

Year 12

Henry VIII

Revision Guide



CONTENTS:

How to use this booklet	3
The Structure of the exam	3
How to answer the exam questions	4-5
Unit 2: The Pre-Reformation Church	6-14
Unit 3: The Structure of Government (Wolsey)	15-30
Unit 4: Henry VIII and International Influence (Foreign Policy)	30-42
Unit 5: The Break with Rome Part 1 (Great Matter to Royal Supremacy)	43-49
Unit 6: The Break with Rome Part 2 (Royal Supremacy)	50-55
Unit 7: The Dissolution of the Monasteries	56-65
Unit 8: How Protestant was England by 1540?	65-68

How to use this booklet

- This booklet contains information on how to answer the section A and section B style questions.
- It also contains key information for each unit.
- Remember; revision and practice is the key to success in history examination!
- You should revise the content and key words and people for a unit by using this book and the smaller revision guide containing key words and practice questions then create mind maps/ revision cards/ spider diagrams. For further depth use your red textbook.
- You should then complete a practice question for each unit, e-mail it to your teacher, and start the process again. **Remember practice questions are found at the end of each chapter in your red textbook!**

The Structure of the Examination for Unit 2

- The examination for 2011 is on **Thursday 19th May**
- The exam lasts one hour 20 minutes
- You have to answer section A and section B
- Section A is one question and it is compulsory. It is worth 20 marks.
- Section B gives you a choice of two questions. It is worth 40 marks.
- Grade boundaries: 50% D, 60% C, 70% B, 80% A

How to answer the examination questions:

Section A: How far do sources 1, 2 and 3 agree that.....

What is this question like?

- This wants you to understand three sources and explain how much they agree with an argument based on WHAT They argue and how RELIABLE and USEFUL they are as evidence.
- It wants you to be able to compare and contrast the sources and evaluate them.

Introduction

- Briefly cross- reference the sources by explaining which sources agree with the statement and which sources disagree with the statement
- Give your line of argument on the question – in other words answer it! How far do the sources agree on the statement that you have been given. In this bit you should have already thought about the reliability of the sources in your planning for this and made a judgement on how far they agree based on their weight (whether their content agrees with it and whether they are useful pieces of evidence)

Paragraph one: Argue which sources agree with the question and how far they agree

- Select the source that agrees with the statement to the largest extent in terms of it's content.
- Explain how it agrees with the statement (use small quotes and explain these)
- Back it up with references to bits of any of the other two sources that also agree (corroborate) with the statement (here you are CROSS-REFERENCING)
- Then evaluate how much *weight* the source/s you have used actually give to the statement in the questions by considering their nature, origin and purpose
- Reach a judgement on therefore how far the sources you have used in this paragraph agree with the statement

Paragraph two:

- Select the source/s that disagrees with the statement in terms of their content.
- Explain how they disagree with the statement (use small quotes and explain these). When you explain you must explain how the sources agree (CROSS-REFERENCING) with each other or perhaps how they both agree with the statement but in different ways. Also clearly compare them to the source/ sources you used in paragraph 1 – how do these sources challenge those used in paragraph 1?
- Then evaluate how much *weight* the source/s you have used actually give against statement in the questions by considering their nature, origin and purpose
- Reach a judgement on therefore how far the sources you have used in this paragraph disagree with the statement

Conclusion: Sum up how far the sources agree with the statement based on their content and reliability. Do this by weighing up the evidence – refer to all sources in the conclusion

Section B:

Use sources.....and your own knowledge.

Do you accept/ agree with the view that.....

Explain your answer using the sources and your own knowledge

What is this question like?

It is asking you to examine the three sources to debate the view in the question using the three sources and your own knowledge.

Introduction

- Briefly cross- reference the sources by explaining which sources agree with the statement and which sources disagree with the statement
- Give your line of argument on the question – in other words answer it! How far do you agree with the view in the question based on the views of the sources, their validity and your own knowledge.

Main part 1: Consider the source/s that agree with the statement and support and evaluate them with your own knowledge

- Select the source/s that agree with the view in the question
- Explain the message of the sources in your own words and how they relate to the question. Make sure you incorporate small quotes to reinforce your points
- Use your **own knowledge** to support the arguments of the sources in relation to the question
- Evaluate the origin and purpose of the **primary** sources (in other words challenge their reliability, typicality, completeness) and also use your own knowledge to challenge the views of the **Secondary** sources
- LINK back to the question by making a judgement therefore on how far the statement in the question is correct based on the two sources you have evaluated and your own knowledge

Main part 2: Paragraphs 2 and 3. Here you need to construct 2 or more paragraphs which challenge the view in the question and use the sources and own knowledge to do this.

- Select the source and parts of other sources that appears to disagree with the view in the question
- Explain how they disagrees and why they disagrees. Make sure you incorporate small quotes to reinforce your points. Make sure you directly **CROSS REFERENCE** here to challenge what you have used from the sources in paragraph 1
- Develop the views of the source/s by using your own knowledge
- Evaluate the origin and purpose of the primary source/s (in other words explore it's reliability, typicality, completeness)
- Challenge the Secondary source/s with your own knowledge
- LINK back to the question by making a judgement therefore on how far the statement in the question is correct based on the source/s you have evaluated and your own knowledge

Conclusion

- Reach a clear judgment on the question based on discriminating use of the source and your own knowledge

Unit 2 - Pre-Reformation Church

Key Questions:

1. How important was the Church in the everyday lives of the people?

Importance of Catholicism in England	Catholicism was the main religion in Western Europe. You were defined by your membership of the Christian Church. Salvation could only be achieved through following the teachings of the church. People followed the 7 Sacraments of which the Eucharist was most important.
Mass and Eucharist	Mass was the central act of worship which took place every Sunday. It was said in Latin by the Priest. People believed they were witnessing the re-nactment of Christ's Sacrifice during the Eucharist where the bread and wine were transformed into the body and blood of Christ. The priest was the central figure in the Eucharist; when he held the consecrated bread above his head the faithful believed they were gazing on Christ's return to Earth. This process was called Transubstantiation
Penance	This was the process of repenting for your sins through prayer, confession and fasting and good works. Catholics believed that one would enter purgatory if they died before repenting their sins. To shorten the time spent in purgatory people would perform Penance while on Earth and pay for Indulgences or masses for the dead to be said in their name. Many confraternities formed to say prayers for the dead.
The Community	The Church was the focal point of the community. The religious calendar dictated people's lives.
Saints	There was strong belief in Saints and the intercessors between God and Man. Communities adopted various saints to protect against misfortune. There developed a Cult of Saints; people had statues and lit candles before them. People also went on Pilgrimages to Holy Shrines (Norfolk Our Lady of Walsingham)
Donations	Common people showed their devotion to the Church through donations in wills and monetary donations for the upkeep of churches. One historian has estimated in Suffolk 50% of Parish churches were remodelled with new wealth provided by citizens. Lay confraternities were also very popular as people gathered to pray for the souls of the dead to speed them through purgatory. There were 176 confraternities in London in the C15

How far was the English Church in need of reform? Code the cards for and against

<p>Ordinary people in England were largely satisfied with the Church. The rituals of the Catholic Church were central to their lives like the Mass, Penance (Confession), community involvement (Confraternities there were 176 of these in London in 15th century), the cult of Saints, and donations (50% of parish churches were remodelled with donations made from growing profits of woollen trade in the 15th century) as shown in wills. Thus there was a deep and unquestioning commitment to the Catholic faith.</p>	<p>The Catholic Church did come under attack from Henry VIII in his reign but this was largely for political rather than religious reasons.</p>
<p>Levels of anti-clericalism were higher in the South than in the north</p>	<p>We must not over-state the decrepit condition of the Church. Ecclesiastical abuses were often high profile and attracted great attention but they were also limited in number. There were lots of good priests and bishops in England who were doing their job well.</p>
<p>The church was need of reform because ordinary priests were poorly paid and ill-educated. They could therefore not deliver the services to their lay flock and could not understand the significance of the Mass and were unable to recite basic parts of the Liturgy like the Lord's Prayer</p>	<p>At a higher level some Bishops were accused of clerical abuses (breaches of Church Discipline). Humanist reformers like Thomas More and Colet drew attention to abuses like Simony/ Pluralism/ Non-Residence/ Nepotism/ Sexual Misconduct. One example is Thomas Wolsey. He was Archbishopric of York and held many other offices at the same time. He used his position to secure benefices for his illegitimate son. The enormous wealth he amassed made him a target for attack from 1528. Simon Fish's 'Supplication for the Beggars' attacked clerical abuses. Bishops were accused on exploiting the funds of lay folk in order to further their won wealth.</p>
<p>The regular clergy like Monks and Nuns played a very important part in the community in terms of education and caring for the poor and needy, however many had let Monasteries dwindle into states of disrepair and moral standards were dropping. Some abbots had grown extremely wealthy from the land rents and were living lives of the country gentry.</p>	<p>The benefit of the clergy was criticised. This was the system whereby members of the clergy who had committed serious crimes could escape trial in Secular courts. Such a system of immunity was open to abuse. The case of Richard Hunne (the well off Merchant who was charged with Heresy for questioning the mortuary fees he had to pay for his dead infant son) showed this. Hunne was found hanged and the clergy accused him of suicide. Hunne's supporters said he had been killed. No one was held to account even though the Bishop of London was indicated.</p>
<p>The majority of Priests were properly trained and the number of University Graduates entering the clergy continued to rise at the start of the 16th century</p>	<p>There were many other bishops who had dedicated themselves to positive, internal reforms. Bishops like John Morton (Archbishop of Canterbury) and Longland of Lincoln wanted positive reform. Longland despised the non-residence and absenteeism.</p>
<p>Many abuses had been around for centuries; there is no evidence the church was on the brink of collapse. Henry himself had not real problems with the standards of the clergy. He wanted to use anti-clerical sentiment to crush the power of English bishops and put himself at the head – not challenge the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church</p>	<p>Ordinary people were largely satisfied with the church</p>

2. Were the motives for religious change from above or below? **Code cards to answer**

Although Lutheran literature was smuggled into England, Lutheranism had little impact outside of Germany.	In 1521 Thomas More helped Henry to pen a robust defence of the Catholic Orthodoxy – the Defence of the Seven Sacraments. He earned the title ‘Defender of the Faith’ from the Pope
Henry was consistently anti-Lutheran. Those found with his works would be charged with heresy and burned at the stake	Henry entertained thoughts of a Lutheran alliance in the 1530’s when he was scared of diplomatic isolation
Some important figures such as Thomas Cranmer (Archbishop of Canterbury), Thomas Cromwell (Vice Gerent in Spirituals), probably secretly harboured Lutheran ideas and did their utmost to push reform in that direction without being Lutheran	Henry was attracted to some aspects of radical thought; especially those which endorsed his imperial Kingship and Headship of Church and State. For example William Tyndale’s ‘Obedience of a Christian Man’ 1528 called upon the King to use his divinely appointed position to head the Church and lead reform.
Cambridge University was a hotbed of Radicalism. Here evangelicals like Robert Barnes met at the White Horse Tavern to discuss Lutheran doctrine. He was executed in 1540 but he had done much to forward religious reform like the vernacular bible.	The Humanist movement was very strong in the 16 th century. It advocated reform of the church but it was a conservative movement that wanted reform from within, not a new radical way of worshipping. Some historians argue that Erasmus laid the intellectual foundations for Luther as many Protestant reformers used his Greek new Testament as a basis for their own vernacular bibles. But Erasmus did not want to challenge Papal authority.
John Colet (An English Humanist) did launch scathing attacks on the abuses of the church, but the impact of Humanists on ordinary people was minimal and there is no reason to believe that the common man was particularly bothered about some of the high profile corruption within the Church so long as it did not affect their everyday worship	The Lollards were a group of radicals in England who had formed in the 14 th century and went further than the Humanists in challenging Papal authority. Their ideas seemed to pre-date the ideas of Luther but their numerical strength as small on the eve of the Reformation. They only existed in Southern communities and did little to advance ideas during the Henrican Reformation.

Key names:

John Foxe	English Protestant, an historian (1516-1587) Wrote Foxes book of Martyrs which details history of English Protestant Martyrs from 14 th century to his own day.
Richard Hunne	Wealthy merchant refused to pay ship tax, questioned mortuary charges for his infant son. Was arrested and apparently committed suicide in prison.
John Morton (ABC)	(1486-1500) - wanted to reform the Catholic Church positively
Bishop Longland of Lincoln	(1521-47) - Despised absenteeism and non-residence

Martin Luther	(1483-1546) - 1517 criticised indulgences in 95 Theses in Wittenberg. Preached importance of the scriptures
Robert Barnes	(1495-1540) - evangelical, Cambridge University
William Tyndale	1525 published the Testament in English, most outspoken Lutheran in England
Erasmus	Humanist, wanted to reform the Catholic Church
John Colet	(Dean of St Pauls') - humanist
Lollards	radical group who wanted complete reformation, heretical
William Melton	-chancellor of York Minster. Humanist in support of reform rather than reformation - 1510 produced an exhortation complaining that many priests were rude and ignorant.

Key words:

Reformation	
Erastian Kingship	the king should be head of the church
Anti-clericalism	People who thought the Catholic Church was sinning and not as religious as it should be.
Salvation	to be saved
Sacraments	Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, Ordination, Bishops, Penance paying for the soul, Eucharist, Mass, Transubstantiation
Confraternities	people who get together and say prayers for the dead
Purgatory	The space between heaven and hell where Catholics go when they have sinned a little but not enough to go straight to hell, priests would pray for their souls when they were dead so they would go to heaven.

Donations	Given to churches so Catholics wouldn't go to hell.
Uneducated Priests	Anti-Clerical people though most Catholic priests were uneducated.
Clerical abuses	Many bishops were accused of serious breaches of church discipline like Simony (purchasing a clerical office) Pluralism (holding more than one clerical office at a time), Non-residence (Bishops who did not reside in their diocese but still collected tax), Nepotism (Donating a clerical post to one's family) and Sexual misconduct (ignoring vows of celibacy)
Monks and Nuns	People who lived in monasteries, helped the sick, fed the hungry, looked after the old, educated the poor. On the other hand, some abbots were fabulously wealthy and lived off the taxes they made all people pay in their villages called tithes.
Indulgences	When you had sinned, were going to die and needed a priest to say prayers for you so you went from purgatory into heaven rich people would pay the Priest to do this, but this mean the poor had to be good or just end up in hell because they couldn't pay.
Papal primary	means the Pope is head of the Church
Papal infallibility	the Pope is right about everything
Vulgate	Latin version of the Bible

What are the main debates on this topic?

1. What was the state of the Church on the eve of the Reformation?

Traditional historians say the pre-reformation church was corrupt and unpopular and buckled under Henry

Revisionist historians would say pre-Ref church was in relatively good health. Only isolated examples of abuse - laity were on the whole loyal and devoted

2. What were the motives for religious change?

Revolution from below - there was popular support for religious change

It was an act of state. Imposed upon the population. A Reformation from below

3. How quickly did religion change?

The Henrican did little to change the lives of ordinary people and how they worshipped. Catholic Orthodoxy remained at the heart of English lay spiritual beliefs The Reformation happened quickly and there was real support for Protestantism by the death of Edward VI

Practice Questions:

(A) Study sources B, C and D.

Source B

And here out of our records I shall mention some of the images and relics to which the pilgrimages of those times brought devotion and offerings such as the milk of our Lady, the bell of St Guthlac and the belt of St Thomas of Lancaster, the coals that roasted St Lawrence, the ear of St Malchus and the blood of Jesus Christ brought from Jerusalem to Gloucestershire, being kept for many ages. This last has brought many great offerings to it from remote places, but was proved to be the blood of a duck, every week renewed by the priests. Besides which it is possible to see an image of St John of Osulston who was said to have shut up the Devil in a boot.

From Lord Herbert of Cherbury's *Life and Reign of King Henry VIII*, published in 1649

Source C

My body is to be buried in the palace near the chapel that I caused to be made in the south aisle of St Magnus' Church.

For tithes forgotten: 3s 4d.

For masses to be said in the church for my soul, my wife's soul and all Christian souls, every month for one year after my death: £6.

Every Friday for a year after my death 3s 4d to be given to prisoners in Newgate one Friday, those in Ludgate the next Friday. The very best canvas for shirts and smocks for the poor people in Bedfordshire. £100 towards the making of an altar table.

The will of Richard Berne, London 1525

Source D

These are [. . .] ravenous wolves [. . .], devouring their flock. The goodliest lordships, manors, lands and territories are theirs. Besides this, they take a tenth part of everyone's wages, a tenth part of [all goods] produced, and even every tenth egg from poor widows. And what do these greedy, idle, holy thieves do with all these yearly exactions they take from the people? Nothing but suck all rule, power, authority and obedience from you [Henry VIII] to themselves!

From Simon Fish's *A Supplication for the Beggars*, published in 1529

**How far do these sources suggest that the Pre-Reformation Church was in need of reform?
(20 marks)**

Source D

These are [. . .] ravenous wolves [. . .], devouring their flock. The goodliest lordships, manors, lands and territories are theirs. Besides this, they take a tenth part of everyone's wages, a tenth part of [all goods] produced, and even every tenth egg from poor widows. And what do these greedy, idle, holy thieves do with all these yearly exactions they take from the people? Nothing but suck all rule, power, authority and obedience from you [Henry VIII] to themselves!

