Introduction
Who were Henry VIII's Bishops?

The image of the Henrician bishops has never been particularly good. Contemporary opinion itself was often hostile. Hugh Latimer, who had been forced to resign as bishop of Worcester in 1539, was obviously still irritated about it eight years later. He noted in a sermon that some of those Henricians still on the bench under Edward VI were far more concerned with worldly than with spiritual matters. He said that as 'they are so troubled with lordly living, they be so placed in palaces, couched in courts, ruffling in their rents, dancing in their dominions' that they were surely unsuited to the positions they held. In his opinion they were too busy, 'some in the king's matters, some are ambassadors, some of the privy council, some to furnish the court' to be effective prelates.[1] Sour grapes perhaps, but he was not saying anything new.

Throughout the reign of Henry VIII, notably with the onset of religious experiments, the bishops were labelled as 'crafty foxes' and 'romish wolves' by influential enemies. James Sawtry, for instance, reacting against the Act of Six Articles, denounced 'these venomous virulent vipers'.[2] William Turner, likewise, attacked the entire Henrician bench but reserved special criticism for Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and 'lying limb of the devil'.[3] Of course, John Skelton thoroughly mined the satirical genre in his attacks on Thomas Wolsey.[4]

A century later, the view of the Henricians had not substantially changed. Indeed, an interesting and amusing anonymous pamphlet of 1641 rehashed the old terms. They were 'deceitfull as craftie foxes'. The pamphleteer wrote that they had only pretended to care for the church and for the kingdom. It labelled them 'disingenuous' in that 'they would pretend any thing, and transform themselves into any shape, so they might but hold their livings . . . they are blood suckers'.[5] These rather ugly depictions seem to have stuck and were picked up on by Whig historians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Only recently have these judgements been questioned by scholars.

Modern historians, less religiously polarised, now tend to view the Henricians in different terms. They are no longer 'unfaithful time-servers', but rather professional bureaucrats and educated lawyers. Not spiritual men or pastoral leaders, but royal administrators[6] with a few idealists and

SAMPLE

reformers mixed in.[7] The administrative structure of the church abetted this condition as those at the top of the hierarchy seemed to lose sight of parochial concerns. The few idealists have been isolated from the conservative, bureaucratic and spiritually-obstructionist majority for individual study.[8] Finally, Stephen Thompson, in his 1984 Oxford thesis 'The Pastoral Work of the English and Welsh Bishops 1500-1558', permanently dismantled the idea that they were entirely apathetic to pastoral matters.[9] Whether good or bad, one answer still alludes us about them. Why were these particular sixty-nine individuals elevated to the Episcopal bench? That question, their influence on the reign of Henry VIII, and the reign's influence upon them, is the purpose of this book.

Can we uncover the king's motivations? He told Wolsey that the reward of Episcopal promotion was not merely political. He required ' some other great qualities (as profound learning) annexed unto the same'.[10] Testing this claim through an examination of their pre-Episcopal careers reveals that the king was quite serious. Although it cannot be denied that those clerics with substantial crown service records often gained the best positions in the hierarchy, it is also clear that clerics who had not served the crown at all were also elevated to bishoprics (and not just in Wales!).[11] Indeed, it also becomes clear that more serious attention has to be paid to the events of the reign and the king's own responses to them as determining factors.

For example, Henry VIII inherited an Episcopal bench very much dominated by men of politics with legal and administrative backgrounds. Jurists, like Richard Fox and Richard Mayew, dominated the councils in England, while men like Christopher Bainbridge, Silvestro de'Gigli and Adriano de'Castellesi handled problems in Rome (and therefore the pan-European stage). John Fisher stands out as a token divine (appointed by Henry VII under pressure from his mother!). A kind of *status quo* developed as the new king established himself and his style. Administrators, like Charles Booth, Thomas Ruthal or Nicholas West, dominated until they were themselves displaced by Wolsey. He so dominated the court that the bishops were left able to concentrate on spiritual matters once again, while necessity dictated Episcopal nominations. Monastic non-entities, like Edmund Birkhead or Henry Standish, served in the Welsh hinterlands while Jorge de'Athequa, the queen's confessor, was nominated to the see of Llandaff so as not to be a drain on the royal treasury.

Defeating the Scots and the French for the sake of high drama and ego taught the king that warfare was restrictively expensive. Luckily, the Field of Cloth of Gold showed him that prestige could be gained in other ways. He could not match Francis I or Charles V in martial glory or wealth, but perhaps he could outdo them as a man of the Renaissance. Thus, the 1520s witness the elevation of scholars like John Longland, Cuthbert Tunstal

SAMPLE

and John Clerk. A man of renowned learning, Lorenzo Campeggio, handled the king's international needs. Of course, promoting scholars and humanists came with a price tag: the circulation of new (and sometimes dangerous) ideas and innovative methods of problem solving. Intellectuals and theologians consequently dominated the 1530s – the divorce, the royal supremacy and doctrinal reform were the major issues. As the king liked to keep his options open, it is hardly surprising that these bishops can be divided into religious factions. Such radical thinkers as Thomas Cranmer and Edward Fox counterbalanced doctrinaire conservatives like John Stokesley and Edward Lee. After 1539, as he grew tired of religious experimentation and looked to re-capture past glories, the dominance of theologians waned as the king looked out for effective administrators like Thomas Thirlby, William Knight and George Day (jurists, ambassadors and politicians).

If the king's decisions were influenced by the needs of the day (e.g. theologians in the 1530s), does this mean that the church suffered? Were these good jurists, respected scholars and radical theologians good bishops or not? That some of his most intimate, experienced and employed advisors were also bishops did open the king up to a certain amount of criticism:

> remember for what causes the kinges your noble progenitors in times paste have chosen bishops . . . given their bishopricks to their counsellors, chaplaines which have been daylie attendants in the court, which also have done to them good service, as ambassadors, or to such which have taken paines in their household, as almners, and deans, of the chappel, clarkes of their closet . . . where God's worde doth not approve any bishoprick to be given to any more for any such service done. . . .[12]

The author obviously thought that the church suffered as a consequence. Although Francis Bacon took little notice, David Hume labelled such bishops too 'obsequious'[13] to be spiritually effective.

Of course there were problems in the English church and in the relationship between the Catholic clergy and the laity in England in the early sixteenth-century. All the countries of Europe experienced some tension in the post-1520 period and all the rulers of Europe, spiritual and temporal, reacted and tried to use the church to their advantage.[14] Henry VIII was no exception, but a comparison of the various responses is interesting and illuminating. It reveals that those rulers who were able to take a firm hand and a personal interest (the rulers of France, England, Spain, the states of Italy) were also those who avoided the more extreme social and political disruptions, like those which affected the German states. The responses took many forms.

