

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The popular reformation in county Durham*

Edward Rowland

### How to cite:

---

Rowland, Edward (1989) The popular reformation in county Durham. Masters thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6551/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE POPULAR REFORMATION IN COUNTY DURHAM, 1530-1570  
(M.A. Thesis, University of Durham, 1989)

by Edward Rowland

Much recent historical writing has doubted whether the Reformation can be described as a genuinely popular movement, pointing out that in many regions the 'official' reforms of 1529-1559 were simply imposed by the authorities from above, while Protestantism often made only slow and difficult progress at a popular level.

The following study, therefore, aims at placing the unique and fascinating County Palatine of Durham within this debate about the causes, development and pace of religious change in the sixteenth century. It also aims, secondly, to examine the profound changes in the religious environment and popular mentalities brought about by the Reformation in Durham - with its defacement of protective symbols and abrogation of liturgical ceremonies - as the reformers attempted to displace the sacraments and ritualised visual effects of the old order with a Protestant emphasis on preaching and the word.

In order to obtain some purchase on the event, the opening chapter briefly examines the nature of the church and religious life in the diocese on the eve of the Reformation, especially the bishopric's devotion to the cult of St. Cuthbert. The study proceeds by examining the region's response to the religious changes of the 1530s, and the county's unique and powerful contribution to the Pilgrimage of Grace with its peculiar blend of northern separatism, popular unrest, noble 'honour' and regional Catholicism. Subsequent chapters show in turn how Cuthbert Tunstal, Bishop of Durham (1530-1559) was able to maintain both conservative religious practices and the Catholic clergy during the latter part of Henry VIII's reign and that of Edward VI, by his political skill and careful use of patronage. The penultimate chapter then explores the way in which Protestantism was imposed in the 1560s from London as a predominantly academic movement, through the efforts of a Calvinistically-inspired cathedral chapter and reforming preachers like Bernard Gilpin. Finally, the study concludes by showing how the failure of the Northern Rising in 1569 enabled the crown to sweep away many of the forces that had preserved popular Catholicism during the previous decade - the Marian clergy, conservative local administration and bastard-feudal Catholicism of the Nevilles.

THE POPULAR REFORMATION IN COUNTY DURHAM, 1530-1570

by

Edward Rowland

Submitted for the Degree of M.A.

Department of History

University of Durham

July 1989

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



17 MAY 1990

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: Recent Historiography of the Popular Reformation: Causes Chronology, Methods and Sources	1
1. RELIGIOUS LIFE IN DURHAM ON THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION	28
2. FIRST REACTIONS AND THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE 1536	49
3. CONTINUITY AND CHANGE: The Enforcement of the Henrician Reformation (1536-47)	76
4. SPOLIATION AND RESTORATION: Edward and Mary (1547-58)	97
5. COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NEW ORDER (1558-69)	132
6. THE TURNING POINT: The Northern Rising of (1569)	167
EPILOGUE: The New Order Consolidated	193
Notes and References	212
Bibliography	272

DECLARATION None of the material contained in the thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS I would like to thank Dr. Fewster and Professor Michael Prestwich for their help and advice, both academic and administrative: Jo and Helen, who typed most of the work with willingness, often for very long hours: my mother, for her encouragement and help with almost every practical problem: Jess, Camilla and Ollie, who made the year in Durham such a memorable one: my stepfather, John Wynne-Jones, for letting me use his office, word-processors and photo-copiers, and above all Dr. Chris Brooks, my supervisor, for his kind reading of the text, helpful comments and patience in waiting for instalments. Naturally I remain completely responsible for what appears below.

E.R.

London, July 1989

INTRODUCTION: Recent Historiography of the Popular  
Reformation: Causes, Chronology, Methods and Sources

---

Historians in the past have sometimes been unable to shrug off a number of prejudices in their treatment of the religious changes of the sixteenth century and their causation. Partly, as John Bossy has reminded us, these have naturally centred on the very use of the word 'Reformation', which by definition carries the implication that a bad form of Christianity was being replaced by a good one. A more helpful approach, if the term is to be used at all, is to recognise that the word 'Reformation' is a colligatory concept, relating several lesser changes (the break from the Roman obedience, the assertion of secular control over the Church and the Protestantisation of the clergy and laity) to an overall movement (1). Similarly a legacy of Protestant and Whiggish teleological thinking has led to the difficulty of many in accepting that important events have lacked deep-seated causes or have run fundamentally against the 'general will'. As a consequence, the general orthodoxy has been to regard the divorce of Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon and subsequent break with Rome as the occasion rather than the cause of the English Reformation, with Henry and the Tudor state unleashing a powerful rising groundswell of lay anticlerical, antipapal and Protestant forces (2). Recently however, scholars (notably Scarisbrick) have emphasised that the English Reformation came primarily from 'above', that is, from the monarch, his ministers and some leading ecclesiastics, rather than from any popular discontent and resentment towards the old religion (3). Indeed the evidence suggests that English men and women were still profoundly attached to the established Church on the eve of the Reformation. The Protestantisation of England, it may therefore be argued, in so far as it took place during Henry's reign, was really a consequence rather than a cause of the religious changes of the 1530s.

Scholars have adduced three sorts of arguments and

evidence to substantiate this view: first, they have examined religious life on the eve of the Reformation and the extent to which the laity were involved, or discontented with, the traditional life of the Church; second, they have analysed the way in which the religious changes were imposed from 'above' by statute, proclamation and royal commissions during the 1530s and the rather minimal part played by Protestantism in this process; and finally they have attempted to explain the way in which people responded to these religious changes and the degree to which Protestantism subsequently took root in the later years of Henry VIII's and Edward VI's reign. Particularly important in this respect, and difficult to explain, is the apparent disparity between a widespread religious commitment on the one hand and the paucity of resistance to far-reaching change on the other.

The revisionist thesis does not however attempt to suggest that 'all was well' with pre-Reformation Catholicism, and it seems as if many of the reformers' indictments were indeed justified. The episcopacy was accused, rightfully in many cases (notably Wolsey) of the serious abuses of pluralism, non-residence and corruption, and of paying little attention to the needs of their local churches. Despite the requirements for a regular and systematic exposition of the faith at lower levels, it is unlikely that the priests put much effort into their duty, or even that many of them were spiritually or intellectually equipped to do so. Although recent studies have shown that the clergy had plenty of aids to preaching and instruction at their disposal, it seems as if the average parochial sermon was hackneyed, derivative and full of crude allegorical anecdotes or exemplar (4). The reformers' central change however was that pre-Reformation Catholicism was pervaded by semi-Pelagian ideas on the efficacy of human works, so that the Church's rites were accepted with little

questioning, while there was for the most part a mechanistic or even quasi-magical understanding of their operation (as witnessed for example by the multiplication of masses). Images were superstitiously venerated, and their favour was often invoked for selfish or materialistic purposes, while there was a new idolatrous devotion to the saints. Even the mass, which remained the focus of spiritual life in most communities, was sometimes used in a negative or aggressive way against dead enemies(5). Moreover, it seems as if, beneath the official life and teaching of the institutional church, there may also have existed much popular religion that was pervaded by sub-Christian folklore and magic. Generally, however, this popular devotion was contained within the framework of the established church. Thus Keith Thomas has argued that when with the Reformation a form of religion was introduced which was less easily adapted to a superstitious interpretation, one apparent result was an increase in unofficial magic such as sorcery, witchcraft, divination and astrology, since magical practices were no longer condoned by the church or rather ritualised in its liturgy (6).

Much of late-medieval Catholicism may therefore have been mechanical and ill-informed. This view should not be over-emphasised however as historians such as C.S.L. Davies - drawing on the work of social anthropologists - have recently suggested,

"That religion was heavily symbolic, even materialistic or 'magical', does not imply that it was somehow unauthentic, still less that it was lacking in strength; indeed the opposite may well be the case, that the more unthinking and accepting a religious tradition, the stronger it is. Reason, after all, opens the way to uncertainty. Those who have castigated late medieval popular religion as being unchristian, even pagan in essence, are applying unattainably high standards to what was, and had to be, a mass religion, and underestimating the capacity for 'real' devotion among the inarticulate and ill-instructed (7).

Hence recent studies have indicated that the abuses listed above were not a cause of dissatisfaction or anxiety for the majority of people, who remained actively involved in the life of the old church. Phythian-Adams has shown that the liturgy of the Roman church and the cycle of the ecclesiastical year still provided the main focus for social and ceremonial activity within ordinary English communities (8). The parish church remained the focus of communal life, and as the largest building built or paid for in most cases by the layfolk themselves, it would have been an object of local pride as well as a symbol of the communities' integrity, continuity and wealth. Generally it would have provided the location for the most important events in peoples' lives, the rites of passage (baptism, marriage and death) even if they were indifferent to the church's teaching (9). Moreover, although the pre-Reformation church did not allow the laity an active part in public worship, particularly the mass, this does not necessarily mean that lay men and women felt excluded from the liturgical life of the church. At the end of the mass the congregation knelt to receive the priest's blessing, which was felt to convey to them its salutary protection, while the increase in votive masses during this period for all reasons, in times of sickness or harvest, meant that many masses were offered for the benefit of lay people and not just for a priestly caste set apart from the laity (10). Indeed, most clergy were probably locally born, and once appointed, remained in the parish until their death. Finally, as Imogen Luxton and others have shown, the church also played an important part in community life by encouraging processions, festivals, churchales, and other forms of popular culture which naturally stimulated neighbourly co-operation and local pride as well as releasing social tension (11).

Furthermore, historians such as Scarisbrick have recently adduced a significant body of evidence which helps to indicate the involvement of the laity with the traditional ways and life of the church (the

methodological problems of these techniques will be discussed later). Firstly, the wills written by English men and women in the first half of the sixteenth century show that up to the very moment when the old ecclesiastical institutions and practices were being swept away and into the 1540s, layfolk were pouring money and gifts in kind of cloth, crops, jewellery and so on into their parish churches. Importantly, Scarisbrick's study of 2500 wills shows that there was still an intense preoccupation with expiatory bequests, that is bequests which resulted in masses and prayers for the souls of the benefactors and his or her kin (12). About two testators out of three in the mid 1530s, for example, were still asking for prayers at their death. Although there was a gradual increase in the number of wills making no religious legacies and explicitly Protestant wills, particularly in London from the mid-1530s and everywhere by the next decade, the overwhelming majority of people in the 1530s and 1540s were still pouring bequests into the old religion. It is dangerous to draw too many conclusions about the testators' religious commitment from will preambles, since these were usually written by village scribes or parish priests (13), but it seems probable that a large proportion of people still held the religious views which the medieval church had taught them, and believed in the efficacy of the mass, prayers for the dead and other forms of expiation which bequests aimed to realise. Secondly, the popularity of the religious fraternities in pre-Reformation England confirms the involvement of the laity with the old ecclesiastical order. A fraternity or guild at the simplest level consisted of an association of layfolk who undertook, under the patronage of a particular saint, the Virgin Mary or Corpus Christi, to provide every member of the brotherhood with a good funeral together with regular prayers and mass saying thereafter. The theology to which the religious guilds was inseparably connected, the doctrine of purgatory and the veneration of saints, was therefore the very antithesis of

Protestantism. Moreover, apart from being lay controlled, the fraternities existed in vast numbers. There were for example 120 in Lincolnshire, although only 12 in County Durham (together with its 53 chantries) (14). Thirdly, the levels of recruitment to the secular clergy seems to have remained high in pre-Reformation decades, suggesting that laymen were not contemptuous of the priesthood. The registers of Lincoln, a diocese which covered the bulk of midland England, indicate that ordinations reached their highest levels in the 1510s after the decline in the fifteenth century, with recruitment falling back only slightly in the 1520s and remaining vigorous (15). Finally, all these types of evidence have been explored at a regional level by Tanner, who has shown that the older and more institutional aspects of the church in pre-Reformation Norwich (the religious orders and parochial organisation) were flourishing alongside the new religious movements that were largely devoted to the laity (the craft guilds and confraternities) (16).

The evidence therefore suggests that the majority of English people were far from being disenchanted with the established church on the eve of the religious changes of the 1530s. This is not to argue that late medieval Catholicism was blossoming. It does help to explain why, although there were a few Protestants in England by 1529, the spread of Protestantism was for the most part a gradual and limited process. In order to argue, however, contrary to this view, for the significance of the popular and Protestant element in the Henrician changes, Dickens searched in the early sixteenth century for the elements of reform and the activities of the minority pressure groups that contributed in his opinion to the Reformation's eventual success as a popular movement: the devotional tradition in England he argued had tended to deflect interest away from the saintly cults and ecclesiastical institutions in favour of an interior and personal religion; more importantly, the Lollard movement, which stemmed from the

anti-sacerdotal and anti-sacramental writings of John Wycliffe in the late fourteenth century, provided 'a springboard of virtual dissent from which the Protestant Reformation could overleap the walls of orthodoxy' (17), particularly after the revival of the printing and distribution of Lollard works in the 1520s. Although it is difficult to assess precisely the influence of such movements on the general intellectual climate in the early sixteenth century, it is clear that they scarcely threatened the old order, containing little social or political power and influence. Certainly the Christian Brethren, the most organised wing of the Lollard movement, raised cash, produced books and provided a determined leadership, alarming the authorities of the diocese of London in the later 1520s. Significantly, the Brethren also provided patronage for William Tyndale while he was translating the New Testament in the early 1520s. On the whole however Lollardry remained a disparate, peripheral and undangerous movement.

Much the same can be said about Lutheran circles in England, despite the inherent attractions of Luther and Zwingli's teachings with their emphasis on a personal religion and the claims of the individual Christian conscience, their stress on the gospel and justification by faith alone. There is evidence for a nucleus of support developing at Oxford and Cambridge in the 1520s in the meagre traditions recorded by John Foxe. A group of Cambridge scholars seem to have gathered at the White Horse to discuss the new doctrines, while several notable English Protestants (including Tyndale, Coverdale, Frith, Cranmer and Latimer) probably first encountered Lutheran doctrines in Cambridge at this time. The first burning of Lutheran books in the university, for instance, is known to have taken place as early as 1520 (18). English merchants and foreign traders also seem to have played an important role in spreading the new religion to England, particularly in London (19). As D.M. Palliser has pointed out, the general pattern of early Protestantism can be explained largely in terms of accessibility to

continental influences (20). The areas most receptive to the new ideas in the 1520s and 1530s were East Anglia, Kent, London and Cambridge, and outside the south-east those districts which were centred on Hull and Bristol and therefore in close touch with Europe and the capital. Early in 1526, for instance, several Hanse merchants at Stilyard were prosecuted for importing Lutheran books, and in the same year copies of Tyndale's New Testament began reaching England from Worms. It is difficult however to assess the impact of the vernacular bible, as there is no way of knowing how many read or were influenced by it. It is known that radicals like Garrett were prosecuted in 1528 for selling Tyndale's Bible (21). Generally though the powerful statute 'De Heretico Comburendo', punishing persistent heresy by burning, would have provided a powerful disincentive except to the most zealous and committed. The early Lutherans therefore only seem to have had a small influence in England until royal policy shifted in a more Protestant direction in 1535-6 (22).

Like Protestantism, Haigh has recently argued, anticlericalism was also in some ways as much a consequence as a cause of the Reformation (23). There seems to have been little sign, as we have seen, of a lay disenchantment with the old ecclesiastical order, while recruitment to the priesthood remained plentiful in the pre-Reformation decades. It is true that tithes could get labourers into a collective fury early in the sixteenth century, but tithe litigation was almost always concerned with the interpretation of local custom rather than the principle of tithing. Again, although many individual clergy such as the Bishop of Norwich were extremely unpopular, Haigh suggests that very few opposed the idea of a priesthood as such. On the whole England did not witness anything like the bitter and violent popular anticlericalism to be found on the continent in the pre-Reformation period, particularly in Germany. The hysteria surrounded the celebrated case of Richard Hunne, a London merchant found hanged in the Bishop of London's

prison while awaiting trial for heresy in 1511, was the only serious case of its kind. Certainly the first session of the Reformation Parliament in 1529 unleashed such anticlerical passion that in John Fisher's famous words the Commons had but one cry 'down with the Church'. It is difficult, however, to know how far this was spontaneous or reflected public opinion, and it seems as if the three 'anticlerical' statutes of 1529 (the Mortuaries Act, Pluralities Act and Probate Act) were largely carried through Parliament by specific legal and mercantile interest groups (24). Finally, as Dickens suggests, the secularist, erastian and anticlerical views of such as Marsiglio, William of Ockham and Wycliffe had remained largely limited, tending to arise only through practical abuses, quarrels, and conflicts of interests. Hence their 'theory remained in the storehouse until the political situation at the Reformation demanded their production and use as propaganda' (25). Marsiglio's heyday, for instance, came only when the propagandists supporting Henry saw in the 'Defensor Pacis' a useful body of arguments.

In some ways this was the same with Henry's attitude towards Protestantism. When Campeggio came to England in 1528 he found Lutheran books freely circulating at court and heard talk of negotiations between the King and Lutheran German Princes. Similarly, in October 1529 Henry apparently told the Imperial Ambassador Chapuys that if Luther had limited himself to inveighing against the vices, abuses and errors of the clergy, instead of attacking the sacraments and the church's institutions, everybody would have supported him (26). It seems highly probable however that the King was largely interested in putting pressure on Rome and never seriously intended marching alongside the Lutherans (27). Throughout the Reformation Henry was quick to use all the weapons at his disposal: of firm Catholic convictions, Henry was nevertheless desperate to achieve the divorce, and it seems as Scarisbrick has argued that the idea of gaining a secular jurisdiction over the church was coming increasingly into

his mind by the late 1520s (28). Although initially cautious - concerned about potential opposition and still hoping to achieve a favourable papal ruling - Henry therefore proceeded after 1532 with a political, legal and expropriatory Reformation to achieve his ends, with little concern for theological agreement or change.

But although the existence of Lollardry, anti-clericalism and continental Protestant influence cannot therefore be considered as causes of the English Reformation, it should be admitted also that such factors were probably important contributory causes to its eventual success as a popular movement in some areas (such as Kent) (29). For this reason, as O'Day has pointed out in a recent critique, Scarisbrick has essentially addressed a problem different to that which exercises the minds of the historians with whom he disagrees: while the latter search for the reasons for eventual Protestant success, Scarisbrick minimises the role played by popular discontent in the 'official' Reformation and looks for the religious views of average English men and women (30). Furthermore, although the majority of people were clearly attached to the established church, it is probable also that a reasonable proportion of those with power and influence (bureaucrats, gentry and intellectuals) favoured the Henrician changes. Significantly, it is impossible to be precise about the exact balance of forces since, for reasons that will be discussed later, neither school of historians are able to quantify their assertions.

The drive and organisation for the religious changes of the 1530s came therefore from above. The decision to proceed by parliamentary statute was inevitable, since nowhere else could Henry find sufficient authority for such a hazardous move against the well-established ecclesiastical authority (31). Moreover, it was in Henry's interests to assert that the changes were due to the will of the realm, and not merely a personal whim.

The fourteenth-century statutes of provisors and praemunire, such as Richard III's statute against praemunire of 1393, also provided a clear precedent for Parliamentary action. The reason for the success of these 'political' measures by 1534 was that the Crown and Cromwell carefully picked off their targets one by one and piecemeal. The demand in February 1531 that the clergy recognise the King as the 'protector and only supreme head of the English Church' followed logically from the charging of the whole clergy under praemunire the previous year, and indeed the renewed attempts in 1529-30 to place the divorce proceedings under an English jurisdiction. More importantly, as far as Henry was concerned, the 'Act in Restraint of Appeals' to Rome in March 1533 (which in turn followed on from the bill to prevent the payment of annates the previous year) enabled Cranmer to nullify Henry's marriage to Catherine. The final achievement of the 'Act of Supremacy' in 1534 was therefore the culmination of years of chipping away and manipulation, incorporating and extending what had been done before in terms of jurisdictional rights, but also crediting Henry as the 'supreme head of the Church of England' with the power to control the spiritual life of the church. Above all though, it is clear that these first successes of the English Reformation and gaining of the royal supremacy owed officially and in practice little to Protestantism.

It is true that the movement towards religious reform, implicit in the claim to control doctrinal affairs, subsequently made partial headway in Henry's reign between 1535-8. The domination of Archbishop Cranmer and Cromwell at court (the latter as vice-Gerent of ecclesiastical affairs after 1535) meant that they were able to use their position to encourage a gradual shift towards a definite Protestant policy. The position was a delicate one, however, given Henry's own theological orthodoxy. Although the traditional structure of belief might be partially undermined, it was clear that the Catholic doctrine of the mass, blasphemy

to Protestants, would remain the official doctrine of the English church as long as Henry lived. Expressing the new tone of the Henrician Reformation, alongside the Acts for the Dissolution of the Monasteries, were the Ten Articles of 1536, the royal injunctions of 1536 and 1538, and the official publication of Coverdale's 'Great Bible' in English the same year. The Bible, it may be argued, ensured that Protestantism was the religion of at least a substantial minority of Englishmen.

Henry was not prepared, however, to commit himself wholeheartedly to a 'Cromwellian' Lutheran - orientated policy, and to the dismay of continental and English Protestants, fell back into moderation after 1538. Partly this was because the Pilgrimage of Grace in the autumn of 1536 had shown the dangers of pressing on with a Protestant policy at home. More importantly, Henry feared an invasion after the Truce of Nice in 1538 between Charles V and Francis I, who declared themselves ready to co-operate in the defence of Catholicism. As a result, after the last of the larger monasteries was dissolved in 1540 there was a gap of seven years before the attack on the guilds and chantries finally began in 1547, and for that matter a fifteen-year delay between the assertion of royal supremacy and the repudiation of the mass under Edward VI (32). The discrepancy between the 'political' Reformation and doctrinal religious reform must therefore be emphasised, particularly when considering the popular reaction to these changes.

How then was the Reformation received by the English people? The claim that the motivation for the changes sprang from 'above' comes up of course against the fact that it was implemented with the consent of Parliament, the Reformation Parliament of 1529-30. (33). Henry was naturally keen that the Reformation appeared to reflect the 'popular will'. It is difficult, however, to establish the extent to which the Reformation statutes actually represented the views of the Parliamentary classes, or

whether (as More thought) they were passed only by intense government manipulation. There were some signs of opposition, both in the Queens Head group and in the opposition to the Act in Restraint of Appeals in 1533. Generally however the MPs were townsmen representing their boroughs, and were probably concerned more with the particular interests of the communities they represented (and their own interests) rather than national issues. There is moreover evidence of manipulation by the Crown at crucial moments: pressure was placed on members of both houses to stay away, Fisher and Throckmorton in 1534, and several bishops and peers during the monasteries bill in 1536; Henry maintained an active supervision of parliament through his ministers, and intervened personally in 1531, 1533, 1536 and 1539. In general, however the Commons passed the Reformation statutes largely because they had little to do with religion as practised in England and were couched in very conservative terms. As a consequence little bullying was necessary. Indeed it would be naive to argue that the Reformation statutes could have run directly against the views of the governing classes, just as it would be to suggest that the statutes represented the will of the nation. Despite Henry's caution, the papal connection was cut away in Parliament amidst general indifference.

This was not true in the country at large, however, and Elton has shown how the enforcement of reform by Cromwell and the government was a much harder task than previously imagined (34). From 1533 onwards Cromwell was forced to organise a two-tiered campaign: of propaganda to make the new ideas acceptable, and of police-work to enforce acceptance. Unrest and resentment of the changes seem to have reached their highest levels, moreover, once Henry's policy moved into its aggressive and 'Protestant' phase after 1536. Above all, it appears as if the Dissolution of the Monasteries and the Henrician attack on saint-worship and relics affected daily life far more deeply than the breach with Rome. The result it may be argued was the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, the largest

rebellion in English history and essentially a protest against change, a conservative rebellion. As C.S.L. Davies has shown, the revolt was in large measure stirred up and fused together by a sense of communal proprietorship and popular shock at the projected religious changes (35). If this view is correct, however, there might appear to be a difficulty in explaining how traditional religious practices were subsequently so easily abolished with a surprising lack of overt resistance. Sheer fear, and the defeat of the pilgrimage, were obviously important disincentives to renewed resistance: attempts to stir up further rebellion in 1541 and 1549 were failures. Equally important was the fact that the drift to doctrinal Protestantism was checked, and then reversed, with many traditional devotional practices (mass, the chantries) remaining in place until Edward VI's reign. Consequently many of the fears of 1536 were unjustified. It may also be, as C.S.L. Davies has argued, that the 'sense of lay proprietorship which lay at the heart of the commitment to traditional religion contained the seeds of a very different religious orientation' (36). Hostility to change and excessive clerical privilege could take the form of a support for poorer local vicars and traditional belief as it did in 1536. It could easily however become an outright opposition to the clerical estate as a whole. On a symbolic level the government's carefully staged campaign against superstitious images in 1538 would also have encouraged the scepticism of some to turn to mockery. In February, for instance, Boxley monastery's greatest treasure the 'Rood of Grace' was held up to public ridicule at St Pauls (37). Significantly the government in England was not prepared however to go as far as some Lutheran reformers in Germany, who syncretised various elements and images from pre-Reformation culture with their own theology to produce an 'image-culture' (for instance the notion of the 'incombustible Luther') which would combat the strength of Catholic forms (38). Nevertheless, the break with the past was equally

unsuccessful in this country. In general, scholars have recently emphasised the toughness and capacity for survival of traditional religious forms, even in unpropitious circumstances, with images, a veneration for shrines, vestments and a literalistic belief in the sacrament of the altar persisting into Elizabethan England, even in the more advanced Protestant areas (39).

Such at least, therefore, is the general consensus that has emerged among historians in their attempts to chart the origins of the English Reformation. Although it is reasonable to suppose that Lollardry, Protestantism and discontent with the medieval church had prepared the ground in some quarters for religious change, the upheavals of the 1530s were not the result of a long-term growing discontent which finally heaved over the old order. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that the majority of English people were very much attached to the established church on the eve of the Reformation. But although traditional religion was well-rooted, events were to show that it had developed little resistance to an organised and increasingly aggressive Tudor state, which with Parliamentary consent imposed the break with Rome during the 1530s in order to serve Henry's ends. Protestantism played little part in this political and legislative process, and indeed it was the peculiarity of the English Reformation that the movement towards religious reform made only limited headway during Henry's reign. The unique convergence of ideas, events and aspirations during the 1530s and 1540s - the influence of events on the Continent where the Reformation gathered full momentum, the effect of humanist criticism, the Bible, political uncertainties, the support of influential sections of the community for the reforms and the succession of Edward - all served however to bring about changes which no-one, least of all Henry, had envisaged.

#### THE CHRONOLOGY OF POPULAR RELIGIOUS CHANGE

The question of the origins of the English

Reformation clearly has a bearing in turn on the progress of the religious reforms at a popular level. Indeed recent interpretations of the English Reformation can, as Haigh has shown, be essentially categorised around these two interlinking matrices, the twin problems of the causes and the chronology of religious change (40). But if scholars are now largely agreed that the Reformation was largely imposed in the 1530s and later through official coercion from 'above', the secondary debate over the subsequent pace and acceptance of religious change has remained a matter of much dispute. Some historians have suggested that Protestantism made real and rapid progress in the 1530s and 1540s, becoming a powerful force by the death of Edward VI in 1553 (Elton and Dickens), while others have argued that the main task of Protestantising the laity had to be undertaken in the reign of Elizabeth (Haigh and Scarisbrick) (41).

Both 'schools' have received powerful support from studies in the localities. Two English counties in which Protestantism made substantial progress during the reigns of Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth were Kent and Gloucestershire, studied by Clark and Powell respectively, but each had been unusually influenced by Lollardy, each was the hinterland of an important port (and therefore had trading links with Protestant centres abroad) and each was supervised by a committed and active reformist bishop (42). Furthermore, Peter Clark has shown how Cromwell paid particular attention to Kent because of its strategic importance, and built up a reformist group among the county governing gentry and urban oligarchies by the skilful use of patronage. The latter in turn took over the administration of the church and the task of evangelising the county. Indeed, Clark's analysis of wills and the complexion of town governments shows that due to the combined pressure of Cromwell, Archbishop Cranmer and their reformist group, the Reformation from 'above' was so successful that it led to a Protestant breakthrough by the mid-1540s (43). But as Haigh has pointed out, even in these areas where the Reformation

did spread quickly (London, Essex, Kent, Bristol) it was 'not a walkover for the Protestants, it was a real contest': there was nothing inevitable about the 'final Protestant victory' (44). Furthermore, the twin influences of a port and episcopal pressure, so crucial for the early spread of Protestantism in Kent and Gloucestershire, were far from typical, and in other counties further away from London circumstances were much less favourable for a 'rapid Reformation'.

Indeed a growing number of local studies, such as those of Haigh, Manning, Keeling and Rowse on Lancashire, Sussex, the Borders and Cornwall respectively, have in fact suggested that the popular Reformation in those areas made only minimal progress before the reign of Elizabeth (45). There were a number of reasons for this. In the first place, the Reformation from 'above' depended for its effectiveness upon the co-operation of justices of the peace and diocesan administrators, both largely conservative groups who were unlikely to be effective proponents of reform. Furthermore, in order to avoid crippling county government, as Haigh has shown in Lancashire, these secular and ecclesiastical administrations could often be remodelled only slowly, so that local government sometimes proved to be a block to religious change well into the 1570s. Thus, although the Ecclesiastical Commission had been purged in 1568, it was not until 1579 that the clearly Protestant Bishop Chadderton arrived at Chester and then in 1587 that the commission of the peace was remodelled. Only when this had been done could Protestantism make any real impact, and radical preachers work unmolested in the countryside.

For the second major problem relating to the imposition of religious change was precisely the fact that it was something being brought as an academic movement to these outlying areas and not something arising out of a tradition of native dissent. There was no more than the merest trace of Lollardy and early Protestant heresy in these counties because of their isolation, and evangelisation was almost entirely in the

hands of graduate theologians, rather than the laity. As a consequence, the missionary efforts of these visiting preachers were bound to be a slow and localised uphill struggle, particularly since their proselytising activities received almost no support from the local beneficed clergy. As Haigh has written for Lancashire, 'the fairly intensive efforts at conversion made in the reign of Edward had reaped only a meagre harvest, and Protestantism had gained very little support by 1559. Though habits of regular church attendance might give the Elizabethan Church a period of grace in which Catholic opinion could be attacked and a reformed theology promulgated, success would only be achieved by a sustained campaign of propaganda and coercion' (46).

A third problem was that the inherited church fabric and administration did little to provide the Protestant authorities with the necessary machinery for religious change. Although the upheavals of the 1540s and 1550s were to shake accepted orthodoxy, their impact (particularly that of the Edwardian spoliation) was almost entirely destructive and negative, and they did little in the more remote regions to improve the church's resources. As Keeling has shown for the Border Counties, the large and poor parishes, ill-trained clergy, patchy provision of education and deficient ecclesiastical administration of the pre-Reformation northern province only gradually improved, remaining a constant problem for the Protestant diocesan administration in the 1560s and 1570s (46a).

Finally, perhaps the greatest stumbling-block to rapid religious change was the nature by definition of the appeal and presentation of evangelical Protestantism: the new religion was above all a religion of the word, both preached and printed, stressing salvation through God-given faith supported by a reading of the scriptures and attendance at sermons. Hence, as some studies have suggested, it is probable that Protestant ideas spread far quicker among the more literate merchants and artisans of the towns, where popular preaching and bible-

reading and corporate patronage of ministers became a regular feature (47), whereas the rural parishioners - whose needs had to an important extent been met by the symbolic and communal rituals of the late medieval church - found that the new ideas and official church had far less to offer them. Thus as late as 1590 a group of rural Protestant Ministers in Lancashire complained that 'it were hard for the preacher to find a competent congregation in any church to preach unto', while parishioners in Northamptonshire thought 'that it was a merry world before there was so much preaching' (48).

In general, however, it is important to stress a highly variegated and confused regional picture. Quite clearly the counties near to London tend rather to support the idea of an official and essentially popular Reformation, whereas a 'slow' Reformation tends to be supported by outlying provinces where government was less effective and where communications were poor. But further than this, Palliser has warned against a simple geographical determinism, suggesting that a diversity of opinion could mark the inhabitants of regions and towns, social classes and even occupational groups. Of 66 peers in 1580 for instance, 22 were Protestant, 20 recusants, and 20 were relatively indifferent (49). Margaret Spufford has also indicated the considerable difference of religious feeling between the populations of three villages, showing that people's loyalties could be swayed by individual preachers, local interests, the stance adopted by the local magnate and socio-economic conditions: at Willingham, where the fervent Launcelot Ridley was the incumbent, there was an enthusiastic Protestant congregation as early as the 1540s, whereas Dry Drayton remained resistant to the new religion until the 1590s, despite having the prominent Elizabethan evangelist Richard Greenham in the village for over twenty years (50).

Nevertheless, specific studies have largely supported a view of the Reformation as a struggle to ensure enforcement in the localities. Bowker's study of the huge

diocese of Lincoln, covering nine Midland counties (probably a more typical region than Kent or Lancashire) indicates that despite the favourable factors of a university, an area of strong Lollard influence and strong ecclesiastical administration, the clergy and laity showed little inclination towards Protestantism until the late 1540s and effective evangelisation probably only came in the reign of Elizabeth. Unfortunately her study ends in 1547, but the pattern of the early reformation is clear, 'it seems reasonably certain that when Longland died in May 1547 he left a diocese with priests and a laity as conservative as he was. The wills studied suggest that many still believed in the efficacy of intercession for the departed, and priests seem to have mistrusted Henry VIII's Injunctions and in some cases appear to have ignored them... (Longland's) careful control of preaching and his use of his patronage meant that if there were Protestants they were unlikely to get either pulpit or parish at his hands' (51).

In sum, it seems as if the institutional machinery of the church and its personnel were simply not geared to perpetrate a wholesale reformation before the middle of Elizabeth's reign. Although the new religion seems to have taken root in the universities and towns (especially the ports) during the latter years of Henry's reign and his son Edward, it was far from the case that England was converted to Protestantism by the reign of Mary. Indeed there are numerous indications that Catholicism (or at least an inarticulate conservatism) remained strong, particularly in the north and west. Only with the advent of Elizabeth and the Crown's continuous pursuit of an Anglican religious policy, so that the parishes were ostensibly staffed by Protestant clergy, preachers and schoolteachers, could formal Protestantism make a lasting but extremely imperfect popular impact.

## METHODS AND SOURCES

How then do historians measure the process of religious change? What sort of index and types of evidence can be used? Is it possible to penetrate beyond the outline sketched above and to provide empirical quantitative evidence that would settle the various disputes? Historians have, first of all, used the preambles of wills as evidence of ordinary people's religious beliefs. By studying the rate at which testators departed from the Catholic or traditionalist formula for a will preamble (which generally opened with a commendatory clause followed by a request for the Intercession of the Virgin and saints) and shifted to a Protestant or reformist formula (which bequeathed the soul to God above or invoked the merits of Christ) they have attempted to show the extent to which the doctrinal changes were accepted, and therefore the pace of religious change, in the areas under examination. There are however a number of difficulties in using wills in these ways, particularly as evidence of the precise religious beliefs of testators, above all because there is no practicable way of determining whether or not the wills were actually written by the testators themselves. Margaret Spufford has shown that village scribes and parish priests were commonly employed to write their client's wills (52). Hence, she suggests, the men or women lying on their deathbed must have been very much in the hands of the scribe writing their will, and extremely committed to ask for a formula that would risk the fury of their parish priest (and the authorities since the wills were also later proved in the consistory and archdeaconry Courts of the diocese). Although the testators would have been asked detailed questions about their temporal bequests, it is probable therefore that the words of the actual preamble which bequeathed the soul reflected the opinion of the scribe or formulary book the latter was using rather than the individuals concerned. This is suggested by her study of the series

of wills written by the various scribes in three villages - Orwell, Dry Drayton and Willingham. In all of the six wills written by Nicholas Johnson, for instance, a churchwarden at Orwell early in the seventeenth century, the clause bequeathing the soul is almost exactly identical 'I commend my soul into the hands of Almighty God that give it me .... when it shall please God to take me out of the present' (53).

This does not mean that wills never reveal the deep-felt religious convictions of the testator. Firstly, the sorts of specific personal bequests made by the testators after the preamble can provide important insights into their religious views (for instance whether they made expiatory bequests that resulted in masses and prayers for the dead or secular benefactions for education, hospitals or roads). As Scarisbrick and Zell have pointed out, these sections of people's wills are generally so full of contingency plans and therefore dependent on an intimate knowledge of the testator's family and resources, that they could not have been devised by the scribe or the parish priest. To that extent they probably provide the most important evidence that wills as a source contain (54). Secondly, as Spufford points out, strongly individual pieces of phraseology could sometimes be inserted even within the scribes preamble formula if a testator felt sufficiently strongly about his religious beliefs. Nevertheless, the important point is that will preambles cannot be used statistically (as they have sometimes been) as objective evidence of people's exact religious affiliations,

'The evidence is not statistical. It is wrong for the historian to assume that if he takes a cross-section of over 440 wills proved over a particular period, he is getting 440 different testators' religious opinions reflected, unless of course the wills also come from 440 different places. Even then the scribe might have a determining influence. One is still getting evidence... but it would take a much more stringent analysis to show how much evidence one is getting, and to eliminate more

than one of a series of wills written by the same scribe. On the other hand when a testator had strong religious convictions of his or her own, these may come through, expressed in a variant of the formula usually used by the scribe concerned. If any local historian wishes to study the religious opinions of the peasantry, he should look for these strongly worded individualistic clauses which occur in any run of wills for a parish, which alone record the voice of the dying man' (55).

Can wills then be used at all as an index of religious change? O'Day makes the point that large series of wills can still provide reasonably reliable evidence of the percentage of committed Protestants and Catholics, since although the scribe would influence the form of the wills preamble, it is probable that only a reformist would use the services of a Protestant and that traditionalists and Catholics would refuse to do so (56). In general, research suggests that non-traditional will formulae were increasing in number from the late 1530s and 1540s onwards, particularly in the south-east (57). Dickens study of the wills of gentry and substantial yeomen from Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire also suggests that a third were non-traditional by the 1540s (i.e. 33 out of 82 between 1541-44) (58). The picture in the far north and west is rather different however, and Haigh has shown that the new Protestant formula made little impact in Lancashire before the reign of Elizabeth (59). In Durham itself, a survey of the wills contained in the three volumes of the 'Wills and Inventories' published by the Surtees Society indicates that the commendatory clause and the invocation of the saints remained the rule up to the end of Henry VIII's reign, and continued to predominate in the reign of Edward VI even after 1549 (60). For instance, of 45 wills dated in Edward VI's reign from the three volumes, 36 invoke the aid of the Virgin and the Saints. With the reign of Elizabeth however, the change is at once noticeable. Now the general rule was to commend the soul to God only, in a formula that seems to have become fairly standard by the

mid 1560s (61). For the years 1565-70 there are still fewer examples of the invocation of the saints, but it is not until the 1570s that the formula becomes definitely exceptional: the three volumes of published Durham wills supply only three examples for the decade 1570-80.

What other sorts of material can be used to examine the process of religious change in Durham during the sixteenth century? Unfortunately, the manuscript records of the see and bishopric contain several gaps for this period, primarily it seems because of a serious destruction of records that took place in the seventeenth century. Interestingly, some of this damage may have taken place during the riots on Durham caused by the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536. Bishop Tunstal wrote in 1537 that 'the chauncery of Durham, where the records lay, was spoyled as wel of records as off all odyr stuff that was there', while a payment roll also contains the following entry: 'Paid the morn after St Luke's day (19th October) to Marmaduke Clargenet (5s) and other of his company, and Robert Lewyn (5s) for helping to save the records in the chauncery, in the time of spoyling of the same, 10s' (62). Nevertheless, the vital episcopal registers are complete for the sixteenth century, several important account rolls also exist for the immediate pre-Reformation period, and the receiver's and treasurer's books begin for the re-established chapter in 1541-2 and 1558-9 respectively (63).

A much more serious deficiency, insofar as tracing 'popular' change at a parochial level is concerned, is the lack of churchwarden accounts for the bishopric before the last two decades of the sixteenth century. This means that - although it is possible to reveal from the episcopal register how conservative clergy were gradually dismissed and replaced by Protestants - it is impossible to know with any accuracy how long it took for the church fabric and services provided to conform to the Royal Injunctions and Prayer Books of Edward and Elizabeth (64).

Nevertheless, there is still an ample array of material that can be used to portray the religious

environment in Durham and its subsequent alteration. The evidence of chantries, guilds, religious processions and offerings to saintly shrines all provide useful insights into traditional religious life and lay piety on the eve of the Reformation. In turn, the evidence of the licensing and ordination of preachers, ecclesiastical visitations and episcopal registers all serve to indicate the spread of the new religion (65). Particularly useful finally for indicating popular beliefs and superstitions, as Keith Thomas' work has shown, is the material contained in ecclesiastical depositions and witchcraft trials. But although extremely revealing, the fragmentary and possibly atypical nature of the evidence presents a number of difficulties. Historians have criticized Thomas' technique of presenting his evidence in the form of examples and counter-examples, suggesting that such material needs to be supplemented where possible by detailed case studies and a greater indication of the normality of the cases cited(66).

The reality of the matter, as O'Day has emphasised, is that the available documentation does not permit the historian to quantify, even in the dioceses and counties with the best evidence (67). Although most of the questions about the spread of the popular reformation really require some sort of quantification (how widely did Protestantism spread? to whom did the new religion appeal? how many people had any strong religious convictions?) the surviving rather scrappy evidence mostly enables the historian to identify various factors that hindered or stimulated the process of religious change and indicate their significance for the geographical area under study. Nevertheless, unless these methodological difficulties are confronted, historians will not even be able to provide reliable approximate answers to these questions.

