³ 'them' in ms.

¹⁴ The title 'apostolice sedis legatus' was not abolished by statute. On 4 November 1534, Thomas Cranmer appeared in convocation and announced that henceforth he was to be known as 'metropolitanus'. Cf. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 769. For the identification of the statute alluded to in the text, cf. n. 3 above.

The two texts at Lincoln have been collated to produce the transcript below, where the readings of the bishop's register have been taken as the standard text. The bishop's register is noted as L1 and the dean and chapter register as L2. All three copies of the protest at the P.R.O. have also been consulted and significant variations noted below. The text in S.P. 1/91 is noted as L3 and the two versions in S.P. 1/85 as L4 and L5 respectively. Variations in spelling and minor modifications in grammar, along with small corrections to individual texts which can be verified from other readings, have not been noted individually below.

29 July 1534. Protest from John Longland, bishop of Lincoln, inserted into his certificate of execution to the archbishop's citation for the latter's metropolitanical visitation of the diocese of Lincoln. The bishop of Lincoln received the archbishop's citation on 11 June, whereupon he protested that neither he nor the clergy of the diocese intended any injury to the crown of King Henry VIII, or to the laws and statutes of the realm, for they refuse to accept the archbishop as a competent judge. Executing the archbishop's citation only under the terms of this protest, the bishop of Lincoln has cited the dean and chapter and others named in an accompanying schedule (which no longer survives) to assemble before the archbishop, or his commissary, in the chapter house at Lincoln cathedral on Wednesday, 5 August. God willing, the bishop of Lincoln will also appear.

REVERENDISSIMO in Christo patri, et domino domino Thome permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopo, totius Anglie primati et metropolitano vestro ve commissario in hac parte¹ legitime² deputato cuicumque, vester humilis Johannes eadem permissione Lincolniensis episcopus omnimodas reverenciam et obedienciam tanto reverendissimo patri debitas cum honore. Mandatum vestrum reverendissimum iamdudum viz. xi^{mo} die mensis Junii proximo preterito ea qua decuit reverencia recepimus in hec verba: THOMAS [etc.].³

AC DEINDE (communicato consilio) publice et aperte protestati sumus, prout etiam per presentes coram vobis reverendissimo patre et commissario vestro in hiis scriptis protestamur, nomine nostro ac vice et nomine ecclesie et cleri et diocesis nostrarum quod per aliqua per nos vel nomine nostro seu nomine capituli ecclesie nostre cathedralis Beate Marie Lincoln', cleri ve nostre diocesis Lincoln', coram

¹ 'in hac parte' interlined as a contemporary correction in L1.

² 'legitime' omitted in L2.

³ The whole of the archiepiscopal citation, announcing Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation, is registered in L1 at this point. L2 has the following as a marginal heading: 'Certificatorium visitationis metropolitice archiepiscopi Cant' una cum protestatione reverendi patris Johannis episcopi Lincoln'.

vobis reverendissimo⁴ patre aut commissario vestro in hac visitatione vestra allegata sive alleganda, proposita sive proponenda, exhibita sive exhibenda, producta sive producenda, exercita sive exercenda, gesta seu gerenda, confessata sive confitenda, dicta sive dicenda, facta ve sive facienda, principaliter vel incidenter, tacite vel expresse, directe vel indirecte, iudicialiter vel extraiudicialiter, aut etiam per nostram coram vobis reverendissimo patre,⁵ sive commissario vestro seu commissariis vestris, comparitionem presentem vel futuram, non intendimus quicquam agere seu exercere, aut cuius rei dicende, faciende vel exercende consentire que in derogationem excellentissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi, Dei gracia Anglie et Francie regis, fidei defensoris et domini Hibernie illustrissimi, regalie aut corone sue regie, statutorum vel consuetudinum huius regni Anglie tendere videbitur;⁶ nec in vos reverendissimum patrem tanquam in iudicem nobis in hac parte competentem, nec in commissarios vestros vel eorum aliquem consentire, neque iurisdictionem vestram aliquatenus prorogare (nisi dumtaxat in casibus in iure specialiter expressis), et nisi quatenus de iure, fundatione, statutis vel consuetudinibus ecclesie nostre cathedralis Beate Marie⁷ antedictae ad id tenemur seu astringimur; quodque etiam per premissa seu eorum aliquod non intendimus aliquibus indultis, privilegiis, libertatibus, concessionibus, immunitatibus, constitutionibus, consuetudinibus aut statutis, aliis ve iuribus aliquibus nostris aut ecclesie nostre cathedralis sive cleri diocesis nostre antedictae quovismodo renunciare seu eisdem in aliquo derogare, aut ab aliqua provocatione, appellatione vel querela alias ex parte nostra ac nomine ecclesie et cleri diocesis nostrorum⁸ pro conservatione premissorum seu alias facta sive interposita, alio ve iuris remedio quocumque pretexto alicuius gravaminis hactenus nobis, ecclesie aut clero seu diocesi nostris in aut circa premissa vel eorum aliquod illati recedere, sed eisdem omnibus et singulis uti eisque adherere cum effectum, atque hanc protestationem nostram salvam omnino et reservatam fieri, in singulis quoque actibus futuris successive pro repetita haberi atque repetitam censi volumus et intendimus per presentes, salvo iure addendi, detrahendi, corrigendi et reformandi presentem protestationem, prout res exigerit, iuxta consilium iurisperitorum.⁹