In Venice, the rulers checked the growth of papal authority with violence

SAMPLE

(e.g. the War of Ferrara, 1482). In Florence, Savonarola reacted by undertaking a limited reformation of the church. In 1475, the Inquisition was established as an instrument of the Spanish crown rather than of the Spanish church. These reactions failed to fundamentally improve the situation because they did not attack the real basis of the problem - the papal power of ecclesiastical nomination and promotion. Once it was realised that the ruler could take a firm hand in the determination of the character of the national church by gaining a voice in the nomination of bishops and other higher clergy, the way forward became clear.

In England, this lesson had been learned in the fourteenth century and had resulted in the statutes of *Praemunire* and *Provisors*. By Henry VIII's reign he could say, with confidence, that 'we are King of England, and the kings of England in time past have never had any superior but God only'. This confidence would later be enacted in statute form with the royal supremacy. This was not quite the case with regard to England's overseas territories in Ireland. Although, since the reign of Henry II, the English crown had special-relationship status with the Irish Church, until the royal supremacy was imposed this amounted to little more than an over-lordship of the English speaking half of the ethnic division in the four important dioceses of Armagh, Meath, Dublin and Kildare. Until 1534, the crown nominated an English or Anglo-Irish bishop to care for the needs of the English settlers, while the dean and remaining officials were papally provided Irishmen who looked after their own.[15]

The French monarchy also came to a new arrangement when, in 1438, Charles VII, the estates of France, and Pope Eugene's representatives agreed the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. This reinforced, at least in theory, French traditions and rituals (e.g. like the right of chapters to elect bishops and abbots) and also limited the power of the papacy to almost a rubber stamp. Of course, some electoral freedoms eventually gave way to force and bribery, legal disputes and lawsuits, as the church was too weak to withstand external pressures. So, while it did increase the power of the French church, it had not, as had the English statutes, firmly increased the power of the crown.[16] By the 1470s, after a series of powerful kings, the nomination of bishops and abbots had very much fallen into the hands of the crown. They pushed the Sanction aside as a mere inconvenience, and royal influence over the church expanded, much as it had in Spain, England and throughout Italy.

This left the bishops in the unenviable position of owing their powers and status to two, often conflicting, masters. In France, England (including Ireland) and Spain (Castile, Aragon etc.), kings and popes vied for supremacy. In Germany and Italy, owing to their unique political arrangements, there were some differences. In the former, bishops and prince-bishops were not simply representative of an ecclesiastical order,

SAMPLE

the sees having been largely secularised by this time. The bishops appeared to the world rather more like temporal princes and nobles than spiritually-minded ministers.[17] Moreover, the prince-bishops in particular might well have been lured away by their dynastic duties and pursuit of church privileges. Similarly, in Italy, where bishoprics and other benefices were considered the preserve of the noble families, indeed, were treated no better than chattel, the cardinals were also under pressure from dynastic families and expectations from the papacy.

As in the French and Scottish cases, and for a variety of reasons, by the sixteenth century the European crowns were strong enough that the papacy could not ignore their nominations. The results, however, were not particularly good. In most cases, the failure to strike a balance between spiritual, temporal and familial duties was most often the cause of criticisms against the Episcopate (and the bishops themselves did little to assuage their image). Once elected, they generally set out to improve their fortunes and build up the power and prestige of their families. This led, inevitably, to accusations of worldliness, ambition, arrogance, extravagance or ostentation, as abuses such as pluralism, absenteeism, simony and nepotism ran rampant.

That is not to say that there was nothing positive. The bishops of Europe did erect buildings, they wrote books, they patronised scholars and initiated reform. Many took their pastoral duties seriously, visited their dioceses and issued decrees and exhortations. Most, however, only paid lip service to the ideal of ecclesiastical service. In France, Scotland, Italy, Germany, Ireland and the Iberian Peninsula there are some fine examples of pastoral caregivers, but the relative scarcity of the paragons tends rather to reinforce the popular image. The case in England was different. The Henricians stand head and shoulders above their contemporary colleagues as 'conscientious' men. Having said that, it is necessary to understand just what was expected of them.

A bishop in early modern Europe was an extremely important man. He held a central position in the social, political and administrative life of his country. He provided a connection between the spiritual world (as the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy) and the temporal world (due to participation in government and by virtue of vast property holdings). While it is the case that their individual duties and strengths might be geared more toward one aspect of their position: diplomacy or hunting heretics, it should be remembered that a good bishop did not ignore his other duties. Indeed, a good bishop would, ideally, handle all his duties equally well. What credentials would identify the right men for the position? Was there an ideal against which they might be measured?

When Francis I negotiated the Concordat of Bologna with Pope Leo X in 1516 they agreed certain practical qualifications as a basis for future

SAMPLE

nominations. Candidates had to be over twenty-seven years of age, suggesting maturity. They had to have a university education to the level of doctor of canon or civil law, or master or licentiate in theology from a 'famous university'. They also had to be legitimate by birth, ordained before their consecration, and they had to have demonstrated good moral behaviour.[18] The delegates to the Council of Trent echoed these requirements. Besides age, education and morality, candidates were forbidden to use their positions to enrich their families, concentrating instead on spiritual matters. They were to ensure that religious life within their diocese was satisfactory, scrutinise the work of priests and dispense discipline. In other words, candidates had to be capable of carrying out their duties by maturity, character and training.[19] Even the royal supremacy, effecting so much else, did not essentially alter this perceived ideal.

Bishops Stokesley and Tunstal wrote, in the late 1530s, that just as the king was the head of the mystical body, ' the office deputed to the bishoppe . . . is to be as eyes to the hoole body' to 'shew unto it the right way of lyving'. Just as the eyes draw power from and translate information to the head, so do the bishops claim a like authority from, and responsibility to, the king.[20] Here, as with the Concordat and Trent, a good bishop is measured by his responsibilities – to advise the king, to exhibit morality, and act as a spiritual model for everyone else.