## DURHAM

Finally, apart from the primary documentation how suitable is the county of Durham for such a study? It is well known that the region in general was slow to accept the religious changes, and this is largely assumed from the rebellion of 1569. But although B.N. Wilson has dealt thoroughly with the 'official' Reformation in Durham and the Northern Rising, while D. Marcombe and A. Hilton have studied the Elizabethan chapter and Catholic recusancy, the pace of popular religious change in preceding decades has not as yet been studied in detail by historians (68). Nor secondly, have the violent changes in the religious environment and popular mentalities brought about by the Reformation in Durham been closely considered, although it is clear, as Mervyn James has written in a more general context, that the 'Reformation with its defacement of powerfully protective and socially integrative religious symbols caused a painful lesion in popular consciousness and religious life' (69). There is for instance no study of the Durham region's involvement in the Pilgrimage of Grace, which, it will be argued below, was to a large degree stirred up and bonded together by a sense of regional identity and popular shock at the projected religious and administrative changes (70). James has however examined the wider social implications of the Reformation period in his book 'Family, lineage and Civil Society' in which he aims to analyse the evolution of the Durham region between 1500 - 1640 in terms of a development from a 'lineage society' to a 'civil society' (71). The former was bonded by kinship and the ties of the extended family, its social and political pattern determined by loyalties which centred on the great aristocratic household. In the latter, he suggests, the family had become more 'privatised', and loyalties centred more on the state, with local society, becoming increasingly bonded by law, an extended humanistic education and the new Protestant religion. While concentrating in this

study therefore on the spread of popular religious change in Durham, it is important to consider the Reformation as a momentous social event in human life, affecting people and society at all levels.

In order to obtain some purchase on this event, Chapter 1 will briefly examine the nature of the church and religious life in the diocese on the eve of the Reformation. Chapter 2 will then examine the region's response to the religious changes and the county's unique and powerful contribution to the Pilgrimage of Grace, with its peculiar blend of northern separatism, noble 'honour', popular unrest and regional Catholicism. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 will then show how the character of the religious environment depicted in the opening chapter was changed by the Reformation with a Protestant emphasis on preaching and a proclamation of the word slowly displacing the mass and the ritualised visual effects of the old order. Finally Chapter 6 will look at the Northern Rising of 1569 and examine its consequences for the religious life of the region.

## 1. RELIGIOUS LIFE IN DURHAM ON THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION

The identification of an ecclesiastical corporation with its patron saint is a familiar feature of late medieval history; but nowhere was this identification so powerful, complete and above all wide-ranging as at Durham. For St. Cuthbert's influence and 'patrimony', the lands which he ruled, owned and protected from those seeking to violate the church or its possessions, transcended the cathedral priory itself and its properties, stretching 'between the Tyne and Tees of the county of Durham and the wapentake of Sadberge, commonly known as the bishopric' (1). Inhabitants of the 'bishopric' were regarded as St. Cuthbert's people, as 'Haliwerfolk' or holy man's folk, a name which apparently came near to being attached to the county as a whole (2). Nor was this the region's only peculiarity: the topographical singularity and genius loci of the cathedral city and its site, the long distances that separated Durham from London, Canterbury and Edinburgh, above all the Palatine status conferred on the 'bishopric', all served to create for the county a peculiar religious and political identity. The Bishop of Durham was unique in his capacity to organise, within the Palatinate, powers which were monopolised by the crown in the rest of the country. 'Quiquid rex habet extra, episcopus habet intra' (3). Thus until 1536, the King's writ did not run within the Regality, and the Bishop exercised complete jurisdiction through the chancery court and the justices of assize and other civil officers that he appointed. He also coined his own money, while his subjects served in the Bishop's army and elected representatives to a Palatinate assembly.

Nevertheless, despite its northern remoteness, this did not mean that the bishopric of Durham was a marooned ecclesiastical and political anomaly, largely isolated (like Lancashire) (4) from new developments and the mainstream of national life, religion and politics. The

fact that Durham lay on the Great North Road between London and Edinburgh guaranteed even in the early sixteenth century that an important succession of ecclesiastics, politicians and soldiers passed through the city (5). Land communications were also supplemented by maritime and trading contacts with London, the east coast and the continent. Although an important route-centre, Durham itself of course had never become a significant entrepot for long-term commerce due to the unnavigability of the Wear, but grain, cloth, iron and other commodities from East Anglia, the Netherlands, and the Baltic reached the county through Hartlepool, York and above all Newcastle (6). Contacts with the court were also encouraged by the proximity of the Border, which opened up many military and administrative posts in the service of the Crown to Durham's leading lords and gentry, the Earl of Westmoreland, Sir Robert Bowes and Sir William Eure (7). As a result, metropolitan cultural tastes seem to have been well represented in the County's great aristocratic households and castles at Brancepeth, Raby and Lumley, which Leland clearly regarded (along with the cathedral and close) as the significant centres of the Bishopric during his visit in 1538. Lumley Castle, in particular, with its fine pictures and furnishings, seems to have been considered a centre of renaissance taste (8).

But although the county was not isolated, Leland's descriptions and the county's population figures make it clear that the Palatinate - despite its small urban centres and occasional industrial settlements - was a predominantly rural region of villages, hamlets and remote farmsteads (9). In such circumstances it is clear that the church, with its clergy who were often intimate members of village society and its apparatus of ecclesiastical discipline, was an extremely powerful source of order in the pre-Reformation period. The cohesive role of the parish church, as the political and social centre of most village communities, has already been discussed. It is also now known that the church courts, whose jurisdiction covered much of lay life, were

more popular than historians once believed, often providing quicker and more accessible justice than the King's courts (10). In these courts a body of regulations and rules relating to a generally approved social morality was enforced (the 'good works and sins' codified by canon law), which aimed particularly it seems at ensuring the stability of marital life and the patriarchal family. Surviving depositions from the bishop's and archdeacon's courts in Durham, for instance, in the period 1531-6, reveal that litigation was primarily concerned with offences relating to sexual morality and marriage (such as adultery, divorce and incest) although it also dealt with cases of robbery, defamation and witchcraft (11).

It may even be, as Mervyn James suggests, that 'religion' for significant numbers of people really only meant conformity to this body of social and moral regulations backed by punitive sanctions. Keith Thomas' work suggests that many pre-Reformation English men and women probably did not go to church very regularly, and some hardly ever or not at all (12). Furthermore, although such things are impossible to quantify, it seems as if substantial parts of English society, particularly in remote dale and border country (like the western uplands of Durham), had scarcely been Christianised at all, with folk religion and sub-Christian paganism thriving under a veneer of official Christianity. To the educated, these borderers and uplanders appeared 'more superstitious than virtuous, long accustomed to frantic fantasies and ceremonies which they regard, more than either God or their prince, right far alienate from true religion' (13). Nevertheless, although such people would have had little time for the Catholic church or clergy, and while a large proportion of the population may have been largely ignorant of Catholic theology, few would have avoided participation in the crucial rites of baptism, matrimony and holy burial. This is suggested by the fact that exclusion from the body of the Church and the sacraments by means of excommunication was taken extremely seriously in some quarters. In popular belief an unconsecrated burial condemned the deceased to suffer

eternal damnation, while the threat of excommunication by Bishop Fox in 1498 forced the surrender of a band of 15 thieves from Tynedale and Redesdale, as well as the loyal acquiescence of minor officials such as Sir Thomas Darcy's under-constable (14).

How far though did the pre-Reformation church actually satisfy the spiritual needs of Durham people? The visitation of the city and diocese in 1501, undertaken by Thomas Savage (who had just been promoted to the archbishopric of York) during the vacancy which followed Bishop Fox's translation from Durham to Winchester, provides useful evidence that a significant number of the laity were far from satisfied with the conduct of the clergy and the structure of the church at a parochial level. The right of the archbishop on such occasions to exercise his jurisdiction over the diocese as metropolitan had been a continual matter of dispute ever since the eleventh century, but on the present occasion Savage seems to have met with no difficulty or resistance, and the records of the commissaries are extremely comprehensive and revealing (15). On 20th October, 1501 Savage appointed five vicar-generals and guardians of spiritualities to exercise his authority in the diocese of Durham (including the prior, Thomas Castell), but the actual business of the commission was under the control of the 4th clerk, Dr. John Carver (archdeacon of Middlesex) who arrived in Durham and proceeded to make further local appointments (16).

The visitation of the priory itself took place on the 10th November, but it seems as if Carver did not attempt the delicate task of more than a merely formal visitation, in which he received the oath of obedience from the 43 members of the monastery. It may be that the full report was never completed, but the surviving records make it seem unlikely that a strict enquiry into the priory's condition ever took place (17). The main programme of the subsequent visitation into the archdeaconry as a whole extended over a week from the 12th to the 19th of November, and proceeded by summoning the clergy and between four and six laymen from each

parish to various central churches such as St. Nicholas in Durham and St. Andrews. The returns of the visitation exist in full, and they include, invaluable, therefore the views of the laymen who came to present a list of their complaints. The questions asked of them, which have not been preserved, seem to have been concerned, as the answers suggest, with the churches' fabric and furniture, the character of clergymen and the morals of the laity. The habitual report from the majority of parishes was 'omnia bene', but the parishioners of Newcastle and Gateshead in particular and some other areas within the archdeaconry of Durham provided a fairly extensive series of complaints, dealing with the shortcomings of chantry priests, the non-residence of their rectors and various lay moral offences (18). John Balswell, for instance, dean of Chester-le-Street and rector of Middleton-in-Teesdale, was reported to be mentally deranged; '*nec aliquibus gaudet lucidis intervallis*'. At Bishopton the church roof leaked, so that during mass the rain fell through holes in the high altar and dripped onto the sacrament, while several of the windows in the choir were broken; '*item, quod temporibus ventuosis candelae tempore celebracionis missarum accensae supra summum altare stantes persepius extinguuntur et ventus afflat easdem*' (19). (Such structural neglect was to remain a problem. In May 1532, for instance, Bishop Tunstal sequestered the revenues of the prebends at Durham because the chancel of the church was in such a 'ruinous' condition (20)). With regard to the clergy, it may be noted that individual rectors and vicars were frequently pluralists or non-resident, as at Brancepeth, Houghton and Norton, and that in the larger parishes the care of souls was often deputed to a parish chaplain (21). During the absence of the vicar of St. Nicholas, Durham, for instance, his parochial duties were undertaken by a parish chaplain, six stipendiary chaplains and seven priests, apart from the five endowed chantry priests who also served the altars of the church. Rural parishes such as Edmonbyers and Wearmouth, however,

were less well served. Finally, the vicarages of a few churches were held, against canon law, by canons of the religious houses to which they were appropriated. Thus the vicars of Stanton and Hart, for instance, were canons of Guisborough (22).

Nevertheless, despite these shortcomings, there is a significant body of evidence which helps to suggest that the laity in Durham were still firmly attached to the established church in the immediate pre-Reformation period. The wills written by Durham men and women in the period c.1500-1536 are the first evidence. Unfortunately, these are sadly limited in number, since the series of wills contained in the Durham registry does not begin in substance until the 1540s (23). Nevertheless, the wills proved in the visitation of 1501 (which are principally of citizens of Newcastle), taken together with the ten wills extant for the period in the first volume of 'Wills and Inventories' published by the Surtees Society, still provide considerable interest even if they do not exist on a sufficient scale to be reliable (24). They show that most people in Durham were still pouring gifts of money, plate, velvet, jewels and cloth into their local parish churches, as well as making donations to religious orders such as the Observant Franciscans at Hartlepool and Newcastle and the collegiate churches at Staindrop and Chester-le-Street (25). The will of John Trollop, the squire at Thornley in 1522, provides one of the most generous examples,

'Also I bequeth to the saide Church of Kellaw two torches pric' viys.... Also I bequeth xxs to bye a Vestment to the High Altar there... Also to the Church of Petyngton viys d to bye a Chalice with. Also I bequeth to our Ladye of Petye of Segefild vis viy d... Also to the Mount Grace xs. Also to the other Thre houses of the freers of N. Castell vis viy d er'ny oon of theym. Also to the Guylde of our Ladye of Kellowe xxs, and my harpe' (26).

Furthermore, the wills show that there was still a significant preoccupation with expiatory bequests, that is

bequests which guaranteed requiem masses, prayers and a regular stream of intercession in perpetuity for the souls of the benefactor and his or her kin. Thus in at least 17 out of the 21 wills in Durham that survive for the first four decades of the sixteenth century, the testators were still asking explicitly for prayers or requiem masses at their death. Finally, all the wills (unless they were so short that they omitted the preamble) retained the traditional formula which began with a commendatory clause followed by an invocation for the prayers of the Virgin and saints. The will of John Hedworth from Chester-le-Street in 1533 is a typical example,

'ffyrst I com'end my soll to god almightie and to the blesseyde v'gine mare and to all the saincts of heven and my body to be buried within the colledge churche of chester in the streite in owe ladies porche' (27). As it will be seen, there are in fact no examples of an explicitly reformist or Protestant preamble in Durham until the 1550s (28).

The popularity of religious fraternities in pre-Reformation Durham confirms this apparent lay accord and involvement with the old ecclesiastical order. A guild or fraternity at the most basic level consisted of an association of layfolk who undertook, under the patronage of a particular saint, the Virgin Mary or Corpus Christi, to provide every member of the brotherhood with a good funeral, together with regular prayers and mass saying - in the chapel that belonged to the fraternity - on every patronal feastday thereafter (29). The important point, therefore, is that they were fully controlled by the laity. Although members of the clergy, local parish priests and monastics were often among a fraternity's members, they rarely held office, and the guild clergy in Durham (mostly clerks) were all appointed and paid by their lay masters (30). Furthermore, apart from being lay controlled, the fraternities existed in significant numbers for such a small, predominantly rural, county. According to the official chantry returns of 1548 - which often listed only a fraction of the total in existence

(31) - the bishopric contained 12 fraternities (along with its 53 chantries), of which the dominant proportion were located in the county's towns. There were three for instance at Bishop Auckland and four in Durham city itself (32). It is nevertheless significant that neither of the two parish guilds in the Durham churches of St. Nicholas and St. Giles had ever been well endowed. At their dissolution the guild of St. Nicholas was without an incumbent or even an chalice, and their combined annual revenues were only £10 11s (33). Richer by far was the much older 'Guyld of Saincte Cuthbert within the Cathedral Church of the said citie', which was financially administered by the cathedral sacrist and their obedientaries (34). However, by far the most prominent role in the religious and social life of the city in the century before the Reformation was played by the great civic guild of Corpus Christi, which had been founded by the chancellor and other Palatine officials in the 1430s and attached to St. Nicholas parish church in the market place (35). Above all the guild sponsored the great Corpus Christi procession to the cathedral and Palace Green, later remembered by the post-Reformation author of the 'Rites of Durham' as the ceremonial highlight of the urban liturgical calendar. The annual celebration of the feast, 'on the thursday after Trinite soundaie', began with a service of Mass in St. Nicholas Church, after which the congregation formed a 'goodlye Prosession... the Baley of the towne did stande in the Towle boothe and did cawle the occupations that was inhabitens with-in the towne, every occupation in his degree, to bringe forthe ther banners, with all the lights apperteyninge to these severall Banners, and to repaire to the Abbey Church doure, every Banner to stand in ranke in his degree'. At the rear of the procession the guild's 'fynely gilted' shrine, containing the Corpus Christi (the Body of Christ in the form of the host just consecrated at the mass) was ceremonially 'carried the said day with (four) prestes up to the Place Grene, and all the holie Prosession of all the Churches in the said towne goying before yt... then

was Sancte Cuthbert's Banner brought fourth, with two goodlye fine crosses, to meet yt, and the Prior and Convent, with all the whole companye of the quere, all in there best Copes... and then, carrying yt forward into the Abbey Church... it was sett in the Quere, and solemne service done before yt, and Te Deum solemnly sange and plaide of the Orgaynes, every man prayinge God. And all the banners of the Occupations dyd followe the saide Shrine into the Church, goyng rownde about Sancte Cuthbert's fereture, lyghtinge there torches and burning all the service tyme. Then yt was caryed from thence with the said Prosession of the towne, backe againe, to the place from whence it came, all the Banners of the occupations following it, setting yt againe in the Church... and the saide Shrine was caryed into the Revestrie, where yt remayned until that time Twelvemonth' (36).

It is known that the various guild contingents in the procession were also accompanied by 'pageants' or moving platform wagons. All these theatrical properties and actors were assembled into depictions of famous biblical scenes and incidents, each one being the responsibility of the various guilds marching in the procession. This is revealed by the Books and Ordinances of the 16 craft fraternities in Durham, which show that each company was uniformly directed to join the procession on Corpus Christi day and enact the play or mystery that belonged to their guild. The barber's ordinary, for instance, dated 1468, recounts that it was 'ordand and assentyd be all thaym that occupyes the Barber Craft, Waxmakers and Surgeons, in the Cyte of Durham and suberbes ... that they geder to gyder ons in the yere... and at the Fest of Corpus Christi day goo to gyder in p'cession, and play the play that off the olde time longes to their craft' (37). The Goldsmith's ordinary, containing a similar obligation, was confirmed by Bishop Tunstal as late as the 12th May 1532 (38). Although only part of the prologue of one of these dramatic productions survive, it is clear therefore that an annual cycle of 'mystery' plays or pageants was performed at Durham, as at Coventry, Newcastle, York and

Wakefield, where the texts of full-length Corpus Christi play cycles have survived (39).

The meaning and characteristics of the Corpus Christi cult, as a ritual of Christian integration in late medieval cities, have recently been discussed by Mervyn James. He argues that the Corpus Christi procession, in which the various contingents proceeded in accordance with a carefully defined order of precedence - with the humbler craft guilds going first, the wealthier fraternities behind them, followed by the town magistracy (the sheriffs and aldermen) and last of all, marching next to the host with its attendant clergy, the mayor - served to create a symbolic representation of society seen in terms of body: and 'that the concept of body provided urban societies with a mythology and ritual in terms of which the opposites of social wholeness and social differentiation could be both affirmed, and also brought into a creative tension, one with the other' (40). Thus the procession and the play-cycle, with their careful systems of hierarchy and precedence, came to express competitive changes in the social body and the result of shifts in the status and economic welfare of the constituent guilds. In turn, ritual served to resolve this tension by reaffirming the process of incorporation into the social body (and its archetypal symbol, the body of Christ) under the overall direction of the secular magistracy and the church. Two further general points are worth making. In essence, as Phythian-Adams has shown in detail for Coventry, such civic ceremonials along with other ritual observances in the communal year peculiar to each local community (such as the Feasts of St. Cuthbert on 20th March and 4th September (41), served to provide a rich and creative religious rite and ideology for urban societies, in which the alternative ties of lineage, lordship and the village community, available in rural areas, were naturally lacking (42). Indeed, it appears that this repetitive annual pattern of ceremonies came to lie at the very centre of urban social activity and popular culture. Secondly, the cult of Corpus Christi should not be

written off as an imposition of priests and patricians: the description in the Rites seems to indicate and extremely enthusiastic popular participation, even if the full spiritual meaning of events was no doubt imperfectly understood by many of those involved, for whom the day simply provided little more than an excuse for distractions and some fun-making.

It is also clear that the shrine of St. Cuthbert continued to be the object of a flourishing pilgrimage traffic right up to the dissolution. Of course, the intensity of veneration displayed towards a particular saint is impossible to quantify, but it seems that Cuthbert continued to be one of England's most popular saints, and there are no grounds in this instance for Thomas' assertion that the 'impetus behind the worship of saints .. slackened considerably during the fifteenth century' (43). A journey to St. Cuthbert's shrine remained an obligatory part of a royal progress north of the Tees, so that the priory received visits from Richard III in 1483 and Margaret Tudor in 1503 (44). Similarly, the annual receipts of pilgrim's offerings to St. Cuthbert's shrine (as recorded in the account rolls of the Durham feretrar) were once used by James Raine to suggest that 'St. Cuthbert and his cause were fast falling into disrepute long before the finishing blow was given to them by King Henry the Eighth' (45). All who visited the shrine would make at least some small offering in money which was dropped into a box (or 'pix') that was secured at the head of the shrine, so that the feretrar's receipts provide a useful though imperfect index of Cuthbert's popularity. Raine believed that the roll of 1513-14, which had never been completed, was the latest surviving feretrar's account in the pre-Reformation period: hence the 'blank' from which he drew the false inference that offerings had ceased (46). In fact the feretrar's rolls show that there was a continuation of offerings by pilgrims right up to the eve of the Reformation; for 1525-6 the receipts show a figure of £11 7s.2d., and for 1536-7 £7 10s.3d. Most remarkably

of all, pilgrims continued to pay a sum of £4 7s.5½d., in 1537-8 even after the initial defacement of the shrine, the 1536 Injunctions, and the Dissolution of the smaller monasteries (47). Finally it is clear that many people, primarily in the monastery, continued to read about St. Cuthbert: indeed the continuing influence of Bede's prose life of the Saint upon the priory is testified by the fact that it featured prominently in the monastery's fifteenth century library catalogues, while the work was still being copied as late as 1528 by William Todd, one of the last monks (48). Interestingly enough, the latter became one of the first prebendaries in the new cathedral foundation (49).

There does not then seem to be much evidence of any dramatic collapse in popular attachment to the established church in Durham on the eve of the religious changes of the 1530s. This view is confirmed by the fact that the new reformist opinions can scarcely be detected in Durham during the first four decades of the sixteenth century. Indeed, so far as is known, not one single Protestant was burnt or executed in the diocese during the episcopates of Bishops Ruthall (1509-23), Wolsey (1523-29) and Tunstal (1530-1559) (50). Nevertheless, a see that included Newcastle and other small east-coast ports could not fail to be affected by continental ideas - even if their trading links with Europe (and London) were extremely slight - and it is known that Roger Dichaunte, a merchant from Newcastle, was brought before Tunstal in 1531 and abjured opinions of a remarkably advanced and articulate type. Amongst other things he declared 'that there is no purgatorye after that a man is deade, And that it is but folye too praye for them that bee deade; Also that the sacrifice of the Messe is not acceptable to God, but rather stireth the ire of God, and crucifieth Christe of newe; Also that it but vaine to praye to Sanctes, because Christe is onelye our mediator; Also that, because we be justified by faythe, no goode worke neither commaundyd bye God nor inventyd by man can maike us acceptable too God... Also that every Christian man is a preste, and

hath the power to consecrate the Bodye of oure Lorde, and too doo all other things which prestes alone now use too doo; Also that every preste myght and awght owght too be maryed; And also that all the lyfe of relygiose men lyinge in their cloysters is but yprocrisye, and therefore all monasteryes awght too be pulled down' (51). But although Dichaunte was the only recorded case of heresy in the first half of the sixteenth century, it is probably that his views were shared by others in the Newcastle trading community. In 1534, for instance, Bishop Tunstal complained to Thomas Cromwell that heretical books were being circulated in the seaport towns of the north (52).

The failure of Protestantism to make an early impact in Durham was undoubtedly connected to the fact that it was a county almost entirely lacking in any tradition of Lollard, reformist or anticlerical dissent. It is true that some traces of Lollardy can be discerned in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century records, particularly during the episcopate of Bishop Langley (1406-37). Sir William de Neville, for instance, son of Ralph, the 4th Baron Neville of Raby, who died in 1389, had been a prominent Lollard leader. Similarly in 1414, and expressly on account of the spread of heresy to the north of England, the bishop had ordered the prior and all the masters of Durham's cells to hold solemn processions during Lent in which all citizens were to join, praying to God to protect the Church from the insults of the heretics. The letter was to be announced every Wednesday, Friday and Sunday, either during mass or the sermon. Again, in the winter of 1428-9 Bishop Langley had written letters to prior Wessington and the master of the cells warning them against the heresies of Wycliffe and Huss (53). Nevertheless, these documents by no means prove that there was ever a powerful or influential Lollard movement in Durham, and there is certainly no evidence of a resurgence of such opinions in the early sixteenth century. Indeed there is no single proof in the extant records, so far as is known, that

either Lutheran, secularist or humanist writings had even reached the bishopric before the late 1530s. No doubt this was due to firm episcopal control. Bishop Ruthall's (1509-23) sympathies were clearly on the side of the old order, as his frequent presence at the burning of Lutheran books in London suggests (54). Tunstal was even more active in rooting out the new religion. As Bishop of London (1522-30) he had directed a campaign by the City authorities in October 1526 to seek out and confiscate all Lutheran books and Bibles in English, while by the end of the following year he had forced the abjuration of several leading Cambridge and London radicals, such as Bilney, Jaye and Arthur (55). He seems indeed to have been particularly concerned about the disruptive effects which the influx of Tyndale's New Testaments and Lutheran pamphlets would cause, as his later letter in 1534 suggests. Thus in March 1528 he had commissioned More to reply in English to the vernacular Protestant pamphlets that were entering the country, and so 'to make plain to simple and ignorant men the crafty malice of the heretics' (56).

Although it is extremely difficult to measure with exactitude the extent and intensity of popular lay attachment to the established church on the eve of the Reformation, a good sense of the appeal, mentality and sheer visual impact of the old religion can be derived from the 'Rites of Durham', a description by an anonymous Elizabethan of the cathedral in the pre-Reformation state. Little is revealed about the spiritual quality of the community of Benedictine monks, although their everyday routine and daily round of liturgical prayer in the abbey church is vividly described (57), but it is known that Durham's tradition of university learning persisted right up to the eve of the Reformation. Out of 66 monks at the Dissolution, for instance, 2 were MAs and

at least 14 were BDs or DDs (58). Nor were there many 'abuses' of the kind discovered by royal or episcopal visitations in other monasteries. Commissioner Leyton wrote to Cromwell in January 1536 that 'your Injunctions can have no effect in Durham abbey in some things; for there was never a woman in the abbey, further than the church, nor they (the monks) never come within the town' (59). It is probable though that a convivial and conciliatory welcome, along with some judicious bribery by Prior Whitehead, lay behind the generosity of the Commissioner's final report (the 'Compendia Compertorum' (60)), as an entry in the bursar's book suggests: '1536-7. Paid to George Potheary, against the arrival of the Commissioners for 7lbs 'marmalayd' 5s; 12½lbs of sucket 10s; 6 'closse tarts' 4s; 2 march pannes 2s 8d; wine and baking 12s; in all 23s,1d' (61). Cromwell himself moreover had been receiving annuities from Durham since 1534 (62).

Naturally there are dangers in using the account of a nostalgic Elizabethan writing in 1593, but in general a reading of the 'Rites' gives the impression that the human and material resources of the Durham chapter were used largely to project a dramatised religion of the image - rather than any great spirituality - expressed through magnificent works of art and extensive ritual placed within an awe-inspiring architectural setting. Thus the author continually uses such phrases as 'rich and sumptuous', 'lively', 'most curiously and finely wrought', 'the rich jewels and ornaments ... bestowed of that holie man St. Cuthbert', thereby emphasising the idea that sanctity accompanied riches and rare workmanship (63). Significantly, he also concentrates as much on the altars, shrines and their decorations as on the architecture, reminding us that mediaeval churches were designed to accommodate the performance of a liturgy very different from that which obtained after the Reformation. The east transept contained for instance nine altars 'dedicated and directed in the honoure of several saints', each of which 'had theire owne Shrines

and covers of wainscote over head in very decent and comely forme ... with fine branches and flowers and other imagerye worke most finely and artificially pictured and guilted, contayninge the severall lockers, or ambers for the safe keepinge of the vestments belonging to everye altar' (64). Perhaps most magnificent of all however was St. Cuthbert's colourfully painted shrine, which adjoined the High Altar and choir in the west end, and was 'exalted with most curious workmanship of fine and costly marble, all limned and guilted with gold ... (which) made the shrine to be so richly invested, that it was estimated to bee one of the most sumptuous monuments in all England, so great were the offerings and jewels that were bestowed upon it' (65). In general, therefore, the cathedral emphasised the sense of the late mediaeval church as a great material power which could exploit all the best skills, resources and craftsmanship of the age.

But this 'power' was not merely material. As Keith Thomas has shown, the late medieval church had come to act as a repository of supernatural power which could be dispensed to the faithful to help them in their everyday problems (66). Although the church, on the eve of the Reformation, did not as an institution claim the power to work miracles, it recognised that the working of miracles by its members enhanced the church's reputation and was the most efficacious means of demonstrating its monopoly of the truth. Saints' shrines, in particular, were the scene of numerous miracles of healing (over 500 for instance were associated with Becket's shrine at Canterbury). Holy relics and other saintly objects had become magical talismen, believed to have the power to protect against danger and to cure illness. An account roll of Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham, shows for instance that the signet of St. Wilfrid was considered a remedy against murrain in cattle (67). Images were also credited with a similar efficacy. Paintings of St. Christopher, for example, of which at least one hundred and eighty-six examples have been discovered in English village churches, were said to offer a day's preservation

from illness or death to all those who looked upon it (68). Even rather facile and mechanical images such as 'Oure Ladye of Boulton' in Durham Cathedral, which 'opened (so) that every man might see pictured within her, the father, the sonne and the holy ghost', had therefore a serious devotional purpose. Images and works of art were to be 'so artificially wrought... with marvellous fine colours... and excellently fynely gilt... (that) the more a man did looke on it the more was his affection to behold it' (69). Furthermore, by the late Middle Ages ecclesiastical authorities had developed a comprehensive range of ritual formulae designed to obtain God's blessing for secular activities as diverse as duels, journeys and harvests; these usually involved the presence of a priest and the use of holy water and the sign of the cross.

The various miraculous and efficacious powers popularly attributed to saints were, however, by far the most powerful and far-reaching example of the general 'power' which the medieval Church had come to exercise. Ecclesiastical corporations, trade guilds and parish churches all had the patronage of their own particular saint, and these territorial associations meant that specific places were identified with their saints particular spiritual powers, whose influence was primarily protective and benevolent. This identification was of course particularly complete in Durham, where the myths, rites and beliefs connected with the cult of St. Cuthbert (the Apostle of Northumbria, the British Thaumaturgas) (70), proved so powerful and enduring. It was believed that the saint's 'power', which emanated from and was expressed by his magnificent shrine, could be beneficent even in the Holy Land (71) towards those whom he favoured (for instance by miracles of healing, the last of which was recorded in 1503 with the cure of Richard Poell, one of Henry VIII's retainers) (72), or maleficent towards those who violated the cathedral, its possessions, or Cuthbert's 'patrimony'. William the Conqueror for example had become violently ill when he

insisted on having the saint's coffin opened during his visit to the north in 1076 (73). Similarly, the battle of Neville's Cross, which was fought just outside Durham in October 1346 and resulted in the comprehensive defeat of King David of Scotland, had rapidly been interpreted as a personal triumph for St. Cuthbert. The legend ran that David had foolishly attempted to invade the Palatinate despite a dream the night before in which he had 'admonished that in any wise he should not attempt to spoile or violate ye church goods of St. Cuthbert: or any thing that appurteyned unto that holie saint' (74). The Durham monks, who traditionally stood as champions of the bishopric and the liberties of Saint Cuthbert, were of course well aware that devotion to the defence of the patron on the part of the county's magnates and gentry was one of their strongest assets, and probably helped publicise such legends in order to encourage a spirit of resistance. All sorts of other fertile myths had also begun to cluster around the cult of St. Cuthbert. The banner of the Saint, containing a relic of Cuthbert sewn into it (part of the holy corporax that had been found in his coffin), was established on the eve of the Reformation as one of the most effective and efficacious battle ensigns in England. Thus the men of the bishopric, when they went to war, always marched behind the banner, which it seems was last displayed on a field of battle in 1536 during the Pilgrimage of Grace (75).

As well as saints, relics and images, Keith Thomas' work has shown that a horde of popular superstitions had also generated around the church and the sacraments themselves, which endowed religious rites and objects with a quasi-magical character that the ecclesiastical authorities had never themselves claimed (76). The Mass, in particular, and thereby the altar, had become associated with magical power. By the sixteenth century it seems as if the ceremony had acquired at popular levels a mechanical efficacy in which the operative factor was not the participation of the congregation, but the special power of the priest for whom according to the

church's teaching, the sacrament worked automatically (ex opere operanto) regardless of his moral worth (77). It is probable also that such an approach to the rites of the church, where the efficacy of the mass and other sacraments depended merely on their ritual performance, would have been particularly common in primitive upland communities where the level of pastoral instruction was extremely limited. It is extremely difficult, however, to measure how far such attitudes held sway in county Durham. Certainly the few surviving wills of the pre-Reformation period in Durham make it clear that it was common to attach special value to the performance of a certain number of masses in succession - whether five, seven, nine or thirty (a trental) (78). The description of the Mass in the 'Rites' also serve to indicate the highly ritualised effects of the old religion and the minimal part played by the congregation,

'And when the Monkes went to say or sing the High Masse they put on their vestments in the vestrye, both the Epistoler and the Gospeller... and when the office of the masse began to be sange the Epistoler came out of the revestrie and the other two monks following him, all three arow, at the south Quire dore, and there did stand to the Gloria Patri of the office of the masse began to bee sunge, and then, with great reverence and devotion, they went upp to the High Altar (and one of the vergers that kept the vestrie did goe before them, with a tipt staffe in his hande, as it was his office so to doe), bowinge themselves most reverently to the blessed sacrament of the Altar, the one on the one side of him that said the masse and the other of the other side, also the Gospeller did carrye a marvelous faire booke, which had the Epistles and Gospels in it, and did lay it on the Altar... which booke did serve for the Pax in the masse... and, the masse beinge ended, they went all three into the Revestrie, from whence they came, and carryed the booke with them; and, one of the Vergers meetinge them at the south Quire dore, after the same sort they came, and went before them into the vestrie' (79).

As with the mass, a whole group of parasitic myths clustered round all the other sacraments, which attributed to each ceremony a material significance that theologians and the church authorities had never claimed. Baptism, for instance, which signified the entry of the newly born baby into the community of the faithful, became essential in the popular mind if the child was to turn into a full human adult. Indeed, it was thought in Durham that if the child did not cry at the ceremony, or if it's 'evil spirit' was not exorcised, then he or she would not live at all (80). In part these beliefs were inevitable, since the church taught that children who died unbaptised would never obtain salvation. Such views were also fostered by the extensive 'incorporative' rites at the end of the Catholic ritual, by which the baptised were 'marked' with the sign of the cross as a rite of appropriation by the deity and of incorporation into the body of the church. Similar ideas also generated around the ceremonies of confirmation, marriage and extreme unction. By the eve of the Reformation therefore, most of the sacraments had become crucial 'rites of passage', or what Van Gennep has termed regenerative 'life-crisis' ceremonies (usually involving three major phases - separation, transition and incorporation) which served to symbolise and ease an individual's transition from one social state to another, while at the same time securing divine sanction for the change in status (81).

Despite its apparent vigour, the religious environment depicted in the Rites was to be radically altered within subsequent decades. The monastic community at Durham was dissolved in 1539 and converted into a cathedral church of the 'new foundation', while the cult of St. Cuthbert was finally brought to an end in 1542. Even more significantly, Protestantism slowly began to undermine some of the traditional attitudes

examined above, since its theology deliberately played down the objective power of the sacraments to ensure salvation and the degree to which the institution of the church, through its priesthood, controlled that power. Consequently, the new religion's emphasis on the proclamation of the word (both through Bible-reading and preaching) gradually began to displace the dramatised visual and ritual effects of the old order. The process was to prove an arduous struggle, however, that was by no means complete even by the 1570s. In the meantime, the Henrician religious changes, introduced through parliament by 1536 (82), were to meet an immediate and determined response.

## 2. FIRST REACTIONS AND THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE

The Pilgrimage of Grace remains a controversial subject of much interest for the reformation historian. These four rebellions in the autumn and winter of 1536-7, which provided the only substantial armed challenge to the Henrician Reformation, were extremely complex historical events, and, some scholars such as A.G. Dickens have emphasised the 'real' economic and social grievances which underlay the revolts, drawing attention to the demands made by the Commons for lower rent and their attack on enclosures and tithe-barns (1). Similarly, there has been a mass of recent research emphasising the role played by the gentry and clergy in instigating the risings, with M.E. James and Elton advancing a political interpretation which argues that the Lincolnshire and Yorkshire rebellions were deliberately stirred up by discontented gentry and a defeated 'Aragonese' - Marian court faction rather than being a spontaneous mass protest (2). However, C.S.L. Davies has collected powerful evidence to suggest that popular religious protest was a significant element in the movement (3). Although the rebellion was brought about by an interaction and fusion of several grievances, it remained essentially a religious revolt in the wide sense that it was a protest on behalf of the old religion and monasteries. The Pilgrims, apparently alarmed by false rumours (often deliberately spread by the clergy) of increased taxation and a wholesale attack on the parish church, demanded the rooting out of 'heresy' and a renunciation of the recently asserted royal leadership of the church, while they restored at least sixteen of the fifty-five northern houses that had already been suppressed. Above all, religion provided an important unifying ideology, as witnessed in particular by the pilgrims oath and imagery (the banner of the Five Wounds) giving the multi-class rebellion what coherence and unity it had.

This compelling interpretation does not however fully

explain the regional character of the movement. If, as C.S.L. Davies argues, the revolutionary changes brought about by the implementation of the royal supremacy caused such a 'massive distrust of the Crown's motives.... over a wide and geographically, socially, and culturally very diversified area of England', why was the rebellion confined to certain regions of the six northern counties and not others? (4). Without underplaying the religious element of the rising, it certainly seems as if Elton is right to stress that the crucial factor is the spread of the rebellions was the attitude of the local nobles and gentry and their willingness or capacity to control the commons (5). For instance, Hallamshire and the South Riding - dominated by the loyalist Earl of Shrewbury - did not rebel, whereas the central areas of the West Riding, controlled by the Percies and Sir John Constable, joined the Pilgrimage. In Lancashire the rebels only dominated north of the Ribble away from the powerful influence of the Earl of Derby, while in most regions, especially in the West Riding, rebellious areas were mixed up amongst loyal ones depending on the stance adopted by the lords of the respective fiefs (6). Furthermore, an emphasis on one particular 'interpretation' tends to gloss over local variations and disregard the large differences in geography, social and political structure that influenced the insurrections in the areas concerned. It is clear for example, that the risings in Lancashire were indeed largely a religious protest, while the risings in Cumberland, Westmorland and Craven had the characteristics of peasant rebellions (7). In general, therefore, more research is needed on the sources of the Pilgrimage at a local level. Obviously this chapter cannot look at all the questions of causation or even discuss all the regional details of such a large historical subject. Its aim will be twofold: first to establish as far as possible the course of events in the Bishopric from the scanty evidence available, and second to analyse the nature and implications of the Pilgrimage for the Durham area (8). In particular, it will discuss

how far the revolt can be seen as a popular protest on behalf of the established church and the region's unique religious identity.

What might have been expected for the Pilgrimage as a whole in terms of the role played by the gentry was the type of revolt that actually took place in Lincolnshire (9). There the initial unrest, which began at Louth after the vicar's sermon on 1st October, 1536, spread quickly but within a limited geographical area. The earlier stages of the revolt anticipated the northern rebellion: there was the lynching and swearing-in of various members of the gentry and nobility, voluntarily or not, followed by a march to the county capital. Rumours that the King intended to suppress many of the parish churches and confiscate church plate spread around the diocese. But the revolt soon collapsed on the 12th-13th October after the reading of the King's letter in Lincoln cathedral on 10th October and the approach of a royal army under Suffolk. Most significantly, a recently discovered letter from the Lincolnshire gentry to the Duke - included in Thomas Master's seventeenth century narrative account - confirms that the former played a major role in diverting the energy of the rebellious commons into static petitioning when the rebels own inclination was for a military advance beyond Lincoln (10). It seems as if the gentry consistently acted to delay the Pilgrims, and they contrived to use the petition as an excuse for procrastinating from the 3rd October up to the time the Commons were finally persuaded to disperse on Friday 13th (11). As a consequence no military confrontation took place, although Suffolk's letters show that the county (at least north of Lincoln) remained volatile and unsettled into the latter part of the month (12).

The main Pilgrimage presents a very different picture, both in terms of its size, longevity and

cohesion. So far as Durham is concerned, the movement in Mashamshire and Richmond (Yorkshire) which spread north to the bishopric seems to have begun as soon as news reached Ripon of the Lincolnshire rising. The message came from Archbishop Lee, with orders to his steward, Lord Latimer, to stay his tenants, but rather suspiciously (given the latter's passionate involvement with the rebellion) the news had more effect than the orders (13). Richmondshire rose on Friday 13th October and Lord Latimer and Sir Christopher Danby were sworn in by the commons in Mashamshire on the 14th. The rebels then set out to seize Bowes and John Dakyn, the vicar-general of the diocese of York, at Barnard Castle. Robert Bowes, along with his brother Richard, captains in the castle, surrendered immediately on Sunday 15th October and took over command of the revolt (14). From there the Mashamshire and Richmondshire rebels advanced north to Oxneyfield by Darlington on Monday 16th October, and then on to Bishop Auckland the following day with the intention of capturing the Bishop of Durham there. The bishop however had been warned, again rather suspiciously, and had fled at midnight, making his way to his own castle at Norham where he was to remain behind enemy lines until the movement collapsed (15). For his desertion the commons 'spoiled the Bishop (his palace at Bishop Auckland) contrary to their own proclamation' (16). This spoliation seems to have taken place while Bowes had gone on to Brancepeth to take the Earl of Westmoreland. Westmoreland refused to join the rebels himself, but he took the oath (almost certainly under compulsion) and his son Lord Neville was taken to ride with the rebels (17).

Meanwhile, on hearing of the rising from his cousin Sir Thomas Hilton, sheriff of Durham (who was probably also at Bishop Auckland with Tunstal) the other major figure of the Durham nobility, Lord Lumley, packed up his plate and jewels at his manor of the Isle on Monday 16th October and set out to deposit them in the Maison Dieu at Newcastle which was 'his strongest house' (18). He

reached Newcastle by way of Lumley Castle the following day with his son George, and on Wednesday 18th he was joined by Sir Thomas Hilton, who persuaded him to leave the town by convincing him that the 'commons there would join the rebels'. George Lumley's later examination by Cromwell in the Tower on 8th February 1537 provides the only substantial account of the mustering that took place in Durham on the following three days, and it is worth quoting in full, particularly since it seems to indicate that the gentry quickly took control, supervising the oath-taking and perhaps also using the traditional method of calling out the tenantry in formal musters at various assembly points. After leaving Newcastle,

'his father went to Sir Thomas Hilton's house and himself to a house of his father's called the Isle (this would suggest that George Lumley was not opposed to the rebels as they were also mustering that day at Spennymoor, only five miles away). Soldiers from Richmondshire asked him to go to Lord Latimer or else they would spoil his father's goods. Went and found Lord Latimer with 8,000 or 10,000 mustering before Awkelande, the Bishop of Durham's house. Thither came Mr. Bowes with an answer from the Earl of Westmoreland. Sir James Strangwishe, young Bowes, Sir Ralph Bowmer, and another knight that married with, and dwells nigh Lord Latimer, came in with companies. Lord Latimer asked him to send word to his father to come in and gave him the oath. Returned to the Isle and hearing from Chr. Arnolde that his own house and wife were in danger, went home next day (to Thwing in Yorkshire)' (19).