Qua quidem protestatione nobis et ecclesie, clero et diocesi nostris predictis ut prefertur in omnibus semper salva, et sub eadem et non alias neque alio modo auctoritate et vigore eiusdem mandati vestri reverendissimi huiusmodi visitationem

⁴ 'vobis [fo. 253] reverendissimo' in L1.

⁵ 'coram vobis' in L2; 'coram vobis reverendissimo in Christo patre' in L3.

⁶ 'videbitur' omitted in L1, but cf. L2.

⁷ 'Beate Marie Lincoln' in L2.

⁸ L3 adds 'antedictorum' after 'nostrorum'; L2, L4 and L5 render this phrase as 'nomine ecclesie et cleri diocesisque nostrarum'.

⁹ 'peritorum' in L3.

vestram metropolitica[m] iuxta iuris exigentiam infra diocesim nostram Lincoln' intimavimus, ac sic fecimus intimari, decanumque et capitulum ecclesie nostre cathedralis Beate Marie Lincoln' ac ceteras personas eiusdem peremptorie admoneri et citari fecimus quod personaliter compareant, et eorum quilibet personaliter¹⁰ compareat, coram vestra reverendissima paternitate vestro ve commissario legitimo quocumque in domo capitulari dicte ecclesie nostre cathedralis die mercurii quinto die mensis Augusti proximo iam futuro, cum continuatione et prorogatione dierum si oporteat tunc sequentium, visitationem vestram metropolitica[m]¹¹ iuxta iuris exigentiam subituri, facturique ulterius et recepturi quod ius dictaverit in hac parte; et nos ex parte nostra in forma iuris debita iuxta iuris exigentiam die et loco predictis (Deo favente) parati erimus. Et sic mandatum vestrum reverendissimum huiusmodi iuxta iuris exigentiam debite sumus¹² executi, nomina vero omnium et singulorum per nos in ea parte citatorum in scedula presentibus annexa plenius conscribuntur.¹³

IN QUORUM OMNIUM et singulorum fidem et testimonium sigillum nostrum ad causas presentibus apponi fecimus. DAT' sub sigillo nostro huiusmodi vicesimo nono die mensis Julii anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo xxxiiii¹⁰ et nostre consecrationis anno decimo quarto.

3. DIOCESE OF NORWICH

3A

25 September 1534. Protest before William May, the archbishop's commissary, in the metropolitical visitation of Norwich diocese by Thomas Cappe as proctor of William Nykke, bishop of Norwich. Nykke refuses to accept May as a competent judge and, for the honour of his episcopal office, he will not appear before the archbishop of Canterbury. By the common law of Christendom (ius commune), no commissary of an archbishop may pronounce sentences of suspension, excommunication or interdict, but the archbishop has threatened the bishop of Norwich with such action. Cappe therefore requests that his master be spared any further vexatious actions from the archbishop or his commissary.

L.P.L., C.R., fos. 138v–9r.

¹⁰ 'personaliter' omitted in L1, but cf. L2.

¹¹ 'metropolitica[m] predicta[m]' in L2.

¹² 'fuimus' in L3.

¹³ 'constabuntur' in L3. The names of those cited are not registered in any surviving manuscript source.

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Coram vobis venerabili viro Magistro Willelmo Maye¹ legum doctore reverendissimi in Christo patris et domini domini Thome miseratione divina Cant' archiepiscopi, totius Anglie primatis et metropolitani in visitatione sua metropolitica infra civitatem et diocesim Norwicensis ...,² ego Thomas Cappe³ decretorum doctor, procurator et nomine reverendi in Christo patris et domini domini Richardi permissione divina Norwicensis episcopi⁴ sufficienter et legitime constitutus, dico, allego et in hiis scriptis, animo declinandi vestram iurisdictionem pretensam quam in presenti declino et omnino difficeo,⁵ propono ac palam et publice protestor in hiis scriptis quod per aliqua per me coram vobis nomine dicti reverendi domini mei dicta seu dicenda, proposita seu proponenda, exhibita et exhibenda, allegata seu alleganda, non intendo neque reverendus dominus meus intendit in vos tanquam iudicem eidem domino meo in hac parte competentem quovismodo consentire aut vestram iurisdictionem pretensam prorogare; qua protestatione michi et reverendo domino meo semper salva, quam in singulis per me nomine dicti reverendi domini mei agendis vel gerendis repeto et pro repetita habere volo. Dico et propono quod vos commissarius pretensus antedictus fuistis et estis iudex⁶ omnino incompetens in hac parte, nullam penitus in dictum reverendum dominum meum habens iurisdictionem aut