From Simon Fish's *A Supplication for the Beggars*, published in 1529

Source F

From stupidity and the darkness of ignorance that there arises a great and deplorable evil throughout the whole Church of God. Everywhere through town and countryside there exists a crop of oafish and ignorant priests, some of whom are engaged on ignominious and servile tasks, while others abandon themselves to tavern haunting, swilling and drunkenness. Some cannot get along without their wenches; others pursue their amusement in dice and gambling all day long. There are some who waste their time in hunting and hawking, and so spend a life which is utterly and wholly idle and irreligious even to advanced old age.

From an extract from a sermon preached by William Melton, Chancellor of York Minster, in 1510

Source E

People always hear Mass on Sunday and give generously to the Church and to the poor. There is not a parish church in the kingdom that does not have crucifixes, candlesticks and cups of silver, as well as many other ornaments worthy of a cathedral.

From a description by an Italian visitor to England in 1500

(A)

How far do sources D, E and F agree that the Catholic Church was in need of reform?

Source D

These are [. . .] ravenous wolves [. . .], devouring their flock. The goodliest lordships, manors, lands and territories are theirs. Besides this, they take a tenth part of everyone's wages, a tenth part of [all goods] produced, and even every tenth egg from poor widows. And what do these greedy, idle, holy thieves do with all these yearly exactions they take from the people? Nothing but suck all rule, power, authority and obedience from you [Henry VIII] to themselves!

From Simon Fish's *A Supplication for the Beggars*, published in 1529

Source F

From stupidity and the darkness of ignorance that there arises a great and deplorable evil throughout the whole Church of God. Everywhere through town and countryside there exists a crop of oafish and ignorant priests, some of whom are engaged on ignominious and servile tasks, while others abandon themselves to tavern haunting, swilling and drunkenness. Some cannot get along without their wench; others pursue their amusement in dice and gambling all day long. There are some who waste their time in hunting and hawking, and so spend a life which is utterly and wholly idle and irreligious even to advanced old age.

From an extract from a sermon preached by William Melton, Chancellor of York Minster, in 1510

Source G

The Church was full of weaknesses and abuses; reforms had been talked about for a very long time. The parish clergy were often ill-educated and ignorant, unable to understand and sometimes even to read the Latin of the services; often too, they were wretchedly poor. Coming from the same class as their flocks, they could rarely command the respect that a better education or a slightly higher standard of living would have produced. The higher clergy were wealthy and worldly and resented by their own inferiors; many of them practised those abuses against which pope after pope, and council after council, had issued their edicts.

G.R. Elton, *England under the Tudors*, 1955

(B)

1. Do you agree with the view that the Pre-reformation church was in need of reform.

Use sources D, F and G and your own knowledge to explain your answer

Source H

Such, then, in bald outline was the situation of the English clergy during the early decades of the sixteenth century. Their power and influence in society was more apparent than real. They were beginning to lose their once effortless intellectual ascendancy. They stood in no favourable posture to wage any conflict against the growing pretensions of the laity and of the State. Their leaders lacked inspiration, unity and loyalty to the supranational concept of Christendom. While the Papacy as yet needed to reform itself before it could inaugurate reform within the national churches, our English Church remained too full of conflicting interests, too complacent in its conservative and legalist routines to reform itself.

A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 1964

Source I

Late medieval Catholicism exerted an enormously strong, diverse and vigorous hold over the imagination and the loyalty of the people up to the very moment of Reformation. Traditional religion had about it no particular marks of exhaustion or decay, and indeed in a whole host of ways, from the multiplication of vernacular religious books to adaptations within the national and religious cult of saints, was showing itself well able to meet new needs and new conditions . . . when all is said and done the Reformation was a violent disruption, not the natural fulfilment, of most of what was vigorous in late medieval piety and religious practice.

Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 1992

Source C

My body is to be buried in the palace near the chapel that I caused to be made in the south aisle of St Magnus' Church.

For tithes forgotten: 3s 4d.

For masses to be said in the church for my soul, my wife's soul and all Christian souls, every month for one year after my death: £6.

Every Friday for a year after my death 3s 4d to be given to prisoners in Newgate one Friday, those in Ludgate the next Friday. The very best canvas for shirts and smocks for the poor people in Bedfordshire. £100 towards the making of an altar table.

The will of Richard Berne, London 1525

2. Do you agree with the view that the Henrican Reformation was largely supported by an enthusiastic 'Reformation from Below'

Use sources H, I and C and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

Unit 3: The Structure of Government

Key questions:

(1) How did Wolsey rise to power?

Who was Thomas Wolsey?

- Butcher's son
- Got a 1st from Oxford at 15
- Deane of Canterbury 1502
- Henry VII's Chaplain
- Efficient Administrator
- Opportunity to shine under Henry VIII
- Royal Almoner
- Organises successful expedition to Tournai in 1513
- Bishop of Tournai in 1514 and Archbishop of York
- Cardinal and Lord Chancellor
- 1518: *legate a latere* (a personal representative of the Pope



Was his rise to power the result of luck or skill? Use the evidence to decide.

<p>Wolsey was born the son of a lowly butcher in Ipswich in 1473</p> <p>He possessed a fine mind: when he was 15 he got a 1st Degree at Oxford University</p> <p>He was extremely academically able and possessed drive and confidence</p> <p>From this he went on to be a priest in 1498</p>	<p>Wolsey's appointment to Deane of Canterbury in 1502 meant he worked in the most powerful Church in England.</p>
<p>Becoming Henry VII's chaplain in 1507 meant he knew the king on a personal level</p> <p>During this time he stood out as an effective, efficient and flamboyant administrator where he organised small scale diplomatic expeditions to The Netherlands and Scotland</p>	<p>When Henry VIII came to the throne Wolsey seized the opportunity to gain more power. Many of Henry VII's advisers were old and unwilling to act decisively or become the new King's men. Henry VIII was 17 and muscular and able. He viewed his father's advisors as outdated and cautious. He got rid of key men like Epsom and Dudley. So when Henry VII died in 1509 Wolsey took his chance and became Royal Almoner (an official whose task it is to distribute the King's charity), which meant he had automatically become a member of the Royal</p>

	<p>Council. He was prepared to give the King what he wanted to hear and encouraged the King to pursue the life of gaiety and leave the boring government work to him.</p> <p>Although he was assisted by the fact that key leading figures were removed from the scene like Empson and Dudley. Thus he had an uncontested rise to the top.</p>
<p>But despite favourable circumstances he still had to prove himself to the King. He was in a position to have regular access to the King and plenty of opportunities to shine. These were the two requirements for success.</p>	<p>IN 1509 Henry was young, inexperienced and more interested in sporting pursuits like hunting. Wolsey was willing to take on the bureaucratic tasks and make himself indispensable to Henry.</p>
<p>In 1512-13 Wolsey showed remarkable skill in organising an expeditionary force to invade France, after which was won Tournai. He defied all critics to ensure the right people were in the right place at the right time with the right resources. He annoyed many others in the process by ordering results to tight deadlines but this ruthlessness only seemed to impress the young King even more as he had found someone willing and capable</p> <p>Wolsey was therefore given the title Bishop of Tournai in 1514 and Archbishop of York (particularly important as it made him the second most senior person within the church in England. He was also made the King's chief Minister.</p> <p>Wolsey was not content with this though. He wished to be seen as number one but the highest post in the Church – the Archbishop of Canterbury – was held by Warham who was not going to give it away. Therefore Wolsey orchestrated a campaign to exert pressure on the Pope to make him a Cardinal. This was a position that outranked all churchmen except the Pope. Henry was fully supportive and Pope Leo X succumbed and gave it to him.</p>	<p>Wolsey was quick to convince the King that the King's honour and dignity demanded that his leading Counsellor should both hold positions of the greatest possible status and receive an income allowing him to adopt a lifestyle befitting as Henry's most favoured servant. Therefore the cheapest way that Henry could do this would be by securing Wolsey's appointment to posts that were not paid for from the Royal finances – The Church was the main area therefore.</p> <p>In the same year he became cardinal Wolsey was also appointed Lord Chancellor, the most powerful political advisor in Tudor England. He held the senior office of the State which made it difficult for Nobles to challenge his decisions.</p>

<p>But he was still not content with his position as despite being a Cardinal he was not the most important churchman in England. He therefore campaigned vigorously (with Henry's support) for the Pope to appoint him as <i>legate a latere (a personal representative of the Poe)</i></p> <p>He managed to achieve this in 1518 where he promised to act on the Pope's behalf in negotiations for what was hoped to become a general European truce between the major states in order that a crusade against the Turks could take place. He exploited diplomatic advantages. The position gave him the authority to reform the church and appoint new benefices (clerical appointments in England).</p>	<p>The appointment in 1518 as legate a latere made gave him big problems during Henry's divorce proceedings; however in 1518 it must have seemed as if he had complete control of the English Church.</p>
<p>Thus by 1518 Wolsey had risen to a position of extreme power. It was less crucial for him to be appointed to official positions within the State than formal grants of power within the Church as he enjoyed the support of Henry VIII whereas he was never in a similar position with the Pope in Rome. As long as the King was prepared to back up his decisions he had nothing to fear from his fellow countrymen</p>	

(2) How successful were Wolsey's domestic policies?

Use the information to work out areas of success and failure for Wolsey's domestic policies: Try to find evidence to support and challenge the idea that Wolsey planned a great deal of domestic reform but failed to achieve much in reality

Justice

Historians have disagreed over whether Wolsey did bring greater justice to the legal system or not. The historian John Guy has argued that Wolsey did achieve greater justice and presided over many individual cases in person.

After he was appointed as Lord Chancellor in 1515 he was head of the country's secular legal system and directly responsible for the legal work of both of the Royal Courts (The Court of Chancery and the Court of Star Chamber). These were courts which could be used by the King's subjects (ordinary people) to get justice. Wolsey's success

was due to the fact that he devoted a considerable amount of time and attention to this aspect of his responsibilities. He heard many cases individually and anyone regardless of their wealth was able to bring their case before him in the Star Chamber. The Star Chamber dealt with 120 cases per year under Wolsey compared with only 12 under Henry VII. Wolsey genuinely wanted to ensure impartial justice was delivered in the courts and he enjoyed championing the poor against the rich.

Wolsey took pleasure in calling cases into one of his own courts when he learned that a common law verdict in a common law court had gone against what he considered to be natural justice and he ensured that such cases of the weak against the strong were given an early hearing and civil law was applied to overturn the verdict. This meant that Common Law – which was the system of justice that had prevailed since the Norman Conquest of 1066 and was based on court decisions, customs and usages rather than on codified written law therefore cases could be decided on a technicality- became second to the system of Civil Law which was based on Roman Law and an emphasis on natural justice. Wolsey is therefore remembered for championing this shift in use of law and his endorsement of a more progressive legal system.

Wolsey was also quick to use the system to further his own interests by overturning common law decisions that adversely affected him and using the law as a personal vendetta against those whom he had a grudge. The best example of this how he treated Sir Amyas Paulet. On first entering the church (Benefice) years before, Wolsey had been put in the stocks by Paulet to teach the young Wolsey a lesson about humility, grace and arrogance. When Wolsey became Chancellor he was quick to get revenge by summoning his enemy to appear before him and keeping him waiting in daily attendance for five years under threat of confiscation of all his property. Wolsey used him as a public reminder of what would happen to those who caused offence.

He also created further resentment through his work in the Star Chamber, especially among nobles who were targeted for abusing their aristocratic privileges. He stated that those nobles and gentlemen who were responsible for administering justice in their localities should not see themselves as being above the law. To demonstrate this in 1515 he sent the Earl of Northumberland to Fleet Prison for contempt of the council's jurisdiction. Thus perhaps he saw the law as a means of bringing his social superiors down to size.

It must be remembered that Wolsey was essentially far less determined in the pursuit of justice than he was in furthering his own interests. He attempted no institutional changes that would have outlasted him. He was quick to abandon the weak if there were more pressing matters concerning him. Perhaps he championed the poor as part of his vendetta against the rich because he had been so often treated with contempt as a commoner. Despite his energetic approach as Lord Chancellor he left an enormous backlog of cases to be heard in the Star Chamber by 1529 and the administration was chaotic.

Enclosure

Some historians like Peter Gwyn focus on the action Wolsey took against nobles that enclosed land illegally. They argued this shows Wolsey's dedication to the plight of the poor. Enclosures involved fencing-off common land for profitable sheep shearing and this was thought to be responsible for rural depopulation and poverty. Three statutes had been passed against Enclosure before Wolsey but had been largely ignored. Wolsey went on to work on enclosure in 1517 and launched a national enquiry into enclosed land. Many brought to court were ordered to rebuild houses that had been destroyed and allow the land to be free for arable farming. But in reality enclosure continued to take place and reform was piecemeal. He did not show determination to tackle the whole issue. His

actions made him more unpopular with the ruling classes; in a parliamentary session of 1525 Wolsey was forced to accept all existing enclosures thus demonstrating he could not exert total authority over the nobility.

Finances

Historians have debated whether Wolsey really brought effective reform of the financial system to make it more fair and efficient. His greatest achievement was to replace the system of 'fifteenths and tenths' which as the standard form of taxation in England paid by towns and boroughs to the crown with a more flexible and realistic 'Tudor subsidy' based on the ability to pay. Wolsey organised a national survey called the 'General Proscription' to assess the populations' taxable wealth. Graduated rates of tax were established to place a greater burden on the rich. The new Tudor Subsidy was favoured by Wolsey because it was more progressive. Between 1513 and 1516 it raised £170,000 while the old system only raised £90,000. For the first time since 1334 the crown was taxing realistically. But money caused Wolsey problems in dealing with Henry and Parliament. In 1523 Wolsey demanded over £800,000 from Parliament in taxation on top of loans which already amounted to £260,000. His manner was abrupt and forthright and in reality he only raised £300,000.

He also had to accept concessions on enclosure and it was clear parliament were frustrated with him and his fiscal policies were causing resentment from the ruling classes. This is evident in the fact that late payments became increasingly common and he was having to anticipate money from taxpayers in advance thus accounting for money he did not even have yet.

Matters came to a head with the Amicable Grants Crisis in 1525 after the French Army had been annihilated at the Battle of Pavia. Henry wanted to take this opportunity to invade and defeat France (led by Francis I) especially as the French King was held captive by Charles V. But the coffers were empty. Therefore Wolsey demanded a non-parliamentary tax called the Amicable Grant. The new demand would target clergy and laity on a sliding scale but it met with violent displeasure as it came so soon after the forced loans and parliamentary tax of the previous three years. The result was a refusal to pay and rebellion across Suffolk and East Anglia. 10,000 men marched on Lavenham (an important cloth-making centre in Suffolk). The hostility was not initiated by nobles (many actually helped to restore order) but it showed unpopularity. The Amicable grant was therefore abandoned in 1525 and no further attempt at taxation was attempted by Wolsey. Many historians see this as the beginning of the end for Wolsey. Henry began to doubt the talents of his aid and denied all knowledge of the Amicable Grant. Wolsey's opponents began to sense his vulnerability. English foreign policy therefore turned full circle and Wolsey switched from an alliance with Charles V to an alliance with the French. This was then going to prove disastrous in trying to secure a divorce for King Henry and his great matter.

The Nobility/ Councillors and Parliament

Many historians have criticised Wolsey's attitude towards Parliament. He is accused of deliberately monopolising power and attempting to get rid of Parliament altogether. This is essentially accurate as Parliament met only twice during the whole period. Wolsey believed that Parliament was a potential source of trouble for the government and therefore himself. Wolsey only met parliament when he had to (e.g 1523) and by this stage he had caused such resentment among members of Parliament that they were reluctant to give him what he needed. However Parliament was not really at the heart of Tudor Government. It only had very limited powers. The main institution at the heart of Tudor Government was the Privy Chamber. This was made up of the King's trusted friends and saw to his intimate needs. Those trusted confidantes in the council had daily access to the King. They were usually

young, ambitious men who wished to serve their King and further their careers. It has been argued that Wolsey saw such men as political rivals and purposefully initiated a purge of the Privy Chamber in 1519 by expelling rising stars and giving them mundane jobs away from court.

But the historian Gwyn argues that these purges did not show paranoia by Wolsey and that he did not believe the Chamber to be a threat to his political eminence. But many others believe his actions continued to build resentment.

In 1526 Wolsey secured a new Edict called the 'Eltham Ordinances'. This reduced the number of Gentlemen of the Bedchamber from twelve to six. The historian Gwyn defends this action saying that it was an efficient cost-cutting exercise and that fewer numbers would increase the efficiency of the administration in the King's household. But others argue that this step was really a power hungry attempt by Wolsey to monopolise power. After the Ordinances had been initiated and he had control over the selection of ministers, he lost interest in continuing the rest of the measures to reform the Privy Council. Many argue the Ordinances therefore were pursued by Wolsey to further and consolidate his own position when many nobility had returned to England after wars with France by 1525.

Therefore the extent to which Wolsey purposefully isolated nobles in order to maintain his own power is strongly debated. Further evidence of this could be seen in his role in the trial and execution of the Duke of Buckingham in 1521, or the imprisonment of Henry VII's solicitor Thomas Lucas without trial. Wolsey guarded his position fiercely and made sure he was well informed of political manoeuvres by nobles. On the other hand there is no clear evidence that Wolsey was completely hostile to the nobility. The Earl of Worcester considered the Chancellor to be a good friend and Wolsey tended to use a carrot and stick policy in many ways. By holding out desirable appointments for the nobles he hoped to get them on side.

Finally Wolsey never had a monopoly of power over Parliament or the nobility because essentially his pre-eminence could only last as long as Henry supported him. As long as Henry believed that the Cardinal was serving his interests effectively he was untouchable. What Wolsey did in terms of building his own wealth and titles only confirmed his status. Henry made Wolsey and he also had the power to break him.