Such concerns developed because a bishop held a great deal of power, often expressed in the form of patronage (which was an easily corrupted system). Bishops appointed candidates to a wide variety of offices both clerical and temporal, and held the right to examine, accept or reject any clergymen or laymen presented by others for office in their own gift.[21] Such power allowed the bishop to take an active role in determining the character of his clergy and, consequently, the character of religion in the parishes. That said, just how well did the Henrician bishops serve the church? We shall see that they were not mere dilettantes. On average, between first clerical appointment and elevation to a bishopric, the Henricians served sixteen years. They held every office in the spiritual hierarchy and served with low non-residency ratings. Between first post and bishopric, they thus became very familiar with the needs of the church (both spiritual and administrative) and with the needs of the souls in their care.

* * *

Sixteen years training, in any field, suggests not only keen competition but also the high standard expected. For the Henricians, promotion to the Episcopal bench came only after a distinguished pre-Episcopal career. Of course, some did not serve quite so long and some proved their worth

SAMPLE

only after a considerably longer time. Moreover, non-residence and pluralism cannot be denied, nor should they be, but these problems can easily be magnified out of proportion. Anyway, it is generally accepted now that the parishes were served rather well. Who were the rockets? Paul Bush, Cranmer, Gardiner, Fisher, Thomas Goodrich, John Hilsey, Latimer, Nicholas Shaxton and John Skip all spent less than five years in training.

Bush is neither famous nor infamous, but had gained a reputation as a 'wise and grave man well versed both in divinity and physic'. He was 'a grave orator' among the men of his order, the Austin canons.[22] He served them as provost, corrector and rector of Edington in 1537, was a Salisbury canon (prebend of Bishopston) and had earned himself the patronage of William, Lord Hungerford, who recommended him to the king.[23] He became a royal chaplain and, two years later, first bishop of Bristol. More impressively, Cranmer took only two years, and Gardiner three, to earn promotion. On the way, Cranmer had been rector of Bredon in Worcester and archdeacon of Taunton, whereas Gardiner (who served as private secretary to both Wolsey and the king) had been rector of St Michael's Gloucester and had held three archdeaconries, Norfolk (1528-9), Worcester (1530) and Leicester (1531). Both men had been diplomats, but the overriding factor in their success was their work for the king in the annulment suit (as was the case for Latimer, Goodrich, Shaxton and Skip[24]). Who would question the commitment to the church of a Hugh Latimer, however?

Seven bishops served less than ten years. These were Robert Aldrich, Geoffrey Blythe, Edmund Bonner, Edward Fox, Nicholas Heath, Henry Holbeach and Robert Holgate. Taking Blythe as an example, he served ten years and had been rector of Corfe, archdeacon of Cleveland and a canon of York in that time. Bonner had a more conventional career perhaps, putting in a great deal of diplomatic service while holding four rectorships and the archdeaconry of Leicester, prior to elevation to the see of Hereford in 1538.[25] Holgate, the subject of a monograph by A. G. Dickens, had been prior of St Catherine's without Lincoln (1529) and of Watton in Yorkshire (1536), vicar of Cudney in Lincolnshire and master of St Gilbert's, Sepringham (1534). As master, he was ' indispensable to all legal actions by or against the Order'. Dickens found him to have been a morally upstanding and conscientious man too.[26] If these overnight success stories were worthy clerics, were the men at the other end of the scale less so?

William Atwater served forty years between his first appointment at St Frideswide's, Oxford and his elevation to the see of Lincoln in 1514. He had been vicar of Cumnor and rector of Piddlehinton, Spetisbury and St Nicholas Abington (all Berkshire). He held prebends (e.g. Liddington and Ruscombe in Lincoln), archdeaconships (e.g. Lewes and Huntingdon) and had been dean of Salisbury (1509). Nicholas West put in twenty-nine years.

SAMPLE

He had been vicar of Kingston on Thames, Surrey (1502), rector of Yelford, Oxfordshire (1489), archdeacon of Derby (1486) and dean of the chapels royal over that period. He had also served as vicar-general to Richard Fox and as the treasurer of Chichester Cathedral (1507) before his promotion to Ely (27 November 1515). His rise through the clerical ranks was long, not because he was an unworthy cleric but because he was an indispensable diplomat. He had been Henry VII's ambassador to Emperor Maximilian, had served Henry VIII as ambassador (three times) to James IV (1511, 1513) and once to Louis XII (1514) and had been the royal envoy to George Duke of Saxony (1505) and to Francis I (1515).

Outside of Chichester, Robert Sherborne's reputation has been tarnished by the fact that during his twenty-two year pre-Episcopal career he had made so much money. It was also thought that he had forged the papal bulls to his elevation to the see of St David's.[27] As Steer made clear in his monograph, however, Sherborne's preferment had been legitimately earned and, like his colleagues, covered all the available offices. In fact he had one of the most extensive clerical careers among them. He had been a rector, of Childrey, Oxfordshire (1491), had held ten prebends, including Langford Manor in Lincoln (1486, 1494), Alresford, Essex (1494) and Wildland in St Paul's (1489), three archdeaconries (e.g. Buckinghamshire in 1495), and had been dean of St Paul's (1499), treasurer of Hereford (1486) and master of St Cross Hospital in Winchester (1492-1508); quite an interesting cross-section of experiences. The controversy surrounding his provision to the see of St David's (5 January 1505) amounted to little, and there he remained until his translation to Chichester (18 September 1508). But was he a serious churchman?

The fact that he resigned shortly after 25 May 1536 over his opposition to the royal supremacy would seem to suggest it. Moreover, he had used his accumulated wealth quite effectively, encouraging future generations with the foundation of prebends (Bursalis, Exceit Bargham and Wyndham) for the alumni of New College or Winchester, and a grammar school in his hometown.[28] Of course, a time-server could do the same, but 'the records which testify this testify also to his inward piety; and the munificence with which he gave equalled the magnificence with which he lived'[29] – one man's opinion, perhaps, and what about the infamous Wolsey? He founded an Oxford college and a grammar school in his hometown of Ipswich. Did this make him a dedicated cleric too?

Wolsey is an interesting case. The appendix examines his career in full and we find that, while it was extensive, it was hardly awe-inspiring. He was resident vicar of Lydd in Kent (1501) and had been resident rector of Lyminton. His time as vicar was probably short, however, due to the fact that later the same year he became chaplain to archbishop Deane.[30] He had also been rector of Redgrave, Suffolk (1506) and Great Torrington,

SAMPLE

Devon (1510), held prebends (e.g. of Pratum Minus, Hereford in 1508), was a dean (e.g. of Lincoln in 1509 and of Hereford in 1512), but had served the church in a number of unusual ways too, having been 'rural dean' of Depwade and Humbleyard, Lincolnshire (1499), for example, taking special responsibility for those distant parts of the large diocese. He had also been parson of St Bride's Fleet Street, London (1510), precentor of St Paul's (1513) and chaplain to Sir Richard Nanfan, the Deputy of Calais (1503), doing good service in this most personal capacity. His later reputation and the many writings of his enemies have blackened his character.