Lumley remained at Thwing for two days before leading his tenants to York on Thursday 21st October. He did not see his father again 'till they met on the heath at Doncaster', and denied that he knew any of his movements. As a consequence, little is known of the later mustering in the bishopric until Lord Lumley, Latimer and a half of the Durham contingent of 10,000 men rode into York on Friday 20th October, bearing in front of it the banner of St. Cuthbert (20).

It is not true however that after the rising of Beverley (10th October) and Richmondshire (13th October) the revolt simply spread northwards, since Hexham and the Borders had been in rebellion since the end of September. Although these minor disturbances gained their significance from the widespread movement further south, it seems as if they also provided a catalyst to the Durham insurgents. The Priory of Augustinian canons at Hexham was indeed the only smaller monastery in the far north which offered any determined resistance to the Act of Dissolution (although the yearly value of the house was over £200, so that it should not have come within the scope of the act, it had nevertheless been included among those to be suppressed) (21). In late September, Prior Edward Jay went up to London to beg Cromwell that it might be spared, but in his absence the sub-prior and the master of the dependent cell of Ovingham resorted to more direct methods, raising the local parishes and laying in weapons for the defence of the monastery. On 28th September, before the prior's return, the four commissioners for the dissolution were resisted, and by early October events had reached a stalemate. No one in the area would help the commissioners or Sir Reynold Carnaby (who had received the grant of the lands (22)) against the canons, and no royal troops could advance from the south because of the rebellions in Yorkshire.

It was into this rather curious position that John Heron of Chipchase, one of the 'men of Tynedale' or local freebooters, intervened in order to turn the state of affairs to his own advantage. On 15th October he rode to Hexham and persuaded the canons that their only hope of saving the monastery was to buy the help of himself and his band. On the same day (15th October) we first hear of the insurrection by the 'commons' in Durham, and at some time in the following week Heron's brother-in-law John Lumley, brought him a letter from them containing 'certain articles' and an oath (23). It seems highly possible, as the Doddses suggest, that Heron had been in touch with Lumley and the Durham rebels from an earlier

date, and therefore knew what their intentions were (24). Heron then sent Lumley on to Sir Ingram Percy at Alnwick Castle, who, with the Earl of Northumberland (who was warden of the East Marches) lying ill at Wressell Cattle in Yorkshire, had rapidly assumed authority and already sent out a summons to the Northumbrian gentry (25). Richard Guyl, Sir Ingram's servant, later testified that his master was brought the 'nawette (naughty) letters' from the commons of Durham 'in the name of "Captain Poverty"', which commanded him to swear their oath and remain in Northumberland 'to stay the Scots', which he did (26). Sir Ingram clearly could not later claim to Cromwell that he had taken the oath under compulsion, as it was brought by a single messenger from a days ride away. Indeed, his enthusiastic support for the rebellion had become apparent as soon as the gentry had assembled for his summons on Sunday 22nd October, when he ordered that the commons letter and articles be read out loud and that everyone present should take the oath. For the rest of October, until the time of Doncaster, 'he did all he could to stir the gentlemen to be of the commons part', holding musters and assemblies in his office as sheriff and seizing all Sir Reynold Carnaby's lands. As a result, almost all Northumberland, with the exception of a few castles such as Chillingham and Halton, were in the Percies' control by the end of the month.

No less significant for a successful northern rising was the town of Newcastle with its great fortress. As has been seen Lumley and Hilton attempted to make sure of the town before setting out for York, the latter sending two of his servants to discover the attitude of common people, who reported that no resistance would be made to the rebels. But although the mayor Robert Brandling and his corporation (who were loyal to the King) represented only a narrow oligarchy of prosperous merchants, it is clear from a later letter by Suffolk on 30th November that they had managed to conciliate the commons. William Blytheman, one of Cromwell's commissioners for the suppression of the monasteries, had reported from

Newcastle that 'that town "and chiefly the mayor himself" have served the King well and will resist the rebels' (27).

In sum, although Newcastle had remained loyal to the King, almost the whole of the county of Durham, including Barnard Castle, Brancepeth and Durham were in the hands of the rebels. The nature of events in the city of Durham itself however, from the beginning of the rising on Sunday 15th to Friday 20th October, when Lords Neville, Latimer and Lumley rode into York at the head of 5,000 'haliewerfolk', remains sadly obscure. It is known that the bishop's chancery was spoiled by the commons (28), and this may well have taken place at the same time as the Pilgrims obtained possession of St. Cuthbert's banner, which was in the charge of the Cathedral feretrar, William Wylom. Although the monks seem to have given it up voluntarily, as Wylom paid 16 pence to Thomas Merlay the standard bearer, the banner was damaged at some stage and five shillings were also spent on repairs (29). It may be, as the Doddses suggest, that Lumley and Hilton set out after leaving Newcastle and raised Durham without going through the formality of being sworn in by the rebels, and this would certainly be in keeping with their enthusiastic support for decisive and extremist policies later in the Pilgrimage (30). Willingly or otherwise, however, they must have joined Latimer and the rebels by Thursday 19th October for the march to York, and it is likely that they did so at Spennymoor on Wednesday 18th October, when the companies were divided into two, one half to advance to the siege of the Earl of Cumberland, and the other to York (31).

From York the Durham Pilgrims marched to the assembly at Pontefract Castle on 22nd October, which had been captured by the rebels three days earlier, almost certainly with the connivance of its commander, Lord Darcy (32). Orders were now despatched for the rest of the northern rebels, still besieging Skipton Castle, to attend the Pontefract musters, while Aske's proclamations

and copies of the oath were sent out to all parts of Yorkshire, Durham and the north (33). Apart from carrying St. Cuthbert's banner, Aske later recalled that the 'haliewerfolk' were the first of the companies arriving at Pontefract to adopt the device of the Five Wounds, a protective talisman associated with the crusade and carrying implications of religious war (34). Signifying the Five Wounds of Christ, the badge depicted a wounded heart in the centre, from which drops of blood fall into a chalice, with two pierced hands above and two pierced feet below. On seeing the device worn by the Durham leaders, Darcy conveniently remembered a store of Five Wounds badges left over from a crusade against the Moors in Spain in 1511, and these were distributed among the whole army to represent their Pilgrimage for the Faith. The story has been regarded with extreme scepticism, and seems to suggest a degree of premeditation, but the point remains that the Five Wounds was an extremely powerful symbol (35). After arriving at Pontefract, Aske had immediately introduced 'the gentlemen of the Bishopric' to Lord Darcy in the castle chamber, and drawn a select number aside (Bowes, Neville, Lumley and Sir Thomas Percy) for a discussion of the campaign (36). It was determined to advance to the Don the next day, and oppose the crossing of Shrewsbury, Norfolk and the royal army, which had reached Doncaster. Although the 'men of the Bishopric' as bearers of St. Cuthbert's banner would lead the vanguard in battle, Sir Thomas Percy was sent ahead immediately with 4,000 men since 'Ferry Bridge, as a "straight passage", must be guarded that night' (37). He was joined the following day (23rd October) at Hampole next to the Don by the forces of the Palatinate and Richmondshire, under Lords Latimer, Lumley, Neville and Sir Thomas Hilton, and their combined companies formed the 'vaward' of 12,000 men, while the rest of the Pilgrim army mustered behind them (38).

Subsequent events, as the two armies confronted each other across the river Don for the next five days, are familiar and do not have particular significance for the

Bishopric. Norfolk and Shrewsbury preferred to compromise rather than risk what would certainly have been an unequal confrontation. In a letter to the Council, Norfolk himself blamed bad morale, plague, inferior numbers (15,000 troops) 'the cold weather and the want of room to house more than a third of the army' for his decision 'not to appoint the enemy' (39). Although some of these factors would probably have applied equally to the rebels, it is clear that the Pilgrims did comprise a very substantial force, and Aske (who was in the best position to know) twice stated that there were 30,000 or more at Doncaster (40). These numbers are certainly considerable if true, especially considering that Yorkshire and Durham had only sent men who, as their leaders declared, were armed (at least basically), while the majority of companies in the Pilgrim army were drawn from these two counties. Indeed, C.S.L. Davies has suggested that these figures possibly represent a majority of the able-bodied men from the areas concerned (41). A truce was finally concluded on 27th October, despite the determination of the Durham 'Lords' to accept Norfolk's challenge, sent by Lancaster Herald, 'that if they refused (to accept his offer of negotiation) he would give battle in place convenient' (42). It seems that Aske, heading a party in the council which favoured negotiation and moderate measures, managed to persuade the Durham Lords that 'it was no dishonour but a duty to declare their grievances to their sovereign', and that indeed the Pilgrimage had been assembled for that very purpose (43). As a result, Sir Ralph Ellerker and Robert Bowes were despatched to present the Pilgrims petition to the King, once the rebel leaders had resolved on the five essential points that were considered weighty enough to explain their rising (44).

Under the terms of the truce both armies were to disperse while they hoped for the King's decision. Clearly Norfolk hoped that once the Pilgrim forces had dissolved it would be impossible to reassemble them. But although the majority of the commons (including those

from the Bishopric) were induced to disband and return home peacefully, the Pilgrim command structure remained in being and exercised effective control throughout most of the six northern counties until early December, installing for instance garrisons in strategic centres like Wressell and Hull and coining 'new money' for the cause from mints in Durham and Newcastle (45). When Ellerker and Bowes reported to the rebel leaders on their return from London on 17th November, the King's reply and promise of a pardon on submission was referred to the Pilgrim Council at York from 21st to 25th November, at which over 800 representatives of the rebellious parishes and town in the north as well as the leading Lords and gentry assembled (46). Although Henry doubtless believed that this earlier grant of a general pardon with only ten excepted persons was a display of princely leniency which would finally resolve the crisis, a further Council at Pontefract from 2nd to 4th December (at which a substantial armed force had again reassembled) forced Norfolk to concede a free pardon without exemptions and the King's reluctant promise that the Pilgrims detailed statement of demands would be fully debated at a free Parliament (47). Only then, after a final conference had been concluded at Doncaster on Saturday 9th October 1536, and the commons had 'come to the market cross and received knowledge of the King's free pardon which they were to have under the Great Seal', was Aske finally able to induce the rebels to disperse, tearing off 'his badge and crosses with the Five Wounds, and in like manner did all the others there present, saying "we will all wear no badge nor sign but the badge of our sovereign lord"' (48). Norfolk along with some of the rebel leaders (Aske and Constable) set off south to report to the King, while most of the northern gentry returned home, where they attempted to establish some order and settle such disputes as had arisen in their absence (49).

At last therefore the Pilgrimage gradually dissolved during the extended truce until the promised Parliament. But suspicions by the Commons that they were being

betrayed by the gentry were latent, and it soon became clear that the latter had undertaken a difficult task when they promised at Doncaster to keep the north quiet until Norfolk's return. Popular unrest had begun as early as the 13th October, when it was reported that in Durham, Richmondshire and Cleveland the commons would not pay their rent, nor allow any 'suppressed house' to be closed, while 'seditious words and bills have lately been set up against all lords, knights and gentlemen, both of the south and north, "saying that under the meetings at Doncaster and now by, counselling above, all is to betray them, therefore none they will trust unto"' (50).

Durham was to remain a centre of unrest throughout the winter. Lancaster Herald wrote from Berwick on Tuesday 26th December that he had proclaimed the King's pardon at York, Durham, Newcastle and Berwick and found the commons 'everywhere..... very sorry for their offences against the king' and eager for the coming of Norfolk (51). In fact it turns out that he did not even dare to read out the proclamation as it stood in Durham (the Proclamation was not an actual pardon but merely the promise of a pardon when each individual pilgrim had made his submission to the King's Lieutenants) (52). The herald was reported to have read the pardon one way in the city of Durham and another way in the loyal town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. When this was known in Durham the citizens were so angry that they 'ungoodly handled' the herald on his return and he did not 'escape without danger' (53). Similarly, on the 2nd of January Richard Bellasis warned the Earl of Westmoreland that there were 'ill disposed persons' about Auckland 'who were purposed to make a great insurrection forthwith' (54).

This unrest, exacerbated by rumours that the prisoners in Lincolnshire were already being brought to execution, that the monasteries would not be allowed to stand and that the 'King's Grace intends to perform nothing of our petitions', finally culminated in the renewed rebellion in the East Riding in January 1537 led by Sir Francis Bigod and John Hallam (55). The

involvement of the Durham commons in the insurrection was again significant, and it seems that Bigod was partly encouraged into the revolt at the outset by news of a rising in the Bishopric: apparently the people had spoiled the properties of Robert Bowes, Archdeacon Franklin and Lord Latimer, whom they accused of betraying them (56). In his letter of 15th January to Hallam, Bigod also declared that he had received positive news that the commons of Durham and Richmond intended to rise on 16th January, the day on which simultaneous attempts on Hull and Scarborough were to be made (57). Sir Francis had acted on the messages at once, and on Friday 15th January his servants were despatched up north to call out men for the new rising. One of these messengers, with a copy of the 'newly devised' oath and letters for Staindrop, Richmond and the Palatinate, reached Durham city on Wednesday 17th January where he delivered them to the bailiff and Cuthbert Richardson. The two officers of the town however immediately took both the letter and the messenger to the Earl of Westmoreland at Brancepeth, and gave 'answer to Sir Francis that the men of Durham have sworn to the Earl of Westmoreland to rise at no command but the King's or the Earl's in the King's name, and will stick to the King's pardon' (58). In the Earl's absence, the countess gave orders for the apprehension of any others that might come and sent a copy of the letter south to her husband. When the commons of Durham heard what their bailiff had done, they seized him and 'would have stricken off his head unless he had found means to get the fellow (the messenger) out of my said lady's custody' (59).

The instigators of this unrest among the commons in Durham are unknown, but the extent of their activities and the increasing level of popular organisation is clear (60). Proclamations and popular manifestos, several of which were seized and sent to the King, were fastened on church doors and passed from hand to hand. On Friday 19th January for instance, a bill appeared in Richmond commanding the commons of every parish to seize the

gentry and make them swear upon the mass-book to maintain the true church and take nothing from their tenants (61). A collection of wills was also made (or so he testified) by Sir John Bulmer in Cleveland, who had deliberately made his servants attend their parish assemblies. One of these ordered the men of Durham to take the Earl of Westmoreland, Lord Lumley and Lord Neville, while the men of Pickering would then seize Sir John Bulmer, and all the bands would then advance to capture the Duke of Norfolk and force him to keep the promises made at Doncaster. (62).

But despite the efforts of the commons and clergy, Bigod's renewed rebellion meant that Norfolk now had the excuse to move in his forces, and many of the Durham gentry who had been involved in the main Pilgrimage (such as Sir Thomas Tempest, Sir Robert Bowes and Sir Thomas Hilton) now sought to clear themselves by taking arms against the rebels. Norfolk began the work of repression at Carlisle in early February, using martial law initially in the north-east, then proceeding throughout the north to the trial of those who had exempted themselves from the earlier pardon by their involvement in the rebellions after the agreement on 9th December. He reached Durham on Thursday 8th March, where the Earl of Westmoreland had already imprisoned 13 'illdoers', and the trials began the next day despite a defective commission (63). On April 12th sentence was finally passed with 'not one acquit', as the Duke noted, and a total of sixteen prisoners were 'hanged in chains near their dwellings', so that 'no one now alive shall live to see like attempts, the people being in such fear' (64). The Pilgrimage was finally over, the promise of a 'free Parliament' and the discussion of grievances now ignored.

What then can be deduced about the meaning of the Pilgrimage in Durham? How significant was the element of popular religious protest? And what was the social

nature of the support for the rebellion? There seems little doubt that the rising in Mashamshire and Richmondshire which spread northwards had, at least on the surface, shown most of the features of a peasant revolt. The rebels showed little respect at first for the church, as their threatening behaviour with the Abbot at Jervaux revealed (65). Moreover rather than being an organised campaign, the sources give the impression of a slow process of mobilisation by the commons interrupted and accompanied by continual negotiations and the swearing in of nobles and gentry. But was this the truth of the matter? Elton has launched a powerful critique of the conventional narrative established by the Dodds from the documents largely contained in the 'Letters and Papers', and their interpretation of a 'truly popular movement which coerced the upper sort into compliance and promoted the restoration of the old Church against the innovators... what gave this patently biased account such authority and long life was that it did seem to be entirely in accord with the discoverable facts... from first to last the book breathes an animus against Henry, Cromwell, and the reformers, something like devotion to the cause of Catherine of Aragon and a profound conviction that what was at stake was 'liberty', a term never defined but frequently employed' (66). Apart therefore from the Doddses 'impartiality', Elton criticises their unquestioning use of the extensive documentation that has been left to historians because of the thorough investigation conducted by the government after the rebellion's suppression. This evidence, he argues, is crucially distorted. The gentry, nobility and higher clergy who were later interrogated all claimed to have been coerced: they testified without exception that the initiative had come from the volatile commons. Elton suggests that this was the inevitable and false response of people determined on saving their life and property and argues on the contrary that the northern risings were in large measure stirred up by disaffected members of the ruling classes.

It is true that the gentry not only joined the Pilgrimage in considerable numbers, as we have seen, but invariably acted as its leaders, quickly taking an active lead, applying the oath-taking and calling out the tenantry. It is also true that while there were some entirely popular rebellions, especially in Craven, Carlisle and the north-west, the main Pilgrim host soon came to be constituted of the gentry-led rebels in Durham and Yorkshire. However, it is precisely because of the limitations of the sources that Elton mentions (the fact that the rebels shrouded their movements in secrecy during the rebellion, while the later evidence consists of confessions made afterwards under cross-examination) that so little is known of the 'secret gentry organisation' of the Pilgrimage, if there was one. Although it is clear that many members of the northern aristocracy had good motives for joining the Pilgrimage, and therefore entered the rebellion with enthusiasm, there is very little evidence that the actual revolt was the work of a disaffected nobility who manipulated the commons to achieve their own ends.

On the contrary, recent evidence has emerged to show indeed that the very possibility of resistance to the rebel host was sometimes restricted by the collapse of the normal ties of authority and deference even within aristocratic households. A newly discovered letter in Thomas Master's narrative seems to indicate that the Earl of Cumberland suffered the loss of his retinue and household at Skipton to the commons during the Pilgrimage (67). More significantly, as far as Durham is concerned, another letter from the same source also casts light on the ambiguous attitude of the Earl of Westmoreland. It has been commonly assumed in the past, with reference to an undated letter written by the Earl's servant Henry Eure to the 'Master Captain' (Aske), that Westmoreland gave covert support to the rebellion but avoided making any direct commitment by having his son Lord Neville lead the Durham Pilgrims (68). In the letter Eure asks the recipient in a rather coded fashion to

believe that 'my Lord is true according to his first promise to Bowes' (who had taken his surrender) and that it had been 'past his power to resist them... both he and all his council are true (69). The new letter however makes the nature of Westmoreland's relationship with the Pilgrims explicit: the nobles at Doncaster reported that 'the Earle of Westmoreland was taken in his Castle, and in forced to send his eldest son with St. Cuthbert's Baner, or else to have dyed' (70). It seems in fact as if the Earl's surrender in October 1536 was forced on him by the loss of his household and retinue. In April 1537 Norfolk told Cromwell that Westmoreland had refused to accept the wardenship of the East and Middle Marches because during the Pilgrimage 'his own servants refused to follow the King, for which he finds fault with one and other of them daily, dismissing them from his service, as he has done the steward of his house' (71). It is particularly significant that Marmaduke Neville, one of the Captains of the Bishopric, abandoned the Earl, mobilising for the Pilgrimage not only his following but also those Durham forces (the bishop's tenants) who normally made an important contribution to the defence of the border (72).

Nor was Westmoreland's attitude shared by other members of the Durham aristocracy, and their intervention in the rebellion was certainly to prove crucial, giving it a cohesion it would otherwise have lacked. What were the reasons for their involvement in the Pilgrimage? All the leading Durham families, the Lumleys, Nevilles and Hiltons, had found it difficult to come to terms with the Tudors because of their Yorkist traditions. The descent of the 5th Lord Lumley (1510-45) from a natural daughter of Edward IV meant that his family rarely received any favour in Court circles, while the Nevilles distrust of the Tudors stemmed from the fact that a large part of the family inheritance had been appropriated by the Crown after the fall of Warwick the Kingmaker, and neither of the Henries had made any initiatives towards restoring it. This distrust was fully reciprocal, especially after

the marriage of the 4th Earl of Westmoreland to the daughter of the Duke of Buckingham. The Nevilles were also distantly related to the so-called 'White Rose Party' who were the legitimate Plantaganet line in England: Westmoreland's mother had become Lord Darcy's second wife while Darcy had also served the Earl as his steward (73).

Consequently the Tudors were often reluctant to entrust office on the Borders to either of these two families if alternatives were available, even though the Lumleys and Nevilles had come to regard their control of the March offices as an inalienable right. As a result their leadership of the narrow circle of rich upper gentry which dominated the political scene in Durham had come increasingly into question, particularly during the rule of the great administrative bishops Ruthall (1509-22), Wolsey (1523-29) and Tunstall (1530-39), whose allegiance lay firmly with the Crown. The Nevilles traditional connection with the stewardship of the bishopric had lapsed under Henry VII, while Wolsey appointed the latter's natural son the Duke of Richmond to the same office in 1525 (replacing Westmoreland) (74). Similarly Lord Lumley had lost control of the offices of master forester and coroner of Chester ward after legal disputes with Ruthall and Wolsey. No doubt both families were therefore exasperated at these snubs received from the Crown and courtier bishops (a reflection of these grievances also emerged rather curiously at a popular level during the Pilgrimage, when it was reported by the Abbot of Jervaux that the commons of Piercebridge and Middleham - one of the Neville lordships which had come into possession of the crown - had said during the insurrection that 'they would make new lords of Midham and restore divers who were put from their office by wrong' (75)). There was probably considerable irritation too at the increasing need for the great Durham families to make approaches to Cromwell regarding the affairs of the bishopric in the 1530s, while the impending dissolution would impart an even greater influence to the

court because of the wealth of land and offices which would be placed under its control (76). Finally the involvement of the Durham aristocracy in the Pilgrimage may also have partly reflected the rivalry between the leading local houses and those heads of the Durham gentry or 'new men' who aspired to lead the region in alliance with the bishops, and who realised that their main prospects of advancement lay in the service of the Crown. These included men such as the Durham lawyer Sir Thomas Tempest, who was appointed deputy steward in 1510, and held the stewardship until 1544, Sir William Eure who was made lieutenant of the Middle Marches in 1523 by Wolsey, and Robert Bowes who was appointed excheator of Durham and Sedbergh by Tunstal in 1530 (77).

But although these 'new men' Sir Thomas Tempest and Sir Robert Bowes perhaps surprisingly joined the Pilgrimage, their motives and approach differed markedly from that of the Durham 'lords' Lumley, his heir Roger, their cousin Sir Thomas Hilton and Lord Latimer, who led the extremist party among the leaders of the rebels. Tempest and Bowes joined the moderate party among the Pilgrims, led by Aske, and seem to have used their influence at the Council at Pontefract in December 1536 to advance policies of compromise and constitutional negotiation. Aske later testified that it was Sir Thomas Tempest amongst others 'who sent advice in writing to the lords, knights and this examine at Pomfret for reformation of the said statutes by Act of Parliament', rather than seeking the amendment of the acts and policies against which they had risen by petition to the King, and then 'by sword and battle' if their petitions were rejected (78). Indeed, it is likely that Bowes and Tempest had joined Aske at the outset in proposing a peaceful and diplomatic course of action to the Pilgrim leaders at Doncaster in October, when the Durham lords had been eager to take up Norfolk's challenge to battle rather than accepting his offer of a negotiation. Again this was the policy that was adopted. Aske, Bowes and Tempest were all skilful lawyers (the Durham pair were

both employed by the crown as counsel in the north) and it was these three along with the courtier Lord Darcy, who handled the subsequent important and delicate negotiations with Norfolk as the King's Lieutenant (79) For them the very concept of a Pilgrimage seems to have implied a largely non-violent kind of demonstration, proceeding by petition to the King on behalf of his oppressed subjects, rather than any military campaign.

The moderate's approach contrasted strongly however with that of the extremist party of violence, represented above all by the 'lords of the Bishopric', whose distrust of Henry VIII made them ready for an appeal to use force against the King. As well as being eager as their 'honour' required to carry the issue to 'war and battle' with Norfolk at Doncaster, they remained resolute in their support of violent policies throughout the Pilgrimage (80). At Pontefract in December, Latimer wished to obtain a ruling from the clergy that if the Pilgrims petitions were refused 'it was lawful for them to fight, in the cases specified, against their prince' (81). It seems therefore, as Mervyn James has argued, that apart from the 'touchy self-assertiveness of honour' which naturally 'drove the group towards violent courses', the Durham lords were certainly encouraged in their traditionalist reaction against the crown by the idea of religious war. As it has been seen, it was the Durham men who first adopted the device of the Five Wounds, a protective talisman associated with the crusade. Thus, along with the language and images of crusade that had been cultivated by the More, Pole and 'Aragonese' circle in the early 1530s James argues that, 'a highly disruptive motivation was made available for resisting Henry VIII on the grounds that he had become a heretic and a schismatic' (82). However, despite pressure from the extremists, Archbishop Lee consistently refused to define any grounds on which 'we may danger battle' (83), so that the Pilgrimage never really adopted a stance by which effective resistance could be offered to Henry.

The wide measure of support the rebellion received from all groups of the governing class in Durham also indicates that above all it was the reaction of a community traditionally accustomed to ordering its own affairs in its own way without undue interference from the south. The Act of 1536, which transferred the bishop's criminal jurisdiction to the Crown (along with the appointment of justices of assize and of the peace) was probably viewed with considerable unease as a sign of increasing intervention by central government (84). It is not surprising therefore that one of the Pilgrims' demands in the Pontefract Manifesto (Article 19) should have been the restoration of the 'liberties of the church' in the Palatinate (85). Similarly, it was Sir Thomas Tempest (MP for Newcastle in the Reformation Parliament 1529-36) who introduced the bitter complaint about conciliar management in the Commons and the extent of Cromwell's influence 'what so ever Cromwell says ys right and noyne but that' (86). At least some of the northern gentry in 1536 were complaining therefore about their alienation from the court as well as Cromwell's administrative centralisation.

It is certain too that the concern to defend the region's identity lay behind the religious aspects of the rising. The diocese of Durham county was very much affected by the act for the dissolution of the smaller monasteries in March 1536 as it contained sixteen monastic and conventual properties with an annual value of under £200 that were due to be alienated (87). It is clear that this caused great unease in both secular and religious circles. The visitors had first arrived in Durham in February 1536, when a report was made of the irregularities in the bishop's household, and in June a list of smaller houses had been drawn up (88). Determined to preserve some of the dependent houses, the prior wrote to Cromwell attempting to bribe him into changing his mind (89). Rumours of a further abolition of monastic privileges in Durham priory itself, including sanctuary rights, also caused unrest and prompted Sir France Bigod

to intercede with Cromwell on behalf of the church's rights, arguing that their restitution 'would win the hearts of all in the north, especially in the Bishopric, adeo sunt dicati Cuthberti' (90). It is more difficult however to measure the importance of the monasteries for the commons at large. During his examination Aske attempted to put forward most of the reasons which made the abbeys, as Norfolk wrote in 1537, 'greatlie beloved with the people'. Less romantically, he had earlier stressed their social and economic usefulness to the lords at Pontefract (91). The abbeys acted as a social focal point in the neighbourhood: they provided legal relief and rudimentary education for the poor, tenancies for farmers, general hospitality to travellers, medical aid and hospitals for the sick or infirm, and a place to dispose of aged relations or unmarried daughters. The pilgrim's ballad certainly makes it clear that the commons themselves largely identified the threat to the church with the treat to the poor (92), the latter becoming a symbol of oppression in the popular imagination,

'But now to see them wandering  
My soul with sorrow faints' (93)

It is doubtless true that the dissolution affected the daily life of the people in Durham far more deeply than the breach with Rome, providing the first tangible manifestation of the changes that were in store for established religion in the bishopric. While the visitation had been in progress (June 1535 - February 1536), Tunstall - like the other bishops - was forced to preach on the royal supremacy in various parts of the diocese, and compel the lesser clergy to do the same in every parish. His compliance and success in this measure is confirmed in a letter to Cromwell by the Commissioner Thomas Legh early in 1536, who reported that the bishop had 'set forth the utter abolishment of the bishop of Rome... so that no part of the realm is in better order in that respect'. This fits in with the fact that there is little evidence as a whole for the royal supremacy

being a source of major discontent in the Pilgrimage (94).

More serious, as far as Durham was concerned, were the Ten Articles promulgated by Henry VIII in July 1536 as Supreme Head of the Church, and the Injunctions that soon supplemented them in August, both of which attacked the veneration of saints (along with images and relics) and so therefore the cult of St. Cuthbert on which the fame and sanctity of the monastery rested. There is little doubt then that the banner of St. Cuthbert which they brought from the cathedral would have carried an immense emotional significance for the Durham contingent. The Henrician attack on saint worship was also extended to the suppression of superfluous saints days (decreed in August) which seems to have caused popular unrest throughout the north. At Kirby Stephen the villagers complained when the priest failed to announce St. Luke's day, while in the East Riding there was anger among the commons when they were not allowed to keep the time-honoured ritual of St. Wilfrid's day. It seemed likely, moreover, that this general attack on superstition could easily develop from an attack on abuses to an attack on catholic practice as such. The Ten Articles mentioned only three of the sacraments as being scripturally based, while the preaching of sermons against purgatory posed a direct threat to the whole apparatus of prayers and masses for the dead (95).

It was this general atmosphere of fear, uncertainty and suspicion that provided a seed-bed for the widespread crop of rumours (or 'bruits') that circulated the north before and during the pilgrimage, and which had so much to do with the strength and persistence of the popular response. These rumours needed to be credible and related to authentic popular sentiments if they were to result in action. Hence, as C.S.L. Davies has argued, the stories which the rumour-mongers spread (and the response they evoked) indicate something of popular hopes and worries: these included fears of an extension of the taxation system to include 'every wedding, burying and

christening', and not only an attack on the monasteries but also on local parish churches, which would result in the confiscation of church treasure, the replacement of gold and silver chalices, and a rationalisation of the parochial system leaving only 'one church within five miles, and ... all the rest shall be put down' (96).

'Heresy' became the generalised term of abuse for those imposing innovations and threatening traditional parochial worship, while Cromwell in particular became the bogey for these various grievances - 'their especial great grudge is against the Lord Cromwell, being reputed the destroyer of the Commonwealth' said Aske (97).

This is not to argue that the Pilgrimage was a spontaneous commons revolt, although evidence for an increasing popular organisation in Durham and elsewhere has been discussed earlier. Rumours were often deliberately spread, particularly it would seem by the clergy, who had excellent reasons for raising their parishes and mobilising the commons (apart from the attack on traditional religious practices and the fear of a general confiscation of ecclesiastical property, the clergy were suffering a large increase in taxation especially now that the Valor Ecclesiasticus provided the government with a realistic assessment of clerical income). At Knaresborough, for instance, the friars posted bills through the town falsely announcing the imposition of new taxes - plough money, cattle taxes and charges for baptism. Similarly, when Lancaster Herald visited Durham in December to read the King's pardon he 'found the most corrupted and malicious spirituality inward and partly outward that any prince hath in his realm. They were the greatest "corypers" of the temporalty, and have given the secret occasion of all this mischief'. Thus, of the sixteen ringleaders who were executed in Durham, at least three were members of the priory (98).

Elton has argued, contrary to this view, however, that the clergy were largely acting as 'agents not originators' on behalf of their lay patrons, and more

generally that these rumours were being deliberately spread as part of an upper-class conspiracy by Lords Hussey, Darcy and a defeated 'Aragonese' court faction in alliance with disaffected 'anti-court' gentry. There is not space to discuss his wider arguments here, and they have been countered elsewhere (99). But although it is clear that Hussey, Darcy and Aske hoped for a rising like that which eventually happened - most notably in their meetings with the imperial ambassador Chapuys in 1534 - the evidence, as suggested earlier, for the Pilgrimage itself being the result of their pre-planning is not convincing or conclusive (100). In particular, there is little proof (apart from the exceptional efforts of Darcy's agent the Vicar of Brayton in early October) that the clergy active in the business of spreading rumours and raising the people were merely acting as clients of disaffected gentry. Rather it seems as if there was a real and rapid spread of unrest in the early autumn of 1536 that was stirred up in large part by the clergy, but which evoked a substantial response from the commons. Hussey, Darcy and other members of the northern aristocracy and gentry then hurried to turn the rebellion to their advantage (particularly in terms of the monasteries (101)).

This groundswell of opinion and general reaction against change brings us back therefore to the sense of regional identity, propriety and popular attachment to the established church as a manifestation of the parochial community, which has been discussed in earlier chapters. The response of the commons to the rumours clearly testifies to their psychological and monetary investment in the parish church and its furnishings (as Mervyn James has shown, this sense of communal proprietorship and local pride was as strong in a corporate urban context as in the villages (102)). The commons were defending after all what they themselves had provided: it was lay people who financed the gilding of images, the improvement of church furnishings and the maintenance of saints' shrines. Consequently, as N.Z.

Davis has shown in a European context, the images, relics and saints currently under attack in the Henrician reforms were extremely emotive symbols, often serving as a catalytic focal point for religious confrontation (103). For traditionalists they represented their own participation, individual and communal, in the process of worship, and therefore had to be defended at all costs against those 'heretics' who were determined to challenge accepted religious ideas and impose change from the outside. More generally, their determination to defend the established church and rid the community of 'pollution' meant that religious rioters rarely acted in an 'entirely mindless way... people will to some degree have a sense that what they are doing is legitimate, the occasions will relate somehow to the defence of their course, and violent behaviour will have some structure to it - here dramatic and ritual' (104). It is insufficient therefore to argue, as Elton does, that the religious imagery of the Pilgrimage was merely foisted onto the people by Aske and others to provide a rallying cry for the movement. The banner of St. Cuthbert, the device of the Five Wounds, the Pilgrim's oath (105) and marching song were not adopted simply to legitimise the movement against the King: they provided an authentic and potent symbolism for the commons and gave (in the case of the oath) an element of sanctity and mystery tht served to bind the unwilling to the cause.

In sum, the Pilgrimage - with its peculiar blend of northern separation, peasant unrest, noble honour and regional Catholicism - had achieved little of consequence for the Durham region. In political terms the revolt marked the further decline of the great Bishopric families. George Lumley's involvement in Francis Bigod's rising in January 1537 led to his subsequent execution,

and although his father was spared, the attainder of the heir served to put the whole future of the family inheritance in doubt. The loyalty of which Westmoreland could assure the King probably enabled the lesser Nevilles and the family's supporters or clients to escape with their lives, but only at the cost of continued political and financial decline and disfavour which lasted into Elizabeth's reign (106). At a popular level, the reprisals against the commons in Durham were fairly limited, but the brutality with which the rebellion was put down in the north as a whole provided a powerful disincentive to renewed rebellion that lasted thirty years. Discontent remained common however, while the revealing case of John Pearson (a 'priest of the Corpus Christi guild within Durham') in July 1537 suggests that the clergy remained persistent in their efforts to stir up the people (107). Their efforts were in vain. Above all, the defeat of the Pilgrimage was followed by the destruction of the regional cult it had attempted to defend: in 1537 St. Cuthbert's shrine was defaced, and by 1541 the monastery at Durham was dissolved.

### 3. CONTINUITY AND CHANGE: The Enforcement of the Henrician Reformation (1536-1547)

By 1536-7 Thomas Cromwell and Henry VIII had initiated the greater part of an official revolution in English religion. The Act of Supremacy had replaced the authority of the pope by that of the King as 'the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England'; traditional teachings on images, relics, and the worship of saints were attacked by the Ten Articles of 1536, which also reduced the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church to three (baptism, penance and the Mass); certain religious practices such as the celebration of 'superfluous' holy days and patronal festivals were abrogated, while the Royal Injunctions of August 1536 required that the clergy teach the parishioners the Pater Noster, the Creed and the Ten Commandments 'in their mother tongue, and the same so taught shall cause the said youth oft to repeat and understand'; perhaps most dramatically of all, the Act for the dissolution of the smaller monasteries in March 1536 had begun the slow assault on the nation's religious houses (1).

It was inevitable that these changes would cause enduring resentment in Durham county as elsewhere, since they were clearly interpreted by many as an attack on the very functions of the established church. Cromwell in particular was accused of heresy and was said to be undermining the priesthood and the sacraments. As late as 1538 the people of the north were said to be the ministers 'extreme mortal enemies' (2). Furthermore, it has been noted previously that the royal supremacy was probably a peripheral issue for the laity in Durham, and that the Pilgrimage of Grace followed not the break with Rome but the Ten Articles and Royal Injunctions of 1536. Thus although there are some signs of a popular allegiance to the papal primacy in the bishopric, such feelings seem to have been shortlived and primarily confined to monasteries or the clergy. Richard Marshall, for instance, Prior of the Black Friars in Newcastle, had

preached a series of sermons during the winter of 1535-6 against the Royal Supremacy and in favour of the Pope (3). Anthony Heron, from Coniscliffe in County Durham, had also been indicted on September 30th 1535, for stating both that day in York castle and on previous occasions that the King could not be head of the church, since the Pope already held that position (4). By early 1536, however, the monastic visitors Legh and Layton were able to write a glowing report of Tunstal's preaching of the King's title of Supreme Head, although their account was probably coloured by the conciliatory treatment they were receiving at the hands of the prior: Layton told Cromwell on the 26th of January that 'the county here about Durham is substantially established, in the abolition of the bishop of Rome and his usurped power' (5).

But there can be little doubt about the considerable opposition in the north to the attack on ceremonies, doctrines and shrines. Archbishop Lee of York reported that although few were advancing the primacy of Rome, 'at such novelties, specially handled without charity or discretion, the people grudge much' (6). Similarly, the general response of the northern laity to the Ten Articles was summarised by Hall as 'See, friends, now is taken from us four of the seven sacraments, and shortly we shall lose the other three also, and thus the faith of the Holy Church shall be utterly suppressed and abolished' (7). But of greatest significance for Durham was the desecration of St. Cuthbert's shrine in 1537, which represented in symbolic terms an attack on the region's spiritual identity and the end of the old order. As a consequence, Catholic historians attempted to compensate for the sacrilege with their descriptions of the discovery of the saint's incorruptible and indestructible body by the King's visitors,

'After the spoile of his ornaments and jewels, they approached near to his body, expecting nothing but dust and ashes; but perceiving the Chest he lay strongly bound with iron, the goldsmith, with a smith's great fore

(forge?) hammer, broke it open, when they found him lying whole, incorrupt, with his face bare, and his beard as of a fortnight's growth, and all the vestments about him, as he was accustomed to say Mass, and his metwand of gold lying by him. When the goldsmith perceived he had broken one of his legs in breaking open the chest, he was sore troubled... which Dr. Henley hearing, called to him, and bade him cast down his bones. The other answered, he could not get asunder, for the screws and skin held them so that they would not separate' (8).

Although such descriptions gave added strength to enduring Catholic traditions that the real body was secured from further profanation, while a counterfeit was substituted in St. Cuthbert's coffin in 1542, the saints cult was effectively brought to an end when the latter was reburied in a plain tomb the same year (9).

It is clear that such actions, along with the loss of the monasteries, continued to cause serious popular discontent in Durham long after the Pilgrimage had been defeated. The year that followed the rebellion was generally characterised by spasmodic disturbances in the bishopric, while rumours and rebel propaganda tracts were still circulating when Cromwell's 'bedeman' John Gladwyn visited the county in January 1538, to 'hear and see the fashion of vicious people, schismatics, ipocrites, boger treatours (and) rebellys' (10). Unrest over the loss of shrines in the Palatinate was reported as late as the winter of 1539, while Cromwell was told that the Prior and three or four others were determined never to surrender the monastery (11).

Thus the Henrician government were forced to take on the vital task of justifying actions and disseminating ideas which many lay people would find extremely objectionable, and which would be strongly opposed by important sections of the clergy. Beginning in 1533, but increasing in intensity by 1536-7, Cromwell therefore organised a twofold campaign: of propaganda to make the new religious doctrines acceptable, and of 'police-work' to enforce their acceptance (12).

Material on the propaganda campaign in Durham is fragmentary but it is apparent that it followed the same lines as in the rest of the county. It has already been observed that in June 1535 Cromwell had sent out a letter to all the bishops, ordering each diocesan to preach every Sunday the King's new title of Supreme Head, and further to give new instructions to do likewise to 'all manner of abbots, priors, deans, archdeacons, priests, parsons, vicars, curates, and all other ecclesiastical persons' in his diocese. Similarly, the Royal Injunctions of August 1536 had ordered all clergy to 'open and declare in their said sermons and other collations' the ten Articles 'unto all them that be under their cure' (13). It is difficult however to know how much preaching was done, and the central problem for the government was one of enforcement. Indeed, whatever the vigour of political and religious leadership in the capital, the royal programme had ultimately to be justified by local clergy and officials over whom central government had only limited control. Although archdeacons and rural deans were instructed to report on those parochial clergy who failed in their duty, it is clear that the Palatinate was desperately short of licensed preachers, and there was no certainty that even the bishop's instructions would be fulfilled at a local level. The Prior of St. Oswalds, for instance, writing to Thomas Cromwell in 1538, complained that there was a great scarcity of preachers in 'Newcastle and the county around', adding that the same area was also 'destitute of good pastors'. Similarly, Bernard Gilpin later commented in Edward's reign that some pulpits in the region are 'covered in dust, some have not had foure sermons these fifteene or sixteen yeares' (14).