The Church

Historians debate over the issue of whether Wolsey created any meaningful reform of the Catholic Church. By 1515 the Hunne Affair had increased anti-clerical feeling and Parliament were frequently accusing of the unfairness of the Benefit of the Clergy. But Wolsey's continued extravagance and his appointment as Legate a Latere enhanced his ecclesiastical position and allowed him to establish his own Probate Courts (religious courts that dealt with the wills left by the laity and included monetary donations to the Church). Therefore he was in a very strong position to reform the church if he had wanted to.

However historians argue that Wolsey was guilty of pluralism, nepotism and absenteeism. Although Wolsey did hold an Ecclesiastical Council in 1518 in York to discuss ways of improving the church and the conduct and work of the clergy, the meeting did not really bring change and nothing new happened as a result. Historians like John Guy argue the York meeting was merely a way of trying to impress the Pope in light of his upcoming appointment as Legate.

Wolsey did initiate Visitations (inspections) of Monasteries in England and he created constructive proposals for reform. Where fault was found with the standards that the monks and abbots were supposed to prescribe too, action was taken to replace them. By the end of his career Wolsey was proposing 13 new Episcopal Sees (Specific areas over which Bishops have authority) which would have dissolved Monasteries to account for the population changes but these achievements were fairly minimal and not without opposition.

Many bishops like Warham objected to Wolsey’s heavy-handed ways. His dissolution of 30 religious houses to pay for the building of Cardinal College in Oxford and Ipswich School upset defenders of the monasteries. Historians also argue the main reason for Wolsey’s education programme was to further his own reputation and standing in the Tudor Court.

The extent to which Wolsey brought meaningful reform to the church has been debated. He did not carry out a great deal of personal reform despite being in a strong position to do so.

Historians have also disagreed over whether Wolsey actually weakened the Catholic Church through his actions leaving it unable to withstand attack from Henry in the 1530’s. As Wolsey was first and foremost Henry’s servant his role in the Church came second to this. Therefore Henry could use Wolsey as a civil servant in charge of the church, and ensure that Royal Power over the church increased over the period. Wolsey’s intense centralising policies in all; aspects of church affairs served to weaken the institution at the expense of royal power.

(3) Was Wolsey an ‘Alter Rex’? (What was the nature of his relationship with Henry and who was in charge?)

Use the evidence below to form arguments for and against the idea of Wolsey as Alter Rex. You should also use evidence from Unit 5 (Foreign Policy) and Unit 6 (Annulment Crisis) to form arguments

<p>Traditional historians argue that Wolsey was an ‘Alter Rex’ – a second King. They suggest he held real power at court which meant Henry had a passive role. This suggests Wolsey was a master and Henry was a puppet. Evidence to support this would be Wolsey’s influential decisions with regards to domestic policy in his role as Cardinal and Lord Chancellor from 1515 (see notes above). Wolsey’s use of the Court of Star Chamber to challenge the power of the nobility is one example of his power, another is his use of the Court of Chancery where he made important decisions like establishing a permanent judicial committee to hear cases brought by the poor. His revolutionary new ‘Tudor Subsidy’ in the tax system was also progressive. His role in Enclosures was also significant. His new Edict of the Eltham Ordinances has been argued by some historians to prove his central role in government.</p>	<p>Recent historians argue that Wolsey’s role was more a partnership with the King. Henry may have been willing to give Wolsey space to make decisions when he was more worried about hunting and having fun. But the King always made the final decision on key issues. Henry was content to allow Wolsey to get on with mundane matters of domestic policy but when it came to more important matters of foreign policy or bigger domestic decisions the King was at the centre of decision making (e.g think about Wolsey’s downfall in failure to get an Annulment). The fact that Henry relied on Wolsey to make exercise the affairs of government does not mean that Henry was not in overall charge.</p>
<p>Wolsey’s wealth served to further his political power. His court was magnificent and often described as ‘quasi royal’. Thus he used the trappings of political success to set himself up as the most important man in the country next to the king. He had the largest</p>	<p>There are examples of disagreement between Wolsey and Henry which some suggest shows conflict between the King and his adviser. But these were only rare examples:</p>

<p>disposable income in England and he was probably 10 times richer than his nearest rival. His income came from his multiple bishoprics of York, Tournai, Bath, Wells and Durham and Winchester. He was also Abbot of St Albans which was the richest Monastery in England. He also gained money from holding ecclesiastical courts and through the prestige of building places like Hampton Court and Cardinal College Oxford.</p>	<p>In 1528 Henry fell out with Wolsey over the seemingly trivial matter of Wolsey's appointment of an abbess to a nunnery. Henry disapproved of the appointment but Wolsey had ignored him. He was forced to make a grovelling apology</p> <p>Henry disapproved of Wolsey's surprise attack on the French Navy in 1522</p>
<p>It was not until Wolsey's failure to secure an annulment of Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon that the Cardinal was dismissed from his post</p>	<p>Wolsey's inevitable wealth and power created resentment amongst the nobility but Henry never yielded to criticism of his leading minister because Wolsey served him loyally and effectively</p>
<p>Many historians argue Wolsey was not ruthless and did consult other nobles. They argue his reputation stemmed from Jealousy and the fact that he clearly decided on policy in private with Henry before presenting it before Council. Wolsey and Henry had a partnership whereby it was hard for anyone to criticise Wolsey's policies because essentially they were the King's policies.</p>	<p>Wolsey maintained his power through ruthlessness. There were many complaints of his mistreatment of nobles. Polydore Virgil (The Humanist) was put in the tower of London for failing to give support for Wolsey's request to become a Cardinal. Wolsey was also implicated in the execution of Buckingham. But much of these accusations were to do with jealousy from contemporaries.</p>

(4) Why did Wolsey fall from power?

He provoked a Long-term Noble Conspiracy

Traditionalist historians argue that Wolsey was an unpopular royal favourite who constantly fought to retain his power over the King. He therefore antagonised other nobility around him and in the end they therefore took their revenge when Wolsey lost favour with the King over the divorce crisis. Thus traditionalists would argue that there had been a long-term noble conspiracy against Wolsey that played a role in his eventual demise between 1528 and 1529.

Traditionalists would argue that despite the fact that Wolsey may have debated policy with the nobles, he only did this after the decision had been made in private with the King. Therefore he was only paying lip service to the conciliar government and this must have provoked envy and resentment. They argue Anne Boleyn could also have been a key factor in Wolsey's fall as she despised the Cardinal because he had broken up her affair with Henry Percy in order to allow the King to claim his woman.

He did not provoke a long-term noble conspiracy. There was a short-term conspiracy which only occurred with Henry's dissatisfaction in the Divorce Crisis

Revisionist historians argued that Wolsey was a skilful politician who did not intentionally antagonise the nobility. They argue he was the victim of a short-term noble conspiracy led by the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk who acted on Henry's dissatisfaction with Wolsey over the Great Matter of the divorce. Peter Gwyn argues that Wolsey did consult nobles on important decisions.

They would also argue that Anne Boleyn was not a major factor in Wolsey's fall as he was the one who must have seemed like the only man who was capable of realizing her dream of becoming queen of England. Thus whilst there was resentment and envy of Wolsey's position there was no long-term noble conspiracy against him as such actions were pointless whilst he remained in Henry's favour.

He contributed to the unpopularity of government by 1529

One of the main reasons why Henry lost faith in Wolsey was because of the increasingly unpopularity of Henry's government between 1527 and 1529. Wolsey had orchestrated an alliance with France from 1527 (With Francis I) in a bid to break Habsburg control over Italy and cajole the Emperor (Charles V) into negotiations over Henry's marriage to Catherine. The Anglo-French alliance was very unpopular with the nobility as it disrupted trade with the low countries (Netherlands) and ultimately put Henry in a weak position regarding the Great Matter as Charles V sacked Rome in 1527 and therefore had imperial domination of Italy and the Pope.

He failed to get Henry a divorce

In the end Wolsey fell from power because of his failure in the Great Matter divorce crisis. Henry had believed that Wolsey would be able to use his Legatine powers to attain an annulment of Henry's first marriage. However this would not be possible and Wolsey's efforts failed.

Wolsey first failed to convince Henry to try to challenge the original dispensation issues by Julius II as Henry wanted to stick to the Leviticus argument. Wolsey then failed to use his role at Legate to annul the marriage quietly in England before getting confirmation from Rome as Catherine found out his plans and opposed them and then in 1527 Imperial Troops sacked Rome and Pope Clement was held captive by Charles V (Catherine's nephew). Wolsey tried to take advantage of this by establishing a Papal court in Avignon in France instead but the Cardinals there were unwilling to help then Clement was released anyway in Dec 1527. Wolsey could not get Clement to grant him the right to have the case heard in England and instead sent Campeggio to England to oversee the Ecclesiastical court. Campeggio had been told by the Pope in secret to delay proceedings. The pope was essentially in alliance with the HRE so granting a divorce was going to be out of the question. In the Court at Blackfriars in 1528 Catherine argued her case and Campeggio adjourned proceedings for the summer. It was clear the case was never going to be heard in England and Wolsey was now only relying on Henry's support. This quickly dwindled and Wolsey was charged with Praemunire (exercising his Legatine Power in England to the detriment of the King). Wolsey retired to his bishopric in York as Henry hoped he

	<p>may be able to still use him if circumstances changed in Italy. But by 1529 Henry had failed attain his divorce and Wolsey's enemies combined arrest him and charge him with Treason. He died on 24th November 1530.</p>
<p>He made the wrong Foreign Policy Decisions In 1525 Wolsey opened up negotiations with France and got Henry to agree to give up his claims to France in return for an annual pension. This was confirmed in the Treaty of More. This was because the HRE Charles V had won the battle of Pavia in Northern Italy and had defeated the French. But Charles V was not willing to share his spoils with England therefore Wolsey engineered the alliance with the French. This has been seen as a diplomatic revolution by some historians as it moved England away from her traditional Spanish/ Imperial alliance. But when the HRE sacked Rome in 1527 this alliance would spell disaster for Henry as it coincided with his need for an annulment.</p>	

What did Wolsey's contemporaries think of him?

Polydore Vergil

Humanist Italian

Personal ongoing feud with Wolsey – felt aggrieved by lack of favour in Henry VIII's new court after death of Henry VII. Thought it was Wolsey's fault. Wanted to spurn Wolsey's hopes of becoming a Cardinal by writing rude letters back to Rome. Wolsey even condemned Vergil to a spell in the tower in 1515. Not surprising he did not write nicely of Wolsey

George Cavendish

Wolsey's house servant and first biographer

Wrote his account 30 years after Wolsey's death

But he did not enter Wolsey's household until 1522, seven years after Wolsey as appointed Chancellor

He was not privy to Wolsey's political life – only his personal one.

He is only really useful for the period when Wolsey was cast out by the King

John Skelton

Henry VII's poet Laureate

Mocks Wolsey mercilessly

Writing in the popular satirical nature of the time

'Speke Parrot' was written when Henry was beginning to lose faith with Wolsey so it was trying to gain the King's favour

Must not take his words at face value; he moulded it to suit current concerns and ply upon flaws and mishaps that occurred

Edward Hall

Contemporary historian. Wrote 'Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York (1548). Not close to Wolsey and held no personal grudge. But he was clearly anti-clerical and typical of London's professional classes. He saw Wolsey was epitome of corruption and vice. He was a FRANCOPHOBE thus disapproved of Wolsey's alliance with the French in the late 1520's.

(4) How far was Henry at the centre of his government at home?

Some historians have suggested Henry was a ‘part-time monarch’. Decide what the evidence suggests:

<p>The King exercised several direct responsibilities in government and he had a strong understanding of what was happening at all times. For example Henry drew up the agendas for the Privy Council meetings (Privy Council was people appointed by the King to give advice on matters of State). He exercised the power of Patronage whereby he would decide who would get positions at court. For example the case of Sir Ralph Egerton proves how powerful the King’s Patronage was; Egerton caught the King’s attention by impressing him as a jousting at his coronation. He was Henry’s Standard Bearer in the invasion of France in 1513 and made a knight later that year. 1514-1524 he became a leading courtier and amassed different positions in court which included an annuity of £100 for life in the office of standard bearer. By 1525 he held 15 crown offices at had £400 in cash set aside (alot!). But he fell from the King’s favour and had all of his offices reverted to the crown and new Royal servants. Government and politics were always focused on where Henry was and the court always followed him.</p>	<p>In Henry’s earl reign up to 1514 he made an impact early on with the arrests of Dudley and Epsom shortly after Henry VII’s death. Henry VIII was therefore distancing himself from his father’s own councillors. He also had Edmund de la Pole executed in 1513 which sent out clear message about how he would deal with perceived threats to the throne. He also asserted himself on the issue of war early on as he rebelled against the advice of his old council (who were against war because of financial and security considerations). Henry as undeterred and invaded France in 1512-14 anyway.</p>
<p>In the last years of his reign Henry allowed Gentlemen of the chamber to use the ‘Dry Stamp’ on official documents. This was a forged King’s signature only ever given to 3 men at a time. An impression of the signature was pressed on to a document and the indentation was outlined in Ink while the other two looked on.</p>	<p>There were significant factions in Henry’s reign. In fact they were endemic. These were groups of people who sought to advance their shared interests. They could be a threat to the crown. The longest standing faction under Henry’s reign was the Aragonese Faction who supported Catherine of Aragon. Other factions were the Boleyn Faction who helped to orchestrate Wolsey’s demise and the Conservative Faction of Norfolk and Gardiner who tried to dispense with ABC Cranmer in 1543 and get Catherine Parr arrested as a Heretic in 1546. But the extent to which Factions influenced the decisions made by Henry is limited.</p>
<p>The power of the Privy Chamber has been seen by some historians to have increased during the time of Henry, suggesting that it became influential over the King. In particular the role of the Groom of the Stool.</p>	<p>Henry relied on Wolsey and Cromwell to exercise the affairs of government but it does not mean that he was not in overall charge. When anyone failed the King –wife, minister or Friend – they were got rid of.</p>
<p>The example of the Amicable Grant Crisis can be used to argue that either the King was in charge or not. When the rebellion took place in Suffolk and Essex the King was quick to negotiate</p>	<p>The example of the Act of Six Articles of 1539 can be used to argue the King was at the centre of government. Some historians say it reflected Henry’s own personal religious faith</p>

<p>the surrender of the rebels. According to Scarisbrick Henry denied all knowledge of the demand being asked by Wolsey in terms of the tax for war. Wolsey said the plan was devised by the council without the King's knowledge thus when he took the blame and the King publicly forgave him all were in the clear. But is difficult to believe that the King would not have had some knowledge of the attempted collection of such large amounts of money – especially when it was he who had made his intentions to invade France in 1525 very clear to Wolsey.</p>	<p>in Catholicism and his determination to affirm the articles as he was worried about the threat of invasion from abroad because of a 10 year truce declared between Francis I and Charles V. Henry also made corrections to the bill before it went through Parliament. But other historians would argue it was drawn up as a result of Henry being influenced by the conservative faction led by Norfolk and Gardiner at court.</p>
--	--

Key names:

<p>Wolsey</p>	<p>(1473-1530) worked his way up to become a cardinal but fell from grace after failing to obtain an annulment, known as (Alter Rex)</p>
<p>John Skelton</p>	<p>English poet, publicly did not like Wolsey, 1460-1529</p>
<p>Henry VII</p>	<p>Appointed Wolsey as a chaplain in 1507</p>
<p>William Warham</p>	<p>ABC before Wolsey (1450-15320) appointed by Henry VII, objected to the way Wolsey dealt with religious reform</p>
<p>Polydore Vergil</p>	<p>Humanist - wrote Anglica Historia published in 1535. He did not like Wolsey.</p>

Peter Gwyn	Wrote the King's Cardinal, argued Wolsey was ambitious but did not deliberately force his way to the top, he just worked hard and was rewarded for it.
George Cavendish	Wrote Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey 30 years after Wolsey's death, he was Wolsey's Servant, but only from 1522 onwards.
Edward Hall	Wrote The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and York. 1548 Contemporary historian. Not close to Wolsey so no personal grudge. But anti-clerical and did not like clerical vice and corruption. He hated French people, but supportive of the break with Rome.
Francis I	French King
Charles V	King of Spain, Holy Roman Emperor
Pope Julius II (1443-1513)	Originally allowed Catherine of Aragon to marry Henry VIII, despite already being married to Arthur
Pop Leo X (1475-1521)	Made Henry defender of the faith for the seven sacraments he wrote with the help of Thomas More.
Pope Clement VII (1478-1534)	Held by Charles V after imperial troops sacked Rome and would not allow Henry to have an annulment.

Cardinal Campeggio	Sent by Clement VII to England to hold up proceedings, very old, staunch Catholic, gout
---------------------------	---

Key words:

Royal Almoner	Charity worker for the King 1509 Wolsey appointed
Royal Council	King's main advisors
Legate a latere	A representative of the Pope 1518 Wolsey appointed
Appoint to benefices	Allowing the Legate a latere to appoint people he wanted to appoint in England
Amicable Grant crisis	Wolsey's attempt to raise money for war without parliament. Suffolk and East Anglia rebelled against it
Retaining	When a noble keeps a private army that owes loyalty first to that noble, then the king.
Francophobe	Someone who hates the French
Domestic Policies	The laws that Wolsey passed, his politics
Court of Star Chamber	A court which the king was in charge of and where he could sentence people how he liked
Civil Law	Wolsey wanted law based on an old Roman style not common law which was based much more on how society wanted to try a crime.
benefice	A clerical position

Fifteenths and tenths	Tax paid to the crown - Wolsey made it fairer, based on income rather than a set amount
Battle of Pavia Feb 1525	Francis I lost and was held captive by Charles V, Henry thought this was a great opportunity to invade France
Eltham Ordinances	1526 Wolsey cut the number of people who worked for the king - possibly to get rid of rivals - he claims he did it to cut costs.
Probate courts	Church courts that dealt with wills when people died, being legate a latere meant Wolsey could change the laws on this.
Ecclesiastical Council	A meeting of leading bishops to discuss the conditions of the Church
visitations	Inspection of a church or religious house by Crown commissioners.
Episcopal sees	A specific area which a bishop has authority over

(b) Use Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge.