All told, seventeen Henricians had served as vicars of parish churches. They were the men who actually served the parish for the rector. Of course, vicars too could have been non-resident, leaving a curate in their place, but there is little or no hard evidence to suggest that this practice was abused.[31] They did not serve in that position for long, but this should not be taken as an indication that they had not served well. Indeed, between them they held 139 rectorships too, making them responsible for vicars and curates alike. Fisher, a most dedicated churchman, was a non-resident rector (of Lythe in Yorkshire) while we know that Wolsey, at the other end of historical opinion, was resident at Lyminton. To be fair, it is unlikely he ever saw Redgrave in Suffolk or Great Torrington in Devon except on paper. Not to make excuses, but non-residence is not the yardstick of morality it has been taken to be.

For example, Fitzjames took responsibility for the welfare of the souls of two kings, serving both Edward IV and Henry VII as royal chaplain and the latter as royal almoner. Such a burden meant it is unlikely he ever visited Spetisbury, Trent or Aller. Stokesley was non-resident rector of Slimbridge (while vice-president of Magdalen), non-resident at Brightstone (while Henry VIII's confessor) and non-resident at Ivychurch in Kent (while royal almoner). There were nineteen pluralists (four or more rectorships) on the Episcopal bench during Henry's reign, eight of who had been appointed by his father.[32] Moreover, these men also had, on average, pre-Episcopal careers of over twenty-three years. Obviously they were not exclusively engaged in ecclesiastical affairs the whole time. Some were diplomats (e.g. Clerk), court fixtures (e.g. Warham), the sons of nobility (e.g. James Stanley), but some were very dedicated churchmen indeed (e.g. Tunstal).

In general, the Henricians relied more upon prebends than they had upon rectories for their sinecures. They held, on average, two or three (159 in total) each. The prebend was an important position in the diocesan administration, but, as it did not entail a cure of souls, examples of plurality and absenteeism are more frequent. This is only half the story, however. In the fifteenth-century, the average career of a bishop included five

SAMPLE

prebends, while some held as many as ten.[33] As the office tended to divide the attention and loyalty of the recipient between his patron and the corporate body of the church, it was usually awarded to trusted servants or to men who had already served the interests of the church (as vicars or rectors). Twenty-six of the Henricians (mostly regulars) had held no prebends at all. Although this meant that thirty-eight held about four each, the fifteenth-century aggregate of five was steadily diminished from an average of three and a half in the 1510s to one in the 1540s. This indicates that the king would increasingly brook no divided loyalties.

Take Hugh Oldham as an example of a champion pluralist (he held eleven prebends). Was he more committed to his own personal wealth than to the health of the church? It had been due to the patronage of Lady Margaret Beaufort that he was appointed rector of St Michael's Bread Street, London on 19 September 1485. He resigned this in 1488, in exchange for Lanivet in Cornwall. His first appointment to a prebend was in 1492 for St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster. This marked him as a man with great expectations. Still, he served seven other rectories and ten other prebends before elevation to the see of Exeter in 1504.[34] Oldham's commitment to the church often clashed with the desires of the king who wanted him at court, but Exeter held his attention more often than the national political stage.

Of course, with the right connections, movement up the ecclesiastical ladder need not have been so lengthy a prospect. Edmund Audley, son of James Tucket, fifth Lord Audley, held the prebend of Colwall in Hereford in 1464 prior to his appointment as rector of Machworth and of Berwick St John in 1465. Prior to his elevation to the see of Rochester (7 July 1480) he held only two other rectories, Bursted Parva and Llanaber, Gwynedd, but nine other prebends.[35] James Stanley, sixth son of Thomas Stanley, first Earl of Derby, was likewise first appointed to a prebend, Southwell in Durham in 1477. Only subsequently did he hold five rectories and four other prebends before his election to Ely in 1506 (provided 18 July). But Stanley was heavily involved in extensive educational works and never actually served in the government or at court. We might take him to have been more dedicated to the church, at least, than his noble companion. The dedication of the seculars was matched, or bettered, by the regulars.

It would seem obvious that the reign of Henry VIII was not a particularly good time to have been a monk or a friar, the butt of so much humanist joking. Thompson, however, made it clear that where the regulars served as vicars or held the rectory, they did so with distinction.[36] On average the regulars also held fewer offices than the seculars and served longer. The nineteen regulars represent most of the major orders, starting off as canons, friars or monks, basically as a member of a house of their order,

SAMPLE

and performed the basic duties of prayer, education, hospitality, almsgiving, annuities and corrodies. It must be said that, generally, the monks performed their functions very well despite the fact that the monasteries were in decline. Their functions, moreover, could be and were being performed by secular clergy, thus monasticism was becoming more a means to a rising social standing than an end in itself.[37] It was thought that men looked to monasticism to pull themselves out of the yeoman ranking, and this is borne out by the fact that fourteen Henrician regulars had been born to that class (see Table 1). While sixteen years was the overall average from first post to Episcopate, for the regulars the average was just over twenty years.

In any case, Rosenthal held that advancement to the higher offices implied some blend of three conclusions. The man was being given 'responsibility for specific actions and decisions', was being rewarded for good services already rendered to the church or, was being marked out for future expectations.[38] In general, the higher office holding of the future bishops is varied, interesting and clearly indicative of an impressive standard. To be an archdeacon, for instance, was to be very administratively active and included responsibility for part or all of a diocese. The archdeacon was responsible for such things as church property, general discipline and possibly even institution and induction to benefice. Only ten of the seculars had not been archdeacons and, those who had, rarely held more than one office and were usually resident.

Thirlby, for example, had made an impact as a junior government official and was rewarded with the archdeacon's office of Ely in 1534.[39] This was no mere political favour, however. He was clearly the ideal choice. As he was familiar with the affairs of Cambridge and experienced in governmental matters he could liase effectively between the two when necessary. Although he got off to a poor start, he rapidly acclimatised and remained resident until he was called away in 1538 on royal diplomatic chores.[40] Those who had been archdeacons had been given the duty because they were capable and had proven themselves, having, on average, already served the church for ten years. They were ready to be tested with the vastly increased duties the office imposed. Note that the future bishops held only twenty-six different archdeaconries between them, hinting that Huntingdon, Surrey and Gloucester, for example, were a standard part of the career, almost a *sine qua non* of advancement.