1 William May was both an adherent of the Reformation and intimate with Cranmer. In 1532, he was chancellor to Nicholas West, bishop of Ely. On West's death, Cranmer appointed May as his vicar general in the diocese of Ely *sede vacante*, where the latter was denied access to the see's registers. West's successor as bishop was Thomas Goodrich and May also appears as his vicar general. May went on to become dean of St Paul's in 1546 and archbishop elect of York at his death in 1560. Cf. *D.N.B.*, under his surname, and P.S., *Cranmer II*, p. 264.

2 'Commissarium vos dicente' in ms; meaning unclear.

3 Cappe appears as official of the archdeacon of Norwich in 1524 and as a prebendary of Norwich cathedral 1530–5. He was master of the hospital of St Giles, Norwich, from 1532 to 1535; cf. *Alum. Cantab.*, under his surname; *The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Norfolk* (2 vols., London, 1901–6), II, 445–6.

4 Richard Nykke was born c. 1447 and was a firm adherent of the Catholic party in the Reformation controversies. He became bishop of Norwich in 1501 and was largely responsible for the death of Bilney in 1531. He was, however, a target for the king and his councillors. In 1534 he was indicted in a *praemunire* suit for infringing the liberties of the mayor of Thetford and imprisoned. In his appearance before Cranmer at the metropolitical visitation, the archbishop's register describes him as a man, aged eighty and more, broken by old age. Cf. *D.N.B.* under his surname and P. Ayris, 'Thomas Cranmer's register: a record of archiepiscopal administration in diocese and province', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1984, p. 531.

5 'difficeor' in ms.

6 'iudex ... incompetens' underlined in pencil and marked in the margin. Two types of annotation appear throughout the section of material on the archbishop's metropolitical visitation. These occur both in the text and margins of the registered documents (in pencil and ink) and are of uncertain date. All the annotations are concerned to mark out the successive stages of the bishop of Norwich's protest and the archbishop's use of procedures, laid down in canon law, to bring him to book.

motionem saltem legitimam, et talis quod⁷ coram quo non decet reverendum dominum meum comparere pro eo videlicet et ex eo quod persona vestra nulla dignitate fuit aut est fulcita aut aliter de iure qualificata, cuius pretextu dominus meus reverendus, tam ob reverenciam et honorem sacri pontificalis officii tam⁸ propter alias iustas et rationabiles causas per partem domini mei reverendi vobis in hac parte expositas, non tenetur aliquo modo comparere vel respondere coram vobis maxime dicto reverendissimo patre Cant' archiepiscopo in sua provincia Cant' notorie existenti; quodque tam de iure communi quam de consuetudine laudabili legitime⁹ prescripta et observata non competit¹⁰ alicui commissario cuiuscunque archiepiscopi sentencias¹¹ suspencionis,¹² excommunicationis vel interdicti in personam alicuius episcopi vel¹³ archiepiscopi existentem in sua provincia ferre, fulminare vel promulgare. Vos tamen maliciose et contra iuris dispositionem sepius et iteratis visibus publice iactitastis et comminati estis dictum reverendum dominum meum, in casu quo coram vobis minime comparuerit, suspendere vel excommunicare in ipsius domini mei reverendi ac status et dignitatis sue scandalum, preiudicium et gravamen. Que singula nomine quo supra propono coniunctim et divisim, animo vos et vestram in hac parte iurisdictionem recusandi. Quare cum nulla vobis in hac parte competit iurisdictionis, ego procurator predictus nomine procuratorio dicti reverendi domini mei instanter peto primo, secundo et tertio ipsum dominum meum et me eius nomine procuratorio ab ulteriori impetitione, molestatione, vexatione et perturbatione pretextu premissorum dimittendos et absolvendos fore, iuris beneficio eidem reverendo domino meo et michi eius nomine in omnibus semper salvo.

3B

25 September 1534. Second protest by William Nykke, bishop of Norwich, against the archbishop's metropolitical visitation. Since May has refused to accept Nykke's protest, Thomas Cappe (the bishop's proctor) appeals to King Henry VIII, supreme head of the catholic church in England and duly acknowledged as such in each convocation of the realm.

L.P.L., C.R., fo. 139.

⁷ 'qu' in ms.

⁸ 'tum' in ms.

⁹ 'legitime' underlined in pencil and marked in the margin; 'legitime' also written in pencil in the margin.

¹⁰ 'competit ... commissario' underlined in pencil.

¹¹ 'archiepiscopi [fo. 139] sentencias' in ms.

¹² 'suspencionis ... personam' underlined in pencil and marked by vertical lines in ink and pencil in the margin.

¹³ 'vel' omitted in ms.