Do you accept the view in Source 3 that Wolsey's domestic policies were disappointing (40 marks)

Source 1

Thus Wolsey, with his arrogance and ambition aroused against himself the hatred of the whole country, and by his hostility towards the nobility and the common people, caused him the greatest irritation through his vainglory. He was indeed detested by everyone, because he assumed that he could undertake nearly all the offices of state by himself.

From Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia*, 1534

Source 2

He alone transacts as much business as that which occupies all the magistrates, offices and councils of Venice, both civil and criminal. He is thoughtful and has the reputation of being extremely just. He favours the people exceedingly, and especially the poor; hearing their cases and seeking to despatch them instantly. He also makes the lawyers plead without charge for all paupers.

From a report by the Venetian ambassador, Guistiniani

Source 3

Any conclusion on Wolsey seems to carry an air of disappointment. His capacity for detailed hard work together with his creativity promised more than was delivered... By twentieth century standards his achievements seem limited but there is a danger of judging by anachronistic standards. We expect change and improvement where the sixteenth century sought stability and security-objectives that are not necessarily achieved by change. It is also easy to forget that ultimate responsibility lay with the king and to criticise Wolsey's domestic policies is also to criticise Henry for his lack of involvement. **Ian Dawson, *The Tudor Century*, 1993**

Unit 4: Henry VIII and International Influence

1. What were Henry's foreign Policy Aims?

Henry came to the throne desiring glory in war against France. His father's reign had been limited to diplomatic manoeuvres. Henry wanted to flex some muscle. Henry therefore wanted an active role in Europe against the French. However during his entire reign it is important to recognise that England was neither a powerful or influential country in Europe. Henry and Wolsey would always be at the mercy of changing events on the continent.

2. How successful was Henry's early foreign policy 1509-1514?

Event	Success or failure?
<p>The War with France 1512</p> <p>When Henry came to the throne he was frustrated at having to work with his father's old advisors like Archbishop Warham and Bishop Fox who were keen to preserve peace and avoid war in order to make England secure and open to alliances. This had resulted in a peace treaty with France in 1510 much to the frustration of Henry!</p> <p>In 1509 the Warrior Pope Julius II brought together France, Spain and the countries of the HRE in a Holy League to attack Venice. England had not been part of this because of Henry VII's diplomacy. However by 1511 the Holy League had run its course and France had emerged as the most dominant power in Northern Italy and Louis XII's dominance was threatening the Papal States. Therefore the Pope changed direction and reformed the Holy League with England, Venice and Spain to drive France out of Italy. Henry was able to persuade the Great Council (who would grant him money) that war was needed in order to defend the liberties of the Catholic Church. Parliament therefore granted the money and a force of 12,000 troops was sent out under the Marquis of Dorset to Bayonne in the South-West of France. The plan was for England to gain control of Aquitaine in the South West through a joint Anglo-Spanish invasion.</p> <p>But Henry was badly let down by his father in law Ferdinand of Spain. He really only wanted to use British troops as a diversion in order to be able to capture Navarre in Northern Spain! He then made peace with the French! The English were left waiting for the Spanish troops to arrive and in the meantime were hit with bouts of dysentery and drunkenness! Naval defeat at Brest (April 1513) made things worse and marked a dismal first campaign for Henry which had ended in misery after only months.</p>	
<p>The Battle of Spurs 1513</p> <p>Failure in the earlier campaign against France made Henry more determined to invade and gain glory. The Papacy were still keen to pursue victory over France and Henry had learnt his lesson not to rely on his so-called allies if he wanted to achieve his aims.</p> <p>Henry therefore personally led an army of 30,000 men over the channel to Calais in 1513.</p> <p>The campaign was successful and resulted in the capture of Therouanne and Tournai with little French resistance.</p> <p>Therouanne was given over to the Emperor Maximilian while Tournai became an English Garrison at great expense to Henry until 1518. Therefore it was the HRE that benefited most.</p> <p>In reality there was little fighting apart from a minor skirmish with a small French force. But back in England the propaganda machine was in full flow and the victory was named the 'Battle of Spurs' to recognise the speed with which the French had retreated!</p> <p>Some French nobles were also captured and sent back to England in a bid to further enhance the prestige of what had really been quite a one-sided encounter.</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">The Battle of Flodden 1513</p> <p>In 1513 a victory of huge proportions took place in Scotland whilst Henry was away leading forces in France.</p> <p>Under the command of the Earl of Surrey, the English Army defeated the Scottish King James IV who had tried to take advantage of Henry's absence in France to launch an attack on England.</p> <p>In September 1513 the two armies confronted each other on the border of Scotland and England. The English army was outnumbered but despite this they won a memorable victory which removed the Scottish threat for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The core of the Scottish Nobility lay dead in Flodden Field including King James himself.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">The Anglo-French Treaty of 1514</p> <p>In 1514 Henry was forced to make peace with France. This was because both the Holy Roman Emperor and King Ferdinand had lost interest in attacking France. They had secretly been negotiating with Louis XII behind Henry's back to negotiate peace treaties! Henry's coffers were empty and on top of that the new pope Leo X favoured peace.</p> <p>The Anglo-French Treaty of 1514 gave England possession of Tournai and France agreed to pay the arrears of the pension handed out to Henry VII back in the 1490's. Henry also proposed a joint Anglo-French attack on Spain to drive out Ferdinand from Navarre and claim Castille for his wife Catherine of Aragon. This was an unrealistic proposal and did not happen but it showed Henry's annoyance with Ferdinand's betrayal in previous years. The peace treaty also secured the marriage of Henry's younger sister Mary to the elderly Louis XII.</p>	

What had Henry really achieved by 1514?

<p>Stamped his mark on European affairs and shown he was a Renaissance Monarch different from his father. Invasion force of 1513 had been impressive</p>	<p>Henry had been deceived by Ferdinand in 1512</p>
<p>Laid claim to his inherited title of King of France – prestige and standing.</p>	<p>Terouanne and Tournai were soft targets and Battle of Spurs was a skirmish</p>
<p>Thomas Wolsey had risen as a star</p>	<p>High costs of campaigns - £960,000 in 1511-13. His income was only 110,000 per annum. He was stretched.</p>
<p>Flodden</p>	<p>In 1514 reality of finances put pressure on alliance with France</p>
	<p>Essentially events 1512-14 had shown that England was only ever going to be a 'Third Fiddle' in Europe</p>

How successful was Wolsey's foreign policy 1513-1529?

What are the key interpretations of Wolsey's Foreign Policy?

The ORTHODOX TRADITIONAL VIEW

I am what you would call an Orthodox, Traditional historian. I was writing about Wolsey in the early 1900's when we all wanted Britain to keep the balance of power in Europe before WW1. So I argue that Wolsey's main aim was to preserve the balance of power in Europe at the time in the interests of England. I think Wolsey wanted to allow England to have some influence by making sure that no person (e.g the HRE or Francis I) had dominance over Europe without being able to take into account the needs of England. Wolsey managed to do this by threatening to give his support to whichever side seemed likely to be worsted by the other! I think he managed to ensure England's international reputation remained high!

POLLARD

I am a cool 'New Orthodox' Historian! I was writing in the 1920's – My most famous fan is a guy called Pollard. He wrote that Wolsey was only out to become the Pope's favourite as he had ambitions himself to become Pope! So Wolsey changed England's policy at any time if it did not fit with the needs of the Pope. I think my argument is quite convincing given that Wolsey wanted to become Legate! His intentions were a mixture of Principle and self-interest even if it frustrated the King!

THE REVISIONISTS

We are the Revisionist historians! J J Scarisbrick is our man! Yes that's what we do we revise history and mix it all up and make something new out of it! We are sooo cool!

We think that Wolsey did not always follow the Pope's wishes and that in fact at many points he ignored papal instructions. We agree with the old school orthodoxy but we have turned it on its head! We argue that Wolsey did want to establish peace and maintain it so he was trying to play with the balance of power in Europe. But instead of trying to side with the weaker side he always went for the stronger side so that the balance of power would be so ridiculously imbalanced that the other side would realise fighting was pointless! We think that Wolsey's contemporaries did not really understand what his main aims were as he always messed up so was trying to dress up his intentions as something else!

THE MOST RECENT VIEW

Don't forget me!! I am the current most up to date thinker! I largely agree with Scarisbrick. We think Wolsey never really had a coherent pattern in his approach. We don't think there was every a guiding principle that he stuck to! Sometimes he was clearly selfish and just wanted to butter up the Pope. But other times he just had to please Henry. Sometimes he was motivated by what he claimed to be national or altruistic motives to bring in an era of peace in Europe. We cannot make

Use the narrative of Wolsey's foreign policy 1513-1529 below to comment on key points of success and failure:

Event	Success or failure?
<p>Wolsey gets his feet wet: Expedition to France 1513 (Battle of Spurs)</p> <p>Well this was one when I first tasted the glory of diplomatic success; I was like an apprentice that needed some fine tuning! In 1513 I helped my master King achieve victory over the French! I managed to organise an army of 30,000 men in my role as Quarter-Master General (I fed, armed and generally supplied the army with my bare hands!) and we English obliterated the French at Tournai and Therouanne. Henry established his warrior reputation and I basked in my success as a master organiser. Henry now trusted me to guide his foreign policy and even the Queen began writing me letters of praise! I would now look to make sure that our tiny little country would not be ignored by the giants of the Habsburgs and the House of Valois!!</p>	
<p>Wolsey the Peacemaker episode 1 : 1514 Anglo-French Treaty</p> <p>When poor old Louis XII became a widower 1514 I grabbed the chance to show off my diplomatic skills by proposing a Valois-Tudor alliance which would be sealed with the promise of Henry's sister Mary to Louis! Henry was happy enough with my plan as he had no more money for war, the Pope Leo X was a fan of peace, and he was feeling bruised by Ferdinand's betrayal in 1512. My treaty (The Anglo-French Treaty) gave Henry an annuity of 100,000 crowns and confirmed that Tournai was ours. Although if I am honest the King did not <i>really</i> want to have to make peace with France – he had no choice! The Treaty would of course be short-lived when that show off Francis I became King the next year. But it had sealed my reputation as a diplomat.</p>	
<p>1515-1517 A difficult period – England is Isolated</p> <p>Well when Louis XII popped his clogs in January 1515 his arrogant 20 year old cousin Francis became King. He was a bit like Henry – a show off and loved the ladies! He also wanted glory in war of course and he had the money to do it! Francis showed off his potential by first by sending the Duke of Albany to overthrow the Regency Government in Scotland. This annoyed Henry as it was his sister Margaret who was running Scotland since the death of her husband King James IV. He also defeated the Swiss which gave him influence in Northern Italy. And on top of that Francis got in with the pope by getting a Concordat signed. This made Henry Maaaaaad! I tried to help by first sending a secret subsidy to the HRE Max hoping that he would stop Francis over in Milan (after all any pro-Papal, anti-French alliance was going to keep me and Henry happy!). But Max took the money then defected to the French! Then I tried to get Rome, Venice and Spain (and HRE) to gang up against the French with England. But this fell apart when old Ferdinand died and young Charles I came to the throne in 1516. Charles didn't want to go to war straightaway and made peace with the French and unbelievably the HRE Max (Charles's Grandfather) joined the Spanish</p>	

<p>alliance with the Valois in the Peace of Cambrai of 1517. I had helped to make England isolated and humiliated – terrible!</p>	
<p>The Treaty of London 1518</p> <p>Well what can I say! I am so darn proud of this Treaty! After all I had to redeem myself after my embarrassments by 1517. So whilst Henry was getting angrier and angrier with froggy Francis I turned myself into a smarmy diplomat. I came up with the idea of the Treaty of Universal Peace (the name is fab!). I basically hijacked Leo X's papal plans for a western crusade against the Turks and dressed them up to suit the needs of Europe instead – the King LOVED it! I made it look like England was at the heart of bringing peace to Europe. How clever am I!! It was a Christian settlement which bound France, the Papacy, Spain and the HRE to England to act against the Turk. It was a truly huge plan that would bind our leading countries together in perpetual peace. We all had to commit to non-aggression and promised collectively to make war on any ruler who broke the treaty. Therefore it was impossible for any state to benefit from attacking one another. In public I made sure it was sold as a pure Christian Treaty. 20 representatives came to London to sign it . I had managed to heap prestige on Henry, end our little country's isolation in Europe, get more French Pensions from France, get the Duke of Albany out of Scotland, and betrothe Henry's daughter Mary to the Dauphin (Francis's son!).</p> <p>Some nutty historians from the future are more critical of my Treaty! They accuse me of simply working for my own selfish ambitions to get my position of Papal Legate or worse one day become Pope! Well ok – maybe I was using the Pope's plan as my own in order to get that position as Legate but all I was doing was implementing the Pope's wishes to unite Christendom against the nasty infidel Turks!</p> <p>Others argue I was just obsessed with my own self-importance and wanted to gain all the glory in the celebrations when the Treaty was signed. In fact very few people actually think I genuinely wanted England to help peace arrive in Europe!</p> <p>I guess I would have to admit that in reality we lost Tournai (even though we did get 600,000 gold crowns for it) Henry had ended up having to promise his only surviving child to the French Dauphin, and Scotland could easily ignore the promise to end hostilities.</p>	
<p>The Field of the Cloth of Gold, 1520.</p> <p>In January 1519 the Emperor Maximillian died and Charles I of Spain became HRE. Now Francis and him were BIG rivals so myself and Henry tried to remain in the middle as the arbiter of peace. But we knew they would both want us to side with them! But it was soon clear that Charles was going to get more people in Europe to support him and soon it looked like France was up against the HRE and all it's friends. So we little England were in quite a strong position – who was I going to persuade the</p>	

<p>King Henry to side with?</p> <p>I persuaded the King that continuing our established links with France would be beneficial and I arranged for a spectacular meeting of Henry and Francis at the 'Field of the Cloth of Gold' in 1520 in Calais. It was truly magnificent and one of the most spectacular events in history! It lasted for a whole fortnight and many senior elites came from both countries (3000 from each side!). In fact there were so many people there that hardly any were left to rule France and England! It was a truly sumptuous feast of chivalric pageantry. No expense was spared in providing the gastronomic marathon, entertainments, costumes and settings. Henry and Francis competed against each other to out-do one another in the Renaissance bling stakes! The French built a temporary village of tents and pavilions which cost one year of Henry's annual income! Although it was rather funny as because of rain and high winds the whole lot had to be dismantled! Our English contribution was far superior: a temporary palace for the King with two fountains which dispersed wine!</p> <p>Some may say the Field of the Cloth of Gold was just a showpiece which meant nothing. They will argue that in reality it actually worsened tensions between Henry and Francis as they were trying to out-do each other. Also our English noble elites that were present were extremely rude to the French and they made no secret of their francophobe attitudes! I must admit that no concrete agreement was actually signed.....on reflection maybe it was a bit of a waste of time. It as going to be hard for Henry to convince the HRE that England was not sticking to France like a limpit and taking sides in the ever-growing Habsburg – Valois showdown!</p>	
<p>1521: Alliance with the HRE in the Treaty of Bruges</p> <p>Well after the Field of the Cloth of Gold I was Henry's favourite as I had helped him to make out that he was of equal strength to the HRE and France! But even before and after the event I had made sure Henry had met with Charles V to reassure him that England was not taking sides! That just shows that the FOCG was just a showpiece anyway.....</p> <p>But by 1521 this was the situation: I knew that a Habsburg-Valois conflict was on the cards and therefore England had quite a lot of bargaining power. I knew it was important to form an alliance with the HRE for the following three reasons: We had traditional rivalry with France so an alliance with Charles V would get up Francis's back, we had important trade links with the Low Countries that were ruled by the HRE and I knew that the Pope was anti-French because of the fear of French expansion in Northern Italy.</p> <p>Things came to a head when it was clear that Francis I intended to invade Northern Italy with military action against the HRE. Charles V therefore called on little England to come to his assistance to halt Francis. So in August 1521 I travelled all the way to the city of Bruges in all my pomp and splendour to meet with Charles. I agreed that an English Army would invade France unless Francis made peace with the HRE. Some will</p>	

<p>say that at the Treaty of Bruges I was over confident and thought that the threat of invasion by us would scare off Francis. But in reality I was buying time. I was hoped that the threat of was would be dissolved and therefore English assistance would not be needed! Wow look at my diplomatic skills!</p>	
<p>1523 Siege on Boulogne and attack on Paris</p> <p>But by 1523 it was clear that we were going to have to honour our commitments to Charles V as Francis ignored our warnings. Must at first I was not too worried as it looked like French defeat would be likely. This was because Charles V had managed to get an angry French rebel noble, the Duke of Bourbon to risk all in an act of rebellion against Francis I. So we had a three-pronged assault planned! It was going to be us, the HRE and Bourbon's rebels against the French – surely an easy win! I organised a force costing £400,000 but the rebellion never took off and our troops fell apart due to bad supplies in the cold winter! I blame it all on Bourbon to be honest but it as a crushing disappointment for myself and Henry! I was now desperate (as was my King) to be released from the terms of the Treaty of Bruge so that we could make general peace with France behind France's back.</p>	
<p>1525: My Diplomatic Revolution?</p> <p>Oh god! 1525 was a terrible year at first! Would you believe it.... In February Charles V inflicted the most terrible defeat upon France at Pavia in Northern Italy. The French were annihilated and Francis I was taken prisoner by Charles! At first my King and I thought we could take advantage of this and stake a claim to France and the French Crown but I must admit this was wishful thinking. There was no way Charles was going to give us his share of the spoils – what would he gain from giving the French crown to Henry after all? Charles even called off his marriage alliance with Mary! Even my attempts to raise money for invading France were strongly opposed by the rebels in England against my Amicable Grant proposal.</p> <p>Therefore we did a U turn and opened up diplomatic negotiations with France which resulted in the Treaty of More in 1525. Henry agreed to give up his claims to France in return for an annual pension.</p> <p>1525 might therefore be called a watershed in my foreign policy as I turned England against her alliance with Spain and the HRE.</p>	
<p>1526: The Treaty of Cognac</p> <p>By 1526 Francis had been released although he had promised Charles he would not threaten imperial interests in Italy and Charles had kept his sons hostage to make sure. But it was clear that Francis had no intention of keeping to his promises and I was more than willing to join with France to form the Treaty of Cognac which united England, France and Italian states against the Imperial forces in Italy. Although I must</p>	

admit that although I fully encouraged the formation of the League of Cognac I made sure England never joined it!