For the regulars, a priorship had similar career overtones. The prior, either the head or the deputy-head of a monastery or abbey, ranked just below the abbot and was liable for the good order of the brethren and other administrative duties. Take William Barlow as the undisputed champion pluralist. He held the post six times, including Haversfordwest in Pembrokeshire and Bisham Abbey (in 1527 and again in 1535-7),

SAMPLE

holding the last two *in commendam* consecutively with the sees of St David's and St Asaph.[41] Was Barlow dedicated to the care of his brethren or to collecting offices (and wages)?

According to Geoffrey Baskerville it was the former. When Barlow was prior of Bromehill he strenuously defended the 'excellent state of his house, the morals and behaviour of his colleagues', and claimed 'that all was perfect'; a report accepted by the visitor, Bishop Nix (a principled ecclesiastical disciplinarian), in 1526.[42] What few complaints there had been were resolved by the bishop's injunction that Barlow provide a confessor for his brethren. When Wolsey dissolved the priory over the prior's objections, Barlow was still given a pension of £40.[43] On the other hand, as prior of Bisham Abbey in 1527, he apparently displayed no 'liking for monastic life' and, when the time came, he enthusiastically resigned Haverfordwest and Bisham over to the king. As he held these *in commendam* with his early bishoprics it is doubtful that he ever experienced their regimes[44] and, moreover, could he not have been disheartened by his strenuous earlier dispute with Wolsey? This had initiated a series of heretical pamphlets aimed at the cardinal, for which Barlow was forced to make recompense later.[45] The dedication of Capon, as prior of St John's Abbey in Colchester, seems sure by comparison. He was a strict disciplinarian and took a special interest in the abbey's material conditions. He faced two Episcopal visitations (July 1520 and June 1526) but his accounts were well ordered and he had little or no outstanding debts to burden the members.[46] His attention to detail was repeated as abbot of St Benet's Hulme, Norfolk.[47]

As prior of Bristol, and later of the London Dominicans, Hilsey dedicated himself to the reversal of decline in standards of discipline and numbers. He also tried to 'abolish utterly the physiognomy of anti-christ'.[48] Henry Holbeach was not a religious reformer and, as prior of Worcester (after 13 March 1536), clashed with bishop Latimer over reformation issues. Latimer issued injunctions blaming Holbeach for 'neglect of the king's ordinances for the suppression of idolatry and superstition' as he had not bought a whole English Bible.[49] They came to some kind of agreement, however, as Holbeach was later appointed Latimer's suffragan bishop of Bristol and, on 18 January 1540, first dean of Worcester.[50]

The office of dean was a very prestigious and integral one in diocesan administration and not gifted haphazardly. The dean was the head or principal officer of the cathedral or collegiate church and, with the canons, was responsible for the services, fabric and property of the institution. The dean had to be a senior man of proven ability, devoted, a man who could act independently of the bishop when necessary. An appointment as dean was a good indication of the regard in which a man was held. During the reign of Henry VIII, twenty-three deans became bishops, on average, after over a decade of service to the church and, usually, held only one post.

Were they good deans? Sherborne had been dean of St Paul's and, while his biographer suggests that he had little time for the office, it is interesting to note that he was dedicated enough to spend £550 of his own money making improvements to the fabric of the cathedral.[51] Oldham was the logical choice as dean of Wimborne in 1485 and of St John's Hospital Chester in 1493. He had been deeply involved in Lady Margaret's extensive building projects there, as her legal advisor and as deputy-dean to Smith, and suited to the hospital by his own deep interests in the development of such social institutions as hostels, hospitals and almshouses.[52] Clearly, there were also definite deanships indicative of future success – of the Chapels Royal, of course, or of Salisbury, York and Wimborne. Still, there were very prominent individuals, like John Colet, dean of St Paul's, whom one would think exhibited all of the right qualities for Episcopal promotion but who were never elevated. Similarly, only eleven abbots were elevated after the dissolutions. What set these men apart?

Anthony Kitchin, obscure though he was, and although unable to stem the tide of declining membership as abbot of Eynsham, was, in the 1535 visitation, praised as 'chaste in his living' and as a man who 'looks well to the reparation of the house'. He was not, however, a strict disciplinarian: 'negligent in overseeing his brethren'.[53] Thomas Skevington, as abbot of Waverley, was a 'wise' manager, while John Wakeman, as abbot of Tewkesbury, was praised for his financial acumen having significantly built up the property and wealth of the abbey.[54] Bishop Longland (an upstanding churchman) highly recommended Robert King as abbot of Thame after his good regime at Brewern. While King managed to improve conditions at Thame, his former abbey degenerated without his strong leadership.[55] The abbots were not all gems, of course. William Rugg, who replaced Capon as abbot of St Bennet's Hulme (26 April 1530) was denounced in a visitation report of 14 July 1532 for the considerable debt the house had fallen into and for the degeneration of its material conditions. There were financial difficulties, the members showed 'considerable irregularity and laxity of discipline' and Rugg was himself of 'questionable conduct'.[56] Capon, as abbot of Hyde (28 January 1529/30) was counted among the 'absolutely unscrupulous turncoats and timeservers' who had been placed merely to 'prepare a swift end.'[57]

As can be seen in tables five to seven, the vast majority of the future bishops held some office in the service of the church as a corporate body. As chancellors, they were responsible for the consistory courts and served as the bishop's deputy for 'contentious jurisdictions' or temporal matters. As vicar-generals (the chancellor's spiritual equivalent) they performed duties where Episcopal rank was not necessary. These were the 'gracious

SAMPLE

jurisdictions' such as dispensations, collection of Peter's pence and first fruits, elections to heads of monasteries and depravations. Sometimes they were both simultaneously (e.g. John Bell). Richard Sampson was vicar-general to Wolsey at Tournai, serving well above the call of duty.[58] Moreover, they were suffragan-bishops, carrying out the official duties of the bishop which required Episcopal rank, and were cathedral chancellors, nominally responsible for the library and educational functions but, more often, acting as principal secretaries to the dean and chapter.