It is clear that in part this shortage was precisely due to the fact that the sermon was being used as a weapon to enforce the government's religious changes. Since it was likely that some preachers would imbue in the people opinions hostile to the Crown's religious changes, the government and ecclesiastical authorities

made no attempt to alter the medieval practice by which preaching was regarded as a special function only to be performed by those who were formally authorised (15). These men, some of whom were unbeneficed, were specially licensed by the bishops, the universities or the Crown, to preach in public (as the parochial clergy were forbidden to do) in various specified districts. However, with preachers of this sort in such limited supply in the north, the publication of the supremacy and the religious changes depended in the last analysis on the views and abilities of each parish priest, who were entitled by their office to deliver sermons in their own parish churches. But it seems improbable that the administrative machinery in Durham was either stringent or effective in tracking down those clergy who were failing to carry out their duty. A further letter from Prior Robert Ferrer in February 1539 informed Cromwell that the 'keepers of the King's peace and of the spiritual courts as they name them, have been, hitherto, very negligent. As to the setting forth of God's word and the King's supremacy, I hear of no preacher betwixt Newcastle and Berwick, and few in all Westmoreland, Cumberland, Durhamshire and west of Yorkshire' (16).

Nevertheless, Cromwell certainly realised that it was not sufficient simply to put forward reasons for the royal supremacy and the attack on various aspects of traditional religion. In order to enforce their acceptance, the government needed information about the extent of the opposition which the changes had aroused. Thus, a letter from Tunstal to Lord Lumley makes it seem probable that the justices of the peace were set to watch over the parochial clergy in the bishopric from 1535 onwards, and report any unrest among them (17). Cromwell's spies were also at work in the county. On 14th December, 1539, when the diocesan registrar Christopher Chaytor was travelling south to join the bishop in London, he was drawn into a conversation by Craye, a spy, speaking freely with him about Tunstal's submission to the King in 1534, public unrest in the

Palatinate about the loss of shrines and images, the dissolution of the monasteries, and his own belief in the efficacy of relics (18).

The 'police-system', and the way in which men were detected, is also revealed by the case of William Wytham, a gentleman from Darnton in Durham, who reported the Prior of Newburgh to the Council of the North in December 1537. While travelling from the bishopric to York he had stayed at the priory, and during his prayers in the chapel he was approached by Brian Boye, late keeper of the same. Boye told Wytham that when the Duke of Norfolk's judicial activities had been praised by a Mrs. Fulthrop in the prior's presence, the latter had retorted that it makes no matter if one were hanged against the other' (19). After Wytham had reported the incident, the accused, Boye and various other witnesses were immediately summoned to the Council at York, where they were interrogated on 7th December, 1537 (20).

It is unlikely as a whole, however, that the 'police-system' in Durham proved very effective. The church's administrative structure was not particularly strong in the bishopric, and diocesan officers could neither impose their will nor even know what was happening in some parishes so that the presentation of religious offenders depended almost entirely on the individual churchwardens concerned (21). As a consequence, the detection by the authorities of those unwilling to accept religious change was extremely difficult, even assuming that the will for the extensive visitations necessary was present, which is unlikely. Bishop Tunstal seems to have preferred to exercise a distant authority, and only intervened personally where he saw a threat to his own authority or an attack on the faith. There are, for instance, only five entries in his register relating to visitations, and none of these were concerned with enforcing the Henrician changes (22). The apparent 'negligence' of Durham's 'spiritual courts' in tracking down dissenters has also been noted (23). Conservative clerics, as it will be seen below, were therefore able to

fight a strong rearguard action to preserve traditional ceremonies and doctrines, and thereby combat the influence of royal propaganda.

It is true that the Pilgrimage of Grace and the judicial missions of the duke of Norfolk had made it possible and even necessary to reorganise the secular administration of the Palatinate and the government of the north as a whole. The Act of 1536 had already transferred final authority in the administration of Durham justice to the Crown (24). Now, after the Pilgrimage had exposed the flaws of the old Council of the North, whose powers for much of the 1530s were limited to Yorkshire alone, a new body was created in 1537 under Bishop Holgate and then Tunstal himself. Significantly, the bishopric was included in the jurisdiction of the King's council for the first time (along with Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmoreland), while one of the four annual sessions was actually held at Durham (25). The reformed council acted as a link between central government and the Justices of the Peace, whose work it supervised, and was given wide powers to attack religious conservatism and to proceed in cases of treason, murder and civil dispute (26). Furthermore, there is some evidence to suggest that the council began to provide strong local authority and improve public order in the region as a whole (27). Before leaving the Bishopric, once his special work was completed, Norfolk, for instance, wrote that the 'county is now in that sort that none of the realm shall be better governed' (28). The membership of the new Council, composed partly of the leading gentry that had taken part against the Pilgrimage (such as Bowes, Tempest and Hilton), also ensured that vigorous action would be taken against the discontented (29).

In the longer term, the Council was undoubtedly helped in Durham itself by the Palatinate organisation with its fiscal and judicial machinery, which helped ensure effective local administration and justice. There are few signs in this respect that Bishop Tunstal,

whatever his undoubted worries in the 1530s about the King's religious policies, was much concerned with defending the Palatinate's jurisdictional rights. As Mervyn James points out, the Bishop probably felt more intimidated by pressures which could be brought to bear by the greater nobility of the county than royal interference: since the earl of Westmoreland and Lord Lumley in particular were still in possession of several of the greater Palatine offices (justices of assize, commissions of array and justices of the peace) they could make life extremely difficult for the bishop and his official circle, so that the support of the crown was essential if he was to maintain his independence (30). Despite therefore Tunstal's initial willingness to assume the position of President, the extension of the Council of the North and royal justice into the bishopric after 1536-7 seems without doubt to have strengthened his position (31). Appointed as Lord Lieutenant of Durham in 1537, the bishop ruled without challenge in the Palatinate for the rest of Henry's reign, in association with lesser gentry and lawyer figures like Eure, Tempest and Bowes, throwing himself and the Palatinate's resources into the Scottish wars and border business that dominated his time and correspondence in the 1540s (32).

In the shorter term, the Council undertook a sustained campaign against the opponents of royal policy, and between the spring of 1537 and the fall of Thomas Cromwell at least 41 alleged traitors were denounced from the six northern counties, mostly from Yorkshire; 23 were executed, five of whom were from Durham (33). Overt conservatism, at least, seems to have been crushed in the north. John Ainsworth, for instance, who had been patronised by Catherine of Aragon, had preached freely against royal policy in Lancashire at the end of 1537. As soon as he attempted to preach in York, however, within the jurisdiction of the Council of the North, he was prevented. In order to counter the restrictions, he nailed up a copy of his 1533 sermon against the King's divorce in which 'he called the Church of Rome our Mother

Holy Church' and regretted that "now she is blinded again" (34). A few days later he was tried for treason and executed (35).

As a whole, however, it does not seem as if Tunstal and the Council were particularly determined in their efforts to root out religious opposition in Durham itself. Elton has shown that at least 883 people in England, Wales and Calais came within the compass of the treason law between 1532 and 1540. But apart from the trials that followed the Pilgrimage of Grace in March 1537, only one case from the Palatinate was included in this tally, that of a Durham priest, who was committed to ward by Norfolk for his 'treasonable words' in September and then executed the following year (36). Moreover there were no such trials at all in Durham in the 1540s, with the single exception of Thomas Blount, who was attainted of treason in 1543 (37). Nevertheless it cannot be assumed that the small number of prosecutions in the 1530s and 1540s reflected an absence of unspoken or even articulate conservatism in the bishopric. Few cases were being reported because the machinery which existed to detect the disaffected was still inadequate, and only capable of uncovering a handful of incidents. One particular problem seems to have been that the offence of spreading rumours was much too vague for a precise definition, so that unless it was possible to construe treason, the law provided no means for passing judgement. Thus Tunstal, acting as president of the northern Council in the prosecution of the Prior of Newburgh, may well have been disappointed in his desire to 'know the full opinion of the judges what such rumours deserve' (38). In September 1537, the Council's long and complicated charge of treasonable words raised against Thomas Neville, brother of Lord Latimer, also failed to hold (39).

Perhaps the best explanation of why so few people attempted overt resistance to religious change in Durham after 1537, however, is the fact that things had not actually altered that much. Henry's theological reaction

of 1538-9 meant that the anticipated attack on the fabric and doctrines of the established church never fully materialised. Thus although official criticisms were expressed in the 1536 and 1538 Injunctions about Purgatory, it was not until ten years later that the doctrine was actually repudiated. Again, although shrines were defaced in the later 1530s, the worship of saints was not finally forbidden until Edward VI's reign. Even more important was the fact that the mass remained intact during Henry's lifetime, while there was a lull of seven years after the last of the larger monasteries had been dissolved before the attack on guilds and chantries effectively began.

The dissolution of the priory of Durham also serves to illuminate the basic continuity underlying the impact of the Henrician changes in the Palatinate (40). Her eight dependent cells, all with an income of less than £200 (Jarrow, Finchale, Wearmouth, Holy Island, Neasham, Farne Island, Letham and Stamford) had gone in 1536 and 1537, and she alone stood undissolved in 1539 (41). But the conciliatory and diplomatic behaviour of Bishop Tunstal and Prior Whitehead ensured that the mother house continued largely unscathed. Tunstal was absent in London throughout this time and it is possible that he used his influence on behalf of the old monastery (certainly there is no sign of a protest or remonstrance by the bishop). It is likely that the judicious use of bribery by Prior Whitehead proved even more influential: Wrothesley and later Somerset both received pensions from the chapter, while Cromwell himself received at least £40 from Durham annuities between 1536-9, as well as the stewardship of Hōwden Manor (42). When therefore the abbey finally came to an end on December 31st, 1539 with the prompt signing by Whitehead of the deed of surrender, the priory submitted without protest (43). This submissive policy certainly paid handsome dividends: it meant not only that St. Cuthbert's body was saved, but that the government's officials largely ignored the frequent grants of lands and advowsons made by the priory

during the last few years of its existence (44). By far the most important advantage lay, however, in the smooth transformation from a monastic to a secular cathedral, as part of Henry's wider scheme (first broached by Wolsey in the 1520s) for 'reviving' 16 monasteries as secular cathedrals of the 'new foundation'. When Durham was re-established in May 1541, with a chapter consisting of 12 'secular' canons (assisted by 12 minor canons and an establishment of clerks and choristers) presided over by a dean, at least 27 of the Durham monks were provided for in the new cathedral church (45). Even more remarkably, the last prior Hugh Whitehead became the first dean while twelve of the monks were chosen to be the first prebendaries. This continuity of personnel inevitably undermined the change that was implicit in the terms of the letters patent of the new foundation, which emphasised for purposes of propaganda the breach with the 'corrupt' monastic past by changing the dedication of the cathedral to 'Christ and Blessed Mary the Virgin' from the old designation of 'St. Mary and St. Cuthbert the Bishop': the deed of refoundation also stated the intention of reforming the true religion to its 'primitive or genuinely unalloyed pattern', of promoting the Bible and the Sacraments, and of correcting 'the irregularities into which by long lapse of time... the monks had woefully transgressed their bounds' (46).

Apart from the constitutional changes, one genuinely important break with the past that was included among these pious aims was the control of patronage. Whereas the priory had always remained a largely independent corporation as far as recruitment was concerned, despite pressures put upon it by the laity, the most valuable benefices created in 1541 (the deanery, the 12 prebendal stalls, and the eight secular almsrooms) were reserved for the Crown. Although in the short term Henry seems to have been primarily concerned with keeping the number of pensionable monks to a minimum, the Crown's patronage of the prebends (later granted to the bishop) enabled in the long term the introduction of a client elite into the

ranks of the Cathedral clergy during the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth, by means of which Protestantism was gradually established in the county (47).

But apart from the symbolic destruction of St. Cuthbert's Shrine, the tranquil life in the Durham cathedral and close saw little apparent change during Henry's reign. The ex-monks in the chapter were naturally keen to perpetuate the old ideas and attitudes of their Benedictine past, and continued to use the image of Christ and the great paschal candlestick in the services at Easter until at least 1545 (48). That same year, for instance, the prebendaries described themselves as 'monks of the late dissolved monastery of Durham' (49). A high degree of continuity was also made inevitable by the deed of endowment, by which the new cathedral church received the bulk of the old monastic estates in Durham (along with a reduced amount of property in Northumberland and Yorkshire) while at the same time being granted 'all spiritual rights and ecclesiastical privelages which the prior had held or enjoyed... or should have held or enjoyed' (50). The new dean and (increasingly legalistic) chapter seem to have been determined to exercise this right to recover the monks' usurped jurisdiction to the full, particularly in the traditional battle with the Archbishop of York over jurisdictional rights, and the acrimonious disputes that took place under Dean Whittingham in 1576-7 and Dean Matthew in 1587 concerning this issue recalled the struggles of the medieval priors to preserve the liberties of St. Cuthbert. The endowment deed also meant that the two institutions were fairly similar in economic terms: the new foundation cost £1147 13s a year, as compared with the value given in the Valor Ecclesiasticus (1535) of £1250 13s 5d (51). Nevertheless it is probable that the life-style of the reorganised community was considerably less luxurious than that of the monks before the dissolution. Whereas there were as many as 110 servants attached to the Durham priory, the offices actually endowed in 1540 consisted only of a school-

master, an usher, two cooks, two butlers and two sacristis (52).

A general sense of continuity also emerges from a study of the parochial clergy in Durham. Large numbers of those clergy who were ordained before 1536 were able to reconcile themselves to the various changes in the next twenty-five years, although few survived into Elizabeth's reign. Two exceptions were Richard Marshall, who was Rector of Stainton from 1533-82, and Bartholomew Reseley, who was curate of Gibside from 1542 until at least 1569 (53). Both of course may have been largely indifferent to the changes, or motivated by little more than a desire to retain their relatively wealthy benefices. It is probable, however, like most of the clergy, that they simply evaded the law, teaching their parishioners as they had always done and retaining such ceremonies as they thought fitting. John Brown, for instance, who was appointed by Tunstal as curate of Witton-Gilbert in 1547, later confessed in 1569 that 'when I was doing service here among yow I left fwthe that unredd, or taught unto yow which I thought was not good, and took that which was good' (54).

Naturally the main problem for the government was that it had no real means of controlling the parochial clergy's doctrinal opinions, even if it was able to deal with the cases of overt opposition to the Crown's religious changes that were reported. Apart therefore from archiepiscopal visitations and the gathering of clergy in diocesan synods, a new form of control, the royal visitation, emerged in the 1530s specifically to enforce the innovations in religion. The first of these had been carried out in the winter of 1535-6 in order to give substance to the newly defined Supremacy of Henry VIII, although there is little evidence that the royal visitors conducted a parochial visitation at this time. Legh and Layton's tour of the northern province in early 1536 seems to have been concerned exclusively with the monasteries, and the book of 'comperta' from Durham contains no parochial business, dealing only with a few

isolated cases of incest and adultery in the bishop's household (55). In the summer of 1538, however, a detailed parochial visitation at last took place in the bishopric. On 27th March that year, Thomas Legh had issued a set of instructions through Archbishop Lee to the clergy of the northern province, suspending all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and announcing his intention of visiting them the following month. In the provisions and objectives laid down in the document, Legh ordered all churchwardens and three or so lay people from each parish to attend at various specified visitation centres (56). All were to swear oaths of obedience and fealty to the King, denouncing the Pope's jurisdiction, while the clergy were instructed to bring all their letters of ordination and institutions along with the foundation deeds of all chantries. Unfortunately there is no known record of the visitation actually taking place in Durham, but the inhibition was relaxed on 7th July, 1538, the whole northern province apparently having been visited.

Such pressure from central government, along with the attack on the county's religious houses, clearly began to take some effect. Two clergy were removed from their benefices in 1539 (the only deprivations that took place in Durham during the period 1536-47), certainly one case of which was the result of opposition to the dissolution of the monasteries (57). This was a consequence of the so-called 'conspiracy' of Dr. Richard Hilyard, chaplain to Tunstal and vicar of Norton from 1538-9, who preached an extensive series of conservative sermons at Stockton, Newborough, Durham and Malton in December 1539, advising the monks at Mountgrace and Durham priories not to surrender and then finally escaping to Scotland before the end of the year (58).

The Hilyard case is instructive because it highlights the sort of men Tunstal generally appointed, and helps explain the distrust Henry VIII felt for the Durham bishop despite his invaluable work on the Council of the North and as a propagandist for the Crown. Indeed, the part played by Tunstal in keeping the clergy of Durham on

a traditional path cannot be over-emphasised. Although quick to prosecute heretics, such as Roger Dichaunte in 1531, and keen to act against those who threatened his own authority or that of the church, Bishop Tunstal was never prepared to undertake the hard effort required for personal visitation. During his episcopate of twenty-nine years, for instance, it is remarkable to find that there are only five entries in his register connected with this side of diocesan business, and these are all preliminary notices for a single visitation that took place in 1532 (59). It is true to some extent that this was unavoidable, because of Tunstal's preoccupation with national political business elsewhere: he was away from the bishopric from July 1538 to September 1542 as well as from October 1545 to January 1547. As a consequence, he was forced to appoint Thomas Sparke, a Durham monk, as suffragan bishop of Berwick in 1537 (60).

Nevertheless, the bishop's close control of preaching and his use of his own patronage (the rights of which he was determined to keep in his own hands even when he was away from the diocese (61)) meant that if there were any Protestants in the bishopric they were unlikely to receive either a benefice or preaching licence. This is partly confirmed by a study of the ordination lists that survive for the period 1536-47. Although 21 ordinations were held from 1531 to 1535, there was a gap of seven years before 6 further ordinations were held in 1542, and then six more in the period 1543-1547 (the interval, like that between 1547-1555, may partly be explained by popular opposition to the Crown's religious policy) (62). The 29 men ordained by Tunstal between 1536-1547 were moreover, as their wills suggest, a predominantly conservative group of men. Of the wills that survive, none contains an explicitly Protestant preamble, although two (those of Nicholas Burnod in 1569 and John Dobson in 1587) open with a non-traditional commendation of the soul to God alone (63). Others of the clergy are seen acting in defence of Catholic religious forms well into the 1560s. Sir Bartholomew Reseley, for example, curate

of Gibside since 1542, was bequeathed 6s 8d by the will of Roger Blaxton to say prayers for the deceased. John Chapham, vicar of Darlington from 1543, also appeared in 1560 as witness and perhaps scribe to the will of Richard Somerset from Oxneyfield, which began with the Catholic preamble 'ffirst I com'end my soull to Almightye god my maker and redemer and to the ffellowship of the blessed company of heaven (the saints) and my body to xp'iane man's buriall' (64). Finally, it appears that the ability of religious conservatives to achieve ordination was made possible by the flexibility of the registrar Christopher Chaytor, who seems to have disliked the Henrician innovations as much as Tunstal: the oath renouncing the papal authority was only registered three times, while there is only one reference to the oath of supremacy according to the 1534 Act (65). By the episcopate of Bishop Pilkington (1561-76) the oath of renunciation was usually included in the records of institutions and collations.

Nor does it seem probable therefore that the bishopric's clergy carried out with any enthusiasm the crucial royal Injunctions of 1538, which took even further the attack on saints, relics and doctrine. The most important of these Injunctions was that which ordered the provision of one of Coverdale's English Bibles 'in some convenient place' within each parish church, to be paid for equally by the incumbent and the parishioners. Further than this, the priests were also expressly instructed to 'provoke, stir and exhort every person to read the same, as that which is the very lively word of God, that every Christian man is bound to embrace, believe and follow if he look to be saved' (66). The vital and lasting significance of the vernacular bible, now legitimately available for all those who wanted to read it, has already been stressed. Despite Henry's theological reaction after 1538, it probably went further than any of Cromwell's measures towards ensuring that Protestantism was the religion of a significant minority of Englishmen. This is not of course to argue

that the Scriptures were an obviously Protestant book, but rather that the new faith was a Bible-reading religion in a way that Catholicism had never been: indeed, because the Protestant reformers grounded their position upon an understanding of the Bible by all the laity, Bible reading assumed in their eyes an equally important place with teaching. Bernard Gilpin, for instance, later spoke of the 'wonderfull power of the Gospel: even (for) the hard hearted that will not receive it, yet the bright beames of the truthe shining therein maketh them astonished' (67). Consequently a wide enforced circulation of the English Bible would clearly contribute, as Cromwell knew it must, to a weakening of Catholic unity, orthodox theology and the role of the priesthood as sole interpreters of the laws of God.

It is unlikely however that vernacular Bibles reached Durham in any number, while it is clear that few people in the county owned or read books of any sort. Indeed the major stumbling block to the Bible making any immediate impact on the laity in the bishopric (although schools were set up and an attempt was made to encourage vernacular education as the century progressed (68)) was the fact that the majority of the population were illiterate. The wills of the period make this strikingly apparent, as suggested earlier, since they were generally drawn up by the incumbent of the parish because of the testators inability to write (the duty of moving the laity to draw up wills was actually enjoined upon the parochial clergy by episcopal Injunctions for precisely this reason) (69). Consequently, the illiteracy of people and the expensive price of the Bible (about 14 shillings) necessarily limited their possession to the wealthier and more educated classes, particularly those in the Newcastle trading community. Even so, it is remarkable to find that there is no mention of a Bible in the published wills of the laity for the period until the last two decades of the century, when they begin to be listed fairly frequently (70).

Nor does it seem likely that the vernacular Bibles

were installed into the parish churches of the county in significant numbers, although unfortunately there is insufficient evidence to tell whether the 1538 Injunctions were obeyed to any great extent by the county's parochial clergy. Durham is completely lacking in churchwarden's accounts for the first half of the sixteenth century, while there is no mention of an English Bible in the extensive inventories of church goods made during the reign of Edward VI, evidently because the commissioners in 1553 were concerned mainly with those items which might bring some profit to the crown (71). Nevertheless, it is surely significant that the last royal visitation in Durham during Henry VIII's reign took place in July 1538, three months before Cromwell's injunctions were issued in October. Given Tunstal's own distrust of the vernacular Bible, his denunciation of Tyndale's New Testament in October 1529, and his unwillingness to supplement the royal injunctions with diocesan instructions of his own (unlike Archbishop Lee of York), it is improbable that the Durham bishop took any serious steps towards tracking down those incumbents who had failed to provide a Bible for their parish churches. Certainly there is no sign of any such action being taken in the extant sources (although it is known that the cathedral authorities insisted on the use of the English litany 'in the time of processions' by 1544) (72).

The lack of evidence for Bibles in the Durham records is not however surprising, given that many clergy even in the south had failed to provide the Scriptures for their parish churches. By February 1539, it was reported in Oxfordshire that 'divers curates had not the Bibles in their churches, nor their sermons according to the Injunctions', while in 1541 a government proclamation complained that 'divers and many towns and parishes' did not yet have Bibles (73). The reasons for this delay may have been partly financial: the Great Bible cost at least 14 shillings, of which the parishioners and clergy had to pay half each. However, given the generosity of the

laity's bequests to their parish churches in the pre-Reformation period, it seems far more likely that the opposition to the 1538 Injunctions stemmed from the clergy's distrust of the Bible. In April 1539, the parson of Wincanton in his sermon admonished his parishioners against 'these new-fangled fellows which read new books, for they be heretics and knaves and Pharisees, and likened them to a dog that knaweth on a mary bone and never cometh to the pith'. Many clergy seem genuinely to have believed that the reading of a Bible in English was an act of heresy (74).

For all these reasons therefore it is scarcely surprising to discover that the doctrinal views of the laity in Durham seem to have been almost entirely unaffected by the Henrician changes. The few surviving wills of the period 1536-47 retain the characteristics of those discussed for the pre-Reformation period, and generally opened as before with a commendatory clause followed by a request for the prayers of the Virgin Mary and the saints (75). Although the invocation of saints was not expressly forbidden during Henry's lifetime, both the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Bishop's Book of 1537 were extremely careful to guard against any intercessory worship of the saints: the former stated that such prayers were to be done 'without any vain superstition, as to think any Saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ' (76). But despite these attacks the commendatory clause and invocation of the saints remained predominant in Durham up to the end of Henry VIII's reign, and was used in 10 out of the 14 wills that contain a preamble for this period. It is true that four of the wills also opened with a commendation of the soul or of the testator to God alone, while twelve further wills were so short that they omitted the commendatory clause and preamble altogether. The will of Annes Horsley, for instance, who died of the plague in 1544, opened with the simple clause 'ffirst I yewe my soull to Almighty God my soul to be buryd were yt shall please hy' to take yt' (77). Such wills need not however be

interpreted as signs of incipient Protestantism. Most of the wills suggest that an implicit belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead (bound up in turn with the doctrine of Purgatory) was still held. Nine of the wills without a preamble with a commendation of the soul to God alone, contained requests for masses and dirges to be performed on behalf of the testator. Generally the custom was to ask for a mass on the day of burial only, although some people such as Edward Surtees, a Newcastle draper, provided for yearly 'sowlle mass and dirige to be song within the church of Saint Nicholas for the sowlles of me, Isobell, my wyffe and all Christian sowlles for ever' (78). Even more exceptional was the 1541 will of Sir Richard Towgall, a Gateshead priest, who required his nephew (also a priest) to sing 15 requiem masses and 15 'de quinque vulneribus' every year on the day of his burial (79). Furthermore, even if the mass or dirige was not specifically asked for, testators often left money to priests, asking them in return for their prayers, or to sing for the dying man's soul. Before the dissolution it was particularly common to leave money in this way to monasteries and hospitals, but it remained common even in the last decade of Henry's reign to requisition the services of priests for prayers in return for a small fee. Cuthbert Rogerley (d. 1545), for example, left three shillings and four pence to his curate Sir Edward Yonger to pray for him (80).

Finally, it is also worth noting that the wills of this period still contained testamentary bequests, and that parishioners continued to make gifts of money, jewels, cloth and produce to their local churches and guilds despite the fears that were expressed about their fate during the Pilgrimage of Grace. John Swinburn, for instance, bequeathed 5s in 1545 'to the reparacions of Stannerdell church', while Cuthbert Rogerley left an altar cloth and two towels to the altars in St. Hild's chapel at South Shields (81). Naturally the bequests of the religious were the most generous. In 1541 Sir Richard Towgall left to St. Cuthbert's guild in Durham

'two vestments with ther albs, two altar cloythes, one towell, two candlesticks, one antiphonal, one proscurier, a dirige book (and) a pax', although he attached the sensible caveat that 'yf it fortune to go downe then this forsaid books shall go unto my executors without anye impediment' (82).

In sum, there is insufficient evidence to say with any exactitude how far the Crown's religious policies of the 1530s were enforced in Durham during the last decade of Henry's reign. Nevertheless, there are extremely good grounds for believing that when Edward VI came to the throne in 1547, Tunstal ruled over a diocese with clergy and laity as conservative as he was. The wills examined suggest that most people still believed in the worship of saints, Purgatory, and the efficacy of intercession for the departed, while the conservative priests that Tunstal appointed - disliking Henry VIII's Injunctions - battled hard to preserve traditional ceremonies and doctrines. Above all, although this view cannot be closely substantiated, one gains the impression that there was little necessity to take an open stand against royal policies, especially after the doctrinal shift in 1539, since it was unlikely that the changes (with the exception of the dissolution) would be enforced with any vigour. To that extent, it may cautiously be argued that the aftermath of the Pilgrimage of Grace and the 1540s represent as much the failure of the government to enforce the reforms effectively as the failure of the conservatives to mount significant or coherent resistance to religious change.

#### 4. SPOLIATION AND RESTORATION: Edward and Mary (1547-58)

##### EDWARD (1547-1553)

Despite the intentions of the reformers, it seems as if the Edwardian Reformation in the bishopric (as in some other counties (1)) was almost entirely destructive. That is to say, although the fabric of the old church was considerably damaged by the material spoliation, it does not appear as if Protestantism was enforced in any substantial way by Tunstal and the diocesan authorities, while indeed the evidence suggests that the new religion made an extremely limited impact on the people of Durham at a grass-roots level. This may be due to an imbalance in the sources (which include extremely little on the implementation of religious change in the county) but it was also due to the appeal, substance and approach of the new religion, which depended for its success on widespread preaching and effective dissemination of the 'word of God'. Apart from altering religious practice and destroying the material appurtenances and ritual customs of the old religion, there was little that the government could do to 'evangelise' ordinary people in a short period of time, and the measures it took in this respect (the issuing of the new English Prayer Books and granting of licences to preachers) would take effect in decades rather than years. This sort of time the government did not have, although, of course, it would not have appeared that way to contemporaries.

Henry died in January 1547. Soon after the accession of Edward VI, the Reforming party under Lord Protector Somerset completely gained the ascendant. Consequently, with a new (Protestant) regime and the publication of still more radical Injunctions early in 1547, a comprehensive national visitation was again planned in

order to enquire into the spiritual health of the nation (2). In May, all episcopal jurisdiction and preaching was suspended by writs issued in the King's name. Tunstal received the inhibition, duly forwarded by the Archbishop of York, in a letter dated 19th May that was then entered into the episcopal register (3). Finally, in August 1547, Protestant 'visitors' set out to change the religious complexion of the six circuits into which the government had divided the kingdom. The commissaries proposed for the northern province by an extant list of 'the appointments of the circuits, commissaries, preacher and registers for the Kinges Majesties visitation' were the Dean of Westminster (William Benson) and Sir John Hercy with Edward Plankeney as registrar and Nicholas Ridley as preacher (4). Prior to their arrival in each deanery the visitors sent out in advance a set of Articles of enquiry in four sections, to be answered respectively by bishops and their diocesan officials, the parochial clergy, the laity, and finally the chantry priests. Unfortunately no detailed register of these visitation articles, along with the special Injunctions which the visitors delivered to the mother church in Durham, seem to have survived (as they have to the analogous visitation of 1559). But although the local evidence for the visitation is extremely sparse, the retrospective character of the Edwardian Injunctions make it seem likely that great efforts were made to impress upon the bishopric the doctrinal and ceremonial changes so far achieved, while the visitors doubtless also gathered valuable local information to hand on to the chantry commissioners who followed them a few months later.

The first Parliament of Edward's reign (November 1547) then passed the new Chantries Act, which provided for the dissolution of all chantries, religious guilds, surviving colleges of secular clergy, free chapels, and placed them - and all other endowments of obits and 'services' (for requiem masses) - in the Crown's hands (5). The bill therefore affected ordinary laypeople in a

way that no previous Reformation statute had done, since it served to sweep into the Court of Augmentations all the endowments of previous centuries, not merely those intended to perpetuate masses for the dead, but those given in support of hospitals, schools, almshouses and other institutions founded for the relief of the poor. County Durham suffered particularly heavy losses. The Act dissolved not only the 65 chantries and religious guilds in the bishopric that had been partly surveyed two years earlier (inventories of the chantries in Durham city itself were drawn up in May 1546) (6), but also the six collegiate churches of the district - Auckland, Chester-le-Street, Darlington, Lanchester, Norton and Staindrop. Amongst other things this had a serious effect on the level of spiritual care available in these parishes. Although the first four major colleges (constituted in the ordinary way with a dean and prebendaries) were undoubtedly in need of some material and spiritual reform, D.M. Loades has shown that the government later re-allocated less than one-fifth of the income it had acquired from the colleges to spiritual purposes in the region (£106 out of £610), providing revenues for the vicars newly appointed in the four parishes that did not enable them in the long term to reside in their cures (7). The revenues of Norton and Staindrop (a chantry college attached to the hospital) both of which had played a useful role in providing charity and education in their parishes, were simply appropriated without any provision for the continuance of their functions. Finally, it is also worth noting that the Chantries Act had the effect of swelling the ranks of unemployed clergy. Some of these were appointed as curates to continue to minister in their parishes or elsewhere, such as Geoffrey Glenton, a chantry priest at Chester-le-Street, who was instituted in 1548 to the vicarage of Heddon-on-the-Wall (8). Many, however, must have suffered hardship. The dissolution of the collegiate churches alone resulted in 40 incumbents and 22 ministers being turned adrift, merely with pensions

according to their previous meagre stipends (9).

The other major bill passed by the first Edwardian parliament, on the 10th December, 1547, was that allowing the reception of the sacrament 'sub utraque specie' or Communion in two kinds. Although he had opposed the Chantries Act, Tunstal voted for the new bill, determined it seems to co-operate with the new regime, but presumably also because he did not consider that any fundamental part of doctrine had been touched. An added incentive was that the new bill incorporated a previous bill for the Sacrament of the Altar (introduced on 12th November), the purpose of which was to curb the increasing acts of irreverence by the London mob against the reserved sacrament (10). Tunstal continued to avoid the great eucharistic controversy in 1548, cautiously spending most of the year in his diocese until Parliament reassembled at the end of November. Although he stopped actively attending the Council in 1548, Tunstal suffered no personal harm during the first years of the reign, and remained active in mobilising 'his country' against the Scots (11). Nevertheless he spoke out forcefully in the debates on the eucharist in the House of Lords in December and refused to modify his position during the subsequent negotiations. Along with seven other bishops he voted against the Act of Uniformity on the 15th January, 1549, when the first Prayer Book of Edward VI was established by law and the new order of Communion replaced the Mass.

Tunstal's immunity gradually began to vanish, however, after the coup d'etat of October 1549 which replaced Somerset by the Earl of Warwick. The latter, it has recently been argued, subsequently adopted a more radical Protestantism and allied himself with Cranmer purely in order to overthrow his conservative opposition in the Council, which he had achieved by early 1550 (12). Nevertheless, Tunstal seems to have remained briefly in favour, largely it may be assumed because Warwick was hoping to use his considerable administrative expertise in the Palatinate and Borders, and in February 1550 the

bishop was reappointed to the Council of the North after an interval of eleven years (13). By the summer of 1550, however, Warwick realised that Tunstal's general unwillingness to support the official religious policy made him more of a liability than an asset, despite his vast political experience in the affairs of the north. The Durham bishop was in open opposition to the revised Ordinal then under consideration, while in March he had made a determined but abortive attempt to silence the radical preacher John Knox - who had been preaching in Berwick since 1549 - by summoning him to answer before the Council of the North on the charge of asserting that the Mass was idolatry (14).

The circumstances of Tunstal's downfall in the later summer of 1550, and the complicated chain of events leading to the dissolution of the Bishopric in 1552/3, have been widely discussed elsewhere and need only be briefly summarised (15). From September 1550 the bishop was committed to house arrest in his own residence at Coldharbour on the Thames, but he refused to testify against Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, and refused to abandon the Catholic doctrine of the mass. (In retrospect, Tunstal had adopted a position, that of resisting any further concessions to the reformers, from which he was never to retreat). In May 1551 he was interrogated by the Council, along with Dean Whitehead, but Warwick rapidly lost patience, and late in 1551 the bishop was seized and committed to trial on a trumped-up charge of misprision of treason (16). After his trial he was imprisoned in the Tower and deprived of his see on October 14th 1552, while the Earl of Westmoreland took his place as Lord Lieutenant and was made chief steward of the bishopric (17). March 1553 saw the diocese of Durham dissolved and the lands of the Palatinate annexed to the Crown: the see was then reconstituted into the two dioceses of Durham and Newcastle. Warwick (elevated to the dukedom of Northumberland and the position of Lord Warden of the Marches in 1551) was given the lordship of Barnard Castle and, replacing Westmoreland, granted

himself for life 'the office of Chief Steward of all the King's lands ... which belonged to the late bishopric of Durham' (18). But these revolutionary plans rapidly collapsed after Edward's death in July 1553, so that their long-term consequences for the bishopric seem to have been slight: indeed, with the exception of the last few months, the administration of the diocese seems to have been no more affected than it had been during Tunstal's numerous earlier absences on official business (19).

The period of the duke of Northumberland's rule and Tunstal's imprisonment in London (1550-53) did, however, serve to speed up greatly the pace of religious spoliation and change in the bishopric. Following the royal Visitation of 1547, services had begun to be simplified: English was increasingly used instead of Latin, and a reluctant start was made with the removal of images after the general order for their destruction was made in February 1548 (20). The attack on, and disendowment of, the chantries and guilds in Durham had also begun soon after the 1547 Act providing for their dissolution. Inventories of all the religious guilds, fraternities and chantries in the bishopric were drawn up by February 1548 (21). Their buildings and lands were subsequently forfeited, as well as the bells, lead and stone of their chapels. Their plate, cash, chalices and richer vestments then followed the path to the Jewel House or Court of Augmentations in Westminster which the possessions of the monasteries and shrines had already been taken, while their less valuable possessions (such as livestock, poorer vestments and furniture) were sold off on the spot.

But the next phase, the purging of parish churches of their Catholic furnishings and treasure (high altars, wall-paintings, statues, rods, holy water stoups and so

on), seems to have made only partial headway in Durham until the duke of Northumberland replaced Somerset as Edward's chief minister, and Tunstal was called up to London and removed from office (22). The chapter now received in 1551 its first Protestant dean, Horn, who introduced the new English Prayer Book the following year and carried further the process of defacing any 'superstitious monuments' that still remained in the Cathedral (23). This included St. Cuthbert's 'tombe of stoune in the cloyster garth' which he caused 'to be pulled down, and converted the leads and all to his owne use, and the said image of St. Cuthbert was sett on the one syde against the cloister wall'. Even more unfortunate was the destruction of the beautiful series of stained-glass windows which told 'the whole storie and myrcles of that holie man St. Cuthbert from the daie of his Nativitie and both unto his dyinge daie... and after in Kynge Edward's tyme this story was pulled downe by Deane Horne and broken all to peces, for he might never abyde any ancient monuments, actes or deedes, that gave any light of godly Religion' (24).

Finally, when Protestantism had been officially erected and the old liturgy expunged (or so the Council may have believed), the government instigated the final act of spoliation early in 1553 and began to strip the parish churches of their remaining treasure, sending out orders for the royal commissioners in the county to appropriate all surviving mass vestments, sacred ornaments, chalices and vessels on behalf of the Crown: each parish church was to be left with only a bare minimum of plate for the new simple communion service and a sufficient number of chalices and cloth. It is significant, however, that the commissioners for Durham appointed by the certificate dated 26th May (Sir George Conyers, Sir Thomas Hilton, William Bellasis and Richard Vincent) appear to have given their commission a far more liberal interpretation than elsewhere, since they returned one or more chalices and patens and several bells to almost all of the churches, while pairs of

organs were also left in several other parishes (25). Nevertheless the scale of the removal operation in the bishopric was still remarkable. In total, there were sent to London from county Durham, £60 in ready cash ('recevved for the salle of all the church goods and stuffe'), three hundred and forty ounces of parcel gilded plate, two hundred and sixty-six ounces of double gilded plate, and finally, 'a vestment, two tynacles and a cope of cloth of tyssue (i.e. gold) at Darneton, and one vestment of tynacles and a cope of cloth of tissue at Duresme'(26). The twelve Durham guilds alone produced 24 silver chalices (27). Presumably therefore, to account for the large amount of plate, Richard Vincent was accompanied by several cartloads of pyxes, candlesticks, silver servers, processional crosses and incense boats when he finally arrived at the Jewel House in the Tower on 12th June.

This attack on the material fabric of the church was, of course, only one side of the coin. It was now after the accession of Edward that the propagandists of the Protestant Reformation were able to attack freely those magical implications which they saw to be inherent in some fundamental aspects of the Church's ritual, and thereby reassert (so functionalist historians have argued) the distinction between magic and religion which to some extent had been blurred by the medieval Catholic Church. Bernard Gilpin, for example, spoke in 1552 of the 'grosse superstition, charming, witchcrafts and conjuring ..... (that) remaineth still among the people'. Particular objections were made to the consecration of church bells against storms, ecclesiastical blessings, holy water and the wearing of books of scripture as protection against danger (28). James Pilkington, for instance, later Bishop of Durham, wrote that St. Agatha's letters, the holy remedy against burning houses, were

unashamed sorcery, and the use of consecrated bells in a thunderstorm mere 'witchcrafts' (29). This broad denial of the efficacy of the Catholic rituals of consecration and exorcism reached a culmination in the new government's religious measures: The Edwardian Injunctions of 1547 forbade parishioners to observe such practices as 'casting holy water upon his bed, upon images and other dead things ... ringing of holy bells, or blessing with the holy candle, to the intent thereby to be discharged of the burden of sin, or to bribe away devils, or to put away dreams and fantasies ... the extolling or setting forth of pilgrimages, relics or images, or lighting of candles, kissing, kneeling, decking of the same images, or any such superstition ..' (30).

All this was but a preliminary to an attack on the seven sacraments themselves, and an attempt to rid them of any magical Catholic affiliations they might possess. Baptism, for instance, was purged of its more ritualistic and 'superstitious' features. The 2nd Edwardian Prayer Book omitted the exorcism from the rite (along with the anointing and the chrisom), because of its implication that unbaptised children would be damned, although the issue long remained theologically controversial (31). It is significant, nevertheless, that belief in baptism as a beneficial rite of passage with special healing properties for the child concerned remained widespread in Durham until the nineteenth century (32). Confirmation was even more harshly treated by the Edwardian reformers. As well as discarding the holy oil and linen band, the Church actually denied the sacramental character of the ceremony. In the long term it did keep the rite, although it laid an increased emphasis on catechetical preparation rather than the ceremony itself by stipulating that initiates would not be admitted until they had learned to say the Lords Prayer, the Creed and the Decalogue. But by far the most crucial Protestant onslaughts were delivered on the central Catholic doctrine of the Mass, which Dean Horn described as

'abominable, blasphemous and idolatrous'. The miraculous transubstantiation of the consecrated elements was repudiated, and in its place was substituted a simple commemorative rite with the extreme Protestant words of administration ('Take and eat this in remembrance...'). The 'communion service' contained in the new English Prayer Book of 1552 also attempted to remove all grounds for the 'ancient superstitions' by stipulating, for instance, that ordinary bread should be used for the sermon and not the special unleavened wafers used by Catholics. Extreme unction and the sacrament of penance were also completely abandoned. In sum, therefore, of the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church (baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Mass, ordination, penance, extreme unction) only the eucharist, baptism and penance retained their sacramental character after the Edwardian reforms, and even in these every attempt to diminish the significance of the ceremony as an efficacious rite of passage had been made.

The significance of this considerable diminution of the sacramental ritual of the established church as a parochial level cannot be overemphasised, even if it is difficult to quantify. But perhaps an even greater impact at a local level was made by the systematic Edwardian attack on the whole fabric of popular Catholicism and culture, on worship of the saints, pilgrimages, relics, chantries and prayers for the dead. Most of the great shrines including St. Cuthbert's at Durham had been dismantled during the late 1530s. But it was only now ten years later that the intercession of saints was finally forbidden by the Edwardian Injunctions of 1547, while relics were no longer to be adored for their supposedly miraculous properties (33). Similarly, although some official disapproval had been expressed in 1536 and 1538 about Purgatory, the doctrine was not explicitly denied until Edward came to the throne. The 1547 Edwardian Royal Injunctions also put a stop to the religious processions traditionally held at times of special need, along with such traditional calendar

ceremonies as the saints days associated with special trades and occupations, while the Plough Monday procession was prohibited the following year (in 1548). Later ecclesiastical injunctions for specific dioceses also prohibited the entry into the church or churchyard of Lords of Misrule and Summer Lords and Ladies (34).