In 1527 our alliance with France was strengthened when with the Treaty of Westminster where Princess Mary was once more presented as a marriage offer to Francis or his Son. We also threatened Charles with intervention if he did not make peace with France! But in reality I knew that this threat of war could never happen as we did not have the military power to defeat him and the League of Cognac pretty much achieved nothing....this is proven by the terrible events of what happened next....oh dear...

1527 1-1529: The Imperial Sack of Rome and the Peace of Cambrai

In 1527 the HRE sacked Rome and the Pope Clement VII was taken prisoner! I could not believe it! This spelt absolute disaster for England. This was the time when the King was troubled by his Great Matter of getting a divorce and now we were enemies with the very people in control of the Pope! Arghhh. The King expected me to be able to deliver on his request for an annulment but my creation of the alliance with France was now coming back to bite me. My Diplomatic Revolution had placed England in exactly the wrong place to get any favours from Rome. Catherine of Aragon was Charles V's Aunt therefore it was going to be tough for me to get his support for a divorce. I did try to act without the Pope by arguing that a college of Cardinals would be sufficient papal authority to grant the divorce in the Pope's absence, but this was to no avail (as you will learn later!)

Anyway by 1527 Charles had released the Pope but he remained all over Italy. I did declare war on the HRE in 1528 but I guess that was pretty silly as it was clear that we could not afford it and no army was every mobilised. I even thought about an embargo on trade with the Low Countries but in reality it would have been us who would have lost out on trade so we made separate trade agreements with the Dutch even though Charles was our enemy.

By 1528 Charles had complete control in Italy and had defeated the French again at Landriano and would you believe it he managed to get a Treaty signed called the Peace of Cambrai in 1529 in which was a treaty between France, Spain and the Papacy. I was never informed of this settlement until the last minute! It left Charles in control of Italy, England Isolated, and ruined my chances of getting a marriage annulment for the King! It was clear that my diplomacy had failed by 1529 and the HRE certainly did not see England as an equal. Henry had lost faith in me and I would now face the consequences of this. My fate had depended upon the changing nature of foreign affairs which had conspired against me from 1525-1529

Key failures	Key successes
Aims and ambitions were unrealistic. England was naive to think they could regain crown of France.	Capture of Theouranne and Tournai in 1513 were symbols of Henry's Renaissance Kingship. They were not seen as permanent acquisitions but rather bargaining tools with France
The campaigns actually yielded few gains. £1.4 million was spent in the period 1511-1525. The security left by his father was squandered by Henry and Wolsey provoked a rebellion during the Amicable Grant crisis which meant invasion plans with France had to be shelved and Wolsey lost favour with the King	Wolsey was a successful peacebroker; the Treaty of London in 1518 should be seen as his single great achievement. England was the centre of international relations and England was not diplomatically isolated. The FOCG enhanced the prestige of England and bound 20 foremost European states together.
Henry was outmanoeuvred by more experienced monarchs. Ferdinand betrayed him in 1512 and he and Maximillian signed treaties behind Henry's back. Charles V was not reliable as an ally and Henry gained little from the alliance as shown at the battle of Pavia and the fact that Charles did not stick to his agreement to marry Mary.	Considering the dire economic circumstances of England, it could be argued Wolsey did a good job of conducting with Henry a flexible and reactive Foreign policy which by allying with powerful countries in order to preserve English security and interests. Wolsey's courting of the Valois and Habsburgs between 1520-22 is evidence of this; he always wanted a treaty with the HRE but kept the door to France open.
Wolsey could have been seen as a purely selfish figure who was only motivated by gaining his position as Papal Legate. Indeed Campeggio was not allowed into England in 1518 until Wolsey had his new appointment confirmed. Wolsey hijacked the Pope's plans for a crusade in 1518 and turned it into the Treaty of London. He was eager to take the glory of such events.	
Pollard would argue Wolsey directed foreign policy purely to pursue his ambitions to become Pope	But This argument is weak as Wolsey disagreed with the Papacy on a number of occasions and he had no real ambition to become Pope. He only put forward his candidature for the Papacy to satisfy Henry and because he knew Charles V would also endorse his claim.
Wolsey's diplomatic revolution in 1525 was essentially failure as it meant he could not get an annulment for Henry. He backed the wrong side as the Sack of Rome in 1527 proved.	But he was also unlucky as events conspired against him and the divorce issue gave him little room for manouvere.
The French alliance was unpopular and England was never going to have the military might to challenge the HRE. A trade embargo organised by Wolsey against Burgundy also provoked unhappiness at home as it coincided with a failed harvest. The embargo had to be dropped.	

How far did religion shape foreign affairs (e.g how far was Henry vulnerable and isolated in foreign affairs 1530-1540?)

Development:	What does it show about influence of religious changes?
<p>The alliance with France left over from Wolsey's time began to fall apart from 1530-35 as Francis I did not want to be associated with a heretical power that was not longer part of the Universal Catholic Church and he wanted to make an alliance with Charles Vas he knew that the relationship between England and HRE had been damaged by the annulment of the marriage. This left England vulnerable and isolated.</p>	
<p>From 1536-38 Henry chose the option of holding out in the hope that Habsburg-Valois rivalry would naturally develop again. But this was miscalculated as in 1538 France and Spain signed the Peace of Nice which was a 10 year truce. Henry felt vulnerable again. Military defences had to be strengthened as were links with German Princes as threats of a Catholic invasion loomed with the Pope calling for an anti-English crusade.</p>	
<p>Cardinal Reginald Pole – an exiled Yorkist opponent was given further ammunition by the religious changes to call for Catholic invasions of England to overthrow Henry. Henry carried out a brutal purge of Pole's family in England; his brothers were arrested and his mother too was arrested and killed. Other key figures such as Henry Courtenay and Sir Edward Neville were arrested. Henry had dealt with the Yorkist threat once and for all and had squashed hopes of a pro-papal resurgence.</p>	
<p>In 1539 Henry passed the Act of Six Articles which has been seen as an attempt to reassure the rest of Catholic Europe that England would not move towards Lutheranism. But at the same time Lutheran embassy officials were visiting England and were sceptical of Henry's motives.</p>	
<p>By 1539 though Cromwell had managed to engineer the marriage alliance with Anne of Cleves who was the daughter of the Duke of Cleves (part of the Lutheran alliance). Henry went through with the marriage but it was a disaster! He detested the sight of her and would not consummate the marriage. But the war in Italy resumed thus the need to court German princes evaporated. By the end of the 1530's Henry was determined to be involved in continental affairs and would adopt policies of invading Scotland and France.</p>	

Were the years 1541-1547 ones of expensive failure?

Anglo-Scottish Relations

By 1542 Henry was keen to restake his claims in France as Francis and Charles had renewed war between themselves therefore England was safe again.

Henry needed to subdue Scotland before any claim on France could be pursued.

Relations between James V of Scotland (Henry's nephew) and Henry were strained because James did not like Henry interfering with direction of future Scottish Church and Henry thought him to be disrespectful. He also disliked Scotland's alliance with France which was strong under Cardinal Beaton. In 1542 Henry sent Norfolk on an expedition to try to force the Scots to break their Auld Alliance with France but little was achieved and Norfolk ran out of supplies.

The Battle of Solway Moss 1542

Nov 1542 James decided on a show of force thinking Henry's army was weak and marched over the border. The Battle of Solway Moss took place and the Scots were annihilated by the British. The defeat was a national humiliation for the Scots; many nobles surrendered and James V died himself only 2 weeks after. His daughter Mary was left in the hands of a pro-French faction. Henry was determined to take advantage and impose England's rule on Scotland.

The Treaty of Greenwich 1543

Henry bribed captured Scottish nobles to create a pro-English party. The Earl of Arran (new Regent) also approved of Henry's cause. July 1543 treaty was signed: peace between England and Scotland and marriage of Mary to Prince Edward Tudor. It looked like Henry had achieved claim to Scotland through diplomacy!

But the policy failed and Henry was naive. The nobles returned north and did not stick to their terms. Mary was not obliged to go South to marry Edward until 1553 and Earl of Arran wanted the throne so was not going to encourage Mary to fulfil treaty terms. The Treaty simply bought the Scots time to rebuild their defences and strengthen links with France.

The Rough Wooing 1544:

Henry frustrated with failed treaty sent Earl of Hertford north to lay waste to Scotland. Edinburgh was attacked and burned severely. But it only united the Scots more against the English and strengthened their alliance with France. Edinburgh castle remained in hands of English but in all the Scottish campaign had been a failure.

Anglo-French Relations

1543: Attack on France

Henry agreed on a joint invasion with Charles V. 40,000 invaded Calais and the Spanish attacked Paris. But neither Charles nor Henry were going to fulfil their obligations to one another: Henry ignored target of Paris and focused on Boulogne in which the English were quite successful. This annoyed Charles who then made peace with France which freed Francis to put all his forces against the English. Boulogne was garrisoned and the English went home.

Francis planned to recapture Boulogne and invade England. There were minor skirmishes in the English channel (sinking of Mary Rose). In June 1546 a peace settlement was drawn up at Adres. Henry was promised a sizeable pension from the French King and the English were to hold on to Boulogne until 1554 when France would buy the town back.

The cost of garrisoning Boulogne had been 130,000 and total of campaign was £2 million.

Henry had failed to finance his campaign effectively from taxes therefore he had sold off large chunks of land from the dissolution of the Monasteries. Therefore these steady income from future rents was lost forever.

The coinage was debased: This may have gained over £1 million in 1540's but it was a quick-fix only. It intensified inflation and reduced confidence in English markets. Henry had left his son Edward in serious debt and the future solvency of the English crown had been compromised. Henry had little to show from the French campaign.

Unit 5: The Break from Rome Part 1

1503-1532 Key questions:

- 1) Why did Henry want an annulment?
- 2) Why couldn't Henry get an annulment?
- 3) How far did royal policy and Henry's attitude towards the Great Matter change 1530-1532?

Timeline of events 1503-1532

1503: Julius II grants dispensation for marriage between Henry and Catherine

1509: Henry's accession to the throne

1516: Henry and Catherine's daughter Mary is born

1521: Henry writes 'In Defence of the Seven Sacraments'

1527: Henry commits himself to Anne Boleyn and decides to seek an annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Charles V sacks Rome and imprisons the Pope

1528: Cardinal Campeggio arrives in England

1529: June – Legatine court begins to try Henry's case.

July – Court Adjourns. Case referred to Rome

August – Treaty of Cambrai (Peace between Charles V and Francis)

October - Wolsey dismissed

November – Reformation Parliament meets. Acts passed reducing Probate and Mortuary fees and attacking Pluralities and non-residence

1530:

Thomas Cromwell joins Henry's Council

October – Thomas Cranmer and Edward Foxe present Henry with Collectanea Satis Copiosa

November – Death of Wolsey at Leicester Abbey

1531: Convocation agree to Henry VIII becoming Head of the Church in England as far as Christ's Law allows

1532: March, Supplication against the Ordinaries

May, Submission of the Clergy followed by the resignation of Thomas More

1) Why did Henry want an annulment?

Love	Need for a Male Heir	Conscience – Marriage went against God
<p>There is little doubt he fell madly in love with Anne Boleyn. She was the daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn, a courtier and Minister and the niece of the Duke of Norfolk. Henry was infatuated with her and this is proven by the numerous love letters he sent her between. He even got Wolsey to intervene to end Anne's relationship with Henry Percy. But his love for Anne cannot have been the only reason for the annulment. Historians often argue that Henry's desire for Anne simply pushed him further to the separation that was always going to happen. It is not enough to say he was bored with Catherine and therefore turned his attentions to Anne. Historians have asserted that Henry wanted to end his marriage to Catherine before he became smitten. Also Henry had plenty of other mistresses and was not necessarily going to marry Anne Boleyn just because he wanted an end to his marriage. He was not embarrassed by his mistresses and wanted to legitimise his son Henry Fitzroy.</p>	<p>Catherine had fallen pregnant on many occasions in their marriage but they had only one surviving child: Mary. Despite 18 years of marriage this was the situation. By 1525 Catherine was ageing and was unlikely to conceive. The future stability of the realm depended on the succession of a legitimate heir – a son. The instability and chaos of the Wars of the Roses were a recent part of English history and Henry had not wish to reignite a Civil War. In this context a female sovereign was unthinkable as it would weaken the Tudor dynasty and could encourage Yorkist contenders to stake their claim to the crown. In the C12 the last attempt by a woman to take the crown had ended in conflicts for Years. The Omens looked bad – Henry was only made more focused on the illegitimacy of his marriage by the fact that both sons that Catherine had bore died in infancy. He needed a legitimate Heir. He also knew that precedents for Papal annulment did exist in certain cases.</p>	<p>Many historians argue Henry was genuinely concerned about the unlawful nature of his marriage in the eyes of God. As his desperation for a male heir increased, so did his obsession with the belief that he was being punished by God for marrying his brother's wife. He believed his marriage to Catherine contravened divine law and based his case on scripture citing verses from Leviticus that prohibited marriage to one's dead brother's wife. Therefore the Papal dispensation that had allowed Catherine to marry Henry was invalid as their union contravened divine law and this was therefore beyond the authority of Rome. Leviticus also fitted with Henry's concerns over not having a son as it said :'he shall be without sons'. But Leviticus was directly contradicted by the text of Deutoronomy.</p>

2) Why couldn't Henry get an annulment?

<p>The Diplomatic Situation with the HRE Catherine's nephew was Charles V – Holy Roman Emperor. Charles V held huge influence over Pope Clement VII as a consequence of military superiority in the Habsburg-Valois conflict and it would have been unwise for Clement to disgrace the Habsburg Emperor by granting an annulment. This situation was exacerbated greatly by the fact that Rome was sacked by Imperial Troops in May 1527. Papal policy was shaped by Charles.</p>	<p>England's fate in foreign affairs In 1525 Wolsey and Henry ditched their long-standing alliance with the HRE and Spain to make an alliance with France after Charles V refused to share the spoils of his victory in Pavia with Henry. But this dramatic change of foreign policy was the wrong decision in the light of the Great Matter which had evolved by 1527.</p>
<p>Clement the VII Whilst held captive by Charles V Clement was reluctant to be open to the annulment issue. Despite being released in December 1527 the Pope wanted nothing to do with the Great Matter as he feared Charles V and wanted to maintain Papal independence in Italy. But he was inconsistent in his policy as he wanted to pacify Henry so he suggested Henry get divorced in England first then marry Anne, then request an annulment at a later date; Henry would not do this as it was Bigamy.</p>	<p>Cardinal Campeggio and the Papal court in England In 1528 Clement sent Campeggio – an ageing Cardinal – to hear the case in England. He was to join Wolsey but by the time he arrived the Imperialist power in Italy was assured, making the annulment much less likely. Then a document from Julius II was presented by the Spanish in which he confirmed the legitimacy of Catherine's marriage to Henry. The English thought it was a fake. When the case opened in March 1529 at Black friars Campeggio was already under strict orders not to dispense a decision on the Great Matter. No decision was made and Campeggio used papal jurisdiction to adjourn proceedings for the summer (by the fact it was a hot one in Italy!) The Treaty of Cambrai further confirmed the ascendancy of Charles in Italy. Thus it was clear an annulment from Rome was not going to happen.</p>
<p>Catherine and her supporters: She had powerful supporters at court and her plight won her much sympathy. She was determined to defend the validity of her marriage and the legitimacy of her daughter Mary. She argued that she was a virgin when she married Henry and that the King's Levitical argument did not apply to an unconsummated marriage. She had the support of influential men like Bishop Fisher and Thomas More and of course her nephew Charles V. Her loyalty to Henry was unwavering and embarrassing in the legatine court. Her bloodline and opposition was a central reason why Henry could not get a divorce.</p>	<p>Wolsey and Henry Wolsey's initial suggestion of trying to find a legal hitch in the original dispensation for the marriage of Henry and Catherine by Julius II was rejected by Henry VIII as he was determined to pursue the Leviticus argument. Wolsey also suggested Catherine join a nunnery then suggested Henry Fitzroy should marry Mary – but these ideas were rejected by Henry – they were not going to make for a water tight succession</p>
<p>The Levitical Argument was flawed It was contradicted by Deuteronomy. Yet Henry insisted on challenging Papal authority with this argument</p>	

3) How far did royal policy and Henry's attitude towards the Great Matter change 1530-1532?