The most common office, and the most advantageous in terms of administrative training was the self-explanatory post of treasurer. Nine Henricians had held this post, including Fisher at St Paul's and Blythe at Salisbury. Robert Vaughan made his reputation as 'a most publick-spirited man' for his great liberality as treasurer of St Paul's. He even built a house there for his successors! Some of the Henricians had been precentors (in control of choir services and acting as the bishop's lieutenant in cathedral matters)[59] and some were chaplains to the great and the good (conducting religious services in their private places of worship and acting as confessors). Stokesley owes much to Richard Fox's patronage in this regard and his good service brought him to the notice of the king.[60] Other such personal duties were performed equally diligently by Warham, as bishop Alcock's proctor (handling his legal matters), by Edward Fox, as Wolsey's private secretary and by Sherborne as cardinal Morton's private secretary. Moreover, the future Henricians had been advocates and advisors, provosts and proctors, wardens and masters.

As stated above, it is a long-established fact that men found favour and advancement in Tudor England by providing good service. Clerics who offered it were promoted to better benefices. Of course, ecclesiastical service was important and, combined with a good civil service record there was no limit to how high a cleric could climb. That said, and considering the ink spilled in criticism, it is interesting that the actual involvement of the future bishops in the temporal kingdom was so limited. At least twelve of them, one in five, performed no specific function in the king's service at all. There is no evidence that they sat on commissions, were chaplains or councillors of any type.

At some unrecorded point, no doubt, the king or some ranking minister spoke to them or was made aware of their virtues. These non-servants might have been asked to opine on some issue of local relevance or might have performed some ordinary and temporary religious function undeserving of wider comment. Lest we conclude that royal service was of no importance it should be noted that most of them were initially nominated to the poorest sees (e.g. Audley to Rochester, Owain to St Asaph, Penny to Bangor), with only Stanley initially promoted to a major see (Ely) and only two of them ever subsequently promoted to wealthier sees (Audley to Salisbury and Penny to Carlisle). It was possible to achieve

SAMPLE

Episcopal promotion having rendered no appreciable civil service, but it was unlikely that this would result in any form of lasting impression or higher promotions.[61]

That the bishops served both God and the king is plain. That they served both equally well seems clear. But was this their only qualification for Episcopal promotion? Recall that the king wanted 'some other great qualities (as profound learning)'[62] An examination of their educations and intellectual pursuits shows that the Henricians were also surprisingly multi-talented.

* * *

Historical orthodoxy tells us that the Henricians were primarily lawyers. Many were, and those who were not, at least had extensive legal experience. Should this be held against them? Did legal skills not benefit the church? Recall that contemporary evidence of an 'Episcopal ideal' does not itself disparage legal training.[63] It is clear, therefore, that education (learning, knowledge, wisdom) was key to the Episcopal ideal, and what type less so. Oddly, however, this practical view was largely ignored by many kings of the day other than Henry VIII. In terms of degrees earned, intellectual pursuits undertaken and services rendered to the schools, in order to aspire to the highest clerical positions in England a prospective bishop had to have a university education, wider intellectual interests and experience in academic administration.[64]

Indeed, rare was the English bishop without a university degree. In fact, as early as the eleventh century, a man with a good university education and good academic service record was at least as likely to succeed as was a monastic head, magnate or royal servant. By the mid-fourteenth century education had over-taken all other factors in importance.[65] For example, while only half of Henry III's bishops had some university education[66], at least seventy per cent of Edward III's had traceable university careers. In the pre-Tudor fifteenth century, ninety-two percent of the bishops left traceable academic records, of which seventy had earned degrees. Most had pursued either foreign degrees or additional intellectual credentials as well.[67] Henry VII made forty-three appointments (three to Italians) of which forty (about ninety-percent) had university degrees.[68] Of the Henricians almost ninety-five percent had a traceable university education, with about sixty proceeding to the higher degrees. The Henricians are even more noteworthy when placed beside their continental brethren.

Scholars of early modern France, like Baumgartner, Edelstein or Knecht, have looked at Francis I's bishops and found their educational achievements wanting. A total of some twenty-seven so-called 'humanists' had been created bishops and, while the king may have trumpeted this

SAMPLE

achievement, it rather indicates his lack of respect for scholars.[69] At least the emperor showed somewhat more respect in his Spanish territories.[70] In Castile, for example, only forty-four percent of the bishops had no traceable university records.[71] Unfortunately, the Scottish kings followed the French rather than the Spanish model as the extant records indicate only fifteen of fifty-seven had traceable educations. Of these, only George Crichton, bishop of Dunkeld, had undoubtedly earned a degree.[72] Even on the home ground of the Renaissance, where one might expect a combination of learning and spiritual virtue, the results disappoint.

Of the 102 men who held all the bishoprics in papal Italy, thirteen left no educational record and fifteen left evidence of only a so-called 'courtly' education, meaning that they had some limited training in the 'military arts, music and dance'.[73] The Florentines were only marginally 'well-educated'[74], and education played little role in Venice.[75] Moreover, only papal Italy and Henrician England even took note of the type of education. Hallman found the evidence only partially detailed, however, and too sketchy to allow minute distinctions to be drawn between traditional scholastic philosophy and the newer disciplines. For the Henricians, however, more detailed analysis is possible.

The raw statistics are these: twenty-four lawyers (including Campeggio), thirty-five divines (including de'Athequa), six generalists and four with no traceable record. As shown, such details hide the fact that legal training dominated the pre-1530 period while theology dominated the post-1530 period (with honours equal in the transitional 1520s). Events, of course, had a very real impact on the composition of the bench and, as shown, the inverse is also quite true. What other conclusions can be drawn out of these details? Well, besides what Henry VIII inherited in 1509 and the obvious need for divines in the 1530s, it seems clear that the type of education a man had did not in any obvious way sway the king's nominations. But, just as not every dean became a bishop, for every divine or jurist who did, a hundred men with equivalent degrees did not. Why?

One answer is early recruitment. Being recognised as talented at an early age is one thing the Henricians share. Wolsey's reputation as a 'boy bachelor' at least suggests just this kind of notice.[76] Pre-university education is a good indication of such notice, be it through grammar schools, monastic institutions or private households. Twelve had grammar school training – seven at Eton (e.g. Aldrich, Atwater and West), four at Winchester School (e.g. Richard Fox and Warham), and Heath at St Anthony's School in London. Those with early monastic training include Barlow, Bird and Capon. Smith, Oldham, Stanley and Audley were initially educated in private households (Audley at home, the others in the Stanley household under the direction of Lady Margaret[77]). Early education aside, all but two (Owain and Salley) of the native born Henricians can be placed at either Oxford or Cambridge or both (nineteen/twenty-three/

SAMPLE

twenty[78]) but it is important to note that many of them pursued foreign credentials as well.