These steps were said at first to have been taken because of the strife for precedence and general disorder which marked these occasions in the towns in which they took place, particularly it seems during the Corpus Christi celebrations. The staging of one of the cycle plays at York, for instance, (that of Thomas the Apostle), provided the occasion for a Catholic disturbance in the 1550s, while Ketts's revolt was sparked off by a play at Wymondham (35). But at a deeper level, as Mervyn James has argued, the abandonment of the observance of processions and cycle plays arose from an underlying Protestant moralistic and anti-ritualistic critique of Corpus Christi and other celebrations that emerged in some sections of educated urban society (particularly in London) and was duly implemented by the Protestant state (36). Ultimately processions were admitted to be superfluous as well as potentially subversive: prayers and blessings were just as effective if offered up, less ostentaciously, within the church building.

There can be little doubt therefore that these changes caused a significant shift in the social, cultural and religious environment in Durham, particularly in the city itself. Phythian-Adams has argued from the example of Coventry that for urban communities the middle years of the sixteenth century represented a more abrupt break with the past than any other period between the era of the Black Death and the Industrial Revolution,

'not only were specific customs and institutions brusquely changed or abolished but the whole vigorous and variegated popular culture, the matrix of everyday life eroded and began to perish ... At the heart of this

social activity, before the changes were effected, lay the repetitive annual pattern of ceremonies and cognate observances peculiar to each local community' (37).

The contemporary relevance of such practices for urban society in Durham city in the pre-Reformation period has already been discussed (38). What had formed a coherent ceremonial pattern soon rapidly disintegrated in the late 1540s and 1550s. The Feast of St. Cuthbert on 20th March and the celebration of his translation on 4th September - along with the St. George's Day, Ascension and Whitsun processions - were abolished by the Injunctions of 1547 (although the 'feast of our Lady's day' on 8th December seems to have been celebrated in the old manner at Durham during the 1569 rebellion) (39). Other practices were harder to remove. Bourne suggests that the pilgrimage to the well at Jesmond remained an annual event after the reformation, while 'Rag Offerings' to other wells near Newcastle remained common until the eighteenth century. Similarly, 'Rioting and Gaming and Drunkenness' continued at Shrovetide as a secular 'Vestige of the Romish Carnival', while Henderson points out that the pre-reformation 'superstition' of laying rushes or 'seggs' on Ascension Day was still being practised in the 1850s (40).

The decline of the Corpus Christi celebrations in Durham city is no less difficult to trace. The Feast is last mentioned in the sources in the Goldsmith's Ordinary that was confirmed by Bishop Tunstal on the 12th May, 1532, which stated that 'on the Feast of Corpus Christi they shall go in procession with their banners and lights'. The next Ordinary, that of the mercers and grocers, which was confirmed by Bishop Pilkington on the 6th October 1561, makes no mention of the procession or play-cycles: the mercers were simply directed to assemble annually within 20 days of Martinmas, to attend the sermon at St. Nicholas' church, and then adjourn to choose an alderman and two wardens and searchers (41). It is probable therefore that the procession ended soon after the destruction of the Corpus Christi shrine in St.

Nicholas' church in 1547, when one of the Edwardian commissioners, Dr. Harvey, 'did call for the said Shrine, and when it was brought before him he dyd tread upon it with his feete and did breake yt all in peces, with dyvers other ornaments perteyninge to the church' (42). Nevertheless, it is possible that the Corpus Christi plays may have been performed by the guilds as late as 1567, when the 'players of Durham' acted before the Newcastle corporation and were given due reward. Certainly references in the miller's and mason's ordinaries in 1578 and 1581 to the 'ancient play of the fellowship' make it clear that the guild plays were still being performed in Newcastle well into Elizabeth's reign, although by this time they were acted only occasionally by the special command of the mayor and corporation (43).

How then was the 'official' Edwardian Reformation received by the people of Durham? There is certainly little evidence to indicate that these changes had much support among the local population at large. The essential problem, as suggested earlier, was that Protestantism developed in the north as a predominantly academic movement and was implanted in the diocese of Durham from 'above', largely through the efforts of visiting preachers and an intellectual elite that was introduced into the ranks of the cathedral clergy, first in the reign of Edward VI, and then more thoroughly during the 1560s. Durham received its first Protestant dean, Horn, in 1551, and he was ably supported by Birch and John Rudd, his principal allies among the cathedral clergy. But as noted previously, county Durham seems to have been almost entirely lacking in any tradition of indigenous reformist protest, and the influence of these men depended far more on their backing from the government in Westminster and the cathedral establishment than from any local opinion. Until 7th February 1557 the patronage of all the prebends at Durham was vested in the

Crown, so that Rudd, for instance (a former chaplain to Edward VI), was presented to the cathedral by the King on 11th June 1550. It is perhaps significant that, when Horn was installed at Durham in 1551, the Privy Council felt it necessary to write 'to the Prebendaries there is conforme themselves to such orders in religion and Devyne Service standinge with the Kinges procedinges as their Deane, Mr Horne, shall sett forth' (44).

To make matters worse, the approach of these men, mostly zealous graduates and intellectuals, tended to be theologically elitist and chiefly concerned with winning over the educated. Thus, when Tunstal complained that Bernard Gilpin's sermons at Newcastle in 1558 (in which he preached against images and the worship of saints) 'offended the plebeians and ordinary people', Gilpin commented that he felt obliged to 'cry unto all estates as well of the Ecclesiastical ministry', but otherwise he had 'never desired the love of the vulgar' (45).

Nevertheless, although it seems probable that the break with traditional religious practices would have caused considerable tension and conflict, it is remarkable that there is absolutely no evidence of any such discontent in the sources for Edward's reign. The Royal Visitation of 1547, for example, which visited the bishopric in late summer, along with the sermons of Ridley who accompanied the sermon, seem to have been tolerated without any resistance (46). To an important extent, this certainly reflects the complete lack of evidence regarding the workings of the Edwardian changes of religion in Durham. There is no trace either, for instance, of the reception accorded to the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, which involved the entire supersession of the familiar Latin services and Mass. The new English service came into use for the first time in Durham on Whit Sunday 1549, but there are no recorded instances of unrest further north than Seamer, in Yorkshire (47).

But the absence of hostility surely also reflects the fact that, apart from the first acts of spoliation, particularly during the brief interlude under Dean Horn (1551-3) when the latter shocked Durham by bringing his wife into the cathedral precinct, things had not yet actually altered that much even within Durham Close itself. There had of course been much less change in the structure of authority than there was in the material fabric of the church. At least 13 of the monks who had ruled under the old Benedictine regime and then been incorporated into the new dean and chapter, were still active in the cathedral during Edward's reign, and were not finally removed until the 1560s and 1570s (48). The government seems at least to have recognised the strength of the old guard. In 1551, when Northumberland was planning the confiscation of the episcopal endowments of Durham, the dean and former prior Hugh Whitehead, involved in charges advanced against the bishop, was frequently cited to appear before the Council, although he died before there was time to deprive him of his position (49). Nevertheless, even during the brief period when Robert Horn was dean from 1551-3 and Tunstal was safely in prison, the influence of the bishop and his conservative followers seems to have remained paramount in the bishopric. When Mary's accession in 1553 was followed by the return of Tunstal to the see, Horn immediately fled from the county and in his apology, prefaced to his translation of two of Calvin's sermons, he blamed the absent bishop for his unhappy time in the diocese. He complained that false witnesses had been suborned to charge him with preaching heresy, and that he had been maliciously denounced in the bishopric for infecting the region with the new religion, for exercising the episcopal jurisdiction in Edward's reign, and for bringing his wife into the cathedral church (50).

Perhaps the major reason therefore for the apparent lack of popular consternation caused by the Edwardian changes is that Tunstal made very little effort to have them actively enforced in the bishopric. Although he

acquiesced in the royal visitation of 1547, there is no sign in his episcopal register that Tunstal carried out any personal visitations to ensure that the Crown's new religious measures were being observed in the parishes (51). Unfortunately however, the fragmentary character of the register does not allow us to follow any diocesan regulations he might have made. At the same time, although Tunstal voted against the Act of Uniformity on 15th January, 1549, there are no instances of him ever refusing to obey statute law. Indeed, it must be supposed that Tunstal at least went through the minimum motions of conformity, since it would scarcely have avoided Northumberland's and the Council's notice if the bishop had been openly resistant. Nevertheless, it is highly unlikely that Tunstal took any active steps to secure the conformity of his clergy. Only one incumbent was deprived from his benefice during Edward's reign, Henry Aglionby, vicar of St. Nicholas' Church, Newcastle, who lost his vicarage in 1549 simply because he had failed to pay the King's tenths (52). Nor do the surviving depositions from the ecclesiastical courts at Durham contain any cases of members of the clergy or laity being tried for failing to comply with the new Edwardian legislation. Most significant of all, when Tunstal was summoned in 1550 to appear before the Council in London, the Imperial Ambassador reported that the main reason for the summons was to coerce him into signing 'certain ordinances respecting religion', which apparently he had already refused to do on several occasions. It seems that these 'ordinances' may have been designed to enforce Tunstal's obedience to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity of 1549 within his jurisdiction (53).

Due to Tunstal's oversight, therefore, the parochial clergy in Durham remained an extremely conservative group of men. Indeed, with a handful of exceptions, there was almost no change from the previous reign, largely due to the lack of ordinations. Six ordination lists survive from April 1542 to June 1547, during which time Thomas Sparke, Suffragan Bishop of Berwick, ordained 20 priests,

but no more ordinations were held in the see until the reign of Mary (54). Why the interval? It seems probable that Tunstal was intent on preserving the status quo in a time of religious uncertainty, while the revolutionary policies of Somerset and Northumberland might well also have shaken the confidence of the conservative classes and families from which the ordinands were drawn in the bishopric. Furthermore, the clergy actually ordained by Bishop Sparke early in 1547, while Tunstal was acting as one of the late king's executors in London, remained men of predominantly conservative religious convictions. Of the wills that survive for the 11 priests and subdeacons ordained between January and June 1547, none contains an explicitly Protestant preamble, although Ralph Graye, vicar of Kirk Whelpington in Northumberland, later acted as scribe to the will of the Protestant Randall Fenwick in 1571 (55). Others of these Edwardian clergy, however, are seen acting in defence of Catholic religious forms well into the 1560s and 1570s. John Brown and John Nicholson, for instance, both played a prominent part in the rebellion of 1569. The former, a minor canon at Durham and curate of Witton-Gilbert, assisted William Holmes to 'sainge masse at the aulter' in the cathedral and admitted in his 1569 deposition that 'he hadd taught and ledd his parishioners the wrong way by the space of xi yeres now last paste'. The latter also admitted that he had conducted the services and sung psalms in Latin at his church at Heighington (56). Finally, as noted previously, it is clear that the ability of these conservatives to achieve ordination was made possible by the flexibility of the registrar Christopher Chaytor, who appears to have disliked religious innovation/as much as his episcopal superiors, Tunstal and Sparke: the oath explicitly renouncing the authority of the papacy was only registered once in Edward's reign, in December 1551 (soon after Dean Horn's arrival), while no reference to the oath of supremacy according to the Act of 1534 was made until Elizabeth's reign (57).

Nor are there many signs of incipient Protestantism

among the parochial clergy as a whole in the bishopric. Apart from the dean, only two members of the clergy are known to have taken advantage of Convocation's ruling and the Act of 1547 and married during Edward's reign, Prebendary John Rudd and Thomas Atkinson, rector of Elwick (1546-1554) (58). Despite attempts to improve educational conditions and the learning of the clergy, it also seems as if most of the parochial clergy were deficient in the knowledge necessary to expound the Scriptures properly - on which the dissemination of the new religion was intended by the reformers to be based - taking little interest in reading the Bible either to themselves or to their flocks. The Royal Injunctions of 1547 had laid further stress on the study of the Bible by the minor clergy and instructed 'that every parson, vicar, curate, chantry-priest and stipendiary, being under the degree of a bachelor of divinity, shall provide and have of his own, within three months after this visitation, the New Testament both in Latin and English, with the Paraphrase upon the same of Erasmus, and diligently study the same, conferring the one with the other. And the bishops and other ordinaries by themselves or their officers, in their synods and visitations shall examine the said ecclesiastical persons how they have profitted from the study of holy Scripture' (59).

The conservatism of the bishopric's clergy makes it seem unlikely, however, that they carried out the detailed provisions of the Injunctions with any enthusiasm or precision. The lack of evidence for vernacular Bibles in Durham, particularly amongst the laity, and their apparently patchy distribution among the parish churches of the county during the middle decades of the sixteenth century, have already been discussed. The only proof that bibles were installed in churches between 1547-1553 is contained in the 'Detectiones and Comperta' of the 1559 visitation, which reveal that the bibles and other books 'used in Kyng Edward's tyme wer burned' in four parishes, at Elwick, Stainton, Cokefield

and Longnewton (60). Other wise a study of the wills of the clergy for the same period confirms that interest in the Bible and other religious texts was only gradually increasing, and indicates that the majority of the parochial clergy (as well as the diocesan administration in Durham) failed to comply with the 1547 Injunctions. The wills of 73 Durham clergy who died within the period covered by Edward's, Mary's and Elizabeth's reigns have been published. It is particularly significant that books of any sort only occur in 13 out of a total of 49 wills made between 1547-1580, whereas they are mentioned in 14 out of 24 wills drawn up between 1581-1603. Furthermore, bibles are only mentioned in nine cases for the whole period, while about half of those with books were prebendaries or minor canons in the cathedral. The chief emphasis of the reformers on providing a learned ministry was destined therefore to take only a very gradual effect in the north.

The Protestant elite among the Durham cathedral clergy were well aware, however, that the lack of suitable ministers was at a critical level in the bishopric. Dean Horn in his reports to London held the lack of informed preaching responsible for the laity's ignorance, superstitious behaviour and general neglect of churchgoing in the county. Similarly, during his court sermon in 1552, Bernard Gilpin commented that some parishes 'have not had foure sermons these fifteene or sixteene yeares ..... the learned have not done their duties, no more than the unlearned ..... Patrons see that none doe theire dutie, they thinke as good to put in Asses, as men. The Bishops were never so liberall in making of lewde priests, but they are so liberall in making lewd vicars ..... And yet (there is) no place in England more needful of hearing God's word' that the see of Durham, 'for boyes and girles of foureteene or fifteene yeares cannot say the Lord's prayer ..... there is entring into England more blinde ignorance, superstition and infidelitie than ever was the Romish Bishop' (61). Somerset and his Council were so alarmed by

these reports of unorthodox and 'superstitious' preaching in the localities as a whole that in April 1548 parish priests were forbidden to preach, and the right of issuing licences was confined to the King, the Protector and the Archbishop of Canterbury, although in the case of Durham the stringency of the rule was relaxed for Tunstal, who was still authorised as late as February 1550 to appoint such chaplains and others as he thought fit (62).

As a consequence, it seems as if the few lasting conversions made to Protestantism in Durham under Edward were not the product of 'official' efforts, but the achievement of a handful of free-lance reforming preachers such as Gilpin and John Knox who were working in the northern diocese. Although no provision was made by the continuance warrants of 1548 or 1551 for preachers in Durham, certain preachers endeavoured to inculcate the new doctrines in the people. Bernard Gilpin had obtained a licence as itinerant preacher, and apart from the Bishopric he made it his special mission to administer to the people of Tynedale and Redesdale, 'for in these quarters the word of God was never to be preached amongst them but by Master Gilpin's ministry'. Special arrangements were also made for Newcastle. After being employed by the Council from 1549 as preacher in Berwick for two years, John Knox was then removed to Newcastle where he remained until June 1553. Preaching continually in St. Nicholas' church, his preaching proved too advanced even for the government, and he was called upon to answer various articles that he had written (63).

What effect then did these reforming preachers and the Edwardian changes in general have upon the laity in Durham? It is perhaps not surprising to find that the 23 published wills for the period 1547-1553 retain the characteristics of those discussed for Henry's reign, and generally opened as before with a commendatory clause followed by a request for the prayers of the Virgin Mary and Saints (64). In the Litany for the 1549 Prayer Book all invocations of the Saints for their prayers were

omitted, while in the same year Parliament had expressly condemned any such intercessory worship. But despite these attacks the commendatory clause and the invocation of the saints remained predominant in Durham throughout Edward's reign, and was used in 12 of the 14 wills that contain a preamble for this period. The will of William Bee (dated March 27th 1551), formerly a 'professet brodere of the monastery of montgrace', naturally used a more extensive invocation of the saints than most, but the wills of the laity contained similar sorts of traditional formulae, 'ffirste and pryncypally I bequythe my solle unto Almyghtye god my makere and to the holy prayers of the most gloryais vyrgen mary the blessedede mothere of oure most mercyfull savyor Chryst Jehu the wylbelowyd sone of god the father almyghtty and also to the holy prayers of all the blessedede santes in hevене' (65). It is true that one of the wills, that of Margery Tunstall in April 1553 (66), opened with a non-traditional commendation of the testator's soul to God alone, while nine further wills were so short that they omitted the commendatory clause and preamble altogether, but as argued earlier these need not be interpreted as signs of incipient Protestant influence. The only real evidence of awareness of the reformed opinion in the Durham region about this matter is contained in the sermon given by Richard Marshall, late prior of the Black Friars of Newcastle, before the doctors of St. Andrews in Scotland in 1551, in which he argued that the paternoster should be said to God alone, and not to the Saints (67).

Nor, despite the dissolution of the chantries, do the lay wills from Edward's reign reveal any falling off in the number of requests for masses and diriges to be performed on behalf of the testator, which suggests that an implicit belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead was still held. The Royal Injunctions of 1547 condemned the doctrine of purgatory, while the Second Prayer Book of 1552 completely omitted prayers for the dead and the mass for funerals. Nevertheless, there are at least five requests for masses and diriges in the

three volumes of 'Wills and Inventories' for Edward's reign, including that of Robert Blythman in 1548 who provided on the day of his burial for 'dirige with solemne messe of requie' to be celebrat within the saide kirke of saint nycheles for the well of my soull and all trewe crystiane soulls'. Furthermore, even if the mass or dirige was not specifically asked for, testators often requisitioned the services of clergy to say prayers for ther souls in return for a small fee. Henry Sanderson (d. 1549), for instance, left three shillings to three local priests to pray for him (68).

In sum, although the upheavals of the reign had shaken the accepted orthodoxy, it would seem that the Edwardian religious changes made little lasting impact on the people of Durham, particularly in a doctrinal respect. Time, and the role played by Bishop Tunstal, were the chief factors in this failure. The records are defective, but apart from the spoliation there is little evidence either of sustained determination to reform (under Tunstal) or of firm control being exercised (under dean Horn). Nor could the few preachers who penetrated into the bishopric do little more than scratch the surface of the conservatism, ignorance and superstition of the 'haliewerfolk'. Nevertheless, it is likely that these men were responsible for the few lasting conversions to Protestantism made during Edward's reign.

#### MARY (1553-1558)

The reaction of Queen Mary's reign brought the restoration of Roman Catholic rites and furnishings, but not at Durham of the monastic community. More immediately, her accession in July 1553 also meant the collapse of Northumberland's revolutionary plans, so that the see, Tunstal, and the Palatinate were all restored. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore that the reconciliation with Rome in 1554 was celebrated with feasting in the dean's house, 'gallons of Ayle', bonfires and the music of minstrels (69). But the wider long-term

significance of the Marian restoration is more difficult to measure, precisely because the impact of the Edwardian changes in Durham cannot be closely assessed. It seems certain at least though that Tunstal's strengthening of the clergy during the last years of the reign did much to complicate the task of the Elizabethan Protestant regime that followed, and perhaps even ensure the survival of popular Catholicism into the 1560s and 1570s; the priests he ordained or appointed were either deprived in the years following the 1559 visitation or survived to play some part in the 1569 rebellion, occasionally re-emerging as recusant priests in the 1570s and 1580s (70).

On August 3rd 1553 Mary entered London as Queen amidst scenes of great celebration, not so much it seems because of her religion, but because her claim as lawful heir was supported by Protestants and Catholics alike. Three days later Tunstal was released from King's Bench prison and immediately reinstated by Mary as Bishop of Durham, attending her coronation on October 1st in the place traditionally assigned to the holder of the see (71). Pending the arrival in England of Cardinal Pole over a year later, he and Gardiner (two of the bishops left who had experience of the old order) were also appointed the Queen's chief advisers in religious matters. The first Parliament of the reign (October 5th to December 6th) then passed an Act of Repeal, which revoked all nine statutes made during Edward's reign affecting the church and therefore restored the practice of religion to what it had been during the last year of Henry VIII (72). Regaining Tunstal's right to the old bishopric and its possessions by law was, however, to prove much more difficult. A 'Bill for the confirmation of the bishopric of Durham' failed after its third reading on 5th December, revealing the intense suspicion with which the restoration of any ecclesiastical property was regarded by the lay aristocracy. On January 18th 1554, Mary therefore sought to resolve the problem in her own way, cancelling the deprivations and re-erecting the traditional see by Letters Patent on the grounds that the

Edwardian Acts had been obtained 'per sinistram corruptem laborem et maliciam quorundam iniquorum hominum' (73). This seems to have been technically invalid, however, since a new bill for the restoration of the bishopric was soon introduced into Mary's 2nd Parliament in Spring 1554. This time the measure finally passed through both the Lords and Commons by 19th April, but only after Tunstal had intervened in the Lower House in person, and the burgesses of Newcastle were bought off with a 450 year lease of the Gateshead borough tolls and salt fields (74).

During this time the bishop had resumed an active participation in government, and for the first year of Mary's reign he was considered to be one of the most influential members of the Privy Council. It is difficult, however, to measure the extent of his influence upon Mary's ecclesiastical policy, although he sat on several ecclesiastical commissions, including those which deprived a number of Protestant Edwardian bishops by the exercise of Mary's authority as Supreme Head in March 1554 (75). He was certainly also a firm believer in the need to restore papal jurisdiction, and played at least a formal part in the ceremonial reconciliation on 30th November 1554 (the feast of St. Andrew) when Cardinal Pole, as legate of the Apostolic See, formally absolved the nation and received England back into the Roman Church (76).

After Mary's 3rd Parliament, however (November 12th to January 16th 1555), - which passed an Act reimposing the heresy statutes as well as formally re-establishing the Pope's authority - Tunstal's attention was now firmly concentrated on his diocese, and he did not serve on the reduced Council of State which was set up after Philip's departure in August 1555 or even visit London at all between November 1555 and the death of Mary (77). Certainly there was a great deal to be done. Despite Mary's firm belief in papal authority, the queen had issued a new set of Royal Articles in 1554 as a means of enforcing a return to the old religious practices, and

these needed close supervision by Tunstal. It is significant in fact that the diocesan authorities were left to enforce the Articles, while no attempt was made to conduct a royal visitation in the bishopric. In general, Mary and the Council do not seem to have been unduly concerned about maintaining firm control over the ecclesiastical life of the region, issuing few preaching licences for the north-east and granting patronage of the prebends at Durham to the bishop in February 1557 (78). This might be due to an accidental lack of evidence, but it seems likely that the government accepted the Catholic reputation of the north-east and was content simply to face no opposition in the region.

This left Tunstal with a busy agenda. In 1555 he reported the steps he was taking to suppress 'a seditious book of questions in print' that was in circulation in the Newcastle area (79). He was also frequently instructed to be ready at short notice to send the military forces of the Palatinate to defend the Border, while in the summer of 1557 he was involved in diplomatic negotiations with the Scots. Indeed, the bishop seems to have been so preoccupied with ecclesiastical administration and Border matters during these last years that he only attended one session of the Council of the North during the whole reign (at Newcastle on July 20th, 1555) although the Lord President, Shrewsbury, frequently asked his advice (80). He was doubtless grateful therefore that part of his position of political responsibility and predominance in the bishopric was once again assumed by the Nevilles: Mary endowed the earl of Westmoreland with numerous grants of land in Yorkshire and Durham and also appointed him Lieutenant-General of the north in 1558 (81).

But apart from his extensive commitments, Tunstal's absence from court during those years (1555-1558) also reflects the fact that he was an extremely reluctant prosecutor in the heresy trials, and he seems to have preferred to be employed beyond the range of the burnings (the only burning in the Northern Province took place at

Chester in 1555) (82). He had been present as one of Gardiner's fellow commissioners at the trials of John Rogers, Bishop Hooper and Dr. Rowland Taylor in January 1555, just three weeks after the statute 'De Heretico Comburendo' had been reintroduced. But the bishop seems to have been happier trying to win back the prisoners in the Tower to the true faith, and only took part in one more trial, that of John Philpot, in the summer of 1555. Certainly no-one was burnt as a heretic in the bishopric during Mary's reign, and Fox 's description of his prosecution of Russell, a Protestant preacher, shows his concern to keep the burnings out of the diocese. After Russel had been briefly cross-examined by Tunstal, his chancellor, Dr. Hyndmer, 'would have had him examined more particularly ... (but) the Bishop stayed him, saying "hitherto we have had a good report among our neighbours: I pray you bring not this man's blood upon my head"' (83). This also suggests that Tunstal would not have been actively concerned with hunting out the relatively few protestants who lived in the Palatinate during Mary's reign.

But despite his lack of intimate concern with parochial business, it is probable that the bishop would have made some efforts towards securing a reversion to Catholic practice and belief in the parish churches of the county. New grails and missals, for instance, had to be brought in by 'shipe', probably from Newcastle (84). In some areas, however, the Edwardian changes appear to have made so little impact that there must have been little for the diocesan authorities to do. All the chantries were still standing at Coniscliffe, for example, when Mary came to the throne in August, 1553, which makes it seem unlikely that the church itself had been removed of its Catholic furnishings. Similarly, it is known that the chantry of the 12 Apostles in Barnard Castle was still in existence in May 1554, although it may have been refounded immediately after Mary's accession (85). High altars were also put rapidly back into place, as early as September 1553 in some parishes such as South Shields

(86). Finally, Eyre, a nineteenth-century Catholic historian, records, (without giving his source) that when the diocesan officials visited Houghton-le-Spring late in 1553 the Edwardian Injunctions ordering a change of worship had never even been heard of by the inhabitants of the parish (87).

Similar work was also quickly carried out in the Cathedral, even before Horn fled the diocese in October 1553, and he left a graphic account of his feelings when he saw 'God's book containing the word of life taken forth of the churches of the bishopric of Durham, and a foul sort of idols, called laymen's books, brought in therefore ... the Common Prayer in the vulgar tongue ... banished, and in the place thereof a kind of prayer used, far dissonant from God's law ... (and) the Lord's table ..... carried away, the communion abhorred as heresy. And for these, Baal's altars reared up, and his priests and monkish hypocrites returned to their abominable, blasphemous and idolatrous mass, as dogs to their vomit.' Soon after Tunstal's release, the bishop had called the Protestant dean before the Council on the charge of having preached heresy in the Palatinate, and even though the heresy statutes had not yet been revived Horn fled abroad at the end of October, from where he heaped a savage stream of invective on 'devilish dreaming Duresme' (88).

He was immediately replaced by Thomas Watson, Gardiner's chaplain, who was instituted as dean on the 18th November, 1553. Watson (dean from 1553-1558) was a scholar with a reputation for disliking religious innovation, and the relationship between Bishop Tunstal and the cathedral's administrative body seems to have been particularly harmonious during this period (89). In 1554 the commission was issued which drew up the present statutes of the cathedral, with Bonner, Tunstal and Heath all serving as advisors (90). In general, these Marian Statutes (issued on March 20th 1555) formed a thorough revision of the earlier Henrician statutes, finally regulating the powers of the newly constituted governing body of the cathedral (the dean and chapter) and their

relations to the bishop, as well as prescribing the procedure to be followed when vacancies occurred in its ranks. Naturally, the new Statutes had heavy Catholic overtones, including masses for the souls of Philip and Mary (91). Nevertheless, they reveal that the Catholic Queen and her bishops were fully conscious that the new corporation should be fulfilling a substantially different role from that of the monastery: residence was to be more strictly enforced than in the old secular cathedrals, while the Durham prebendaries were encouraged to hold diocesan cures and undertake regular preaching (92). In relation to the central question of authority, clause 40 of the Marian Statutes greatly clarified and extended the visitorial powers of the bishop in the cathedral, enabling him to hold triennial visitations and full judicial power if the statutes were disputed. As a consequence, Tunstal is known to have carried out a visitation of the cathedral in 1556, issuing special Injunctions for the purpose (93).

An even more significant addition to the bishop's powers was made on the 7th February 1557 when Mary granted the patronage of the prebends (reserved since 1541 for the Crown) to Bishop Tunstal, a move which brought Durham into line with the secular cathedrals. This transfer of ordination rights was extremely significant in the long term because it forged a much closer link between the bishops and their chapters, the former using the prebends to provide for their favourite preachers and administrators (as well as relatives). In the 1560s this was to have the important effect of enabling Bishop Pilkington to build up a powerful faction of Protestant client prebendaries in the cathedral, by which he was able to dominate the older Catholic clergy backed by the conservative gentry of the county (94).

As for the parochial clergy in Durham, it has been seen that their position had altered little before the accession of Mary, and this did not change after 1553. The Act of Repeal which came into force in December 1553, containing an annulment of the Edwardian Act allowing

priests to marry, and the Queen's Injunctions of March 1554, which commanded bishops to deprive married clergy, resulted in large-scale deprivations elsewhere in the country early in 1554 but did not affect the bishopric to any significant degree. Apart from Dean Horn, who fled abroad, only the two parochial clergy in Durham were deprived, Thomas Atkinson (rector of Elwick 1546-1554) and Prebendary John Rudd (also vicar of Norton 1539-1554). It is true that the actual number may have been far higher than this, since no count can be made of the number of unbeneficed clergy who were suspended or removed, while several of those who 'resigned' may in reality have been deprived, but in general the Catholic outlook of the diocese seems to have meant that the rule of celibacy was still maintained among the priesthood (95).

Certainly there was little immediate turnover in the clergy's ranks, few ordinations or institutions being held in Durham in the early years of Mary's reign. On 9th May, 1554 the Crown presented George Bullock as a prebend to the cathedral church after the deprivation of John Rudd, but the first ordination did not take place until 28th February 1556(96). Between 1556 and 1559, however, Tunstal and Spark ordained a total of 34 priests (some of whom came from Carlisle and Chester dioceses) in an apparent attempt to strengthen the Catholic clergy such as that which enabled the Lancashire Catholics to withstand the changes of the 1560s (97). Indeed, Tunstal continued to ordain up to May 1559, as late as was possible in Elizabeth's reign, seemingly overcome by a growing sense of urgency as he saw the end approaching. Those he raised to the priesthood, for example, included men such as George White, Richard Hartburn and John Pearson, leading figures in the 1569 rebellion: Roger Venys, who fled the country after being deprived in 1570, and then returned, via the English College at Rheims, as a recusant priest in 1580: and finally George Rayn, William Ustayne and Hugh Ile, all of whom strove to maintain Catholic forms and belief well into the 1580s

and 1590s (98).

Some of the 54 priests instituted to livings during Mary's reign also put up a similar resistance under Elizabeth (99). Although a significant number were eventually to conform (at least nominally) in 1559, particularly among the lesser clergy, there were some notable exceptions, such as Anthony Salvin, William Carter, Thomas Sigiswick and Robert Dalton. It is significant that all four were collated by Tunstal rather than by the Crown or other patrons of the livings. Furthermore a large number of those who originally conformed or absented themselves in 1559 were eventually caught up with by the authorities, and 27 of these Marian priests resigned or were deprived for unspecified reasons in the 1560s and early 1570s. In total, at least 15 of the priests ordained or appointed by Tunstal in Mary's reign were also involved in the 1569 rebellion (100).

But the reaction of Mary's reign was not simply a blind reversal to the Catholic past. Tunstal was sympathetic with the reformers' emphasis on improving the learning of the clergy, and following the Henrician Statutes of the early 1540s, the new Marian Cathedral Statutes of 1556 made certain University qualifications necessary for the dean and prebendaries of Durham. The value of the sermon was also appreciated during the Marian restoration, with the new Statutes ordering that the dean and each of the prebendaries should preach not only in the cathedral, as was ordered by the Henrician Statutes, but also 'twice at least in each year outside this Church in divers places within the Diocese of Durham' (this meant a total of 26 sermons each year in the diocese, in addition to the 52 that were to be delivered in the Cathedral itself) (101). In his 1556 Injunctions, Tunstal followed up this command by enjoining that the dean and chapter should provide for frequent sermons (especially during Lent) in all churches under their jurisdiction, while again the following year he wrote to the cathedrals instructing 'that in each Church belonging to the Dean and Chapter of which you are

patrons ye sow the seed of the Word of God at a convenient season in each year ... either personally or by others chosen by you, lest thro' lack of knowledge of the Law of God the flock of Christ perish by spiritual famine, to the great peril of your own souls' (102).

With hindsight, therefore, it may be argued that Tunstal's (and the Marian Statutes') conception of the mother Church as a mission centre in many respects paved the way for the effects of Protestant dean and chapter in the 1560s.

How then did ordinary laypeople respond to the doctrine and ceremonial reversal of the Marian restoration? Given the limited impact of the Edwardian doctrinal changes, it is difficult to detect the transition to Mary's reign in the wills of the Durham laity, although some become more markedly Catholic in tone and content by 1557-8. This is partly apparent in the growing number of requests for 'sowlle mass and dirige', and trentalls of masses, all of which (with one exception) occur in the last two years of the reign (103). It is also visible in the will of Robert Collingwood from Eslington in Northumberland (dated June 12th 1558), in which he stated that he had 'devised the erection and continuel for ev' of a priest to celebrat in the p'she church of Whittingham at the alter ... in the said chauntrie' (104). Collingwood does not reveal when he had founded or refounded the chantry, but it seems probable that it was during the reign of Mary. The preambles of the wills for Mary's reign also remain uniformly Catholic in tone. Of the 21 wills (containing a preamble) that survive for the period 1553-1558, 18 opened in the traditional manner with a commendatory clause and a request for the prayers of the Virgin and Saints. There is, however, one notable exception. Richard Leigh, master of St. Johns's hospital at Barnard Castle, used in March 1557 the first explicitly Protestant formula that survives for the bishopric, beginning 'I geve and bequyeth my soule to Almyghtie my maker and redemer in whome and by the merrys of whose

blyssed passion I beleve to have forgeveness of all my synnes' (105). Finally, it is also significant that the wills of Mary's reign increasingly contained testamentary bequests, and that parishioners began once more to make gifts of money, cloth and jewels to their local parish churches, despite the spoliation that had taken place during Edward's reign. Thomas Trollope, for instance, bequeathed 10s in 1558 to the 'amendinge of the churche of Kellowe and ornaments of the same', while Edward Younger left several 'impleme'ts and ornaments' to the chapel of St. Hilds at South Shields (106).

Often these bequests consisted of appurtenances to the very Catholic furnishings or ornaments that had recently been removed. Jane Lawson of Newsham, for instance, bequeathed 'one vestemente of blak velvet' in 1557 to the high altar in Harworth church (107). Indeed, in many cases it must be assumed that testators were returning goods they had rescued or bought from the Edwardian Commissioners in 1553. As noted earlier, the latter sold off on site large quantities of furnishings, vestments, altar clothes and other ornaments which the Crown did not want. Unlike some other areas, moreover, there appears to have been no difficulty in Durham in obtaining a local sale for these goods, since the commission for the bishopric was fully completed before the end of June 1553 (108). In general, there appears to have been a significant number of lay people who felt no qualms in 1553 about buying up the trappings of Catholic piety (candlesticks, statues and altar cloths) that had previously belonged to churches. One man from Ludlow, for instance, paid 10d for an 'image of Jhesus', while another paid 18d for a statue of St. George (109).

But as Scarisbrick has shown on a national scale, many of these ornaments and furnishings from parish churches had disappeared well before the commissioners' auctioneering work had even begun, in some cases as part of a 'deliberate policy to forestall the Crown' (110). As early as 1536 a sailor from Hull was boasting that his town had taken the precaution of selling off the church

plate in order that the king should not acquire it, while by 1552 the churchwardens at Thame had sold off over £300 worth of chalices and crosses, dividing the cash between themselves and friends (111). But this was not always done for private gain. Throughout the country in the late 1540s and 1550s churchwardens were selling to local silversmiths and other purchasers, plate, ornaments and other church goods with the 'whole consent' of parishioners, for such purposes as relieving the poor, paying for 'reparacions' to churches and equipping men to fight the Scots.

As a consequence, lay commissioners (sheriffs and JPs) were ordered in 1549 to call on churchwardens each year to show that nothing had been sold or stolen in the previous 12 months, with of course the added motive of drawing up inventories of parochial church goods which prepared the way for their later expropriation by the Crown (112). Since only the naive could have failed to understand what was going on, however, it is likely that these royal commissions only served to precipitate the very process that they were designed to check. Well before the 1553 sale, therefore, many lay people (particularly churchwardens) took such goods into their possession - for private gain, or just to prevent their confiscation by royal officials in the immediate future - but often with the intention of restoring them later to the use of their church. Everybody was grabbing what they could, as Bernard Gilpin noted: 'covetousnesse is the roote of all, every man scratcheth and pilleteth from other, every man would sucke the blood of other, every man encroacheth upon another ..... every man envieth another ..... there was never more idolatry in England, than at this day: but the idols are hid, they come not abroad ..... and all that while the poore lively images of Christ, perish in the streets, through hunger and colde' (113).

Some of these vestments, ornaments and church goods sold or transferred to local people in Edward's reign were then bought back or bequeathed to parish churches in

Mary's reign. In Durham, William Bell bequeathed to the church at Middleton-in-Teesdale, 'three bells of an hundrethe weight ... one Cope, a vestment and a deacon all of one sute, of silk tynselde with borders of Images of soundraye saynts' (114). At Ludlow (where the evidence is more extensive), after Mary's accession Thomas Season immediately 'restored to the churche' four copes, several candlesticks and a statue, all of which presumably he had acquired during Edward's reign. Presumably, these items had not been turned to profane uses and were still worth buying back, so that the copes and vestments had not been turned into bedspreads and curtains, as was often the case (in 1570, for instance, the parish clerk at Billingham deposed that there was a 'read cope ..... as yet undefaced' in the parish church). Nevertheless, it is clear that what Pogson has termed the 'Beauty of Holiness ..... so vital to Roman ceremonial and belief' could not be restored overnight in 1553, and Tunstal apparently commented in 1558 that he had still not restored all the necessary ornaments to the cathedral (115).

Apart from these smaller parochial church ornaments and goods, Scarisbrick has also indicated from a widespread survey of surviving churchwarden accounts across the country that high altars, statues, holy-water stoups and rood lofts were taken down in Edward's reign, put back in Mary's reign and then removed again after Elizabeth's accession with a minimum of disruption (116). Unfortunately the churchwarden accounts for Durham are extremely sparse, so that it is difficult to verify whether this took place in the bishopric. Only three parishes (Pittington, Ryton and Houghton-le-Spring) have account books containing material for the sixteenth century, and these do not begin until the 1580s and 1590s (117). Nevertheless, it is clear at least that altars were put back rapidly after Mary's accession, as in Lancashire (where they were so soon in use again that Haigh has suggested they may never have even been removed). In Durham, the high altar was back in place in

South Shields by September 1553, while the altars at Norton, Tynemouth, Harworth and Sedgefield were restored by 1557 at the latest (118). Furthermore, it is also known from later evidence that altars rood lofts and holy water stoups remained intact well into Elizabeth's reign, probably being removed by local people for safekeeping before churches were once more purged of their Catholic past in 1559-60. Despite Grindal's Injunctions in 1571 and Barnes Visitation Articles in 1577, Coniscliffe church, for example, was still found to possess on either side of the high altar the corbel stones on which the images had stood, as well as the 'remants of the roode lofte untaken downe'. The presentations at the Royal Visitation of 1559 also revealed images of saints still standing in various parishes, and others hidden away in the hope of yet another change of religious order (119). The most telling evidence, is provided by the proceedings of the rebels in 1569, which reveal that altars and holy water stoups were carefully preserved, often in the church precincts or chancel floor, ready for that restoration of Catholicism for which many hoped and the rebellion now seemed to promise. When the Northern Rising reached Durham and the old forms of religion were briefly restored - with mass being said once more in the Cathedral and neighbouring churches - it is known that altars were restored in at least ten parishes, while holy water stoups were set up in a further seven churches (120).

## 5. COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NEW ORDER 1558-69

---

It is difficult to avoid writing history with hindsight, but the false centralist assumption that the 'English Reformation' was somehow definitely completed by the Elizabethan settlement, with 1558 being regarded as a vital turning-point, is still preserved among some historians. Even Mervyn James, for instance, has written that 'the advent of Queen Elizabeth, and the Acts of Supremacy and Conformity in 1559, were to mark the final victory of Protestantism'. But although a political and legislative decision for Protestantism was taken at the centre in 1558/9, there had as yet been only a very limited 'popular' reformation in the parishes of the northern diocese. Bernard Gilpin, for instance, complained at the end of the decade that there had been no reform of 'so many abuses touching images, reliques, pilgrimages, buying and selling of masses and trentalls ..... which in the time of King Edward the papists had not onely confessed to be superstitious, but had promised reformation of them'(1). Furthermore, after the conflicting religious policies of Edward and Mary, it is hardly surprising that few contemporaries imagined that the 'official' reformation was irreversible or that the injunctions and laws of 1559 would constitute a permanent settlement. As in other northern counties like Lancashire - where stories that altars and crucifixes were to be restored remained rife in the 1560s - there were persistent rumours about an 'alteracyon of religion' in Durham in the months leading up to the northern rebellion in 1569, while outside the Protestant chapter many parishioners and clergy were extremely reluctant to deface images, remove altars, and implement the ecclesiological and liturgical rules of 1559 (1a).