The debate:

- 1) Henry drifted (Elton). There was no clear policy. Thomas More was chancellor and could not bring himself to support the King's case. Henry wanted an annulment from Rome which was watertight – thus no wonder there was a drift
- 2) But others argue that by 1532 his mind was made up to make the Break with Rome and establish Royal Supremacy over the church of England..

What happened?

1. Henry charges Wolsey with Praemunire in 1529 – made the point to Rome that Henry's authority was total in England. Still applying great pressure on Rome
2. In 1529 **The Reformation Parliament opened** (it is later called this). It passed the Probate, Pluralities and Mortuaries Act which tapped into anti-clerical sentiment in England and put pressure on Rome. Henry was increasingly influenced by the growing anti-clerical movement – one notable anticlerical was Simon Fish. Henry became increasingly convinced that the Church needed to be brought to the heel of the Great Matter and he began to assert his authority over the Clergy.
3. In 1530 Henry began to collect the opinions of the finest universities in Europe (including Oxford and Cambridge, on The Great Matter). It was hoped that they would provide legitimate arguments in support of the Leviticus argument. Many returned favourable verdicts but many were also bribed.
4. In 1530 it was clear Henry was considering more radical alternatives as he provided interest in the *Collectanea satis copiosa* written by radicals like Edward Foxe and Thomas Cranmer. They had used ancient English manuscripts and Anglo-Saxon chronicles to support the concept of the King as Head of State and Church. Thus historical precedents were being found to support the idea of Royal Supremacy.
5. 1531: The Pardon of the Clergy: more pressure on the Church was exerted when the C of E was charged with Praemunire because they had endorsed Wolsey's Papal posts. They had to pay £118,000. And were pardoned for unlawfully exercising their spiritual jurisdiction in church courts.
6. In the Pardon of the Clergy, Henry insisted that he be referred to as sole protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy. This provoked angry reaction from conservatives such as Bishop Fisher.
7. As Henry became more convinced about his choice to adopt Royal Supremacy, the radical faction in court began to hold sway over the conservatives.
8. In 1532 The Supplication against the Ordinaries which was a petition against the power of the Church courts and clerical jurisdiction in the Commons. It was drawn up by Thomas Cromwell and it marked a direct attack on the legislative independence of the Church.
9. In 1532 the Submission of the Clergy was drawn up. It established the shift whereby the legislative independence of the Church was surrendered to the crown. Convocation could only meet with permission of the

King, new canon laws needed the King's approval, existing canon laws would be inspected and removed if deemed to undermine Royal authority

10. Thomas More resigned the Chancellorship in 1532 as he could not reconcile his commitment to the King with his devotion to the Church

11. In March 1532 Parliament passed the Act in the Conditional Restraint of Annates. This challenged the economic and consecration aspects of Papal Power and marked a direct move towards Royal Supremacy. It stated that if the Pope refused to consecrate Bishops without the Annates, then they would be consecrated in England. This challenged centuries of tradition and worship. But this act was extremely radical and dangerous – the repercussions in England and Europe could have been huge. It therefore remained on the statute books until 1533

12. 1532 could still be seen as a watershed in policy; Henry had all but given up hope of annulment and Anne Boleyn was pregnant – thus marriage was an urgent matter. But the legislation of 1522 would probably have happened anyway despite the pregnancy. The Year 1532 saw the permanent change in direction that meant Henry had chosen the path of a break with Rome and Royal Supremacy – this was going to be the only solution to the Great Matter. The Reformation Parliament would then go on to make this policy a reality.

Examination Practice

What is the major grievance drawn up in source H?

Source H

Firstly the prelates and other of the clergy of this your realm, being your subjects, in their Convocation by them holden . . . have made and daily make divers fashions of laws and ordinances concerning temporal things; and some of them be repugnant to the laws and statutes of your realm; not having nor requiring your most royal assent of the same laws by them so made, nor any assent or knowledge of your lay subjects is had to the same, nor to them published and known in the English tongue.

Supplication against the Ordinaries, 1532

Why would Chapuys report on the background of Cromwell in source G?

Source G

Sir, Master Cromwell, of whose origin and antecedents your Secretary Antoine tells me you desire to be informed, is the son of a poor blacksmith, who lived in a small village four miles from this place, and is buried in a common grave in the parish churchyard. Cromwell in his youth was an ill conditioned scapegrace. For some offence he was thrown into prison, and was obliged afterwards to leave the country.

A letter from Eustace Chapuys to Charles V, 1535

What is the major grievance drawn up in source H?

Source H

Firstly the prelates and other of the clergy of this your realm, being your subjects, in their Convocation by them holden . . . have made and daily make divers fashions of laws and ordinances concerning temporal things; and some of them be repugnant to the laws and statutes of your realm; not having nor requiring your most royal assent of the same laws by them so made, nor any assent or knowledge of your lay subjects is had to the same, nor to them published and known in the English tongue.

Supplication against the Ordinaries, 1532

Do you agree with the view expressed in source K that the diplomatic situation was the main reason for Henry's failure to attain an annulment of his marriage to Catherine by 1529?

Explain your answer using the sources and own knowledge

Source J

Anne Boleyn is at last come hither, and the King has lodged her in a very fine lodging, which he prepared for her himself. Greater attention is now paid to her every day than has been to the Queen for a long time. I see they mean to accustom the people by degrees to endure her, so that when the blow comes it may not be thought strange. However the people remain quite hardened, and I think that they would do more if they had power. Wolsey uses all his means to bring the Emperor into hatred, and Francis into favour; but it is hard work to fight against nature.

From a letter written by the French Ambassador, December 1528

Source K

The diplomatic situation was running hard against Henry by March 1529. Pope and Emperor were fast coming together and in a few weeks Clement would confess to a close friend that 'I have quite made up my mind to become an imperialist and live and die as such.' In the face of all this Henry was not likely to make much headway with a programme which in even the most favourable circumstances, would have been a thorny one to handle.

From J.J. Scarisbrick's biography, *Henry VIII*, 1968

Source I

After I had exhorted her [Catherine] at great length to remove all these difficulties, and to content herself with making a profession of chastity, setting before her all the reasons which could be urged on that head, she assured me that she would never do so; that she intended to live and die in the estate of matrimony, into which God had called her, and that she would always be of that opinion, and would not change it. She repeated this many times so determinately and deliberately that I am convinced she will act accordingly. She says that neither the whole kingdom on the one hand, nor any great punishment on the other, although she might be torn from limb to limb, should compel her to alter this opinion. I have always judged her to be a prudent lady, but her obstinacy in not accepting this sound counsel does not much please me.

From a letter written by Cardinal Campeggio to Pope Clement VII,
26 October 1528

Unit 6: The Break with Rome Part 2

Key Questions:

1) How did the Acts of Parliament secure the break with Rome and the Royal Supremacy?

The Royal Supremacy 1531

In 1531 the Church had been forced to accept the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England as far as the law of Christ allows. However his actual role was ambiguous.

Supplication of the Ordinaries 1532 (Internal Attack)

The supplication (request) was taken by Cromwell on behalf of the Commons (lower house of parliament) to place limits to church courts and its ability to change canon law. Henry was not directing this attack of Church legislative (law making) power however he did make it clear that he would not allow the church to make laws without his agreement. This led to the convocation (assembly of clergy) to be restricted from law making unless agreement was made by government. Existing canon law were to be reviewed and any that were against the royal prerogative were to be annulled. Effectively the Church's legal system was under royal control. This action of pressure resulted in what is known as the **Submission of the Clergy in 1532**. The authority of the church was undermined and the path to supremacy was made clear.

Act in conditional Restraint of Annates 1532 (External Attack)

This Act would be a direct attack on the Papacy; the Lords (upper house of parliament) discussed and considered the Bill of Annates. The proposal to abolish payments (annates) by English bishops to Rome would put pressure on the papacy financially. Henry made this act conditional because in 1532 he still had hope that he may get his annulment as the pope had yet to make a judgment on his appeal. It was a clever tactic to leave room for negotiation. Henry was made to look like it was he that held back the Bill from parliamentary pressure.

A new Archbishop of Canterbury 1532

In late August of 1532 Archbishop Wareham died and Henry took his opportunity to appoint Thomas Cranmer who was more sympathetic to Henry's annulment and the Supremacy. Cranmer was linked to Boleyn family. At the turn of the year Henry still did not have a verdict from Rome about his first marriage and in January Anne Boleyn was clearly pregnant. Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell were now set to make the break with Rome affirmed.

The Act of Restraint of Appeals 1533 (Established)

In 1533 the Act to end appeals to Rome meant that the authority of Rome's decision was not recognized in the England. Any appeals on the grounds of religious law including Henry's annulment would be heard in English church courts instead. The appeal would go to convocation where they would be heard by the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is from this point forward that the king's Great Matter was settled in England and his role as Supreme Head of the Church was recognized. The supremacy was asserted not as a revolution but rather a return to ancient rights of a imperial sovereign ruler. The annulment was granted (May 1533) on the verdict that original papal dispensation in 1503 was invalid and Anne Boleyn was crowned queen September 1533 having secretly married Henry in 1532.

Acts of Dispensations 1534

All payments to Rome were stopped. All canon law cases would be dealt with by the Archbishop of Canterbury and not Rome. Attempts to ignore this act of parliament would land you with the charge of praemunire (treason).

Act of Succession 1534

Henry's children with Catherine were now bastards and his heirs from Anne Boleyn were legitimised. It became a treasonable offence to speak maliciously against Henry's second marriage. The Pope responded with reaffirming the validity of Henry's marriage to Catherine and Henry responded by ordering the Pope's name be struck out of prayer books.

Act of Supremacy and Treason Law 1534

This gave Henry complete administrative and legislative control over the Church. The Act of Supremacy was to be enforced by a new Treason Act that made it a capital offence to deny the Supremacy or deny the King's new title.

2) How serious was opposition to the Break with Rome and the Royal Supremacy?

What was the opposition?

The Holy Maid of Kent (Elizabeth Barton)

Rocketed to fame from an unknown peasant background at the age of 16 when she claimed to have had a vision of the Virgin Mary.

Her prophecies were once listened to (Archbishop Warham had regarded her as a messenger from God)

In 1533 she predicted the death of Henry because of his relationship with Anne. She gained the support of people like Bishop Fischer and thus became a tool of the opposition to the Supremacy, but a significant tool. Her spiritual guide Edward Bocking was keen to publish your prophecies.

She even voiced her beliefs in public against Henry when he visited Canterbury and claimed he would be dead within a month because he had married Anne.

In November 1533 she was sent to the Tower of London and executed with 5 of her followers.

Her death was considered a political necessity and it was not by chance that she was executed on the same day as Londoners had to swear to the Oath of Succession

Religious Orders: Carthusian and Observant Friars

These were two strict religious orders based in London

The Observants were particularly dangerous as they were based near Greenwich Palace so they could spread the voice of dissent through their teaching easily.

All 7 of the Observant houses were shut down on the King's orders and a number of Friars were imprisoned

The Carthusians were not as much of a threat as they were less united .

But Cromwell was unable to silence the dissenting opposition and had to change from reasoned persuasion to imprisonment and torture. Over 3 years 18 members of the Charterhouse (Carthusians) were killed by execution or starvation. Between May and Jul 1535 6 leading Carthusians were killed in a period of terror.

Conservative Opposition: John Fischer, Bishop of Rochester

He was the only Bishop to oppose the Supremacy to such a degree that he was executed for his beliefs.

He was respected across Catholic Europe for his piety. He had always stood by Catherine and supported the Pope.

He argued that any denial of the Pope's authority was a sin. He was closely allied with Eustace Chapuys, Charles V's Imperial Ambassador who was trying to get Charles to invade England.

He was imprisoned in the tower of London in 1534 after refusing to swear the oath of Succession.

He had lots of support abroad – in May 1535 Pope Paul III announced the he was to be made a Cardinal! This was the last straw for Henry VIII and he was tried and executed in June 1535. He is remembered as the first high profile martyr of the Henrican Reformation.

Conservative Opposition: Bishop Tunstall

Leading conservative clergyman who initially opposed the Supremacy. Spoke out against Henry's motives and desire for a divorce as well as the Supremacy. But loyalties to the crown and instinct for self-preservation brought him round to Henry's point of view.

Thomas More

He was dangerous opposition for Henry as he was a respected Humanist and theologian. He was Henry's Chancellor after Wolsey. But he found it increasingly hard to reconcile his commitment to Catholicism with his commitment to the King. He resigned from his post after in 1532 when it was clear that the break with Rome was going to happen and the Submission of the Clergy took place. He was a dangerous opponent of Henry as he would not swear on the Oath of Succession in 1534 and would not approve Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn. Neither would he condemn papal jurisdiction. Henry hated this as he was one of the most respected Humanists in Europe and you even published his views on the King. He was imprisoned in the Tower of London and stayed silent on the Act of Supremacy which made it hard for the King to charge you him treason. But he was then visited by Henry's solicitor General Richard Riche who used what you Thomas said to him in his cell against you in a trial. The jury was also rigged and Thomas was convicted of treason and killed in 1535.

3) Why was there so little opposition to the Royal Supremacy and break with Rome?

Fear

All adult males had to swear an oath to the terms of the Act of Succession

All clergy had to make a declaration that the Pope had no greater God-Given Authority in England than any other Foreign Bishop

The Treason Act 1534: Passed in 1534 and strengthened in 1535. Served to silence opponents. Treason to speak out against Henry or Anne.

Loyalty

People were both loyal and respectful of the Crown. The King was divinely ordained and seen to protect from internal disorder and foreign invasion. It was treasonable and sinful to resist the King. The execution of high profile opponents of the regime and treason law frightened people into submission.

No Change

In reality the Supremacy did little to change people's everyday lives. The absence of the Pope in the new church was the main change but he was a distant figure anyway. Most people seemed to accept the removal of Papal authority and were quick to stop paying Peter's Pence.

Local Affairs

People were more concerned with local affairs than their wider world. The Henrican reformation did little to change local affairs. It was only in the north in 1536 when rumours of the possible plundering of small Parish churches came about that the serious insurrection of the Pilgrimage of Grace occurred. People identified more with their King than they did the Pope. Indeed richer members of society were supportive because they could purchase dissolved properties from the Monasteries.

Cromwell

He was central to the whole process. He controlled the Pulpits and printing presses of London. Royal letters were sent out to Bishops, nobles and JP's instructing them to imprison any clergy who showed signs of dissent against royal policies. And he passed injunctions which attempted to place a bible in every English church.

No Mercy:

Henry showed no mercy to the participators of the Pilgrimage of Grace. All key members were executed with no mercy. Henry would not compromise.

4) Was Thomas More a 'Saint or Sinner'?

Interpretation	Evidence to support
Popular view of More as a man of Principle who was willing to die for his people. This has been expressed in Robert Bolt's play 'A Man for All Seasons' and earlier biographers like William Roper and Nicholas Harnpsfield. They both defend More and elevate him to the status of Catholic Martyrdom.	His courageous refusal to swear the Oath of Succession 1534. His resignation after the Submission of the Clergy 1532. His attempt to retire from public life and refusal to speak publicly on the issue of the Supremacy. He insisted he was willing to remain the King's loyal servant and he would not assist his enemies – Cranmer and Cromwell both tried to save him from execution and were willing to accept this promise.
Protestant view of More as a harsh and cruel hunter of good, honest Protestant Men. This was asserted by Jon Foxes 'Protestant Book of Martyrs' written in 1563 and continued by Peter Ackroyd.	More helped Henry write a tract against Lutheranism (Assertio Septem Sacramentorum) and showed himself to be a merciless prosecutor of heretics. More remained a passionate defender of Catholic orthodoxy - writing pamphlets against heresy, banning unorthodox books, and even taking responsibility when chancellor for the interrogation of heretics. His early actions against the Reformation included aiding Wolsey in preventing Lutheran books from being imported into England, spying on and investigating suspected Protestants, especially Publishers and arresting any one holding in his possession, transporting, or selling the books of the Protestant reformation. More vigorously suppressed the travelling country ministers who used Tyndale's English translation of the New Testament. This English language translation of the Bible

	<p>challenged the Catholic monopoly of reading the Latin Bible. It contained translations of certain words—for example Tyndale used "elder" rather than "priest" for the Greek "presbuteros"—and some footnotes which challenged Catholic Doctrine. It was during this time that most of his literary polemics appeared.</p> <p>In total there were six heretics burned at the stake during More's Chancellorship: Thomas Hitton, Thomas Bilney, Richard Bayfield, John Tewkesbery, Thomas Dugate, and James Bainham. Burning at the stake had long been a standard punishment for heresy—about thirty burnings had taken place in the century before More's elevation to Chancellor, and burning continued to be used by both Catholics as well as Protestants during the religious upheaval of the following decades. Ackroyd notes that More explicitly "approved of Burning" After the case of John Tewkesbury, a London leather-seller found guilty by More of harboring banned books and sentenced to burning for refusing to recant, More declared: he "burned as there was neuer wretche I wene better worthy."</p>
<p>He was a Reformer who was a forerunner of the Reformation</p>	<p>1684 translation of More's book 'Utopia' by Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, suggests that More was not a slavish follower of the Papacy but rather a reformer who could be claimed by the Anglican Church as a forerunner of the Reformation.</p> <p>In 1516, he published his most important work 'Utopia' - a description of an imaginary republic ruled by reason and intended to contrast with the strife-ridden reality of contemporary European politics.</p>

Why did Henry make the break from Rome and establish the Royal Supremacy?