Bainbridge, Booth, Clerk, Edward Lee and Nix went to Bologna.[79] Bainbridge, Knight and Nix went to Ferrara. Richard Fox and Edward Lee attended Louvain.[80] Richard Fox, Sampson and Stanley went to Paris. Stokesley and Tunstal (who also attended Padua) studied at Rome.[81] So, almost all Henry's bishops were educated, almost all had degrees, quite a few had higher degrees and many of their talents were recognised early. Still, many well-educated clergymen did not achieve equal status. What else set them apart were their wider interests.

Simple put, they were an impressive group of intellectuals who could call upon many talents. Stokesley, for example, had impressed no less than Erasmus himself with his philosophy and theology skills[82], and many attested his remarkable linguistic abilities.[83] Edward Fox was a political theorist of no small beer.[84] Fitzjames had interests in astrology[85], Gardiner loved music and drama, as did Sampson[86], both Foxes, Longland and Tunstal were humanists of the highest order, while Barlow was a writer and 'learned wit'.[87] Latimer and Fisher were noted theologians, Tunstal was a mathematician and bibliophile and Ruthal, like Wolsey, was a dedicated patron of the arts.[88] Lacey Baldwin Smith showed that some of them were also dedicated Erasmians, while others, like Edward Lee, were not afraid to challenge the great scholar's ideas. Even as they sought their individual interests, common interests were also pursued. The infamous White Horse Tavern group included Thirlby, Gardiner, Heath, Skip, Edward Fox and Shaxton[89] (not all radical divines), while the men of Doctor's Commons included Bonner, Gardiner, Roland Lee, Clerk, Richard Veysey, Bell, Tunstal, Sampson, Bulkeley and Stokesley (not all lawyers).[90] But there were other ways still in which the future bishops distinguished themselves from their brethren.

Twenty had earned academic distinction as 'fellows' of the colleges[91], while others had been gifted researchers[92] and brilliant teachers.[93] Obviously there were many ways to serve the colleges and gain administrative experience and intellectual prestige. The office of provost, for instance, served the interests of Aldrich, Bainbridge, Day[94] and Edward Fox quite well, while Fitzjames and Rawlins, as wardens at Merton College, became involved in both spiritual and temporal matters.[95] What better pastoral training ground than the mastership of a student hall (e.g. Aldrich, Blythe and Day) or the office of college principal (e.g. Fitzjames, Richard Fox, Skip, Longland, Stokesley and Wolsey)?[96] Certainly, both teaching and pastoral care were good means of gaining a reputation for prudence but, having the ability to absorb knowledge, effectively teach and supervise did not necessarily make a man ideal for later Episcopal promotion, no matter how well regarded his abilities; much more would have been expected. Thus we find that many of the future bishops had also served as functionaries and officials in university administration, serving their schools

SAMPLE

and, undoubtedly, also their own future interests.

Those with financial talents, like Atwater, Wolsey and Stokesley, served as bursars.[97] For those who had proven themselves in the junior posts, a university proctorship moved them into the higher rankings. As such, Fisher, Mayew, Goodrich, Stokesley and others, supervised the various financial officers, security forces and practically all other related duties (including the arrangement of funerals!)[98] This was good training indeed for responsible senior pastoral positions and these men attracted attention from outside academia because of it.[99] Although the highest administrative posts, chancellor, president and their deputies, were most often held by men who were already bishops, this was not always the case. Mayew (later chancellor of Oxford) had been president of Magdalen College prior to his nomination to Hereford.[100] Stokesley was acting-president of Magdalen in 1510, Ruthal was a chancellor before he was a bishop, and Atwater, Fisher and Day had all been vice-chancellors.[101] All told, over forty Henricians had held some office or other in academia: a strong indication of solid administrative training.

***

There is another way in which the Henricians are unique in early modern Europe. Their achieved status (as bishops) was not the result of their ascribed status. This means that their social positions at birth and, indeed, their regional origins, did not significantly affect their chances of success in the church. In fact, the Henricians are little more than a social microcosm of contemporary England. Though the men themselves had little say in the matter, it is still interesting that the king paid so little attention to what was, on the continent and in Scotland, the overriding factor.[102] However one defines social rank[103] we have reliable information on most of the bishops, so placing them is not as difficult or odious a task as it might seem.[104] It is, in fact, quite rewarding.

Henry VIII (like his father) nominated no blood relatives[105] while Francis I nominated no less than nine princes of the royal blood (taking twenty-three appointments between them!) Edelstein could do little more than conclude that in early modern France the most lucrative sees were the preserve of the royal family.[106] In Scotland, both James IV and James V nominated not only their close relatives but also their illegitimate sons. The former went so far as to nominate Alexander Stewart to the archiepiscopal see of St Andrew's in 1502 when the boy was only nine years old to replace the king's late brother, the Duke of Ross.[107] Such appointments, excused as political gifts, did have the tangible benefit of easing the strain of greedy relatives on the royal treasury. The figures for the non-royal nobility are equally telling.

For reasons of political necessity, Henry VIII had three noble bishops on his Episcopal bench. All had been appointed in the 1520s and all were Italians (Campeggio, de'Ghinucci and de'Medici). They were all of 'patrician' families[108] but were, in fact, bishops in name only, rarely attending to diocesan business. The king had inherited two bishops of noble birth, Stanley and Audley, but these five accounted for less than eight percent of the total.[109] This is impressive when compared to Edward III's fifteen of eighty-five nominations[110] or to the pre-Tudor fifteenth century's seventeen of seventy-nine nominations.[111] Then, of course, Episcopal promotion was an inexpensive and beneficial way to ensure noble support. Henry VIII's record is even more impressive when compared to his European counterparts.