Elizabeth succeeded to the throne in November 1558. In April 1559 the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were passed by the first Parliament of the reign (15th January

- 8th May), and the following month a Royal Commission was set up to enforce the provision of the Acts throughout the country (both the oath of allegiance to Elizabeth as 'Supreme Governor of the Church of England' and the use of the new English Book of Common Prayer) (2). On 30th June Tunstal wrote to Elizabeth and Cecil begging an audience with the Queen ('her Majesty's presence') and by the 20th July he had reached London (3). Apart from the return of the Marian exiles and the drastic situation on the episcopal bench - nine seats were vacant by death at the accession of Elizabeth while nine others were vacant by deprivation after 17th November 1558) - a letter from the Spanish ambassador suggests that Tunstal's main concern was with the new Prayer Book, which denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and reintroduced the 'communion service' with the ultra-Protestant administrative words of 1552 ('Take and eat this in remembrance'). Bishop Aquila wrote to the emperor that the 'Bishop of Durham ..... came up from his diocese to tell the Queen what he thought about these affairs. He showed her documents in the handwriting of King Henry against the heresies now received ..... and begged her to respect the will of her father'(4). Tunstal's unwillingness to serve Elizabeth unless she maintain the theological position of her father (as revealed in Henry's will - of which he was an executor - and the Six Articles) seems to have been a bitter blow to the Council, who were apparently anxious to get his tacit sanction to the settlement as the only surviving bishop whose consecration had preceded the break with Rome (5).

His decision to refuse the oath of supremacy was also hardened by the new Injunctions issued in the summer of 1559, which completely bypassed episcopal authority: Protestant 'visitors', armed with articles of inquiry, were to distribute these Injunctions throughout the country and promote their reading in addition with the book of homilies. On 19th August he wrote to Cecil: 'Where I do understand out of my diocese of a warning for a Visitation to be had there, this shall be to advertise

your mastership that, albeit I would be as glad to serve the Queen's Highness and set forward with her affairs to her contentation as any a subject in her realm, yet if the same Visitation shall proceed to any such end in my diocese of Durham as I do plainly see to be set forth in London, as pulling down of altars, defacing of churches by taking away of the crucifixes, I cannot in my conscience consent to it being pastor there; because I cannot agree to be a Sacramentary (i.e. one who denies the real presence of Christ), nor to have any new doctrine taught in my diocese ..... my conscience will not suffer me to receive and follow any doctrine in my diocese other than Catholic' (6). On 9th September Tunstal declined to assist in the consecration of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury, and after refusing the oath of supremacy with 'certen disordered speche', he was finally deprived of the bishopric on September 28th 1559. Seven weeks later, on 18th November, he died at Lambeth Palace (7).

Unknown to Tunstal, however, the commissioners were already at work in the north. Draft lists of commissaries for the Royal Visitation had been drawn up in early summer (using the 1547 circuits as a model) and on the 24th June when the new Prayer Book became mandatory, Letters Patent were issued to establish six circuits and sets of commissioners for each region: those for the northern province included Sandys, a leading Cambridge theologian, Harvey, a skilled ecclesiastical lawyer, Scambler, a Protestant preacher, and several members of the Council of the North that were 'trusted in religion', such as Sir Thomas Gargrave, Sir Henry Gates and Lord Evers (8). The terms of the Commission were similar to previous visitations, and the visitors powers included all aspects of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Apart from obtaining subscriptions to the royal supremacy, the Injunctions and the new Prayer Book, the Commissioners were also empowered to examine the clergy's letters of ordination and institution, to grant probate of wills, to remove unsuitable incumbents, and to review

the cases of those deprived by Mary of their benefices.

The commission reached county Durham by the middle of September and sat first at Bishop Auckland on the 21st. Four members of the clergy initially refused to sign the proposed declaration (9): Thomas Sigiswicke, Regius professor of divinity at Cambridge and vicar of Gainford, who was subsequently bound over with £300 to appear when required and was later deprived of all his benefices; William Bennet, ex-monk, prebend of the 4th stall and vicar of Aycliffe, who was also bound over but not deprived; Robert Dalton, ex-monk and prebendary of Durham as well as vicar of Billingham, who said 'that he belevith that he who sittithe in the seate of Rome hath and oughte to have the jurisdiction ecclesiasticall over all Christian Realmes' and had his emoluments temporarily forfeited; and finally William Whitehead, nephew of the Prior and vicar of Heighington, who finally submitted ater three refusals but was later prosecuted after the 1569 rising (10).

On Saturday 23rd September the commissioners moved on to Durham itself, where sessions were held at the chapter house on the same day and at St. Nicholas church on Monday 25th. Only one prebend, Roger Watson, subscribed outright, and all the remaining prebends and eight of the minor canons in the cathedral chapter refused to sign the declaration. These included Dean Robertson, who declared that 'the Bisshope of Rome owghte to have the jurisdiction ecclesiasticall of this Realme' and was bound over with £50 to appear in London; James Crayforth, ex-guardian of the Franciscans at Newcastle and prebend of the 1st stall, who was later commissioned by the Chapter at York to act as one of four vicars-general in the Durham diocese 'sede vacante' (1559-61), despite his refusal to subscribe; Stephen Marley, ex-monk and prebend of the 6th stall, who had his goods sequestered and was bound over to appear in London; John Tutty, ex-monk and prebend of the 8th stall as well as vicar of Brantingham, who was bound over and later deprived in 1560; Nicholas Marley, ex-monk and prebend of the 9th stall as well as

vicar of Pittington, who would 'not answer directlye to th' article of supremacy, but said that the Bishshope of Rome had soom jurisdiction in this Realme', and was later deprived after his subsequent refusal in 1560; George Bullock, prebend of the 10th stall and master of St. John's College, Cambridge, who affirmed that the 'sea of that bisshope was the sea Apostolicke' and was deprived of both the prebend and mastership, later appearing at the English Hospice at Rome in 1581; Anthony Salvin, prebend of the 11th stall, rector of Sedgely, and master of University College, Oxford 1557-8, who had his goods sequestrated and was bound over to appear, but was later deprived of all his benefices the following year; George Cliffe, ex-monk and prebend of the 12th stall, who was bound over to appear but was later instituted to the vicarage of Billingham in 1560; Thomas Sparke, Bishop of Berwick and prebend of the 3rd stall who absented himself sick from the visitation; and lastly William Todd, ex-monk and prebend of the 5th stall, who refused the oath from his sickbed and had his goods sequestrated but was not deprived (11). Eight minor canons also refused the declaration and were referred to London after a second refusal - William Smyth, John Brown, John Byndley, Thomas Pentland, Roland Blenkinsopp, John Pearson and William Hall (12).

Alongside these diocesan officials and members of the chapter, all members of the parochial clergy had also been summoned to appear before the visitation. Many failed to appear, including thirty-six from the diocese (out of about one hundred and eighty) and thirteen from the bishopric, and these were declared contumacious, 'pena reservata'. No further action seems to have been taken against them, however, and the only clergy deprived were as a consequence of the restoration of those clerics (John Rudd and Thomas Atkinson, rector of Elwick) who had been ejected during Mary's reign for having married (13).

This general leniency by the authorities seems to have been due to the extremely low supply of suitable clergy in the late 1550s (especially graduates) which

meant that any attempt to carry out wholesale evictions would have completely incapacitated the church. As it was, 10-15% of livings nationwide were void at Elizabeth's accession, so that in the first eight months of his episcopate, the new Archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker was obliged to ordain 233 (generally ill-trained) men in the diocese of Canterbury to fill vacant cures 'in all parts of England'. In the longer term, moreover, O'Day has shown how the low turnover rate and the barriers raised by the patronage system - which supported the preferment of local men into livings - meant that older men and those from non-clerical backgrounds continued to be admitted to orders until the supply of young, university-trained recruits improved in the 1580s and 1590s (14). Only by these later decades therefore did the Elizabethan church hierarchy receive any substantial benefit from the large expansion of secondary and higher education, and support from the growing numbers of university graduates leaving Oxford and Cambridge. The number of graduates rose, for instance, from 1,267 in 1564 to 3,050 by 1662 (15).

In the meantime, however, the leniency of the visitors in 1559 (and subsequently vicars-general 1559-61) only served to make the task of the reformers in Durham even more difficult during the 1560s. The eight minor canons and five prebendaries (Bennet, S. Marley, Cliffe, Sparke and Todd) who merely had their livings sequestrated and escaped deprivation in 1559-60, all survived to preserve conservative influence in the 1560s and several were involved in the 1569 Rising. William Todd, for instance, was twice called before the High Commission at York in 1564 and 1567 on the charge of wearing popish vestments, while it was also reported that he 'used to say loud and superstitious prayers with a loud and audible voice that the people dwelling nigh the places where he was might hear him' (16).

Nor were the authorities particularly stringent in their visitation of the laity, despite an appearance of efficiency (17). The major task on the agenda at each

visitation centre was the reception of presentments by churchwardens and lay representatives from each parish in answer to the Articles that had been sent to them in advance. Like their 1547 predecessors, these 1559 Articles essentially provided a blueprint for the ecclesiastical policy of the new Protestant regime, stipulating that the clergy should be diligent in performing the services prescribed by the new Prayer Book and in teaching the essentials of the Christian faith to their parishioners, while the laity should co-operate in keeping the church fabric in repair and in reporting people who were suspect of heresy or other lay offences (18). By means of their presentments then, the churchwardens were asked to report at the visitation on the human failings of their parish in any of these areas, and to give figures for the numbers of books burnt, vacant livings, images not destroyed and clergy dispossessed by May.

The returns for county Durham are particularly significant, because they show that no single parish conducted any really thorough scrutiny on every article, while (unlike the diocese of York) there are also large numbers of negative returns and omissions. There were no returns, for instance, from either the city of Durham or Bishop Auckland, but it seems impossible to believe from this that none of the parishes concerned had anything to report. Rather, it appears as if everything depended on the initiative and diligence of the individual churchwardens concerned. Nevertheless, although the evidence is unreliable, it is instructive to note the nature of the offences reported in the bishopric. In four parishes (Elwick, Stainton, Long Newton and Cokefield) 'the Bible and all other their bokes used in Kyng Edward's tyme wer burnned', presumably during Mary's reign. At three churches (Darlington, Lanchester and St. Andrews, Newcastle) there was no register book, while the 'alehousekeepers' at Stanhope repeatedly kept 'open their dores in the tyme of dyvyne service and will not be admonyshed'. Similarly, the parish of Ashe did not have

a curate, while the images were still standing in the church at Rothburn in Northumberland. The most numerous complaint of all (in nine churches), however, was that of 'decaye' in the various churches concerned due to 'lacke of reparations', which seems to have meant anything from a leaking roof to a likely state of collapse (19).

In general, therefore, it seems as if the visitation satisfied the crown's purpose of advertising the requirements of the new settlement, but achieved little more. The commissioners failed to secure the subscription of even the leading clergy in the region to the Articles and the restored royal supremacy, and the Catholic prebends were to remain a constant threat to orthodoxy in the 1560s. In this respect, the role played by Tunstal and dean Robertson (1558-9) in uniting the chapter was surely a decisive one, and the contrast between the solidarity of the refusal at Durham, and the total acquiescence at Chester, where the bishop and deanery were vacant, is worth commenting upon. Above all, as far as Durham was concerned, the visitors centralist approach did little to reveal the extent to which the clergy and laity failed to live up to the implied ideal contained in the Articles, while the task of actually enforcing the latter was left to the diocesan authorities and churchcourts themselves. By Wednesday 26th September the Royal commissioners had already moved on to Newcastle. Two days later, on 28th September, Tunstal was deprived.

The see was to remain vacant for seventeen months, but before 20th May 1560 a commission had been granted by the chapter of York to John Crawforth, Roger Watson, Richard Marshall and William Garnet for the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the diocese, sede vacante (20). As Vicars-General, these four (who were all beneficed in the see of Durham (21)) were commissioned to

administer the see until the arrival of Bishop Pilkington in March 1561, and they were helped in this task by Robert Horne, who was briefly restored to the deanery before being consecrated bishop of Winchester in February the following year (22). Little of significance seems to have happened during their period of rule, although a letter from the dean to Cecil on February 18th 1560 provides a vivid sense of the task facing the reformers: Horn described 'the face of the church in these parts as so blemished with ignorance and licentious living, through want of godly instruction and due correction, that if there be not some speedy remedy found to instruct the conscience with knowledge in the true fear of God, and correct the lives of those liberties with some discipline, they shall fall to barbarous atheism, void of all religion, and become a new Babylon in confusion of licentious life ..... there is such continuance in superstitious behaviour (contrary to the order taken for religion) such contempt and neglecting of God's service at the times and places appointed, and such uncleanness through fleshly life, yea, such horrible incests, as have not been heard of among the heathen ..... and as this part of the realm requires that some workmen shall be thrust forth by the Queen ..... to the planting of knowledge and virtue, and the uprooting of ignorance and vice, he names apt men for the vacancies' (23).

Seventeen of the Vicar-Generals acts are recorded in the episcopal register, and these included (as Horne requested) the institution of seven new prebends or minor clergy to replace those who resigned or were deprived after the 1559 visitation. In the cathedral, Dalton, Tutin and Marley were finally deprived in May 1560 and replaced by Sampson, Shepherd and Horton, all firm Protestants, while Beane, Watson, Cliffe and Lofthouse were instituted to the cures in Stanhope, Pittington, Billingham and Sedgefield (that were vacated by Sigiswicke, Marley, Dalton and Salvin respectively). Finally, on March 1st 1561, Pilkington was consecrated as Bishop of Durham, while Ralph Skinner (master of Sherburn

Hospital) was instituted to the deanery of Durham (24).

Under Bishop Pilkington, this shift in the balance of power within the Durham chapter was further accelerated. During his visitation of the cathedral and diocese in October 1561, he compelled the clergy to acknowledge the royal supremacy, renounce the Pope and use the new Prayer Book, although this seems to have made little immediate effect in terms of personnel. The following month, however, John Pilkington joined his brother to replace the deceased Roger Watson as 2nd prebendary, while late in 1562 Edward Banck and Thomas Pentland replaced Richard Hartburn and Hugh Hutchison (who were deprived) as rector and vicar of Long Newton and St. Oswald's respectively. Most important of all, in autumn 1563, Elizabeth granted the deanery of Durham to the scholarly and radical William Whittingham, who had married Calvin's sister and shared in the translation of the 'Breeches' Bible during his exile in Frankfurt and Geneva between 1553-8 (25). His Calvinist credentials were a matter of some repute, and according to his contemporary biographer, Whittingham 'liked better of the order and discipline of the church of Geneva ..... (than) the formes of the government of the Church of England in the dayes of King Edward VI' (26).

Under such a dean, as Marcombe has argued, it was not surprising that a rapid Protestantisation of the chapter was soon achieved, although this was by no means complete, and there remained an obvious tension between the old Catholic prebendaries backed by the Nevilles and the incoming Protestant clergy backed by the ecclesiastical authorities and Court families like the Dudleys and Russells (27). By the later part of the decade, however, the Durham chapter was of a Protestant enough character to satisfy Whittingham and Pilkington, as they succeeded in building up a powerful faction of distinguished reformers to replace those former monks who were sent into retirement. In 1567, for instance, William Todd was deprived by the High Commission at York and replaced by Thomas Lever, who like Sampson and

Whittingham, was a reformer with an international reputation. In general, as Marcombe stresses, these new prebendaries were recruited from a wider geographical area (including southerners, Scotsmen and Marian Swiss exiles) than their predecessors and were often men of great experience and talent (28).

Furthermore, as the number of ex-monks declined, so the role played by the chapter began gradually to alter. The new cathedral school began to take in sons of local merchants and gentry rather than concentrating on ordinands for the monastery, while the prebendaries were encouraged to undertake regular preaching and hold frequent diocesan cures. Generally, indeed, the Durham Injunctions which had been issued to the 'Dean, prebendaries and all the ministers of the cathedral' at the 1559 Visitation laid great emphasis upon education and preaching (as well as revealing a distinct anti-papist emphasis), ordering not only the establishment of a cathedral library but also that all members of the chapter should be 'present at all sermons preached within the church and lectures of Divinitie, and shall cease from all other divine service during the tyme of the same'. Similarly, as well as morning service, the cathedral should have the 'common morninge praier' at six o'clock 'everies working daie ..... with the English Latine (i.e. Litany) and suffragies in place and steade of the morow Masse'. Finally, the 1559 Injunctions ordered that all clergy under the degree of Bachelor of Divinity should have their own Bible in English and Erasmus' Paraphrases, while Parker's later 'Advertisements' of 1566 ordered that archdeacons should appoint certain portions of the New Testament to be learnt by heart by all curates (29).

That this emphasis on teaching and preaching was actually being adopted in the Durham chapter is revealed in a letter from Whittingham to Sir William Cecil (the Queen's Secretary) in 1564, in which he described daily life in the cathedral and his own official efforts to inculcate the new doctrine. There was half an hour's

worship in the cathedral every morning at six o'clock for the song school, the servants and schoolboys, while on Wednesdays and Fridays there was a general fast with preaching and prayers. 'At nyne of the clock we have our ordinary service, and likewise at three afternoone. The Sundaies and holydays before none we have sermons, and at after none the catechisme is expounded ..... because we lak an able scholemaster I bestow daily three or four hours in teaching the youth, till God provide us with of some that may better suffice ..... but the towne is very stiff, notwithstanding they be handeled with al lenitie and gentleness. The best hope I have now of late they begyn to resort more diligently to the sermons and service' (30).

Apart from these regular sermons in the cathedral that were ordered by the Durham Injunctions, special sermons were also provided for the mercers, grocers and other trade guilds, in accordance with rules issued by Pilkington in 1561, by which they were enjoined to attend a sermon every year within twenty days of Martinmass (31). Even more significant, after the Marian statutes and in the 1560s the administration of the diocese became more firmly rooted in the chapter, with a higher proportion of prebendaries undertaking important work in the area as masters of hospitals and parish clergy. Generally, therefore, as Marcombe has shown, the new chapter became more actively involved in the life of the diocese, being active where possible in preaching, and making the cathedral a mission centre of Protestantism in an area that was still largely Catholic in sympathy.

It is perhaps not surprising, as a consequence, that there are increasing signs of explicitly Protestant opinions being held by the parochial clergy in the see. This is partly visible in the wills of the period, with the Protestant element in the region anxious to show their loyalty to the new religious order by a vehement rejection of the old: Lawrence Dodsworth, for instance,

appointed rector of Gateshead in 1564, later renounced in his will (dated June 4th 1571) 'all the Pope's false and usurped primacy, and all his detestable enormities, beseeching God to deliver His church from all his error and false doctrines, for he is the very anti-Christ enemy and adversary to the glorious gospel of our Saviour Jesus Christ(32).

Significantly, there are no examples of the invocation of the saints by members of the Durham clergy after the will of John Semer, Vicar of Stranton in May 1561, although there are no explicit instances, either, of testators asserting their belief in the sufficiency of Christ's death to secure salvation until the 1575 will of William Birche, who stated that he hoped 'only by Jehu Christe to have full forgeaveness of ..... (his) synnes'(33). Most clergy in this period used a fairly indeterminate formula, simply bequeathing their souls 'unto Almighty God'.

Increasing Protestant influence is also revealed by the growing number of married clergy in the Palatinate. The Royal Injunctions of 1559 had reverted to Edwardian practice by allowing the clergy to marry, although they partly discouraged the process by enjoining that the Bishop, two Justices of the Peace and the intended bride's parents should give their approval(34). Nevertheless, at least ten members of the parochial clergy in county Durham subsequently married between 1559-1569, not least because the practice was favoured by the leading ecclesiastical figures of the bishopric - Pilkington, Dean Whittingham and Prebendary John Rudd - all of whom were married themselves(35). After the rebellion, in the 1570s and 1580s, the practice seems to have become fairly general and was no longer confined to clergy of more advanced views.

There were even more signs of active opposition to the liturgy and religious practices of the established church from a small extremist element in the county, although this seems to have been primarily confined to the cathedral chapter. Dean Whittingham and some of the

prebendaries initially refused, for instance, to wear the prescribed minimum of clerical apparel when the new vestments rubric (contained in the 1559 Prayer Book) was enforced in 1564-1566. In a revealing letter to the Earl of Leicester (dated 25th October 1564), Bishop Pilkington pleaded for indulgence on their behalf by arguing against the continued use of old 'Popish apparel' and by describing the particular conditions in the diocese: 'in this rude superstitious people, on the borders, priests go with sword, dagger and such coarse apparel as they can get, not being cautious or scrupulous what colour or fashion it be, and none is offended at them. But such grief to be taken at a cap among them that are civil and full of knowledge is lamentable. Consider, I beseech your honour, how that all countries which have reformed religion, have cast away the popish apparel with the pope, and yet we, that would be taken for the best, contend to keep it as a holy relic ..... this realm has such scarcity of preachers, that if so many worthy men should be cast out of the ministry for such small matters, many places should be destitute of preachers'(36).

Despite Pilkington's plea, Whittingham was repeatedly called before the Ecclesiastical Commission at York to certify his conformity, and on 27th July 1566 - in reply to the 5th and 6th articles put to him by the Commission - he admitted that he often came into Durham cathedral 'in a round capp and a gowne, withoute a surples above the same', and that on Christmas Day 1563 he 'dyd minister the Communion without eyther cape or surples'. The dean was therefore enjoined 'upon payne of deprivacion' to wear 'decent apparell' in the city of Durham, especially in church during services, and after an initial refusal, Whittingham finally 'submitted himself' in August 1567. Similar proceedings were also taken against John Pilkington (archdeacon, 2nd prebendary and vicar of Easington) and Robert Swift (canon and prebendary) for committing the same offences. The former, for instance, admitted that he 'hayd ministyed

often and sundrye tymes without ayther surples or coope in his parishe church of Easington', providing evidence that some rural parishes were coming into contact with radical attitudes(37). Similarly, in August 1567, William Birche (prebend and rector of Stanhope) was deprived for his extreme Calvinist views, while in 1568 the curate of Barnard Castle was accused of failing to use the sign of the cross at baptism(38). Finally, that such attitudes were becoming of some importance in the northern province as a whole is also revealed by Archbishop Grindal's later episcopal injunctions in 1571, since a number of articles were directed against the 'Puritan' wing of the church (although the majority of the regulations were still concerned with recusancy). He enjoined for instance that churchwardens should present to the Ordinary the names of maintainers of sectaries and the keepers of secret conventicles, preachings or lectures(39).

In the cathedral the rule of Dean Whittingham in the 1560s also completed the process whereby traditional furnishings and cultic objects were destroyed. Although St. Cuthbert's memorial chapel had been pulled down during the Edwardian spoliation, a large image of the saint had been left intact - standing by the door of the old locutorium in the eastern end of the cloisters - which was 'verie fynely and curiouslie pictured and wrowghte in the saide stone with paintinge and giltinge marvellous bewtifull and excellent to beholde ..... and he (i.e. Whittingham) caused the said image to be defaced and broken all in peaces, to the intent that there should be no memory nor token of that holie man St. Cuthbert'. Some of these objects were also taken away and put into 'playne uses', such as two holy water stoups 'of fyne marble very artificially maide and grave and bost with hollowe Bosses ... verie fynely and curiouslie wrowghte ... which two holie water stones was take awaie by Dean

Whittingham and carried into his kitchen' for salting meat and fish in (although they may have been briefly restored to the cathedral during the 1569 rebellion)(40). Similarly, he also removed the marble and freestone slabs that covered the graves of former priors of Durham and had them used for horse and pig troughs, as well as the construction of a new washing house(41). Most important of all, Whittingham's wife Katherine 'did most inoriously burne and consume' St. Cuthbert's banner, which legend affirmed was indestructible by fire 'in the notable contempt and disgrace of all ancient and goodly Reliques'(42). By the late 1560s, therefore, it seems probable that the cathedral would have been entirely denuded of its traditional decorations and furnishings with the exception of the stalls, so that a plain and austere setting was finally provided for the performance of the Protestant liturgy(43). As an exception, this austerity did not reach to music, however, and according to his biographers Whittingham 'chose the best songs and anthems that could be got out of the Queen's chapel, to furnish the quire with all, himselfe being skilfull in musick'.(44).

Similar changes were carried out at the same time in the parish churches of the county, where altars were thrown down (or hidden once more) and replaced by communion tables. In accordance with the 1559 Injunctions all surviving relics, images, and other cultic objects (such as sacring bells, paxes and censers) that were found were also destroyed, although as seen earlier, few such objects were reported to - or discovered by - the Royal commissioners during their stay in the bishopric(45). Indeed, the 1559 visitation marked only the beginning of the Protestant chapter and diocesan authorities in this respect, and the commissioners seem to have made no impact at all in the north of the county. While the Duke of Norfolk was at Newcastle in January, 1560, he wrote to Cecil on the state of religion in the region: 'for as muche as I doo fynde this towne and country her about farre oute of order in matters of

religion and the aulters standing still in the churches contrarie to the quenes majesties proceedings, it shall be well doone that you procure her majestie's commands to be addressed to the Dean of Durham and such others as shal be thought mete there, auctorising them to see these things reformed in suche sorte as shall answer to the advancement of God's true religion'(46). At one parish, Sedgefield, Dr Swift (Pilkington's ordinary) did not even attempt to instal the communion table in the church until 1567, six years after the Bishop had enjoined this be done. Similarly, in a will dated October 13th of the same year, Christopher Todd desired that he be buried 'in the church of St. Gregory at the Trinity Altar of the said church in Staindrop'(47). Most remarkable of all, St. John the Baptist and John the Evangelist's Charity in St. Oswald's church was apparently still intact in 1567/8(48).

It is perhaps not surprising that Bishop Pilkington had few illusions about the task facing him in the see as a whole. Having arrived in the north in March 1561, he wrote a letter to Cecil on October 13th complaining of the 'disordered state of the diocese', saying that 'like St. Paul he has to fight the beasts at Ephesus'(49). A month later, on November 14th, he wrote again concerning the people of Durham: 'I would not have thought there had been so frorward a generation in this realm ..... I am grown with such displeasure for them, in part for religion ..... that I know not whether they like me worse or I them'(50). In both letters, he spoke of the difficulties of administering such a huge diocese, particularly with the 'want of good officers', complaining that he could not find twelve able JPs of any religion.

Apart from their crucial role in administration, Pilkington needed these JPs for his visitation of the diocese in October 1561, which he undertook in order to proceed against those parochial clergy who had managed to evade subscription to the Articles in 1559. Along with the four beneficed clergy who had already been deprived

in 1560 (Sigiswicke, Marley, Dalton and Salvin), eight further parochial clergy were deprived in the years 1561-64. These included three priests whose ordinations or presentations to benefices in Mary's reign, or absence at the 1559 visitation, suggests that they were probably Catholics: Hugh Hutchison, vicar of St. Oswald's, Durham, who had been presented by Gerard Calvin, a prominent local Catholic, Thomas Patterson, rector of Bishop Wearmouth, and Richard Hartburn, rector of Longnewton, who later played a prominent role in the 1569 rising(51). The remaining five, however, seem to have been deprived for non-residence or for holding a plurality of cures, such as Richard Forster who was removed from the vicarage at Gainford in 1562 for illegally holding two benefices. That the latter problem was a serious one is also revealed by the diocesan returns for 1563, which show that twenty-six clergy held more than one benefice within the see, while only ten of these employed a curate in their absence(52).

No systematic campaign was launched against pluralists or those who had evaded subscription in 1559, however, although five further beneficed clergy were deprived in the period 1564-9 (excluding the Calvinists Birche and Lever who were removed for their extreme opinions in 1567)(53). As Whittingham complained in 1564, 'many papists enjoy liberty and livings who have neither sworn obedience to the Queen, nor yet do any part of their duty'(54). Significantly, given the small number of deprivations effected in the decade 1559-1569, this meant that the vast majority of parochial clergy in Durham were ordained before the accession of Elizabeth.

Nor was there much prospect of rapid improvement, since the inherited church fabric did little to provide the reformers with the machinery for reformation. Indeed it seems that the provision of sufficient numbers of adequately paid and qualified clergy, the lack of an effective administration to supervise them and buildings to house them, remained a constant problem for the diocesan authorities throughout the 1560s. Dean Horn had

complained to Cecil about the inadequate stipends of ministers in November 1560, while Pilkington wrote in 1565 that in the larger parishes 'the vicars have very small livings ..... the chapels are as big as parish churches and as many resorts to them, and yet they have no livings at all, and many of them never a priest ..... many of the parsonages in these parishes are impropriated to Abbeys and while they stood they were better served. Now they be in the Queen's Majesty's hand or else sold(55).

Significantly, the small incomes in these former cures and larger parishes meant that it was extremely difficult to attract able preachers into the diocese, despite the efforts of church and government to serve them. Bernard Gilpin, for instance, complained that many cures were 'destitute of pastors', although returns for the diocese in 1563 suggest that there were less vacant livings in county Durham than in the see as a whole(56). Ordinations had also fallen, and it appears that only nine novices were ordained during the decade (all of which took place between May 1563 and October 1565)(57). Furthermore, according to their editor, the 'inferior' character of Pilkington's ordination lists suggests 'loss of respect for the church': the entries were often inaccurately dated and given haphazardly, only two candidates were recorded as holding degrees, titles were rarely entered and services were held on weekdays, since Pilkington complained that the people could not be brought to ordination services on Saturdays(58).

Apart from inveighing against the shortage and inadequacy of the clergy, Bernard Gilpin also noted some of the structural problems that caused this deficiency. Many lay patrons farmed out their pensions, while a 'great number never farmed them out at all but keep them as their own lands, and give some three halfpenny Preist a Curat's wages, nine or ten pounds a year'(59). Consequently, realising that vested interests were probably too entrenched to reform the system, Gilpin

(rector of Houghton since 1557) apparently decided to undertake itinerant preaching and teach by example: indeed, according to his biographer it was this 'desolation of the church' and 'ignorance of the common sort' that prompted him to carry out his annual preaching tours in Tynedale and Redesdale(60).

Elsewhere, however, this 'scarcity of learned men who where able to preach the word of God' must have meant that many people were left without anyone to instruct them correctly in the new approach to religion. In a letter to Archbishop Parker of Canterbury in 1564, Pilkington complained of the general negligence and intellectual inadequacy of the clergy in the north: 'it is to be lamented to see how negligently they say any service ... your cures ... be as far out of order, as the worst in all the country'(61). Indeed the position was such, that Pilkington apparently found it necessary to tolerate a variety of observances before the rebellion, allowing the clergy for instance to administer the communion in either chalice or cup(62).

Even more serious as an obstacle for the reformers was what John Bossy has termed the 'bastard-feudal Catholicism' of the Nevilles and other leading families, with its 'tradition of private allegiance and of war with neighbours and government'(62). The Durham countryside, like that of the north as a whole, was overlain by great honorial estates, ruled by the Nevilles, Tempests, Swinburnes and other families that remained strictly Catholic during the 1560s. Furthermore, as the 1569 rebellion was to confirm, the faith of these patrons was usually ascribed to their followers, due to the values and attitudes prevalent in these households of the greater landowners. In a perceptive discussion, Mervyn James has shown how the general outlook and 'code of honour' within these independant seigneurial households

(and their related clientele) crystallised around such conservative values as 'blood' 'lordship', 'service' and Catholicism(63). Moreover, even if the religious sympathies of such families were probably not effective in themselves in sustaining popular Catholicism, these households undoubtedly helped provide (as Bossy has argued) the social institutions necessary to support the 'predominantly social sentiments' and ritualistic observances of the old religion, protecting many Catholics from the social and legal pressures to conform of the new Protestant establishment (due to the landowners control of local government), and enabling clergy like Robert Pearson, chaplain to the Earl of Westmoreland and curate of Brancepeth, to avoid deprivation and exercise a conservative influence on the laity(64).

Another factor ensuring the survival of conservative religions, observances and beliefs in the region was the presence of numerous Scottish priests in the diocese, at least five of whom were living in county Durham in 1563. The following year Bishop Pilkington wrote that 'the Scottishe preistes that are fledde out of Scotland for their wickedness, and here be hyred in parishes on the borders because they take lesse wages than other, doe more harme than other wolde or colde in disswading the people ..... I have done my diligence to avoide them, but it is above my power'(65).

Even more important for the survival of religious conservatism, at least among the educated, was the influence of six or so dispossessed Marian clergy from Durham who kept sending in from Louvain 'bokes and letters which cause many tymes evill rumours to be spredde and disquiet the people'(66). To make matters worse, Pilkington wrote that these men were 'mayntened' by the Newcastle hospitals and their friends and 'nere cousins' among the 'wealthiest' citizens, clergy and gentry of Durham and Northumberland. Gilbert Lewen, for instance (formerly master of St. Mary Magdalen's in

Newcastle) who fled to Louvain in 1565, maintained close contact with Thomas Holyman, the master of Maisondieu in Newcastle, where Lewen had stayed in 1559 when both men absented themselves from the royal visitation. Holyman, along with other wealthy Durham recusant figures like John Swinburne of Chopwell, helped support several English scholars at Louvain from the 1560s, and the latter acted as Lewen's attorney when he was charged with non-residence in 1565(67). Swinburne was also patron to John Raymes, master of the hospital at West Spittal, Newcastle (1558-79), who later fled to Louvain before the Northern Rising(68).

The intellectual backbone of these recusant groups in northern England was the group of Durham cathedral clergy and Oxbridge academics - including Anthony Salvin, Master of University College, Oxford, George Bullock, Master of St. John's, Cambridge, Thomas Sigiswicke, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, Robert Dalton and Richard Hartburn, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford - who had been deprived in 1559-60 for refusing to accept the Royal Articles. Despite their deprivation, these men continued to play a prominent role in the 1560s, due to their connections with local Catholic gentry families, such as the Tempests, Hodgsons and Salvins(69). Thus, although the Ecclesiastical Commission attempted in 1561 to limit the movements of the prebends who had already been deprived, its efforts met with limited success: Dalton was soon celebrating the mass in Catholic vestments and associating with the Nevilles, Todd was in close connection with the Catholic Salvins in Croxdale, while by 1569 Nicholas Marley was living at Louvain with John Raymes(70). Furthermore, the thought and writing of these men, along with the books and ideas that emerged from their extensive links with Louvain, Rome and other recusant circles in Yorkshire, seem to have had a wide influence on the northern gentry and nobility, especially those out of favour with the Elizabethan authorities. The Earl of Northumberland, for instance, later declared in his 1572 confession that the books of Harding, Sandes

and Stapleton were instrumental in persuading him of 'the truth of the Catholic faith', and of the 'unytie whych ever hath beyn, throughout Chrystendom, among those called papysts'(71). The earl was actually reconciled in 1567 by Copley, an old priest who 'hath no certen abidinge', and he was also visited two years later by Dr Nicholas Morton, an english penitentiary at Rome. Most significant of all, there emerged among these 'learned divynes ..... that did debate the matter' the notion that rebellion was legitimate if it advanced the cause of true religion, particularly since the imminent papal excommunication of Elizabeth would make it 'lawful (i.e. under Rome's authority) to take armes against her'. Such ideas were to be widely used by rebel activists during the 1569 rising(72).

But religious dissent in the 1560s was not exclusively the prerogative of intellectual and social elites, even if the majority of simple people were prepared to defer to the authorities in religious matters, and there are isolated instances of opposition to the new Protestant regime. In August 1561 Bishop Pilkington 'did appoynte that the Lord's table should stand in the bodie of the churche; and also that Common Prayer should be ther said and done in all places within the dioces of Durham'. But at Sedgefield, Dr Swift was not able to set up the communion table in the church until September 1567, and it was immediately removed on 7th November by the churchwardens who 'did into the churche, aforesaid enter ..... (and) remove the saide table, formes and desks'(73).

Surviving depositions from the church courts at Durham for the 1560s also show that the new reforming preachers had to suffer all sorts of irreverent behaviour during the new Protestant services and sermons. At Sedgefield parish church, for instance, Brian Headham 'misused the curat' three times during different services, while on the 17th November 1568 'at the sainge of the generall confession and repeting of the Lorde's praier, beleffe, and ten commandements, letane and

suffragies; at which time, by the Quene's lawes, every Christen man ought orderly and reverently to put of his cap and knele upon his knees, and use other reverent behaviour ..... stirred up with develish contempt and irreverence, (he) did, the day and time aforesaid, sit with his cap on his head, and being thereof lawfully admonished, refused contemtuouslie to reforme these defaultes, or to pay 12 d to the churchwardens for the poore man's boxe then demanded, and disturbed the church with talking'(74). Similarly, at Mitford parish church on Easter Day 1569, during the reading of the first lesson, Gawain Lawain, George Walby and 'others did sckofe, laughe and gest at such as did coughe then and ther, that the minister could not say forth God's service'. Despite this setback, the curate later tried to preach from the pulpit when Lawain told him to 'come downe, and leave thy pratlinge'(75).

There was nothing new, of course, about much of this behaviour. Generally in the sixteenth century many people seem to have preferred working, drinking or playing football (even within York Minster itself(76)) to attending church services, and even when they did attend they often misbehaved by talking, sleeping or arguing over stalls. Instances of brawling, disorder, drunkenness and talking in church were common, both before the Reformation as well as after it.

Nevertheless, there can be little doubt about the unpopularity of the new Protestant services, and the ministers that provided them in Durham in the 1560s. In the parish of St. Nicholas, Durham, for instance, William Baley seems to have attacked William Lee (the new clerk in the parish), believing that the latter 'goith not lyk a man of the church, but lyk a ruffyng'. Significantly, Baley seems to have objected to Lee's 'apparell', who is referred to as a 'minister'. In relation to church attendance Bishop Pilkington also observed as early as 1561 that even when sermons were preached the vast majority of people preferred other places of entertainment, 'for come into a church on the sabbath

day, and ye shall see but few, though there be a sermon, but the alehouse is ever full' (77). Similarly Bernard Gilpin spoke of those people 'that contemne his (i.e. Christ's) word' and 'those which had rather be idle, and many times ungodly occupied in wanton and wicked pastimes, than come to the church, prophaning the Sabbath day, appointed for the service of God, and the hearing of his word, bestowing it more wickedly than many of the Gentiles'. This was clearly a serious matter to a popular evangelist like Gilpin, who believed that 'to find Christ we must accompany (him) . . . . into the Temple of his holy word, there Christ is found unto to many as seeke him' (78).

Central to the problem was the inadequacy of popular education, which meant that the efforts of many of the reforming preachers were in vain. Indeed, it seems that the new Protestant clergy - mostly zealous university intellectuals (and sometimes southerners) who tended to be fairly derisory of popular opinion - often pitched the level of their sermons far above the capacity of most of the congregation. As Thomas points out, 'those interested in preferment sought to secure it by publishing learned sermons which would attract the eye of an influential patron' (79). As a consequence, preaching seems to have been extremely unpopular with significant numbers of simple uneducated layfolk. Bernard Gilpin, for instance, was summoned before Tunstal in 1559 - and lost the bishop's support and friendship - because the 'plebeians and ordinary sort of people were extremely offended' by his Protestant preaching and elitest approach. In a later letter to his brother George in 1575, he commented that 'as for the favour of the multitude, I hoped in time through the goodnesse of God to recover it againe, that my preaching might profit the more to edification: but otherwise I never desired the love of the vulgar' (80).

Attendance at sermons was to remain a problem for the authorities, and by 1568 the Council of the North seems to have realised that the only way to procure adequate

audiences for preachers was through compulsion. A letter to the Queen, describing various measures taken by the Council 'for the advancement of God's glory and his holy word', reveals that JPs were obliged to accompany itinerant preachers on tour after 1568; 'perceiving that in many churches there have been no sermons for years past, and that in most parts the pastors are unable to teach their flock, and that the backwardness in causes of religion proceeds rather from ignorance than stubbornness or wilful disobedience, the President and Council have ordered that the preachers in the cathedral and others in the county shall ..... divide themselves by their own assent and travel from place to place, preaching the word of God to the people in all places; and that letters be written to the justices of peace, to receive, assist and accompany them to the places where they preach, to remain at their sermons, and procure sufficient and orderly audience'(81). The Council's plan does not seem to have been put into effective operation, however, until Bishop Barnes finally inaugurated a systematic and comprehensive system for preaching in the diocese as a whole in 1578, soon after his arrival in the diocese(82).

Contrary to the hostile lay attitudes suggested here, W.J. Sheils has argued that deprived of the traditional means by which they could influence the religious life of the community - notably by the dissolution of chantries and religious guilds and the prohibition of religious processions and pilgrimages in 1547 - the laity actually sought new opportunities in the post-Reformation period by canvassing widespread support for the preaching ministry, which due to the institutional weakness of the church provided much scope for local initiative. He shows that some of the support for establishing lectureships, investing in church furniture and purchasing advowsons in the midlands and south came from town corporations and other lay groups, and argues that this was in response to the traditional claims of the

laity to play a part in local religious life'(83). Unfortunately, the record for the bishopric is fragmentary, most notably in relation to churchwarden accounts (which would reveal any lay investments in church furniture), but there are few grounds for believing that there was any such 'continuity' of lay piety in county Durham in the sense that Sheils suggests for other regions. In relation to lay patronage, for instance, whereas advowsons were a jealously guarded form of property during the episcopacy of Bishop Tunstal, the collation of benefices in the diocese as a whole devolved upon the ordinary on at least fourteen occasions between 1562-73 because lay patrons failed to exercise their rights(84).

Similarly, the municipal accounts for Newcastle, which survive from 1561 to 1568 (and then 1574 onwards) provide no indication that the town corporation acquired or financed the lectureships and salaries of Protestant ministers. These payments from the corporate treasury indicate only a continuing concern for the fabric of the church, and commitment to the patronage of traditional types of entertainment. In February 1562, for instance, the Council paid John Brown 2s 8d for repairing the clock of the chapel on the bridge, while in 1566/7 18d was spent on two pounds of wax which was 'wrought in candle for the lantern in St. Nicholas church'. Similarly, the burgesses of Newcastle were continually active in patronising dramas from actor companies such as the 'Duchess of Norfolk's' and 'Lord of Bedford's players', while in 1560 and then on Corpus Christi day 1567 (May 29th) the corporation patronised the performance of a mystery play at which the 'players of Durham' appeared(85).

Nor is it probable that Durham city provided any material support for Protestants. Not only was the town described by Whittingham as being 'very stiff' in its attitudes towards the cathedral chapter: its retarded political and constitutional development make such early corporate payments a slim possibility, unless they came

from the guilds, since the community was only provided with an incorporation charter by Bishop Pilkington in January 1565. Apart from uniting Durham and Framwellgate, the charter appointed a governing body consisting of aldermen (appointed for one year), twelve assistants and twelve inhabitants, and finally empowered them to make laws, ordinances and corporate payments for the common benefit(86).