<p>Political Power</p>	<p>This is the central and probably most plausible argument. It was put forward by the Historian Pollard in 1902. He argued Henry was the chief Architect of the Reformation and his reasons were solely to do with his own power. As the church would not allow him to annul his marriage to Catherine this gave him the opportunity to rid himself of the constraints of the Papacy. Therefore the Divorce was essentially an occasion, not a cause of the Reformation. Pollard argues Henry was seen as the Tudor King to bring peace and stability to England – the force of Nationalist allegiance among the people therefore supported his political decision to break with Rome. Henry's huge ego and craving for power meant he was unwilling to let anybody get in his way. The origins of the Reformation can therefore be seen as a result of Henry's own personal drive and ambition for power.</p> <p>Scarisbrick also supports this; he says it was he King who designed the Royal Supremacy and Cromwell was only the man who executed it.</p>
-------------------------------	---

Divorce	This was crucial in planting in Henry's mind who should have control of the Church of England. But Henry consistently tried to find a solution before breaking from Rome which suggests he was not completely against the Pope's authority
Doctrine (religion)	<p>There is not evidence of religion (Doctrine) in the Reformation Parliament legislation at all. Doctrine only became a feature in the later 1530's with Cromwell's formularies of faith and injunctions. It was Henry and Cromwell – Political figures – not the ABC Cranmer who were behind religious change. Therefore the break with Rome was a political process. Cranmer was a politically shrewd appointment by Henry to help him get his divorce and establish the justification for the Supremacy.</p> <p>Dickens would argue a movement for reform from below from groups like the Lollards pressured Henry into breaking with Rome. He argues the Lollard influence cultivated atmospheres in parts of the country which made the reception of Protestant Continental ideas possible. He argues Cromwell was then crucial in 'pushing Henry into deep religious waters'</p>
Dosh	The Legislation of the Reformation Parliament suggests Henry did have some focus on monetary gains. But this was a fringe benefit rather than a motivating factor. It as not until the dissolution of the monasteries that urgent need for money became apparent.
Cromwell's influence	G.R Elton puts forward the case that Cromwell in his role as Vice Gerent was the chief force behind the reformation. He gave Henry the idea of the Act in Resraint of Appeals to Rome (he drafted it) He had his own political agenda to fulfill; his aim was to set up a limited Constitutional Monarchy with the King and Parliament acting together. Therefore Elton argues it was Cromwell's radical political ambition (boosted by his faith in evangelicalism) which prompted him to influence the King and largely control the affairs of the supremacy.

Unit 7: The Dissolution of the Monasteries

Key question:

1) Why were the Monasteries important in people's lives and why were they under threat?

Read the report from an imaginary Monk in the 1500's and revise the role the Monasteries played in English society. Also revise what the Valor Ecclesiasticus was and why it was a threat to the Monasteries

Our great country, England is a land of Abbeys. There are a magnificent 800 in total in England and a further 100 in Scotland. Out of these some 502 are houses of monks and 136 are nunneries and a further 187 are friaries.

The role of these religious houses is central to the lives of both the rich and the poor. Their main function is of course to say prayers and masses for the souls of the dead in an attempt to ease the path of souls through purgatory. Monasteries are also among the largest landowners in England; they provide mass employment on farms in local communities. But Monasteries are also centres of arts and learning. The beautiful buildings tower over the countryside and monks produce exquisite illuminated manuscripts, carvings and painting.

There are several Monastic orders; The Benedictines (the largest order of Monks and Nuns and the richest), the Cistercians (founded as a breakaway group from the Benedictines and famous for living life in strict abstinence and solitary existence), and the Carthusians (They are the strictest of all Orders and are often known as the Charterhouse)

Then there are open houses in urban areas in which inhabitants carry out good works for the sick and needy. All Monks and Nuns have devoted their lives to the prayer for the souls of their founders and heirs. They have all taken vows of Chastity and obedience.

Most lay folk in towns and villages do have a close spiritual or material connection with their nearest monastery; the people of England are loyal to the religious houses and would not want them to be attacked!

The threat of the 'Valor Ecclesiasticus'

It is with great sadness that we have to announce that the King's Vicegerent in Spirituals, Thomas Cromwell, has commissioned a ridiculous survey of all ecclesiastical property and wealth in England. This is a clear attempt to justify a take over of our houses! Cromwell has rightly identified that the total income of religious houses is over 160,000 per year and one third of landed property belongs to the monasteries. But why should he say this is wrong? Much of our wealth does come from rents but it is also taken from the important Tithes (one tenth of the produce of land and livestock) and profits of Pilgrimages. These are vital services that our religious houses carry out. Cromwell may have pointed out that monastic income is three times that than royal estates, but that is no reason for the recently nationalised English church to exploit our wealth!

We challenge Mr Cromwell to see if they people of England want our monasteries to be attacked. He had better be careful; 10,000 men and women have taken their vows of poverty and chastity and obedience in a population of only 3.5 million. All peasants in the land have some sort of link with their monastery.....

Oh holy brothers of the Papal lands! Help us!

2) Why did Henry dissolve the Monasteries?

Use the card sort to identify evidence to match the following factors:

- **Wealth**
- **Breaking allegiances to Rome**
- **Genuine Religious reasons**
- **Stopping Opposition to the Royal Supremacy**
- **Continental Influence**
- **The Corruption and Decayed state of the Monasteries**

<p>The monasteries were perceived as one of the last bastions of popery! Many of them owed obedience to Rome first and crown second. Many were exempt from visitations by English bishops and looked for spiritual and temporal guidance to Rome</p>	<p>At the heart of the dissolution lay the monetary gains to be made. Henry may not have been sure of the doctrinal direction that his reformation was taking, but he was eager to fill the crown's coffers and bolster England's defences against the possible threat of a Catholic Crusade against England. The prospect of transferring the enormous wealth of the monasteries to the crown was too good for Henry to miss out on; it would double his income and free him from dependence on Parliamentary grants.</p>
<p>By dissolving the Monasteries Henry was removing some of the most strong opponents of his break with Rome. He Franciscans and Carthusians has potentially been some of his biggest opponents.</p>	<p>Religious houses were being dissolved in Germany and Scandanavia which gave a model of what was possible in England. The ideas of Erasmus, Tyndale and Fish, which criticised the Monasteries, were also gaining currency in England</p>
<p>Monasteries were accused of being morally and spiritually lax. Monks and nuns were accused of not fulfilling their vows of chastity, poverty and obedience but rather living corrupt and ostentatious lives. But this argument does not stand completely strong; most monks and nuns continued to live up the Christian ideals that they had done for centuries. Despite reports from the 1520's that there were variations in standards of behaviour (e.g Monks having mistresses and children) there were many accounts of ordered houses where discipline prevailed and good works were carried out in the community. Therefore perhaps the excuse of moral decay was only used by the Crown once the decision had been made to dissolve the Monasteries. Cromwell's Valor provided ammunition to accuse Monasteries of monetary corruption, and other royal commissioners reported tales of immorality on their visitations which were read out in Parliament. These were heavily biased though.</p>	<p>Protestant historians have argued that because of the shift towards church reform with the Royal Supremacy, that the motives driving Henry and Cromwell were to do with getting rid of monasticism because it was outdated and unnecessary. The fact the monks and nuns devoted so much time to prayers for the dead was seen to be unnecessary by Protestants. The new revitalised English church needed to sweep away deadwood in its relentless drive towards Protestantism. But their argument has been heavily criticised; religious houses did not really have an allegiance to Rome, only to continental mother houses (leading monasteries) in Europe. The Crown was actually the founder and patron of many abbeys and most monks had shown their loyalty to the crown over Rome by taking the oath of Supremacy. Henry himself hardly subscribed to the idea of Protestantism; he even refounded two monasteries in order that frequent prayers were said for him before he died! Therefore these Protestant historians are probably trying to emphasise religious reasons for the dissolution because it fits well into the story of the English Reformation.</p>
<p>Henry could pacify potential critics of his break with Rome by allowing wealthy nobles (like Norfolk) to buy Monastic land which as sold off by the crown. This therefore served a political purpose for Henry. Anyone who may have been unhappy with the turn of religious events could be pacified with the wealth that dissolving the Monasteries brought.</p>	

3) Was the dissolution of the Monasteries pre-planned?

Argument 1: Cromwell had a master plan

Cromwell had a Master Plan for dissolution in place from the 1530's; he had always intended to dissolve them. His motives were therefore financial and evangelical. He had promised to make Henry wealthy at the expense of the Church and Monasteries were an easy target in Cromwell's eyes. Liquidation of them was in line with his own Evangelical views that Monasticism was corrupt, anachronistic and failing

Argument 2: Motives were still financial but not pre-planned

It was only after the full extent of Monastic wealth was revealed by the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535 that Cromwell and Henry decided upon dissolution. Thus motives are still financial but more reactive rather than planned. The original purpose of the Valor was to assess how much each clerical institution had to pay to meet the 10% income granted to Henry by the Reformation Parliament, not to reveal the landed assets of the religious houses. Cromwell did not have time to pull together all damning evidence he had received in time for 1536. If they plan had been in place already then this does not make sense. It was opportunistic and reactive

Argument 3: A middle ground?

Cromwell and Henry did plan the dissolution of smaller houses with income of under £200 per annum, but they had no intention of dissolving larger houses. It was only in 1538-39 that the larger houses could be swept away easily that total dissolution entered minds of Henry and Cromwell. Henry was so impressed with the wealth brought by dissolving smaller houses that this then snowballed. Once the opposition from the Pilgrimage of Grace had been swept up he was keen to fill the coffers further with total dissolution.

3) How were the Monasteries dissolved?

In Spring 1536 Parliament passed Act for the Dissolution of all religious houses the with a net income of less than £200 per year.

The smaller houses were seen as hotspots of vice and sin and there was a great emphasis on the need for reform. Inmates of the smaller houses were expected to transfer to the larger houses to be corrected.

The Act even praised the bigger houses suggesting the decision to dissolve all the monasteries had not been decided by 1536.

Only 67 houses escaped closure. Some because they were seen as still carrying out their religious duties effectively and another like the Gilbertines were linked to Cromwell!

Displaced Monks and Nuns were allowed to move to the larger houses or be released from their vows of poverty. They could take up employment as secular clergy or get a lay occupation. They were not released from their vows of chastity

After the Act became official Royal Commissioners were appointed to oversee the closures. This task was the responsibility of the Court of Augmentation. They could be looted by locals and land was rented out for the Crown. Sometime towards the end of 1537 the crown decided to make total dissolution it's aim. This was in the context of the Pilgrimage of Grace many heads of houses involved were declared traitors and executed. Many Abbots therefore gave up hope of resistance and surrendered freely.

Many houses survived up to 1538 despite the fact that many Abbots had given up hope of resistance. It became Cromwell's aim to suppress them all.

Cromwell]wrote to all heads of houses telling them suppression was not planned (he was worried they would already sell their land before the Crown got there!).

In 1538 Cromwell sent out royal commissioners to tell remaining houses to hand over their property freely to the King. Terror was an underlying feature of the visitations.

Most abbots and nuns saw the advantage of signing the prepared form of 'surrender'; especially because there was the offer of a generous pension if they joined the secular world.

Anyone who resisted was forced to resign by royal orders and replaced with men who Cromwell knew would be more amenable. The end came quickly for most when the commissioners appeared by surprise.

In 1539 an Act of Parliament was passed which legalised voluntary surrenders. Most of the larger houses had now been dissolved. A few still protested (Lenton and Woburn) and were forced to surrender: in 1539 the abbeys of Colchester and Reading and Glastonbury went the same way. The Abbot of Glastonbury was executed for supposedly stealing his abbey's treasures!

In Nov 1539 Legh and Layton were given instructions to suppress or 'alter' all remaining religious houses.

Resistance faded as the threat of terror remained. Cromwell and Henry continued to justify reform as they called it by arguing the profits would bring progress.

In 5 years more than 800 monasteries had been dissolved. Waltham Abbey was the last house to be dissolved in March 1540.

4) What were the effects of the Dissolution?

Cultural impact

A common view of the dissolution has focused on the destructive consequences for English culture.

The sale of monastic land and with it the grand religious houses led to vandalism of English architectural heritage. The sale of monastic libraries, religious art, stained glass windows and furnishings meant England lost cultural treasures never to be admired by the English people again.

However with closer study it is true that alongside the destruction there were monastic buildings that survived, some were bought by local communities and continued to serve as parish churches. Other Abbeys survived to become Cathedrals, such as Westminster. We must be careful not to forget that many of the Monasteries dissolved were in a state of disrepair anyway.

Impact on local population

A common view is that the dissolution led to increased levels of poverty because of the end of monastic charity. Yet according to the Valor Ecclesiasticus the average proportion of the a monastic houses income spent on the poor was jus over 2 per cent. Indeed there is evidence that laymen (non-clergy) continued to give to charities and fund hospitals.

A rising population is more likely a cause of population, pressure on the land and rapid inflation were more likely causes of poverty than the loss of monastic charity.

A common view is that dissolution led to a new ruthless breed of landlords who enclosed land for sheep rearing and charged much higher rents.

But there is little evidence for this and many monks were involved in the enclosure process anyway. Rents were always going to rise in a period of inflation.

Some historians argue that Dissolution helped to widen the amount of landowners and give birth to a new landowning class which links to England's development as a Constitutional Monarchy.

But others argue this interpretation is wrong and argue that there was no revolutionary change in the size of England's landowning class.

Impact on the crown

As a consequence of the dissolution the crown benefited almost solely financially. The Supremacy and the Break with Rome were already established by the time that the dissolution was under way.

There was little in the way of promised educational and spiritual reform that Henry and Cromwell had insisted would happen and had attracted learned men to the idea of Dissolution: 6 new Dioceses were established on remains of Monastic buildings/ New cathedral schools were established/ Trinity College Cambridge was founded.

Cromwell kept the land for the crown and used the rents to maintain a regular income for Henry. It was only after Cromwell's execution in 1540 that the lands were sold off to finance Henry's wars in France.

Henry gained nothing of importance from those wars and so the dissolution gained little for the crown long term. Some historians argue that there would not have been such a threat to the English crown in the C17 if Henry had not squandered finances gained from Dissolution in his reign.

5) How serious a threat to the crown was posed by the Pilgrimage of Grace?

What Happened?

The Pilgrimage of Grace refers to those events that took place in the north of England from October to December 1536. It does not include the Lincolnshire rising of early 1536 or the Cumberland rising of early 1537.

It is often seen as a direct reaction to the proposed dissolution of the smaller monasteries but its motivations were not solely religious, they had socio-economic motivations too. It is no surprise that the rebellion took place in the North; the most conservative area in religious outlook. The sight of Monks and Nuns being turned out of their monasteries and monastic treasures being plundered fuelled rumours that Parish churches would be targeted too and their gold plate taken.

The backdrop: Lincolnshire 1536

Trouble first started in Lincolnshire at Louth. Tensions had been raised by the government commissions happening in the county. They were working on dissolving the monasteries, collecting the subsidy, inspecting the quality of the clergy and enforcing new religious laws. But wild rumours ran rife that they were after gold plates, jewels and extra taxes. On top of that there had been bad harvests in 1535 and 6. A local priest delivered a fiery sermon highlighting the dangers to the community from the Crown. Parish Property and rights were seen to be under threat and local people began to demand Cromwell's dismissal. They were also worried about the rumour of the government banning consumption of white bread, pig and capons without a license! The rebels, led by a local shoemaker called Nicholas Melton, drew up a list of Grievances. No doubt they were angry at the level of government interference in local affairs and the dissolution of the Monasteries, but they also complained about high taxes and hatred of the Statute of Uses. Thus no one cause motivated the rebellion but its timing was sparked by the dissolution.

The rebellion did not last long. At Louth on 1st October 1536 the rebels led by Melton marched to Horncastle and anger and violence erupted. The Bishop of Lincoln was murdered in a frenzy. The leadership was then taken over by gentry, priests and even armed monks. 10,000 people were involved and they drew up their grievances. But collaboration between the Gentry and the Commons soon evaporated as Suffolk's Army drew near. The gentry ran for cover and sought for forgiveness and the commons collapsed in confusion. It ended on 11th October. Henry was clearly in no mood to negotiate.

The Pilgrimage of Grace:

But news of the rising had already spread north and from October to December a more serious revolt took place in Yorkshire. It was led by a Yorkshire Lawyer called Thomas Aske. He dispatched letters across the county calling on men to maintain the Holy Church. It was he who declared the rebellion to be a Pilgrimage and he who chose the banner of the Five Wounds of Christ as its standard. Under Aske's leadership 30,000 rebels marched on York. They swore a religious oath which contradicted the Royal Supremacy and they sang ballads in favour of the Monasteries.

The rebels made their headquarters in York and drew up Manifestos (Articles) that called for:

- The removal of evil counsellors from Henry's government
- The restoration of the Old Faith
- The protection of the Monasteries

Their demands were similar to the Lincolnshire rebellion although perhaps they were more politically aware as Aske's followers had called for a free parliament in the North to discuss religious and political issues.