Sixty-eight percent of Francis I's promotions went to noblemen[112] and almost all promotions in the Republic of Venice went to 'trustworthy subjects' (i.e. patricians and relatives of the members of the Council).[113] In papal Italy too, prior to the 1540s (when Trent focused attention on the issue) between thirty and forty percent of promotions went to nobles.[114] In Scotland, at least thirteen of fifty appointments went to noblemen[115] and, while Catalonia might have reflected an English appreciation of factors other than social status[116], the Castilian Episcopate (where thirty percent of Charles V's nominations went to noblemen) is more reflective of the European norm.[117]

Let us consider the nomination of non-noble gentlemen. In England there was a rather artificial two-tier rank of 'esquires' and 'gentlemen'[118], but only three Henricians were of the upper tier, one Italian (de'Gigli), Booth and Cranmer.[119] Twenty-five others are identifiably 'gentleman' by birth.[120] Their appointments were spread evenly throughout the reign (e.g. eight were inherited[121]) and their names are among the most noted, Holgate[122], Skevington, Longland[123], Goodrich and Stokesley[124] included. Perhaps Tunstal can be placed into this lower tier as the eldest (but illegitimate) son of a discredited nobleman[125] and Edward Lee, whose grandfather had been a knight, one-time sheriff of Kent and twice Lord Mayor of London.[126] It is a difficult category to be sure and I have included Rugg as a man from an 'established family', Bainbridge, a man from 'an auncient house'[127], and Kitchen, a man of a 'fairly well-to-do' family.[128] Others would include the son of the a 'prosperous clothmaker' of the affluent town of Bury St Edmunds, Stephen Gardiner[129], while others still might include Bulkeley and Owain for reasons of their own.[130] Whatever the criteria used, the comparison with other Episcopal benches makes interesting reading.

In fifteenth century England, only twenty-five percent of the bishops can be identified as non-noble.[131] Francis I promoted only six gentlemen, all of which were noted humanists and intellectuals, but all of whom had also been royal chaplains just prior to new postings (it must be said to insignificant sees).[132] In papal Italy an average thirty-four percent of bishoprics were held by members of the gentry.[133] This figure must be treated cautiously as we do not know the relationship between these men and the Italian ruling classes. In Castile, the emperor promoted forty-eight of his 100 bishops from the non-noble classes[134] but in contemporary Scotland, only nine of fifty-three

SAMPLE

appointments were to men of the gentry (while twenty-five others had obscure origins).

Henry VIII even nominated men of the lowest social rankings. From the yeomanry[135] he nominated thirty-two men (or almost fifty percent), including the saintly Fisher,[136] the less than saintly Wolsey[137] and several men who fall somewhere between these two in terms of both fame and reputation, like Sherborne,[138] West and Bush.[139] Finally, there were even three bishops of the humblest origins. Adriano de'Castellesi, the Italian bishop of Bath and Wells and younger son of an obscure Corneto man,[140] Knight, and Latimer (who made a positive virtue of his father's humble condition!)[141]

What this tells us, by virtue of comparison, is that the Henrician bench stands out as an example of effective social mobility. Francis I's bench was dominated by nobles, as, of the forty-four bishops with obscure origins it seems highly unlikely that any were of the lower classes. In the Iberian peninsula, where seventeen of Charles V's Castilian bishops had unidentifiable origins, we can perhaps be more generous.[142] In Scotland, only two men are identified as of 'common' social origin – Reid, bishop of Orkney and Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen.[143] Even England's healthy foreign population (which cut across the social spectrum) could be said to have representation in the six foreign bishops.[144] Certainly, no other king at the time had so many foreigners on his bench (discussed below).

As they reflected the social structure of England so too did they represent their society in terms of regional origin. The south-eastern regions were dominant in terms of wealth and population, while political supremacy was heavily weighted in favour of the south and the midlands.[145] Unsurprisingly, most of the Henricians were born in these areas. These raw statistics, however, hide other interesting facts. The king inherited a fairly representative bench (two foreigners, two regionally obscure bishops, four southerners, four midlanders, five northerners and two Welshmen), which only marginally over-represented the south. A generation later the overwhelming majority of his nominations went to midlanders, with the Welsh marches (proportionately) well represented. This over-represents neither the most populated nor the richest regions. Also hidden is the fact that there is no significant correlation between the bishops' regional origins and their first Episcopal appointments. This indicates little or no familial influence unlike the Italian and Scottish models.

Yes, thirteen of the bishops were born in their home diocese or at least very near to it (e.g. Bell, a Worcestershire man, became bishop of Worcester, Vaughan, Owain and Bulkeley were all Welsh[146]) but eleven were nominated to sees practically on the opposite side of the country (e.g. Roland Lee, a Northumberland man to Coventry and Lichfield, Oldham, a Lancastrian, to Exeter). Except for those obscure six, the other Henricians neither moved so far, nor were so close to be statistically noteworthy. If nothing else, at least

SAMPLE

they conform to the patterns of geographical mobility established by social historians[147] and they also compare surprisingly well to other models.

For instance, in his study of the pre-Tudor fifteenth century, Rosenthal discovered that almost a third of the bishops were northerners and, more notably, all of them served southern and midland sees, a trend only evening out under Henry VII.[148] For all of the pluralism and absenteeism of the Italian sees, regionalism is evident. Venetian sees (geographically) went exclusively to natives of the Republic with only the lesser-valued mainland sees ever going to 'foreign' Italians.[149] This was the same situation in Florence, Milan and Genoa[150], and in the Iberian territories, France and Scotland as well.[151] Such factors as social class and regional origin reinforce the proposition that promotion to the Henrician bench was based on talent, a high educational standard, good ecclesiastical service and service to the crown, seemingly unlike the benches of pre-Henrician England or contemporary Europe.

* * *

So, who were Henry VIII's bishops? They were men of all social rankings and diverse geographical origins. The overwhelming majority were university educated, attending the best schools of the day. Most had performed, with distinction, university and college offices. Their administrative skills were obvious, in war and in peacetime, at court or in the diocese. Their record of residence is quite good and their morality is impressive. They had not become bishops through family connections or social status but through early-recognised ambition and a variety of talents. They matched the ideal and met the requirements that bishops of the early modern period were to meet. We should, of course, not deny their weaknesses. Ruthal was greedy, Bonner was arrogant and Wolsey did accumulate offices and titles. All told, however, Henry's bishops must be considered a very conscientious and talented group of men who, in the end, must be held worthy of the high office they had attained and of further research.

SAMPLE

Notes

1. George E. Corrie (ed.), *Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555* (Cambridge, 1845), p.67.
2. James Sawtry, *The defence of the Marriage of Priests, against Steven Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, William Repps, Bishop of Norwich, and against all of the bishops and priests of that false popish sect* (Antwerp, 1541), as quoted in J.A. Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (New York, 1970 edn), p.125.
3. William Turner, *The huntyng and fyndyng out of the Romyshe foxe* . . . (Basle, 1543), as quoted in Muller, p.126.
4. E.g., John Skelton, *The Complete English Poems*, ed. by J. Scattergood (London, 1978), p.291.
5. Anon, *The Bishops Manifest* . . . (London, 1641), sigs. A2, A4.