Finally, how far did the Elizabethan settlement lead to popular doctrinal change in Durham? There is no evidence of any extremist opinions being held by the laity (as they were by the clergy), but it is clear, nevertheless, that the Protestant reformers in the chapter (and their allies in the parochial cures) were beginning to influence the doctrinal views of ordinary laypeople, or at least the mechanisms by which such opinions were expressed. All wills as legal documents were of course proved in the archdeaconry and consistory courts of the diocese, and the Protestant takeover of the diocesan authorities would clearly have encouraged the tendency to drop (or even excise in the courts) the traditional formula for will preambles. The conservative registrar Christopher Chaytor (who supervised the proceedings of the consistory court) was removed in 1559, while in 1563 the Protestant Thomas Calverley was appointed Chancellor (a role that was central in maintaining the link between the diocesan administration and bishop). It is difficult, however, to know how much pressure was placed on testators to use Protestant preambles by the authorities, since there is no practicable way of determining the extent to which the wills were written by the testators themselves. There were numerous notaries, scriveners and officials from local ecclesiastical courts who might provide advice or pressure on the wording of wills, while Protestant

formularies may even have been insisted upon, although this is not borne out by a study of the evidence(87).

Nevertheless, the transition to Elizabeth's reign is clearly visible in the wills of the period. Of the ninety-five wills (containing a preamble) in the three volumes of 'Wills and Inventories' for 1558-69, only fifteen begin with the old invocation of the saints(88). Most of the wills now begin with a simple non-traditional formula, commending the soul to God only: 'ffyrst I bequyethe my soule to Almyghtye God and my body to be buried in the church of .....'(89). In at least seventeen cases, moreover, the testators or their notaries actually asserted their belief in the sufficiency of Christ's death alone to secure their salvation, although this Protestant formula did not become common until the 1570s and 1580s. Agnes Lambton, for instance, began her will (dated January 21st 1564) with the formula, 'fyrst I bequieth my soule to God trusting only to be saved by the passion and merits of his dere son Jesus Crist my Redemer'(90). Doubtless in some instances this was due to the presence of a Protestant scribe, but in others the explicit and intense nature of the commendatory clause seems to suggest that it is the testator's voice we are hearing. The will of William Browne (dated May 20th 1567) is particularly remarkable for its vehemence as well as theological clarity: 'ffyrst I p'fesse and confesse one god in trinitie and that ther is no savior no mediator nor advocat butt onlye Jesus Christ god and man and yt he allone by ye shedding of his most precius blodd haith pacyfied the wrath of god justlye conceyved against man and that there is no sanctafac'on no redempc'on nor purgac'on of synne but onlye by the merits of the Christ's death and passion and all other superstitious and feyned caltells onlye devised to illud the symple and unlerned as ye vile abuses of ye sea of Rome I utterlye detest and abhore'(91).

Moving from the will preambles to the specific personal bequests that follow them, which as suggested

earlier probably reveal more of the individual religious beliefs of the testator concerned(92), the 1559 settlement also seems to have ushered in a significant change in relation to the extent to which a belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead was held by lay people in Durham. Although the Primer of 1559 contained prayers for the dead - while Elizabeth herself had requested a dirige to be sung in St. Paul's cathedral on the death of Henry II of France in the same year - the new Prayer Book (like its 1552 predecessor) condemned the doctrine of purgatory and abolished the requiem mass at funerals. In its place, episcopal injunctions (like those of Grindal in 1571) encouraged a plain funeral sermon or burial feast, that was to be stripped of all its 'heathenical' ritual accompaniments like the tolling bell and the distribution of doles to the poor, which 'tend to the maintenance either of prayers for the dead, or of the Popish purgatory'(93).

As a consequence, from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign onwards, several testators asked to be buried 'with (such) laudabile ceremonies as are p'mitted by ye lawe', or some similar formula, instead of asking for masses and diriges(94). In fact there are only five examples of requests for masses, diriges or prayers in the three volumes of 'Wills and Inventories' for the first two decades of Elizabeth's reign, and these all belong to the period before 1566. In 1560, John Hartburn of Redmarshall left 6s 8d to a priest to pray for him, while Lancelot Claxton requested a mass and dirige on the day of his burial in 1564(95). Such requests were to die out completely in the decade after the rebellion, moreover, although there were two more interesting examples in the early 1580s: in 1581 Richard Marshall, the cathedral registrar, left 'one old ryall of gould' to Thomas Watson (the former Marian dean of Durham) to pray for him, while two years later Edward Lynne from Whitworth left an 'angell of golde' to Robert Crawforth ( a priest involved in the restoration of Catholic forms in 1569) for his prayers(96).

Nevertheless, although the evidence from wills seems to indicate that the old central belief in purgatory and the efficacy of prayers was dying out (at least on the surface), the laity in Durham seem to have felt little enthusiasm for the funeral sermons and funeral feasts of the new ecclesiastical regime. There is only one example of a lay request for a funeral sermon in the published wills of the 1560s. In 1566, William Walton, a Durham draper, asked for a sermon at his burial 'iff itt be possible' and arranged that the preacher should 'be payd sufficiently for his paynes'(97). But there were no similar requests until 1579, and the practice does not seem to have been adopted with any enthusiasm in the bishopric. Indeed that the old rites were still being covertly used is suggested by the fact that Bishop Barnes still found it necessary in his 1577 visitation of Durham to include an article ordering that 'no Communiones or Commemoracions (as some call them) be said for the dead, or at the burials of the dead; or anyversaries or monethes myndes (i.e. monthly masses) be used for the dead, nor any superfluous ringinge at burials'(98). Similarly, between 1561 and 1569 six charges were brought before the Ecclesiastical Commission at York of bell ringing on All Souls Eve, occasionally combined with the offence of taking a collection to pay for masses for the dead. When Archbishop Grindal arrived in the north in 1570, he noted that the 'common people' persevere with many 'superstitious practices', including praying on beads and offering 'eggs at the burial of their dead'(99).

On a wider perspective, nineteenth century collections of folklore show that a rural belief in kinship ties going beyond the grave, and the necessity for assuring the welfare of the dead with traditional burial rites, remained widespread until at least the Industrial Revolution. It is known for instance that soul-mass cakes were still being made in the north in the early eighteenth century, while the custom of keeping the vigil of St. Mark remained common in Durham into

Victorian times(100). Particularly expressive of this close relationship between the living and the dead was the 'lykewake', the custom of assembling neighbours and friends to keep watch over the corpse in the house where the death had taken place. Bourne describes one that took place at Coken near Chester-le-Street in the eighteenth century: on the evening after death 'Friends of the Deceased' met at the house, 'attended by Bag-pipe or Fiddle; the nearest of Kin, be it Wife, Son or Daughter, opens a melancholy ball, dancing and greeting i.e. crying at the same Time, and this continues until Day-Light'. Even in the nineteenth century, the poor in Durham were still expected to touch the corpse if they visited a house with the deceased lying in it(101).

Finally, in order to understand the pace and complexities of religious change in the 1560s, it is worth considering the attitude of the secular authorities towards the region. Apart from the rapid Protestantisation of the chapter, it may be that one important factor hindering the work of Bishop Pilkington in the diocese as a whole was the government's apparent neglect of the northern province during the first decade of the reign. Indeed, it is arguable that it took the 1569 Rising for the government to recognise the north as a specifically religious problem, and that there was no sustained effort to establish official Protestantism in the region as a whole until after 1570 and the partnership of Grindal, Archbishop of York with the earl of Huntingdon, President of the Council of North(102). At first Elizabeth dared not offend the moderate Catholic party: Shrewsbury remained President of the Council until his death in 1560, and Pilkington wrote to Cecil on October 13th 1561 that 'if Mr Mennell (who was seneschal and comptroller of the Palatinate) and others refusing the oath of their allegiance may be on the counsell, in authority still, and have their doings for good, it will

encourage others to the like or more'(103). The death of Shrewsbury, however, meant that the Protestant Earl of Rutland became President, and Archbishop Young of York, Bishop Pilkington and Dean Skinner of Durham (1561-1563) were all given places on the Council, while articles were added to their instructions as commissioners requiring them to help enforce the new Prayer Book and Injunctions. But in general, the Council (as instructed by Cecil) was anxious not to give offence to conservatively-minded vested interests - a tendency that was confirmed with the appointment of the moderate Archbishop Young as President (1564-8) - and avoided involvement with religious affairs.

These were left to the Ecclesiastical Commission at York (set up by Letters Patent on 5th May 1561), but Young was generally unwilling and cautious in its use, aware no doubt that a rigid enforcement of the penal code would have resulted in widespread agitation against the government from the strong and entrenched recusant interest in the north. For this reason the Ecclesiastical Commission was mainly only concerned before the 1569 rising with ensuring a minimum lay conformity and curbing overtly Catholic-minded clergy, showing little desire to enforce the legislation on religious uniformity with any conviction until the 1570s and 1580s. Tyler, indeed, has argued that Elizabeth and Cecil were apparently satisfied with political tranquillity in the north, seeing little reason to stir up religious conflict through the commission without good cause (although the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots in 1568 meant that the laws against recusants were enforced with increasing severity)(104).

The essential problem, however, was that the Crown could only enforce its policies with the co-operation of unpaid officials in the localities. As a consequence, it was very much left to clergy and individual officials (churchwardens, JPs, gentry and ordinary citizens) to show concern about religious orthodoxy and present dissenters before the courts. To that extent, the

records of the ecclesiastical courts reveal the enormous number of problems that prevented an efficient system of prosecutions in the parishes. Above all, there was a continual shortage of parish officers in Durham, particularly churchwardens. Furthermore, even if parishioners did serve, they were frequently subjected to local pressure not to present people from their own parishes before the courts, a factor which helps to explain the limited evidence for religious dissent in this period, notably at the 1559 visitation(105).

Perhaps even more significant, Bishop Pilkington also had to co-operate with the conservative body of JPs who enforced law and order in the bishopric. The religious sympathies of the Durham commissioners of the peace are revealed by a nationwide inquiry in October 1564, in which the Privy Council asked the archbishops and bishops in every county to classify those who were already JPs as favourable, indifferent, or hostile to the government's religious settlement. Significantly, so far as Durham was concerned, Pilkington could only 'commend' six JPs on the commission as being 'favourable in religion' (Charles, Earl of Westmoreland, Lord Eure, dean Whittingham, Thomas Calverley and Thomas Layton). He simply reported that the other fifteen (who were mostly from Catholic families) 'live quietly and obey the lawes', although John Swinburn 'kept a priest to say him masse butt he hais paid hys fine for it'(106).

Furthermore, as Gleason has shown for the North Riding Commission of the peace - on which many leading Durham figures served - this strength of conservative interest and 'great want of good officers' meant in effect that the authorities were incapable of carrying out an effective purge of Catholic JPs until after the 1569 rebellion(107). Without such a purge it was impossible that uniformity could be thoroughly enforced.

But if no serious attempt to establish official Protestantism was made by the government during the 1560s, Elizabeth was extremely concerned with reducing (if not breaking) the power of the northern lords.

Indeed, throughout the decade the Queen and Cecil quietly took gradual steps to weaken their wealth and power by transferring important wardenships, offices and castles of the Marches out of their custodianship and into the control of lesser men who were trusted as royal supporters. Sir George Bowes, for instance, became High Sheriff of York in 1562, Thomas Calverley was appointed Chancellor of the bishopric in 1563, while the Dacre estate was not transferred to Leonard Dacre according to Border custom, but to the Duke of Norfolk(108). The power of the Nevilles in the Palatinate and the north as a whole was also curtailed during the 1560s. The earl of Westmoreland's commission as lieutenant-general was not renewed after Elizabeth's accession while the lands granted by Mary never came into his possession. Furthermore, when his heir Charles (the sixth and last earl) succeeded in 1564, the latter inherited none of his father's offices apart from his position as Commissioner for the Palatinate on the Council of the North. In fact he even had to alienate the manor of Cottingham to the Crown in order to pay off some of his debts(109). This decline in their position, along with the establishment of the new Protestant regime, meant that the Neville's hopes inevitably fastened in 1568-9 onto the projected marriage of Mary, Queen of Scots to the duke of Norfolk (the earl's brother-in-law) and the ultimate succession of Mary, a ~~sch~~eme that was to lead to their involvement in the 1569 Rising and subsequent disaster.

## 6. THE TURNING-POINT: the Northern Rising of 1569

The Northern Rising of 1569 has received a curiously mixed response from historians. Some local historians, like A.M.C. Forster and G. Thornton, have interpreted the rebellion as a last outbreak of fervent regional popular catholicism to which the Earls' revolt gave effective political expression and 'the final fling of medieval feudalism in the face of absolute Tudor political sovereignty', while Scarisbrick has suggested that the rising in some respects marked a beginning: on a wider national level the rebels 'turn to violence... inaugurated a new phase in the struggle between Reformation and Counter-Reformation'(1). Other scholars, like Mervyn James, have argued that far from being a popular rising the rebellion actually served to highlight the extent to which 'religious belief and practice depended on countenance from "authority": its main significance was the subsequent political and social changes caused by the collapse of the Neville interest in the Palatinate(2).

In religious terms, it is true that the rebellion achieved nothing beyond a temporary restoration of the old forms of worship in certain parishes and that many of these changes were instigated from 'above': hastily conceived, premature, with insufficient resources, and on a smaller scale than the Pilgrimage of Grace, the rebellion also stood little chance of success. Nevertheless, the failure of the Rising and the part played by 'authority' in causing the reversion to Catholic forms should not let the religious significance of the revolt be ignored. In the first place, the rebellion reveals the extremely limited extent to which the Protestant regime had taken effective hold in the parishes of the Palatinate, while the Earl's response to 'religion' provoked a very real response at popular levels. Even more important, it may be argued that the Rising proved to be a turning-point in the religious life of the region, since the defeat of the revolt and the

repression which followed it, if not marking the 'death of bastard-feudal Catholicism', certainly served to clear away many of the influences that had protected religious conservatism in the 1560s (the Nevilles and Lumleys, the conservative clergy and diocesan officials). As a consequence popular Catholicism was dealt a severe, if not fatal blow. To substantiate these views, this chapter will approach the Northern Rising from three different directions: first it will provide a brief chronology of the progress of the rebellion; second, it will examine in detail the religious restoration that took place in Durham city and the rural parishes, evidence that has not been considered sufficiently in recent studies; and finally, it will look at the motives of the rank and file of the rebels and the consequences of the rising for the religious life of the bishopric. In particular, it will question the view that the reversion to old religious forms was merely instigated by 'authority'.

On the evening of the 16th May, 1568, Mary, Queen of Scots landed at Workington to begin her long exile from Scotland(3). Her unexpected arrival immediately brought to the fore the question of the succession to the English throne, and gave a rallying cry for discontent among the largely isolated and pro-Catholic aristocracy of the north. To the latter she combined in her person the undoubted rightful successor to the throne as well as a natural symbol and figurehead for the hopes of all northern Catholics for a restoration of the old religion. Consequently, all through the summer and autumn of 1568 several leading members of the nobility, including Thomas Percy the 7th earl of Northumberland, came to pay their respects to the royal exile at Carlisle and Bolton Castles, and Mary soon became the central figure in a plot, encouraged by the Spanish ambassador De Spes,

whereby she would marry the Duke of Norfolk, a leading (but Protestant) figure of the old nobility. It was hoped that this would lead to a recognition of Mary's claim to the throne, the removal of Cecil and the restoration of Catholicism(4). About the same time, Dr. Nicholas Morton ('the most earnest mover of the rebellion'), a papal envoy from Pope Pius V who had been briefed by the Duke of Alva in the Spanish Netherlands, also arrived in the north, telling Northumberland and Richard Norton of the intended Bull of Excommunication, and persuading them to attempt a restoration of Catholicism through Spanish and papal forces(5). When Elizabeth and Cecil were informed of these marriage plans and Morton's visit, however, Norfolk was frightened into abandoning the plot and his imprisonment in the Tower soon exposed the northern conspirators and their connections with De Spes. Consequently, as a result of their summons to court in October 1569, which would probably have resulted in their committal to the Tower, the two northern earls finally decided - after long deliberations at Brancepeth Castle from 8th November - to take up arms and force their policy on the government. The rebellion, somewhat by accident, was launched, amidst a series of alarms and rumours concerning on the one hand a possible 'alteracyon of religion', and on the other an attempt by Oswald Ullstrop and the Queen's troops to seize the Earls in their houses at Topcliff and Brancepeth(6). But although to some extent the Earls had stumbled into the rebellion without any clear idea of the issues involved, it is clear at least that the rebels were not unprepared in military terms. A report drawn up for Cecil by Sir Thomas Gargrave on December 18th revealed that the 'rebels had a privy intent long unknown, in which time - by general musters and proclamation, whereby justices of peace were commanded to have armour and weapons - they prepared both horse and armour'(7).

On the afternoon of the 14th November 1569 the Earls with 60 horsemen then rode to Durham, from which Dean

Whittingham and the bishop had already departed(8), and entered the Cathedral destroying the Bibles, prayer books and communion tables(9). That the restoration of the old religion was to be the main purpose of the rebellion, was immediately stressed in the proclamations that were then issued at Staindrop and Durham on the 14th and 15th November. Apart from accusing the Queen's counsellors of seeking to destroy the 'ancient nobility' and the true religion, they declared that the rebels intended 'noo hurte unto the Quenes Majestie, nor hyr good subjectes; but for as muche as the order of things in the churche and matters of religion are presentlye sett furthe and used contrarye to the ancyent and Catholicke faythe: therefore ther purposes and meanynges are, to redewce all the said causes in relygyon to the ancyent customes and usages, before, wherein they desyre all good people to take their partes'(10).

On November 15th and 16th, Westmoreland summoned his tenants in the bishopric to join him at Brancepeth and then Darlington, while Christopher Neville and the Earl of Northumberland rode off to muster in Kirby Moorside and Richmond respectively. In general the rebel cause seems to have been popular, and Sussex wrote to the Queen that 'the people like so well their cause of religion that they flock to them in all places where they come', but Sir George Bowes also reported on the 17th November that they 'use the Quenes Majesties name in their calls', 'constrening by force' and 'threatening to burne such as absent themselves'(11). On November 17th, the Earls joined forces at Darlington, and began their march to York, their progress southwards being marked by the issuing of more proclamations, the destruction of service books and communion tables, and the spoiling of 'some Protestants such armour or money as they found'. By November 18th the rebels reached Ripon, where they celebrated a mass of great symbolism and splendour: firstly, a long procession of priests, followed by the Earls, the gentry and some of their retainers filed into Church behind a banner on which was written 'God speed

the Plough', then these representatives of the rebel army together offered up the Mass under a 'Banner of the Five Wounds' as had been used in the Pilgrimage of Grace(12).

At York, with only 400 'ill horsed and furnished' horsemen, Lord Lieutenant Sussex did not dare face the rebels in the field for by November 20th they were reported to have 3,800 footmen and 1,600 horsemen(13). County Durham and north Yorkshire were in rebel hands, except for a few isolated strongholds, and Bowes wrote to Sussex from Streatham Castle on the 23rd that 'dayleye the peoplè flee from theys parts to th' Erles, and knowe not what shoulde be done to staye (them)... in all the fyre wapentacks in Richmondshire, the baylyffs be in the leverage of the Erle of Northumberland, and perswad the people to follow there offycers... And the Byshopprige ys in a worse staye than theye, for they be in maner all gone, and goeth daylye'(14).

Yet for three days the rebels hesitated at Tadcaster near York, mustering on nearby Bramham Moor, before falling back to Knaresborough on November 24th. Their relatively small ill-equipped force of 5,500 men, which was only one-sixth of Aske's force at York in 1536, posed no real threat to the government and the Earls had abandoned hope of rescuing Mary. In the south two armies were being gathered, in Lincolnshire under Admiral Clinton and in Warwickshire under the Earl of Warwick, while in the rear of the rebel army the Queen's supporters were also mustering their forces. Sir John Foster and Sir Henry Percy, Northumberland's brother, held Newcastle, Berwick and the East Marches, the Earl of Cumberland had secured Carlisle in the west while Sir George Bowes was raising a power in the bishopric. Furthermore, no support from the border lords, or Catholic Lancashire, or even from the Spanish in the Low Countries had been forthcoming for the rebels, while the proclamations of the Earls had attracted little support outside their strongholds in the north(15).

As a result the decision to retreat was taken. No losses had been sustained, yet the Earls must have sensed

that their cause was lost. Plans to besiege York were abandoned and the footmen began to slip away to their villages, 'deceived of the promises (i.e. pay) made to them' (16). By the 29th November the rebels were back in the bishopric, and two days later mass was celebrated at Durham by Robert Pearson, curate of Brancepeth. There was no prospect of surrender now with any hope of mercy, and so the rebels decided to try to capture Barnard Castle and Hartlepool, which they hoped to hold until the spring when 'ayde frome Kynge Phyllippe' might arrive from the Spanish Low Countries (17). On 1st December Christopher Neville with 300 men seized Hartlepool for the rebels, while siege was laid to Barnard Castle by the Earl's remaining force of 1200 horsemen. Their position in the bishopric itself for the next ten days became an increasingly strong one, allowing them to carry out a restoration of the old religious forms in certain parishes. At Barnard Castle, Sir George Bowes reported that the rebels were being rejoined daily by the men of the Palatinate, while the Earls were also mustering their footmen once more in the districts of Brancepeth and Raby, where clergy and 'all their force' were to be seen moving about wearing the red cross of the Crusades. Similarly, Sir Ralph Sadler had written to Cecil on 30th November that some of the gentry in the bishopric were willing to serve the Queen, 'but for all that, I cannot assure myself of such of them as be papist: for if the further come to us, with x men, his soon goeth to the rebels with xx' (18). During the eleven day siege of Barnard Castle, 226 soldiers of the garrison leapt over the walls to join the rebels (35 breaking their legs or necks in the process), while others eventually mutinied and opened the gates to the enemy. By December 11th, therefore, when Bowes was forced to surrender and leave with his force, Sadler reported that the people 'are all hollie gon unto them, such is their affection to the cause of religion' (19).

The delay caused by the siege had given ample time, however, for an army of 12,000 men to gather under Sussex

at York, and this now advanced north to meet the loyal army in Newcastle, thus trapping the rebels. On hearing of the Queen's forces reaching Northallerton, the rebels issued a final rebel proclamation ordering all able-bodied men aged between sixteen and sixty to repair with horse, food and armour to Staindrop. The only engagement of the campaign then took place at Chester Dene on 15th December when the rebel army met and skirmished with Sir John Foster's government forces from Newcastle, 'whereupon the Erles, perceiving that they were disappointed of the purpose... returned to Durham'(20). Realising that retreat northwards was impossible, and that the only hope lay in flight westwards, on 16th December the Earls gave 'warninge to the commone people to make shift for themselves' and fled west 'with a grett nombre of horsemen' to Hexham(21). From there, with Sussex pursuing them, the Earls fled to Naworth in Cumberland, the Dacre stronghold, and then into Scotland to seek refuge with Black Ormiston and the Border clans loyal to Queen Mary.

The rising was over. With the Queen's forces in control of the bishopric, all that remained was for the government to punish those who had joined the Earls or who were responsible for the religious offences, while at the same time crushing the disturbances and raids from Scotland that formed the aftermath to the rebellion(22). Two main considerations seem to have governed Cecil's and Elizabeth's thinking on the form the punishment should take: 'the example should be very great', but at the same time the landed rebels of the upper orders should be attainted rather than executed so that their property and cash would pass to the Crown, thus helping to pay the government's costs for suppressing the rising. As the Council wrote to Sir Ralph Sadler on 20th December, 'it were pitte, but some of those rascalls wer hanged by martiall lawe; but for the rycher wold be but taken and attaynted, for otherwise it is doubtful how the Queen Majestie shall have any forfeiture of ther landes or goodes' (Bishop Pilkington's right as Prince Palatine to

claim all the forfeitures within the Bishopric from the rebellion was transferred to the Crown by Act of Parliament in 1570)(23). Thus while the wealthy escaped by attainder and confiscation, approximately 320 of the 945 men of the 'meaner sorte' who joined the rebels in the bishopric were 'appointed' to be executed, with particular attention being fixed on the 44 constables and other officers who had assisted the rebels, none of whom was spared(24). Elizabeth and Cecil had been waiting for some years to bring the north into submission, and it seems that they were determined not to miss this opportunity, sending down detailed and repeated instructions to Bowes (appointed Provost-Marshal) urging severity(25). As well as the executions, the bishopric was also being ransacked by the royal forces under Clinton and Warwick, and on the 4th January Bishop Pilkington wrote to Cecil and gave a sorry picture of the Palatinate, 'the cuntre is in great mysere; and as the Sheriff writes, he can not doe justice bi anie number of juries of such as be untouched in this rebellion, unto ther be auther quited by law, or pardoned bi the Queen Majestie. The number of offenders is so grete, that fewe innocent are left to trie the giltie'(26). Nevertheless, as McCall has shown, there are good grounds for thinking that Bowes did not adhere at all closely to the official orders and that he put to death far fewer than the number 'appointed' to die. The evidence is fragmentary, but in Darlington Ward he executed only 21 of the 41 'appointed', while in Richmondshire only 57 of the 215 listed were actually put to death(27). This was partly due to the severe winter weather, the difficulty of apprehending the rebels and doubtless also the distaste with which Bowes regarded his work. By January 11th he was finished in the bishopric.

It was doubtless a conscious decision by the Earls that the religious restoration should begin in the Mother church of the diocese. On their first entry into Durham on November 14th the rebels had 'entred the mynster theyr communyon table defaced, rentt and brok in peces', a destruction that was then repeated in other parishes on their march southwards(28). The rebels had also proclaimed 'in the Quene's name' that no services should be held until 'theyr pleasur knowne', so that no constructive work towards the restoration of Catholic religious forms was in fact carried out until their return to the county at the very end of the month. Several holy water stoups and two altars were then restored to the cathedral, one of which had been hidden 'on Mr Swyfft backsyd and the other was hedd in the century garth under moch mettall'. Twelve workmen, supervised by Robert Pearson, curate of Brancepeth, 'helpte by ther labour at the wyndowes rowlinge and by lyffting to bringe the said 2 stones into the church' (29). At least four masses were celebrated between November 30th and December 9th, at which sacring bells, processions, grails, antiphons and all other accompaniments of the old service was used, while holy water was taken by the people as they entered the church from the stoup erected 'at the south dore'. The cathedral was crowded with inhabitants of Durham, rebel soldiers and people from nearby parishes when William Holmes, a Catholic priest, finally preached on Sunday 4th December in the presence of the Earl of Northumberland and spoke 'expressedly against the stait of Religion established here in England by the lawes of this realme, and commending the laitt service that was abolyshed, and afterward, affirming that he had auctoritie to reconsyle men to the Church of Rome, willyd all, that was disposed to be reconsyled, to kneill doon; whereupon he pronounced a forme absolucious in Latten, in the name of Christ and Bishop Pius of Roome'. Certainly the large numbers of people present seem to suggest that the laity welcomed the changes, many of whom brought their rosary beads and

used the old 'reverend gestures', although the full significance of the proceedings seems to have been lost on some contemporaries, who claimed later that they 'culde not here what he said for the preas of people there' and assumed the papal absolution in Latin 'to be a praiier'. No less than eight of the minor canons were involved in all these proceedings, along with two prebendaries (Swift and George Cliffe), nine lay choristers and the organist John Brimley. It seems as if the latter were active practising the old services and psalms during the absence of the rebels southwards, as one of the choristers, Thomas Harrison, later admitted that 'by the space of diverse daies, before and after ther was any masse, matters or other service done in the Cathedral Church of Durham, (he) did provide ... certen unlawfull bokes, as well privately as in the scholes, instructing the clerkes and queristers to saye and singe the same abrogated service'. Their efforts do not appear to have been entirely successful however, as William Rowling from Sherburn thought that they 'sawng out of tewne'. The only member of the cathedral clergy who seems to have put up any genuine resistance to the changes was William Harding, a minor canon, who refused to be reconciled or attend Holmes' sermon, and only attended mass after Cuthbert Nevill had 'reviled him byfore, sainge he was of wicked being, and also 2 soldgiers came to his ... chamber and commandyd hym to come to the church, or ells yt wolde be worse with hym' (30).

Similar scenes were also taking place in the other churches in Durham city, largely due to the efforts of Cuthbert Nevill and William Holmes, who were active in securing a reversion to Catholic forms throughout the city and county as well as in the cathedral. About the 30th November they seem to have caused some sort of proclamation to be made on Palace Green, ordering the Churchwardens in the city churches to set up the old altar-slabs and holy-water stoups(31). People apparently knew where they were, and when the signal was given they

were unearthed. At St. Nicholas', George Foster and James Nicholl helped set up the altar 'at the pointment of' Alderman Struther and Henry Hutcheson, sacristan of the church. One James Croft also 'bair ... holy water through the parish' while another 'went ... with the hand bell to byd any man come to soul masse and dirige, or to come to the masse at the lait tyme of rebellion'. The old forms of religious service were also being reintroduced. On December 6th, William Watson, the parish clerk, was fetched by four of the earl's men to take part in the burial mass of Hans Fawcon. At St. Nicholas', Holmes asked him if he wished to be reconciled, which he refused, 'yett he tarried masse ther, and helpt the said Holmes on with his mess clothes'. On Saturday December 10th Robert Pearson of Brancepeth sang mass in the choir of the church, while William Headlam, the curate, also said matins and evensong in Latin after he had been called to 'Place Gren' and absolved by William Holmes in his chamber(32).

At St. Margaret's church the old altar-slab was no longer in existence, so Thomas Richmond, the churchwarden, hired William Lasingby, Thomas Waynman and John Skortfield to build a new altar consisting of a 'through stone out of the payment of the church floor' along with lime and stones from the cathedral. Richmond and Skortfield also set up a holy water stoup, apparently just in time for the 'feast of our Ladye's day' (the feast of the Conception of the Virgin on December 8th). Mass seems to have been celebrated in the church since Richmond promised the labourers who built the altar that it would be said 'the morro next after', while his wife apparently distributed holy bread to those carrying out the work(33).

At St. Oswald's, the churchwardens Robert Tedcastle and William Wright ordered Anthony Coots and Robert Sklaiter to erect the old 'alter stone in Elvet Church, which was broken in thre and underlaid with a pece of timber'. The latter two also set up the holy water stoup which was 'hyd in a corner of the said church, covered

with earth', while the churchwardens 'brought doon the books to the bridge end, viz, a Bible, the Book of the Common Praier, the Appologe, the Homilies, all (of) which was burnt'. Although there is no evidence that any services in Latin took place in the church, mass was probably celebrated by Holmes, Nevill and George White or Robert Pearson, curate of Brancepeth, two priests who had been ordained during Mary's reign and took a prominent part in the restoration(34).

Similar work was also carried out at St. Giles, Durham, where Robert Gilson and William Marley, the Churchwardens, 'sett up... the hye altar upon 4 pillors' along with the holy water stoup 'wherwith the folk sprinkelde themselves'. Oliver Ashe, the curate, spoke with 'Mr. Hoomes, about sainge of service in the church of St. Giles', but the latter replied that he 'could not absolve him', since Ashe had been a 'religious man' (i.e. monastic) and was therefore excommunicate. Despite this, Ashe 'maid' or blessed holy water and holy bread, and was certainly accused of having ministered the sacrament. On hearing of the book-burnings at St. Oswald's and St. Nicholas', the clerk Robert Cornefurthe informed Gilson and Marlay of events and told them that as he was crossing Palace Green towards St. Giles, Holmes and Nevill had given him 'commandement that he shulde charge the churchwardens to burne their bookes'. This the latter duly accomplished, as Marlay later stated 'for feir of his life', in front of an indifferent group of forty witnesses none of whom 'aither praised their doings therein or found fault therwith' (35).

The influence of the reaction in Durham city was in turn felt in the rural parishes of the bishopric. William Rawling, one of the churchwardens at Pittington, was present on at least one occasion at mass in the cathedral where he joined the 'procession after the crosse', and subsequently undertook the restoration of 'one alter in the Church of Pyttington, and the hollywater stoop also ther', having hired two labourers Edward Gillery and Gilbert Dixson for the purpose. After

the rebellion Rawling and Dixson then hid the altar stone 'upon the kirk flore' and the holy-water stoup in the bellhouse 'wher byfore they had bein ... yett baith undefaced', and 'as for their bookes, John Wall, Anthony Hall, ande one Laborne (all from Durham) distroyed them'. Rawling later testified, probably in an attempt to divert responsibility, that he had been ordered by Cuthbert Nevill to carry out the work under 'payne of hanginge' (36).

There was also a restoration of Catholic religious forms in more outlying regions. At Long Newton, Richard Hartburn and Captain Welton gave Thomas Colling, one of the churchwardens, a 'commandement in the Quene's Majesties name, and the earls, to buyld up one altar', which the latter accomplished, with the assistance of several labourers and five or so young women who helped to 'beir lyme and sand to the aulter for the making of the same'. A holy water stoup was also set up, while the 'said Welton and his company' entered the church with the help of the parish clerk and tore up ('rent') the books ordered by the Queen's Injunctions. Finally, Hartburn said mass, and preached a sermon in which he said that the auditors were lollards, and hadd bein damned this xi yeres' (37).

It is probable that the people of Sedgfield were more to Hartburn's liking, since the Catholic restoration here was at its most spontaneous and popular. As seen earlier, the churchwardens had already removed the communion table in 1567 when their rector, Robert Swift, had finally attempted to carry out Bishop Pilkington's 1561 Injunctions and place the table in the body of the church(38). Some of the leading gentry in the rebellion, such as Ralph Conyers, William Chavening and Anthony Hebburn also lived in the parish, and nineteen inhabitants of Sedgfield alone had joined the rebels (39). Consequently when these men returned to their homes and families, after the vain march southwards, rapid changes were made in the parish church. The initiative and decision-making process seems, however, at

least superficially, to have been remarkably popular and communal, as Roland Hixson later testified: 'one hollyday after service the parish met to gyther and consultancy to fett in the aulter stone and hallywaiter ston; whereupon about 30 persons helpt to drawe with ropes the said altar stone from Gibson garth into the churche; and he, this examine, and 6 moo helpt in with the said hallywater stone'. At the same time Richard Fleitham, Lancelot Bulman and Roland Hixson carried the church's books to the green by the 'crosse in the towne gayt' where 'other fett fyer and whynes and straw, amongest which was Agnes Sklayter, Isobell Fidler, Florence Lockson, widow Whyte', and a bonfire was made of them at sunrise, next to which 'a great multitude, and specially of youngh' people gathered. It was also later recounted how one of the bystanders, 'seeinge the flames of the bookes fleinge up, said, "lowe, wher the Homilies flees to the devyll"'. Finally after mass was said in Sedgefield church on 7th December, at which sacring bells, holy bread and other trappings of the old service were used, Richard Hartburn preached from the pulpit and spoke 'against the Quene's religion established in this realme .... and the rest of the people, knelinge doon, wer reconsiled, and toke the said Hartburn's benediction' (40).

Although the material is rather more scanty, it is also known that Hartburn said mass at Hartlepool during the rebel occupation of the town, and at Billingham, where the high altar was restored and the church's service books burnt, probably under the instruction of a certain Captain Stafford from Hartlepool, although the town also provided a large number of followers (twenty-two) for the rebellion(41).

While Hartburn was active in Stockton ward and the south and east, the other priests, Holmes, Pearson and White carried out similar work in the rest of the county, preaching, celebrating mass and reconciling the people to Rome. At St. Andrew's church, Bishop Auckland, the churchwarden William Sklaitor hired three labourers to erect the old altar stone and holy water stoup, while

John Lilburn, a local gentleman, 'rent the byble in peices... and further toke 2 boords of the communion table at that instanc, and throw them under fott'. Similar destructive work was carried out at St. Helen's church, where one William Cooke (an inhabitant of the parish) admitted that he 'strove with other soldiers about the tering of the books articulate, whereof he this deponent tere part of them with his hands and teithe'. George White then reached St. Helen's on December 4th, the second Sunday in Advent. Before celebrating the mass, he churched a certain Joan Eden, whose husband Robert had taken part in the rebellion, receiving her 'into the church by the hand as the custom was, and sprinkled holy water upon hyr' and then from the pulpit he 'preached against the stait of religion established in this realme, he willed them to revert to the church of Rome; and thereupon he red absolucion in the Pop his nayme to all the people'(42).

At Brancepeth and Staindrop (nearby Raby Castle) Latin services were taken by Holmes or Robert Pearson, probably during the presence of the Earl of Westmoreland when he was in residence. Certainly the Countess, at least once, played an active part in the restoration of Catholic rites. Elizabeth Rutter, whose husband Henry joined the insurgents, was delivered of a baby girl in St. Oswalds parish, Durham, 'the 15th daye of November, beinge the morrowe after the rebells rose'. The baby lay unchristened until 'the friday fortheneth next after' at which time 'one Agnes Pope the meddwyff, caried the said childe to Brancepeth.... wher she belyvith yt was christened by the priest Sir Robert, the curat ther ... by my Lady Westmoreland commandement, for that the childe was weike and most lyke to dye'. In the later testamony, Elizabeth Rutter also added her belief that the 'holly sacrement of bapty m doith belong to children and she is not of the opinion of any anabaptism that holdith to the contrary'(43).

Full records do not exist of similar events that took place in the other parishes of the bishopric, but it is

known that the altar was restored at Stockton, while mass was certainly celebrated in such rebel strongholds as Darlington, Billingham and Barnard Castle by George White and other priests(44). Elsewhere, the curates of the various parish churches themselves played some role in the restoration of Catholic rites. Proceedings were later taken against both John Browne, curate of Chesterle-Street, and the un-named Curate of Monkwearmouth, for having ministered 'coenam Domini pane illicito'. At Seaham, the vicar, Thomas Wright, daily said 'matutinas Beatae Mariae' privately in his room in the presence of George Winter, John Herison and other priests. At Heighington, the curate John Nicholson, publicly read out in church several psalms in Latin, while at Lanchester the curate Richard Milner publicly used 'the Latany and other suffraiges abolished', while at Whitworth the curate Robert Crawford (who had been an absentee at the 1559 visitation) was found guilty of having used holy water and bread 'contra jura hujus regni Angliae'. Finally at Medomsley, Sir John Cowper, curate of Whittanstall, was procured (probably by Thomas Swalwell), to 'churche three women and manye certeyne persones in Latton, in such rite and forme as was prescribed by the Pope'(45).

The flight of the Earls from the bishopric and the arrival of the Queen's forces under Sussex soon however caused a quick reaction. In some instances the very men responsible for the changes recently achieved, sought to palliate their offences by destroying what had just been restored. For instance, William Headlam, curate of St. Nicholas' church, 'tair.... in peices and burnte' the service book from which he had read matins and evensong in latin, while the churchwardens of St. Giles broke up and defaced the altar stone and holy water stoup that they had erected. Similarly John Lilburn of Auckland sought to demonstrate his loyalty by replacing the bible that he had destroyed with a new one. For the most part, however, as already seen in Pittington, churchwardens simply undid their work again and replaced the altar

stones and holy water stoups where they had previously hidden them, in gardens, under piles of rubbish, in the chancel floors or church towers, waiting perhaps for another restoration. At St. Margaret's for instance, one of the churchwardens Thomas Richmond later confessed that he had 'taken doon' the altar-slab and stoup immediately after the rebellion, and that they were 'boath in the said church undefaced; the hollywater ston turned doon in the belfray, and th'other layd downe where the aulter was'. At Billingham the high altar stone was buried once more in the choir, while an old red 'as yett undefaced' cope, probably used during the recent celebration of the mass, was hidden away again somewhere in the church. At Long Newton, the churchwardens 'and the said women, toke down the said altar stone, and bair yt out of the church yarde, and .... cast yt into the said pytt alias sandhole, which is covered on every syd'. In Durham Cathedral, the altar-slabs used at mass were then 'hedd in the earth', while the processions, grail, antiphoner and 'holy water falts' all mysteriously disappeared again soon after the rebellion. Strangely enough, none of the minor canons could 'depose, nor knoweth any of them', despite being on oath. Finally, at Sedgefield, parishioners attempted to hide the altar-slab even after it had been partially defaced by the Queen's soldiers. It was later reported how Robert Walker and others 'layd the aulter stone down and coverd the same with earthe' while the holy water stoup was 'hyd in the doonghill off William Clarke by Roland Hixson and the mayson, churchwardens', who 'caste strawe thereon, and then said over the same "Dominis Vobiscum" '(46).

What, finally, was the significance of the rising? What prompted the mass of ordinary lay people to join the rebellion?

Although a variety of political, economic and social motives actuated the leading rebels, which have been dealt with fully elsewhere(47), the main rallying cry for the majority certainly seems to have been dislike of religious innovation and opposition to the ecclesiastical policy of the government, which was largely considered to be the policy of the Protestant upstart Cecil. Indeed, as seen earlier, although the rebellion was not initially caused by religious motives, it was to 'religion' (i.e. Catholicism) that the Earls eventually appealed, believing that this was the best way to mobilise mass support for their cause. That the rebel leaders made this decision seems to have been largely due to the various 'persuasions' of Dr. Morton, a papal envoy and ex-canon of Canterbury who met the Earl of Northumberland in 1569 and 'affirmed that he had travelled through most of England, and found most of the common people inclined thereto, if any would at once take the enterprise in hand'. A further 'persuasion' was that Elizabeth was in danger of papal excommunication if steps were not taken to carry out restoration of the old religious order in England, a measure that threatened the souls of English Catholics as well as the 'loss of our country', since 'all Christian princes through the Pope's persuasions would seek to subvert us if we did not reform it within ourselves'(48). Apart from the Earl of Westmoreland - who initially opposed a rising for 'religion' because he did not want his family to be 'accounted as rebels' like those who 'take that quarrel in other countries' - such ideas seem to have been well received by the rebel activists in the bishopric, like William Smith from Esh, who used the argument that 'the Pope has summoned this land once, and if he summon it again, it is lawful to rise against the Queen, and do it (i.e. restore Catholicism) if she will not; for the Pope is head of the Church'(49).