On 21st October they moved down to Pontefract where Lord Darcy, a northern nobleman who owned lots of land was against the Supremacy, surrendered Pontefract Castle, the most important fortress in the North. The rebels certainly looked far stronger than the Lincolnshire rebellion in terms of their numbers; 30,000 men versus 8,000 from the Duke of Norfolk's army! Aske was also very disciplined; he ensured all goods were paid for and no murders were committed.

For a while it looked like the government had been caught off guard and the rebellion was a serious threat. The rebels were organised and many had previous experience of fighting the Scots. If they had wanted to engage in a battle with Royal forces they probably would have won!

Why did it fail?

Essentially the rebellion failed because its leaders wanted to negotiate and they subsequently put their faith in Henry's word. Aske had wanted a show of force to bring Henry to the negotiating table and make the King listen to his demands. In this aim they were to be successful.

But Henry was no fool! Knowing he was outnumbered he instructed Norfolk to play for time and to agree to demands made by rebels. Aske believed Norfolk when he said he would grant a general pardon, a prolonged truce and the promise of a Parliament held by free election in York to discuss the issues raised by the rebels. Aske agreed, but argued that the Monasteries could not be dissolved before Parliament met. The agreement was reached on 6th December and the commons (rebels) reluctantly agreed to disperse on 8th Dec convinced their demands had been met. The government had also agreed not to collect the 1534 subsidy and assured the rebels Parish churches were not under threat.

So it looked like a total victory for the rebels. Central aspects of Royal policy had been challenged and there were real signs religious reform might be reversed. But the sheer size of the revolt mean Henry could not back down indefinitely. He had only meant the concessions to be temporary.

Further revolts in the Wetsmorland and Cumberland in 1537 led by Francis Bigod gave Henry the excuse he needed to carry out reprisals and renegade on earlier promises. Martial law was declared at Carlisle and Gentry and nobility were rounded up an executed. 74 rebels were hanged on the spot. Ringleaders were taken to London and arrested. Ringleaders executed in 1537 included Robert Aske, Thomas Percy, Lord Darcy and Lord Hussey.

What caused the Pilgrimage of Grace?

<p>The Dissolution of the Monasteries</p> <p>Aske claimed this was the greatest cause. The rebels did demand a restoration of the monasteries. The monasteries had previously played an important secular and spiritual life in the North of England.; they provided food and shelter for the poor,they were safe houses for goods, and they were tenancies for farmers. Their closure cast a spiritual, social and economic shadow over the North.</p>
<p>The Defence of the Faith</p> <p>The images, oaths, songs and propaganda of the Pilgrims gave the rebellion a religious aura which acted as a motivation and justification to maintain it. The rebels demanded a rooting out of heresy. They called for an end to the draining of church wealth, the renunciation of Henry’s Royal Supremacy and the rehabilitation of the Catholic Princess Mary.</p>
<p>Food Shortages and Agrarian Issues</p> <p>There had already been poor harvests in 1535 and 1536. Many other agricultural issues seem to have motivated the rebels like Enclosure and rack renting (raising of rents). In most areas these issues were put on the back boiler when the commons and gentry joined together.</p>
<p>Taxation</p> <p>Opposition to the King’s demands for taxes was a consistent theme in the rebel’s articles. They particularly hated Cromwell taxing them in peace time which as introduced in the Tudor Subsidy Act of 1534. They also hated the ‘Statute of Uses’ which was a tax on aristocratic landed inheritances</p>
<p>Opposition to Cromwell’s Policies</p> <p>The North saw itself as under attack from a greedy Cromwell and the crown. Cromwell was viewed as the ‘evil genius’ behind the whole thing. The Treason Act, Royal Supremacy and heresy were all seen as clear examples of Cromwell’s work. In particular the noble and gentry supporters of the rebellion used this cause.</p>

How important were the local nobility and gentry in leading and spreading the revolt?

M.E James and R Smith argue it was the local nobility and gentry which spread the revolts. They argue central areas of West Riding only rebelled as a consequence of the support of Lord Darcy and Percy (the brother of the noble Earl of Northumberland who was a childless earl being pressured to give his lands to the crown) The Percies provided 5,000 men for the cause and Lord Darcy surrendered his castle to the Rebels in Pontefract. On the other hand the areas like Hallamshire remained loyal to the Crown perhaps because the Earl of Shrewsbury did. In Lancashire the Earl of Derby also stayed loyal to the crown.

Elton has suggested it was a Courtly plot orchestrated by the Conservative faction in court who were resentful at the power of Cromwell and Anne Boleyn. He argued figures like Lord Darcy, Lord Hussey (an elderly man with dwindling authority in the North who had been linked to the Aragon faction in court), Constable and Stapleton (A lawyer) planned an armed rebellion. But it is doubted whether this courtly faction really had that much influence over events.

Jon Guy offers an alternative: he argues that noble and gentry supporters of Princess Mary joined forces with Catholic Lawyers from the Inns of Court in revolt against Cromwell's regime. He argues noble conspiracy did have a say in the lead up to events of 1536 but Darcy and Hussey were actually taken by surprise when the revolt started in Lincolnshire. Thus he would say it was the ordinary people who had lit the fuse. Only popular participation and commitment to the cause can explain the speed at which the revolt spread.

How much of a threat was it?

Recent work by Michael Bush has argued that the Pilgrimage was a threat. He argues that the size of their armies combined with the fact that Norfolk did agree to their demands initially means we need to see their achievement as significant, even if few of their demands were ultimately carried out. The armies were 30,000 strong in Doncaster, 15,000 in Lancashire and 15,000 at Skipton Castle.

He also argues the rebels were well organised and showed signs of advance planning in order to mobilise such a force so quickly and the Gentry were important in getting the commons to declare arms. He argues the Hierarchy and Order were central features of C16 life; therefore either the commons were responding to orders from their social superiors or they actively persuaded the lesser nobility to lead the protest.

We must remember the aim of the rebels was not to challenge the crown on the Battlefield but to pressurise the government into changing it's policy and personnel.

Key People:

Benedictines	A religious order following the rule of St Benedict of Nursia. The order has a long tradition of promoting learning.
Carthusians	Monastic order founded in 1084 by Bruno of Cologne in France. The monks practice strict abstinence and live alone away from people.
Cistercians	A religious order formed by St Robert of Molesme in France, 1098 they follow strict rules of solitude, poverty and simplicity.
Secular Clergy	Churchmen who worked outside of monasteries, e.g. priests
Thomas Legh and Richard Layton	Leading Royal commissioners who carried out visitations of monastic property in 1535. Cromwell issued them with a list of questions to ask the abbots and monks and it is likely that they were given instructions by their master to detail any moral shortcomings which they came across in their visits. They returned with a detailed comperta highlighting the sinful excesses of monks and nuns.
Robert Aske	Leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, Aske visited London to discuss the rebel grievances with Henry. Aske happily accepted that the King would listen to the rebels, but by May 1537 Aske was imprisoned in London. He was executed for treason.
Thomas, Lord Darcy	1467-1537, northern nobleman with large landholdings, 1532 he was questioned about the Supremacy, 1534 he committed treason by playing an important role in the Pilgrimage of Grace, he surrendered Pontefract Castle to the rebels.

Key Words:

Valor Ecclesiasticus	1535, this was the result of Cromwell's church (ecclesiastical) census and visitation of these monasteries. It gave the Crown a financial assessment of the wealth and condition of the Church.
Tithes	One tenth of the produce of land and livestock, a tax from the church.
Abuses and decay	Many monasteries were accused of abusing their positions either by being greedy, corrupt or fornicating.
Secular Clergy	Churchmen who worked outside of monasteries, e.g. priests.

Court of Augmentations	Bureaucratic office set up by Cromwell to deal with the transfer of Church lands to the Crown. Administered by Sir Richard Rich.
Pilgrimage of Grace	Some northern earls who did not recognise Henry VIII as head of the Church decided to rebel against him they got an army together in the north however they were put down swiftly by Cromwell's men.
Constitution monarchy	A constitutional monarchy, or limited monarchy, is a form of constitutional government, wherein either an elected or an hereditary monarch is the head of state, unlike in an absolute monarchy, wherein the King or the queen is the sole source of political power. Most constitutional monarchies are parliamentary; the monarch is head of government.

Unit 7: How Protestant was England by 1540?

1) Was there a move towards Protestantism by 1539?

Decide what the evidence below argues:

<p>By 1534 the English Church was fundamentally different to that in other Western European Kingdoms. The break with Rome and the Royal Supremacy had severed English connections with the Papacy and removed Roman influence from English shores.</p>	<p>The changes enacted by Parliament did little to alter popular worship on the ground, which remained Catholic, nor did it encourage an outpouring of anti-clericalism. Essentially the populace at a grassroots level were largely satisfied with Catholicism and Henry was largely conservative in his beliefs.</p>
<p>The break with Rome had served to encourage more radical reformers abroad, and made some believe that Henry was going to take England towards Lutheranism. But in reality Henry had not such intentions; the break had been a political act created by the King and Parliament.</p>	<p>There was little popular support for Reformist ideas as there was in Germany. A.G Dickens has argued there were pockets of Evangelicalism in the South East but they were few in number.</p>
<p>It is important not to forget the significance of Royal Patronage at court: Ultimately the key men in power through the 1530's were Evangelicals. On the spiritual side Thomas Cranmer had risen from relative obscurity to the highest political position in England. On the Temporal side Thomas Cromwell had masterminded the Royal Supremacy. Other men of a reformist nature who had come to light because of the break with Rome were Nicholas Shaxton, Hugh Latimer, Robert Barnes and William Jerome. They had all been given special licenses to preach by Cromwell. Anne Boleyn was also central in providing patronage to reformers; the historian Eric Ives has emphasised her role in protecting and promoting these reformers in court.</p>	<p>But also in court there were strong conservative factions like Bishop Gardiner and Thomas Howard who saw the Royal Supremacy and Doctrinal Reform as the same thing. Evangelicals could only push the boundaries as far as Henry would let them; ultimately he was master in his own Kingdom and both reformers and conservatives would pay with their lives if they overstepped the mark.</p>
<p>A National English Church had been created and much in the way of Papal Authority had been destroyed and financial payments redirected to the Crown, nothing new had been enacted in the way of reform.</p>	<p>The Act of Ten Articles in 1536 essentially defined the doctrinal position of the new national church. It was clear Cromwell was behind their completion. They left out the central Catholic beliefs of confirmation, ordination, marriage and extreme unction. This was certainly a Protestant sign. They also outlined the central Lutheran idea of Justification by Faith alone (Sola Scripture) and they did not mention Transubstantiation. Although they were still only a moderate move towards evangelicalism as they still affirmed the 'real presence' of Christ in the Mass and they did not condemn the mass. The Ten Articles was ambiguous and unclear. They indicated the need for compromise. Cromwell had to hide his reformist radical ideas in watered down words. But Cromwell followed them with a set of injunctions which limited holy days and saints days and took a stance against images in churches and Pilgrimages.</p>
<p>The Bishops Book 1537 This was put forward by Cromwell on the back of the Supremacy and marked a triumph for evangelicalism like the Ten Articles. It included the 4 sacraments that the Ten Articles had not but said they were of lesser importance as they were not in the scriptures. It said the function of the Priest was to preach the word, not the offering of Christ. Mass was only mentioned twice in the book. But</p>	<p>Cromwell's English Bible Behind the scenes Cromwell managed to promote the use of the vernacular bible in English. He first official translation was granted royal permission in 1537. Henry saw it as a propaganda tool which would increase the power of his Kingship. Cromwell saw it as a tool to spread evangelicalism and put words of God in hands of common man. Cromwell used £400 of his own money to get it</p>

<p>it did recognise transubstantiation and justification through good works on earth. It renumbered the 10 commandments to highlight mistaken practice of worshipping graves. But it was clear Henry was not happy with the draft. Later editions in the King's Book in 1543 show amendments had been made to be more Catholic in doctrine.</p>	<p>printed. 3000 were printed in 1539. Cromwell sent out injunctions that all churches should have a copy. This was a political and religious triumph for Cromwell.</p>
<p>Anne Boleyn's Death 1536 Anne's death struck a blow to the spread of Evangelicalism as it was known she was a Lutheran supporter. She had been a central figure in the Henrican reformation; because she supported reformist ideas. She supported the idea of faith in accordance with the scriptures and justification by faith which was encouraged from her time in France. She helped to promote key people like Cranmer when she was Queen. All 10 bishops appointed during her reign were reformists. She provided patronage to radicals like Latymer/ Shaxton and Skip and introduced Henry to writings of Tyndale and Simon Fish. The fact Henry accepted the English bible was largely down to his love for her. But her future as determined by her failure to give birth to a Son. Henry thought he was cursed. Catherine died in 1536 and Anne's enemies at court helped to build the case against her (including her Uncle Thomas Howard, a conservative who also wanted to undermine Cromwell). They set up Jane Seymour for Henry and he was smitten. She was accused of multiple adultery and executed with Henry Norris (Groom of the Stool), her brother (Rochford) and three other men.</p>	<p>Cromwell's death 1540 Cromwell had disappointed Conservative enemies of Anne in 1536 as they had hoped they could bring his downfall too – but his political skill was too great – he was in control of the events leading to her execution and aligned himself with the anti-Boleyn faction before her death. After her death he went against them accusing them of wanting to restore Princess Mary to the Succession. Henry made him Lord Cromwell of Wimbledon and the future of the Reformist movement looked secure. But Cromwell had many enemies who took their chance when the international situation was favourable: France and the HRE were persecuting Protestants fiercely and Henry felt isolated in Europe, worried about a Catholic Crusade against England. Henry made the Act of 6 Articles (a show of Doctrinal conservatism) and had the radical John Lambert executed for heresy. Cromwell held on to his life first by arranging the marriage alliance with Anne of Cleves which would bring an alliance with German Princes but Henry hated Anne when he met her and this marked a turning point for Cromwell. Franco-Spanish relations broke down therefore Henry no longer needed a union with German princes as a defence. Conservatives at court led by Gardiner, Howard, Tunstall presented information to the King which accused Cromwell of protecting Protestants at Calais and unwilling to enforce the 6 articles. Henry had meanwhile fallen in love with Catherine Howard and Cromwell granted the necessary evidence for the unconsummated Cleves marriage to be annulled – he had given Norfolk a strong position. He was arrested in June 1540 and executed in July. His fall marked the end of immediate reformist hopes at court.</p>
<p>The Act of Six Articles 1539 Henry was directly behind this formulary of faith. It was clearly conservative: It confirmed transubstantiation and private masses. It banned the taking of communion in both kinds by the Laity. It upheld vows of Chastity – worried Cranmer as he had an open secret marriage! It was a harsh penal act – nicknamed 'Whip with 6 strings'. Failure to comply could lead to execution. It was a clear statement of Catholic worship. Latimer and Shaxton resigned their Sees the day after the Act was passed.</p>	<p>The Role of Cranmer Cranmer was a radical given the post of ABC in 1532. Henry had hoped to pressure the Pope by appointing him to show he was willing to support and evangelical and wanted Cranmer to help him get an annulment. Cranmer was the ideological think tank of the Great Matter. He drew up Collectanea Satis Copiosa – this justified Henry's imperial Kingship in 1534. He helped draft the 10 Articles and Bishops Book. He supported Cromwell's bible in English. But he was always in the background – he was a scholar, not a politician. He survived because of this - he curbed his Protestant instincts with the fall of Cromwell and maintained Henry's favour. He promoted reform at a slow pace acceptable to Henry after 1540 – he got the English Litany published in 1544. But his survival did not prevent a largely Conservative backlash in Henry's final years.</p>

Gains Made by Protestantism to 1540	The Survival of Catholicism by 1540
<p>The Royal Supremacy had removed the influence of the Papacy and a national Church of England had been created</p>	<p>Little was introduced in Churches in way of Protestant reform: Clergy remained corrupt in many ways – e.g absenteeism and pluralism</p>
<p>Dissolution of the Monasteries destroyed this aspect of Medieval spiritual life forever (although there was significant opposition in Pilgrimage of Grace). Lay men were quick to seize assets from dissolved Monasteries and there was support for a secular clergy rather than recruitment to Priesthood from 1540's</p>	<p>Catholicism remained POPULAR: especially in the North. The Parish churches in local communities remained largely untouched e.g in Yorkshire and Lancashire. In the South in Kent and Essex Protestantism made more progress but this was still patchy.</p>
<p>On a local level popular enthusiasm for Catholic practices in local churches e.g giving of money/ role of religious guilds, seemed to be less strong after the Supremacy than before</p>	<p>Protestants were not tolerated under Henry he remained a Catholic; Those who denied the sanctity of Mass and 7 Sacraments were accused of being heretics and could be burned at the Stake. John Frith was burned in 1533. Henry would not accept a Heterodox religious opinion.</p> <p>The English bible may have been introduced but the Reformation was far from secure</p>
<p>Traditional Catholic Rites like Saints Days, Pilgrimages, relic veneration were reduced significantly by Cromwell's injunctions in the 1530's. Even if these actions did not have immediate effect they must have eroded traditional loyalties to the church in the long-run. Practice of saying prayers for the dead went into irreversible decline 1533-47.</p>	<p>In 1543 the KING's BOOK was published which was an amendment of the Bishop's book. All traces of Lutheranism were removed and Catholic Doctrine was outlined. In the same year an Act for the Advancement of True Religion was passed which limited the reading of the Bible to clerics, noblemen, merchants and gentlewomen – only upper class people were therefore allowed to preach the word of God and this was a blow to one of Cromwell's central achievements.</p>