Certainly the authorities did not underestimate the strength of the religious appeal of the revolt, or its corresponding capacity to succeed. Sir George Bowes, who was commissioned by the Privy Council to report on the 'bruits' and general restlessness in the north, wrote as early as November 2nd 1569 that there were large numbers of people who favoured the rumours concerning an 'alteracyon of religion', while on November 20th Sussex reported that 'the Earls are old in blood, and poor in force in any other cause than this, but it is not be believed of them that see it not what is done directly, and underhand to serve them for this cause'(50). Even the Queen herself was concerned that the rebels had made religion the 'shewe of theyr enterprise', which she directed Sussex publicly to contradict, and to state that it was the Earls intention to bring the country under foreign control and make it the 'spoile of strangers' (51).

But 'religion' was not merely a cloak for the Earls' other motives, and the Catholic sympathies of the leading rebels cannot be questioned. Northumberland had been converted to Roman Catholicism in 1567, while Richard Norton was a reputed extremist, whose son-in-law Thomas Markenfield of Yorkshire had visited Rome and maintained contact with Dr. Morton (also a Yorkshireman). Sir Thomas Gargrave's report to Cecil on 2nd November, 'Notes of Uncertain Brutes', categorised all the leading insurgents as being 'evil of religion', including Robert Tempest and John Swinburne from Durham and Thomas Markenfield and the Nortons from Yorkshire(52). Bishop Pilkington had also fined John Swinburne for keeping a priest to say mass for him, while the Hebburns of Hardwick seem to have employed John Bellerbe, a clerk, as chaplain to the family. Such pro-Catholic sentiment prevailed among the gentry in the region, and in the letter Sir Ralph Sadler wrote to Cecil on the 6th December, he explained the failure of the government forces 'to match with the rebels' by saying that 'there are not 10 gentlemen in all this county that favour her

proceedings in the cause of religion'(53).

A further reason for discontent was that a significant proportion of the rebels and their families seem to have been connected with the dissolved institutions in various capacities. Some had been lay administrators and fee'd servants of the monasteries, such as Simon Welbury, father of two rebels, who had been bailiff of Guisborough. Others had been lessees under the monasteries, such as the Swinburnes, who had been granted a 51 year lease of Chopwell Manor by Newminster Abbey in 1528(54). The same families were also affected by the dissolution of the chantries and colleges in the 1540s, with the money which they or their ancestors had bequeathed for the support of priests being appropriated by the Crown, and the chantries that their families had founded (for example by the Blakistons at Norton) simply being swept away. Finally, as argued previously, this discontent at religious innovation would have been shared by many of the rebels of the 'meaner sorte', who resented the destruction of images, chantries, saints' shrines and everything that provided beauty, transcendence and a sense of local individuality in the services and decoration of their parish churches.

But although these religious grievances provided a rallying cry for the movement, were they sufficient in themselves to create mass support for a restoration of the old religion? Mervyn James has interpreted the 1569 rising almost exclusively as a movement from 'above', arguing that 'religious change in 1569, as in previous religious revolutions was the result less of popular initiative than of action by authority ... in fact the movement showed how difficult it was for any body to assert itself outside the established structure of deference and authority'(55). Thus he points out that the religious restorations in parish churches, the setting up of altars and holy water stoups on the one hand, and the destruction of Protestant communion tables and prayer books on the other, were largely carried out by churchwardens acting on the orders of the rebel earls

and their client priests, who backed up their commands with coercive threats and used the Queen's name to justify their actions. In turn these churchwardens and other officials naturally attempted later to palliate what they had done by saying in the church courts that they had been instructed to carry out the rebels' orders 'upon pain and hanging', 'for feir of his lyffe', 'sore against hys will', or upon 'stricte commandements', given in the 'Quene's Majestie's name and the Earles', 'or ells yt wolde be worse with him' (56). James argues that there is no reason to doubt their testimonies, particularly since the churchwardens, mainly respectable husbandmen or shopkeepers, would have been unwilling to take 'any initiative in the dangerous field of religion without the authorisation of their betters' (57). However, the fact remains that the churchwardens (probably along with many other people in the parish) knew where the altar-slabs and holy water stoups were hidden in or around their respective churches, so that when the signal was given they could rapidly unearth them. Indeed they were probably the very people who had taken them down (for the second time) at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. Another uncomfortable truth to be explained away in the courts was their attempt, after the rebellion was over, to hide the altars and the stoups a third time in the same piles of rubbish, church gardens or tower where they had rested the previous decade or so.

Furthermore, even if most of the religious change in 1569 was initially prompted by 'authority', there can be little doubt that the Earls' appeal to 'religion' - along with the rumours that the activists had 'wylfully stirreth' (as in the Pilgrimage of Grace) - evoked a significant and heartfelt response from the Commons (58). Large crowds of ordinary lay people assembled in the Cathedral at Durham to witness the illegal rebel mass, many of whom brought their rosary beads (especially the women) and 'willinglye used suche reverend gesture thereunto'. Again, from the large number (in some reports as many as eighty) who helped move the altar

stone into Sedgefield church - after the parish had already 'mett and consultancy' to set it up - it seems clear that the reversion to the old religion in some places was both desired by the people and accomplished by them(59). The strength of popular sentiment is also revealed in the letter Sir Ralph Sadler sent to Cecil on the 6th December, in which he wrote that the 'common people are ignorant, superstitious and altogether blinded with the old popish doctrine, and therefore so favour the cause which the rebels make the colour of the rebellion, that, though their persons be here with us, their hearts are with them(60).

However, it would be too simple and reductive to force those who joined the rebels and those who stayed at home into the strait-jacket of respective 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' labels. Some of those who attended rebel mass at Durham, or marched southwards, may have done so out of curiosity, sheer boredom or because they were tenants of people who told them to do so. The crowd of forty people who attended the burning of Protestant books by the churchwardens at Durham St. Giles, for instance, seems to have been completely indifferent to the proceedings, as it was reported later that 'none of the said forty either praised their doings therein or found fault therewith'. At least one person 'of good (i.e. Protestant) religion' joined the rebels, Ralph Conyers, a tenant of the Earl of Westmoreland(61). Furthermore, the rebellion would almost certainly have become entangled with existing dissensions, acting upon a complex society already divided by rivalries between individuals, families, social groups and entire communities. If one man or village joined the rebels, or carried out a restoration of Catholic services and furnishings, that might have ensured that his or their enemies remained loyal to the Queen and the established Church.

Some of these characteristics of the rebellion, and its uneven impact, are confirmed by studying the geographical distribution of the insurgents in the bishopric. From the surviving lists in Sharpe it seems

that at least 954 men of the Palatinate had joined the rebels. Of this total, 481 joined the rebels from Darlington ward, 213 came from Stockton ward, while only 101 came from the two other wards, Chester and Easington (62). The centre of the rising was essentially therefore in the south and east of the county (Darlington and Stockton wards), probably not so much because the people in these areas were any more disaffected or pro-Catholic than in the north and western uplands, but because most of the important Durham gentry in the rising had their property here (the Nevilles, Salvins and Conyers). The map and extant lists of the rebellion show, for instance, that most of the villages near Raby were represented in the rebel army as the result of musters held there by the Earl of Westmoreland, while many of the inhabitants would have been tenants of the Nevilles. Thus fifteen rebels came from Cockfield, forty-four from Staindrop and twenty-seven from Raby itself(63). It was also in the south of the county that all the chief musters were held by the rebels as they marched south from Brancepeth to Darlington, and then on their return from Tadcaster besieged Barnard Castle and Hartlepool.

It seems clear, therefore, that popular support was greatest in areas where the rebel earls made a personal appearance, and were able to make the offers of pay which undoubtedly played an important role in recruiting and retaining the majority of footmen. In his later confession to Sir Francis Jobson, lieutenant of the Tower, Christopher Norton described how 'all the footmen of the bishopric were commanded to be (at Northallerton), and promised to have money, and to be appointed to captains, and to be in wages'. The rebel earls only had £20 available to 'distribute as prest money to the footmen', and wanted 'to promise them 8d a day each', but Norton thought that less than one shilling was unacceptable, and simply told the footmen that 'at Ripon they should know their Lordship's pleasure, and that I would neither will them to go forward or back'. As a result, only the four hundred men who were paid continued

to Ripon, while 'those who received nothing were dissatisfied and returned home'. Similarly, after the earls' army had returned north to Brancepeth, the Earl of Sussex wrote to Cecil on November 30th that the rebel footmen were so 'deceived of the promises made to them - sometimes of pay, sometimes of the spoil of this city, Newcastle, and Barnard Castle - that many have fled from them', a report that was confirmed by Lord Darcy at Doncaster two days later(64).

Bastard feudal allegiance and the tenant levy mustering system also helps explain why many tenants were drawn into the rebellion in support of their Lord, even in districts away from the centres of the rebellion where the Earl of Westmoreland did not make a personal appearance. At Bywell in Northumberland, eighty horsemen out of one hundred and ten Neville tenants were recruited to the rebels' cause, probably by the energetic steward John Swinburn, while Sussex wrote to the Privy Council on November 17th that Christopher Neville 'had raised all the Earl's tenants' about Kirby Moorside and those parts (i.e. Cleveland), and thrown down the communion board ... (and) that the Earl's men have done the like at Darlington and Northallerton'(65). A significant number of the gentry involved in the rebellion were also retainers of the Earls, such as John Swinburn and Marmaduke Redman, and it seems that for many of these men the 'neo-feudal' virtues of loyalty and service were paramount, so that the interests of the lineage had to be defended at all costs. Richard Atkinson claimed in 1570, for instance, that Edward Dacre had been prepared to 'suffer death patiently, so that you and your blood in name might continue your ancestors' (66).

But the appeal to bastard feudal loyalty was not sufficient by itself to raise a significant fighting force, and indeed Mervyn James has used the background of the 1569 rising to question the accepted orthodoxy that northern society - with its 'neo-feudal' lordship, lineage values and supposed devotion of tenants to Lords - was somehow structurally disposed to such a rebellion.

Apart from tracing a new 'civil' concept of order in the writings of George Clarkson (deputy steward of the Earl of Northumberland), he points out that despite Lord Hunsdon's oft-quoted dictum on 31st December that in Northumberland they 'know no other Prince but a Percy', only eighty of the Earl's tenants were actually reported as coming from Northumberland(67). Furthermore, as Bowes reported to his superiors, it was only the 1800 horsemen that consisted of gentry and their tenants, while the majority of the rebel forces (the 4,000 or so footmen) consisted only of the 'meanest sort of husbandmen'. Although men in the former group would have joined the earls through a sense of loyalty, the rebels had to resort to the offer of wages and promise of spoil to recruit the latter.

In general, therefore, the role played by religion and the earls' propaganda in recruiting people to the rebel army for the initial march southwards should not be overemphasised, even if Sir Ralph Sadler was convinced that the people flocked to the rebels because they were 'altogether blinded with the popish doctrine'(68). It is perhaps relevant in this respect that the rebellion's support remained geographically so limited. The appeals the earls made to the other northern catholic nobility and their tenants failed completely, and the rebels received almost no response or help outside Neville or Percy lands, south of the Ouse and Wharfe or west of the Pennines. As a consequence, realising their weakness, the earls were forced to turn back at Bramham.

Nevertheless as far as Durham itself is concerned, it is surely significant that the parish churches in which a reaction was made to Catholic forms of worship were widely scattered throughout the county, including Seaham, Pitlington and Monkwearmouth in Easington ward and Chester-le-Street, Medomsley and Witton-Gilbert in Chester ward. Similarly, most towns and villages in the bishopric are represented in the lists of the number of rebels who joined the rising, even in the north of the country where no official minsters were held. At least

four insurgents even came from the parish of Haughton-le-Spring, for instance, providing some evidence that the preaching of Bernard Gilpin was not favoured by all in his parish. From all this it seems reasonable to suggest that the results of the rising, if successful, would have been willingly accepted throughout the greater part of the bishopric.

## EPILOGUE

A decade after Elizabeth's accession the people of Durham diocese were still described as 'mere ignorante of religion and altogether untaught'. Similarly, after arriving in the north in 1570, Archbishop Grindal informed Cecil about the 'superstitious practices' that 'remain ... among the common people: they keep holy days and fasts abrogated: they offer eggs & c. at the burial of their dead: they pray on beads & c.: so as this seemeth to be, as it were, another church, rather than a member of the rest'(1). As one of the more remote areas that Puritans were beginning to call the 'dark corners of the land', it was perhaps inevitable that there would be a tenacious maintenance of the Old Religion by a significant number of survivalists, what Bossy has described as a 'Catholicism less concerned with doctrinal affirmation or dramas of conscience than with a set of ingrained observances which defined and gave meaning to the cycle of the week and the seasons of the year, to birth, marriage and death (2).

But aside from the region's backwardness and the inevitable lingering of old rituals and devotional attitudes, the continued existence of popular religious conservatism in Durham during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign was due to a number of factors that were peculiar to the diocese. In the first place, it may be argued that bishop Tunstal began a counter-reforming process in the see by recruiting conservative priests (especially other Catholic humanists and academics from the universities) who led the opposition to the 1559 settlement. Even when many of these men were driven abroad to Louvain by the authorities, they continued to maintain contacts with the emerging recusant circles in Durham and influence these networks by their ideas, books and writings. Much more important, as far as preserving popular Catholicism was concerned, the lesser clergy that Tunstal recruited (along with the former monks and other Marian clergy) mostly managed to avoid both conformity

and deprivation and thereby continue to exercise a conservative influence on the laity during the decade. It is clear in this respect that if the new Protestant Durham chapter was to make an early breakthrough with its proselytising efforts - and essential disruption of the region's social pattern due to its rejection of the doctrine of purgatory - it needed extremely close support at a parochial level. All the surviving evidence, however, suggests how unwilling the parochial clergy were to support the new religion, and this is not really surprising, given that they were so closely integrated into county society (indeed, many such as Anthony Salvin and Cuthbert Neville, uncle to the Earl of Westmoreland, came from the leading Durham families). Finally, popular conservatism was protected after 1559 by the bastard-feudal Catholicism of the Nevilles, the most peaceful landlords in the County. Like the Earl of Northumberland, Westmoreland was reconciled to the Roman Catholic church and in touch with clerics like Salvin and Robert Pearson, while the Durham magistracy and commission of the peace were dominated by the earl, his retainers and other conservatives who refused to take the oath of supremacy. As a consequence, the majority of Catholic people in Durham were protected from the pressures of the Protestant establishment (so that only one person, for instance, Elizabeth Branding, was presented for recusancy during the entire 1560s) (3).

For the first decade of her reign, therefore, Elizabeth was forced to move extremely warily (although a policy of leniency seems to have satisfied the government) and only after the form of Catholicism described above was overtaken by the defeat of the 1569 rising was she able to impose a tighter religious and political discipline. This was not immediately apparent, however, and the first consequence of the rising was to destabilise the whole region, as Lord Hunsdon explained to Burghley in a letter in which he described the activities of 'thieves' and 'outlaws' who ravaged the county 'daily and nightly' in the months after the

rising: 'the bishopric is very weak, as there is none to whom they may resort to succour, for the Bishop they make small account of, and whereas the Earl of Westmoreland, Swinburne and others, kept houses, they are now void and nobody in them, so that part of the county is clean waste' (4). Even more serious, the presence of the leading rebels in Scotland (such as Robert Collingwood, John Swinburn, Tempest and the Nevilles) constituted a continual danger, and by the end of January 1570 raids under the leadership of the Earl of Westmoreland and Ker of Ferniehurst reached Alnwick and Morpeth. On February 7th, Hunsdon wrote to Cecil that 'since my coming Dr Pilkinton and others have been with me, and reported that the Earl of Westmoreland has threatened to take certain prebendaries and others of Durham and hang them, whereof they are so afraid that they are ready to go out of the country, also that the Earl's tenants are warned to be ready at an hour's warning' (5). On February 15th, the Earl of Westmoreland actually entered the region with 2,000 troops, but the defeat of Dacre's rebellion at Hall Beck on February 20th finally allowed a great primitive raid into Scotland by the Earl of Sussex. As a consequence, most of the Durham rebels (including Westmoreland, Cuthbert and Christopher Neville, John Trollope, the Blakistons and Tempests) fled to Flanders where they received pensions from the King of Spain and worked in his service. Nevertheless, the danger was not over for the authorities, and there remained a constant (but unrealised) fear for several years afterwards that the rebels would return from the Low Countries with papal or Spanish backing. The earl and his companions also remained in contact with the bishopric, and on October 8th 1571, Henry Simpson from Darlington revealed under examination by Sir Thomas Gargrave that ten weeks earlier at Louvain he had seen an Englishman deliver a letter to the Earl of Westmoreland which reported that the 'poor commonalty were so pilled (sic) that he and his fellows had the hearts of all men, women and children, who would take their parts, and wished them to come in, if but with

five hundred men' (6).

Once control was established by the spring of 1570, however, the government was able to enforce policies of strict religious and political obedience in subsequent years, with the result that the failure of the rising was to have profound and lasting consequences for the bishopric. In political terms, apart from the dozen Durham gentry who were attainted, the rebellion primarily marked the disappearance of the Neville family from the Durham political scene, since the Earl of Westmoreland died in exile, others of the family were attainted and their entire estates (including Raby and Brancepeth castles and a train of dependant manors) were confiscated by the Crown (7). As a result, the Neville's power though not influence was effectively destroyed. Mervyn James has argued that this had the vital effect of destabilising the old balance between the ecclesiastical and secular powers in the bishopric, although it was a process that took several decades: 'the result was the collapse of the traditional pattern of Durham politics, in which the Neville interest had competed with the Bishop for the leadership of the gentry community and the favour of the Crown. After 1569 political life wilted as single-faction government became the rule of the bishopric, just as it would be at Court in the later years of the Cecil dominance. The Bishop gradually emerged as the trusted agent of the Crown in the region, and the trend was set for the rise of a church party which would monopolise political power' (8).

Apart from accelerating vast social changes in the decades after 1570 (not only in the structure of social prestige and political authority that had centred on the Nevilles but also in the disposition of landed property in the bishopric (9)) the collapse of the Neville interest after the Rising also had an important impact on the religious life of the county. Although their influence in the parishes was not immediately removed (in

1571, for instance, George Cliffe was presented to Brancepeth by Lady Aveline Neville after his support for the 1569 rebels (10)), the intimate and significant relationship that the Nevilles had enjoyed with the priory and chapter from the late fourteenth century onwards was finally brought to an end (11): above all, the bishop of Durham now became the main dispenser of patronage as well as the focus of political aspirations so that authority would have passed into the hands of the supporters of the Reformation (as JPs, Lords, Lieutenants and constables). This is an area sadly lacking in evidence, but it is known that all JPs were required to subscribe to declarations of conformity and obedience during the rebellion, and later the following year in 1570 when the excommunication of Elizabeth resulted in much harsher measures against recusants and the inauguration of a new penal code. The impact of these measures is suggested by the 1584 roster for the West Riding Commission of the Peace, on which many leading Durham figures and other rebels (such as the Earl of Westmoreland, Lord Lumley, Leonard Dacre and Richard Dacre) had formerly served, but who a decade later were now conspicuous by their absence. The only representatives from the bishopric at this later date were Bishop Barnes and the Protestants Robert Bowes and Thomas Calverley (who was administrator of the temporalities of Durham diocese) (12).

At lower social levels, there is literary evidence to suggest that the failure of the rebellion also made a deep and lasting impression, even though the numbers of those executed was considerably less than once supposed. In 'The Rising in the North', the author or authors lamented the decline of Neville and Percy fortunes after the rising (as represented by their respective dun bull and half-moon heraldic emblems) but noted that the rebel leaders had left the poorer men of the 'meaner sorte' to bear the brunt of the government's retribution (13),

'But the halfe-moone is fled and gone,  
And the dun bull vanished awaye,  
And Ffrancis Norton and his eight sonnes  
Are ffled awaye most cowardlye

Ladds with money are counted men  
Men without money are counted none!  
But hold your tounge! why say you soe?  
Men wilbe men when money is gone.'

Another ballad, 'Rookhope Ryde', expressed popular hopes for an end to the chaos caused by the rising, and dismay in particular at the raids in early December 1569 by Tynedale robbers, who made several forays into Weardale while the bishopric was undefended ('for there is none but women at home') (14).

'But away they steal our goods apace,  
And ever an ill-death may they die!

Lord send us peace unto the Realm,  
That every man may live his own!'

Except for the extremely committed, therefore, it is likely that the failure of the Rising provided a significant disincentive to further revolt or dissent. On 29th January, 1570, Sussex wrote to Bowes that the 'rebellious and ill disposed people have bene so chastised, as, at this present, every contrey within my said commission remayneth in obedience, and the people redy to be directed by ordinary course of justice' (15).

In religious terms, the laity who had taken part in the religious restoration in the bishopric were treated extremely lightly, primarily it seems because of their insistence that they had acted under the command of leaders such as William Holmes and Cuthbert Neville. Dr. Robert Swift (Vicar-General and Official Principal of the diocese of Durham from 1561-1577), held a court of inquiry into their conduct, and over a hundred people

were examined, including large numbers from Durham, Bishop Auckland and Sedgefield (but not Darlington). Five general libels were drawn up against 'hearers of mass', 'burners of church books' and 'erectors of altars', which advanced the principles that only the services established by the Prayer Book should be used, that the mass and 'other superstitious Latin services' were justly abolished, and that altars and stoups ought to be finally taken down and 'utterly destroyed as monuments of idolatrye and superstition, so that no memorye of the same do remayne in walls, glass windowes, or els wher, within any churche or house within this realme' (16). Having acknowledged these promises and signed a confession of guilt, offenders were made to do penance and then released.

Nevertheless, although the participants escaped lightly, the diocesan authorities now had full knowledge about the whereabouts of altar-slabs and holy water stoups, and it seems probable that the aftermath of the rebellion and the 1570s completed the process whereby these objects and other traditional furnishings in parish churches were finally destroyed. In his 1571 Injunctions for the northern province, Grindal enjoined that candlesticks, sacring-bells, censers, pixes and holy water stoups should be completely destroyed by the churchwardens and ministers of the churches concerned: in particular, altar-slabs should be completely taken down and broken up, while the floors should be paved and the walls whitened in the places where they had stood (17). These instructions were followed up by Bishop Barnes in his Durham Visitation Articles of 1577, which ordered that churchwardens remove 'all remanants of alters, and all cobell stones whereupon images have been placed ... and the places where they stood pargetted (plastered) over with lyme, under the paynes afforesaid' (18). There is no indication in the 'detectiones' and 'comperta' of the subsequent visitation (or in other sources like wills and church accounts) that any altars were still standing by the late 1570s, and so it

must be assumed that the old altars were destroyed in the years immediately following the rebellion. The visitation seems to have been particularly stringent, and only one church in the whole diocese was still 'unwhited' by 1578-9 (19).

Perhaps most important of all, the Rising also seems to have speeded up the process by which the so-called Marian priests and conservative clergy were hunted out into the open by the Protestant cathedral establishment and diocesan authorities. Like the laity, the clergy were also dealt with by the ecclesiastical court under Dr. Swift, but the majority escaped rather less lightly. John Nicholson of Heighington, Robert Crawforth of Whitworth, Richard Milner of Lanchester and John Raynes of the West Spittle Newcastle were all sentenced to a period of imprisonment in Durham jail and submitted to penance afterwards, although Crawforth was deprived of his other benefice at Kimblesworth in 1572 (20). Similarly, Richard Hartburn, William Holmes, William Melmerby of Merrington, and Roger Venys of Mitford, along with four minor canons from the cathedral (John Pearson, John Brown, Thomas Matthew and William Smith) were all indicted by the Queen's Commissioners for 'conspiracy and rebellion'. Holmes and Hartburn were among the ranks of unbeneficed Marian clergy, but the four minor canons were immediately deprived (along with Roger Venys for 'gross neglect of duty'), while Melmerby was merely fined and later allowed to retain his benefice (21). The first two, along with George White, Hugh Ile and William Ustayn, seem to have escaped punishment and probably fled abroad, although White later re-emerged as a recusant priest in North Yorkshire while Ile was reported to be baptising around Thirsk in 1593. There is no sign either that Robert Pearson or John Foster were indicted after the rebellion, but successors were appointed to their respective benefices at Sockburn and Edmondbyers in 1570/1, and the episcopal register suggest that both may well have been dead (22). Several other clergy, such as Robert Hutchinson, Vicar of Grindon and Thomas Wall, Vicar

of Bishopton were simply fined 20s after the Rising by the Queen's commissioners and pardoned, while various 'old priests' - including David Taylor, Vicar of Bolam, William Watson, Chaplain of St. Mary Magdalen, Bartholomew Bartley, Rector of Whatton and Robert Leighton, Vicar of Horsley - were forced to make a submission to Bishop Pilkington in the spring of 1570 (23).

Proceedings were also later taken against both Thomas Pentland, Vicar of St. Oswalds, and William Headlam, curate of St. Nicholas' on April 8th 1570 for having failed to reform their offices at Easter (24). It is significant that the latter still maintained a recalcitrant attitude several months after his initial attempt to undo his work in the rebellion by burning the service book which he had used to say mass. Even less willing to confirm was Thomas Swalwell, who in 1570 at Medonsley and Ebchester spoke openly against the royal supremacy 'in the strete at after noone', saying that the Queen had no more authority over the church 'than any other woman', and that 'after the wordes of consecration but the reall and proportionable bodie of Christ enclosed within the compasse of the solid breade and wyne'. He was suspended indefinitely from his see in February (25). Last of all, Stephen Marley, ex-monk at Durham and prebend of the 6th stall, and Thomas Wright, rector of Elton (who had said 'Mattins of the Virgin Mary' in his room during the rebellion) were both finally deprived in 1572, as a result of an Act passed the previous year which stipulated that ministers of the church be of 'sound religion' and provided for clerical subscription to the Articles on pain of deprivation (26).

In effect, therefore, the defeat of the rising and the repression which followed it removed the influences that had previously protected popular religious conservatism. The papal excommunication of Elizabeth in 1570 resulted in much harsher measures against recusants

and the introduction of a new penal code, and this together with the removal of conservative clergy and officials after the rebellion, reduced the opportunity for the majority of people to participate in Catholic rites. Adhering to the faith now became a clear choice, involving all the legal and social penalties of non-conformity. Popular Catholicism was doomed to extinction, or at least an underground existence outside the parochial organisation.

Eventually, however, as Hilton has shown, recusancy was to emerge from the mass conservatism of the 1560s, under the influence of the seminary priests and increased government pressure, to form the seigneurial religion of a small minority led by a few families of Catholic gentry (27). This process was encouraged by the return of several of the Durham rebels to the bishopric in the early 1570s. Induced by an Act of 1571, which ordered all the fugitives to return to England under pain of forfeiture of their goods, several rebels (including John Trollope and Ralph Conyers) successfully sued for pardon and retained their property in the bishopric. Indeed, apart from the Nevilles, it appears that few rebels suffered any permanent loss (since most of their lands were let out on thirty-one year leases) while most people regained enough property to remain powerful. Thus of the twelve people named as recusants for the bishopric in 1574, eight had taken part in the rising. Similarly, on the list of Durham recusants for 1593, forty of the one hundred and seven people named were rebels or members of their families (such as the Claxtons, Trolloppes and Salvins). (28).

These territorial magnate families would in turn have protected Catholics, particularly those among their own clienteles, and it may reasonably be assumed that some of the older networks for preserving popular Catholicism would not have been destroyed by the 1569 rebellion. Indeed that 'survivalism' continued to exist, at least as an undercurrent, at a popular level, is suggested by the letter of Bishop Barnes to his patron Lord Burleigh on

February 11th, 1577 in which he described the 'stubborn churlish people of the county of Durham ... who shew but, as the proverb is, Jack of Napes charity in their hearts' and referred to the bishopric as an 'Augiae Stabulum ... whose stink is grievous in the nose of God and men, and which to purge far passeth Hercules' labours ... the malicious are marvellously exasperated against me' (29). Much more revealing are the extraordinarily anti-Catholic articles that Barnes issued for Darlington in September 1577, in which he ordered churchwardens and ordinary lay people to make 'true presentment' of all those who have brought over and 'delivered abroad anie bulls, pardons, agnus dei dispensacions, pictures, beades, reconciliac. from the Pope the sea and court of Rome ... or any sedicious bookes, impugninge the religion nowe in this Realme ... (or) praye on beades, Popish practases, primers ... or that fast any superstitious fastes' and also those 'minstrells or jeasters' who 'singe popishe superstitious songs or bawdie ballades full of filthie ribawldrie or anye sedicious songs or rimes in commendacion or defence of popery' (30). Finally, even Bernard Gilpin in the early 1580s was alarmed about the support that Catholic priests were likely to receive in his parish of Houghton, noting that 'mischief doeth increase easily and spread and creep further in one good day than good lessons in a whole month' (31).

For the most part, however, Catholicism was the religion of a small minority, being largely dependant for its survival on a few connected families of recusant gentry and seigneurial households. Although originally underestimating mass conservatism in the 1560s (and therefore the link between survivalism and recusancy (32)) Bossy has rightly argued that since the 'Old Religion' was a 'predominantly social sentiment it could persist only where there was a social institution to support it'. Unlike the majority in the 1570s, these Catholic nobles who disliked the established Church could retire to their estates and seigneurial households, so that the rites of passage and ritual observances of the

Old Religion could be withdrawn from the 'public order of the parish' into the 'private order of the household' (33), and thereby preserved. By 1576 most of the Marian priests were dead but their place was taken by seminary priests trained abroad at Douai and then Rheims. The first seminary priests to arrive at Durham were John Boste, who worked in the north-east from 1581 to his capture in the bishopric in 1593, and Richard Holtby who organised a mission for the whole region after 1581, and sheltered men such as Edmund Campion, who apparently visited Durham during the decade (34). Contact with the exiles and foreign seminaries was also maintained through Newcastle, while the work of these priests centred on the recusant households of the rebel gentry families involved in 1569, such as the Blakisons, Tempests, Claxtons and Swinburnes. Holtby, for instance, based his headquarters for the north-east mission with the Trollopes of Thornley in Durham. By 1593 Sir William Bowes noted that 'false and disloyal religion hath taken deep root, and that in the best houses, increasing daily by number and diligence of the seminaries, with more liberty resorting hither, being driven from other places of both the realms' (35).

Despite this pessimism, there are clear signs that Protestantism was also beginning to flourish, and that having made the political changes necessary for religious reform, the authorities' efforts to promote the work of the reformers started to take effect in the decades after 1569. As already noted, the new compulsory subscription to the Royal Articles in 1571-2 meant that only those Marian priests who were willing to submit to the new regime remained in possession of their benefices after this time. As a consequence, no conservative clergy were deprived after 1572, while Protestants with an international reputation (such as John Foxe, who was appointed to a prebendal stall in the Cathedral on 2nd September 1572) continued to be recruited into the

diocese. This shift in personnel and their attitudes is also confirmed by the growing number of married clergy and the episcopal registers of Pilkington, which show that the discredited title of priest was increasingly being replaced by the Puritan titles of 'minister' or 'preacher of God's word' (36).

Emphasis was also laid on inculcating the new doctrines to the laity and on enforcing their attendance at church. Sabbath breaking was made a punishable offence by 1573, while harsher penalties were introduced for non-attendance, six people being excommunicated for instance during the Chancellor's visitation of the bishopric in January 1578 (37). In his 1577 Injunctions for Durham, Bishop Barnes also ordered monthly communions in all parishes, and it appears that all parishioners were compelled to receive communion at least once a year through the actions of the courts. In fact, Barnes' ideal was not to become a reality until after the Restoration, and the churchwarden accounts for County Durham (which begin in some parishes like Pilkington in the early 1580s) reveal that there was seldom more than four communions during the year in any of the parishes, including one at Christmas and one at Easter (38). Nevertheless, all communicants over thirty were required to know the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments by the 4th Monition of Barnes' Visitation Articles in October, 1577, while vicars and curates were enjoined to teach the catechism every Sunday for an hour before evening prayer (39).

Alongside these measures, a comprehensive system of itinerant preaching in the diocese as a whole was also introduced by Bishop Barnes in 1578, as a means of covering a large area with comparatively few preachers. A total of two hundred and fifteen sermons were to be preached by thirty specially appointed clergy, on top of the individual efforts that Bernard Gilpin and other itinerant preachers were already making (40).

But rather than simply supplementing the efforts of the ordinary clergy, Gilpin (among others) realised that

the only way in which their general quality could be improved in the long term was through education, and onto the grammar school he helped found at Keping in 1574 he grafted a seminary for up to twenty-four scholars, who boarded in the rectory at Houghton (41). Similar attempts to raise the standard of learning among the ordinary clergy were made by the authorities in Durham, and in the 12th Monition of his Visitation Articles in October, 1577, Bishop Barnes provided for frequent examinations of the clergy's scriptural knowledge, ordering that the clergy should give proof of their 'progresse in learninge and studyinge of the scriptures', and give an account of the Gospel of St. Matthew in Latin (if possible) or English (42). The subsequent visitation of Chester and Easington wards took place on 22nd July, 1578 in front of Robert Swifte, while Darlington and Stockton wards were visited the following day. Significantly, the 'task' was performed satisfactorily by thirty-nine, 'imperfectly' performed by seven (including Richard Milnoer, the curate of Lanchester) and 'utterly neglected' by eight, one of whom (Stevenson) was threatened with excommunication. Seven others, including Gilpin were excused due to their learning, seventeen were absent or sick (including the former monk William Bennet and William Resesly, curate of Monkwearmouth) while final seventeen are not mentioned as succeeding or failing.

Churchwardens were also being made increasingly responsible for the maintenance of the forms of religion within the parishes, and stringent proceedings were taken against them if the prescribed books or furniture were lacking in their churches. Although prayer books were scanty due to the 1569 burnings, later churchwarden accounts suggest most churches probably soon possessed one or two bibles and other prescribed books, such as the Postils, the Homilies and the Paraphrases of Erasmus. The churchwarden's account for Pitlington, for example, includes the following list: 'one new Bible and one old, one Psalter, two communion books, Paraphrases of Erasmus,

Apology of Jewel, Queen's Injunctions, two books Homilies, Postils (43). The use of these books had been enforced at the visitation of the parish churches themselves in 1578-9, and the 'detectiones and comperta' of the visitation suggest that considerable progress was being made: only Hart lacked the Paraphrases of Erasmus, Trimdon had no Postils, Defence of the Apologe or Lords Monicions, while in March 1579 Ralph Wright, churchwarden of Stockton was excommunicated because the church had still not obtained a communion book (44).

Since the clergy were obliged to give a minimum of religious instruction to their parishioners, and now had the materials to do so, this was bound to have some effect on the laity, and the wills of the period suggest that popular religious attitudes were also beginning to change. Of the fifty-seven wills contained in the three volumes of 'Wills and Inventories' for the period 1569-72, only two contain the traditional invocation of the saints, while there are only three examples of the commendatory clause for the entire decade 1570-1580. Ralph Collingwood, from Eglingham, for instance, used the traditional form in his will dated 3rd February, 1570, 'First I geve my soull to god almightie and to all the hollye companie of Heving and my bodie to be buried in the quer of Eglinghame my parish churche' (45). As suggested earlier, the practical cessation of such invocations after 1570 may reflect shifts in the structures of authority rather than any decisive growth in popular Protestantism, and it is significant that one of the last testators known to have left his soul to the Virgin and Saints in full medieval form (an alderman of Newcastle in 1582) had the relevant phrase excised in the registered copy of the will (46). Nevertheless, there are at least seventeen 'Protestant' examples for the period 1569-72 in which lay testators declared their dependence on the merits of Christ's death alone to secure salvation (47), even if the majority used a simple indeterminate formula (such as that of Marie Randell on 24th August, 1570). In general, it may be said that the period of

uncertainty in wills was coming to an end by 1572,

It is difficult, finally, to speculate further about the significant changes caused to the content and nature of popular belief during the actual period under scrutiny 1530 - 1570. Palliser has commented, rightly, that 'in view of the inarticulate nature of the "silent majority" at all periods, dogmatic generalisations about popular attitudes will never be justified' (48). Nevertheless, it is clear, at least, that the old assumption that the reformation consisted of a direct battle between Protestants and Catholics - in which everyone was deeply involved in the doctrinal issues at stake - is completely misplaced. In the first place, all the evidence suggests the enormous complexity of popular belief, ranging through complete scepticism, folk religion and conservative survivalism to the evangelical Calvinism of the 'hot gospeller'. Many of the wills of the period, for instance, (however they were drawn up) reveal a complete doctrinal confusion, with testators or their scribes expressing a belief in achieving salvation through the merits of Christ alone, and then invoking the prayers of the saints. As late as April 1572, John Simpson from Houghton, wrote that 'I gyve my soule to Almightye God my Saviour and Redemer by whose meritts and passion I trist to be saved, and to all the celestiaall companie of heaven....' (49). Furthermore, even for the doctrinally educated, there were serious dilemmas and predicaments to be confronted in these decades, as the correspondence between Bernard Gilpin and his relatives strikingly reveals. Gilpin told his brother, for instance, that he had thought long and hard about subscribing to the articles at the visitation in 1559 (50), while his Catholic cousin, Thomas Gelthrop, conceded the need for radical reform: 'that sinne aboundeth it is not the fault of the masse or of the mattins, but the pernicious doctrine and filthy life of the clergy, and of the others. They have already

reformed the communion, and have published a book of the reformed liturgy, but this reformation hath not removed the evill, because we see the people growne farre worse than before' (51).

As for the inarticulate, Scarisbrick has imagined the impact of religious change for the 'overwhelming majority' at the level of the parochial church: 'the Reformation simplified everything. It effected a shift from a religion of symbol and allegory, ceremony and formal gesture to one that was plain and direct. A shift from the visual to the aural, from ritual to literal exposition, from the curious and mysterious to the everyday. It moved from the high colours of statue, window and painted walls to whitewash, from a religion that, with baptismal salt on lips, anointings and frankincense - as well as image, word and chant, sought out all the senses, to one that concentrated on the word and innerliness. There was a shift from a religion that often went out of doors on pilgrimage and procession to an indoor one; from the sacral and churchly to the familial and domestic; from sacrament to word (though this is easily overstated); from the objectivity of ex opere operato and Real Presence, for instance to the subjectivity of "feeling faith" and experience' (52).

Apart from the enormous change to local communities caused by the destruction of religious shrines and the abrogation of civic ceremonies, it is likely also that the shift from the ritualised visual effects of the old order to the printed word, along with the abolition of religious rituals and the confessionals, would have left a vacuum in many people's lives. So far as ordinary folk were concerned, the reduction of the number of Sacrements thought necessary for salvation by the church, along with the authorities' hostility towards previously accepted types of supernatural support - such as the protective power attributed to consecrated objects and holy words and the healing power of images and saint's relics - must have appeared to deprive many men and women of the means by which they could procure access to divine grace and

spiritual protection in their everyday life. In return, the simple undecorated churches and theology of the Protestant reformers (with its emphasis on the supremacy of the Scriptures as the sole means of achieving salvation, and its new doctrine of divine providence (53)) would scarcely have provided adequate substitutes in the lives of non-intellectuals and the majority of uneducated. Bernard Gilpin, for instance, commented that 'the people come to the church to feede their eyes, and not their soules; they are taught that no visible thing is to be worshipped. And for because they see not in the church the shining pompe and pleasant variety (as they thought it) of painted clothes, candlestickes, images, alters, lampes, tapers, they say, as good to goe into a Barne' (54).

Deprived, therefore, by the established church of the prospect of supernatural aid, it is possible as a consequence that the demand for popular 'unofficial' magic by ordinary people increased in subsequent decades (55). Certainly the number of cases relating to popular magic recorded in the depositions of the church courts in Durham rose remarkably after 1560, but this may be due to the fragmentary nature of the historical record or just an increased vigilance on the part of the diocesan authorities. Nevertheless, although only one case of witchcraft was reported in the first six decades of the century, there were twenty-four prosecutions (involving twenty-nine people) relating to magic in the period 1560-1630 (56). Apart from the infamous 'Witches of Hart', Margaret Reed was named as 'horse good mother water wych' in 1569, while soon afterwards Jennett Pereson was accused of witchcraft by the 'measuringe of belts to preserve folkes from the farye'. Most of these prosecutions involved charming or divination of attempts at curing cattle. Alice Swan, for example, who was prosecuted in the consistory court in the 1560s, admitted trying to divine things by turning the riddle and shears, which she conceded was a 'kind of divination and charming, expressly forbidden by Gode's Lawes and the

Quene Majestie and cannot be done without a defection and mistrust to God and some confidence to the devell' (57).

Protestants continued to believe, however, that these and other 'survivalist' superstitious practices were just a hangover from Popery, preserved only by the lack of a decent preaching ministry. Bernard Gilpin, for example, wrote that 'grosse superstition and blindness remaineth still among the people ... infidelitie, idolatrie, charming, witchcrafts, conjuring ... with such other trumpery, which lurke in corners, and began of late to come abroad onely for lacke of preaching' (58).

Similarly, in 1593 Sir William Bowes commented that 'true religion hath taken very little place, not by the unwillingness of the people to hear, but by want of means, scant three able preachers being able to be found in the whole county' (59). Indeed, it was this shortage of adequate ministers, which continued into the seventeenth century, that lay in part behind the moves made between 1649 -1659 to convert the College at Durham into a University (60).

INTRODUCTION: Notes and References

1. J. Bossy, Christianity in the West (1985). C. Haigh, 'Some Aspects of the Recent Historiography of the English Reformation' in W.J. Mommsen (ed.) The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation. German Historical Institute, vol. V (1980) pp 88-106
2. A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (1964) is the classic of the traditional approach.
3. J.J. Scarisbrick, The Reformation and the English People (1984). Haigh, 'Some Aspects', pp 88-106. F. Heal and R O'Day (eds) Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I (1977) passim.
4. P. Heath, The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation (1969) pp 1-4, 93-103.
5. J. Bossy, 'The Mass as a Social Institution, 1200 - 1700' Past and Present, Vol. C (1983) pp 29-61.
6. K. Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic (1971)
7. C.S.L. Davies, 'Popular Religion and the Pilgrimage of Grace' in Fletcher and Stevenson (eds) Order and Disorder in Early Modern England (1987) pp 58-91.
8. C. Phythian-Adams, 'Ceremony and the Citizen: the communal year at Coventry, 1450-1550' in P. Clark (ed) The Early Modern Town (1976) pp 106-128
9. Thomas, Decline of Magic pp 27-57.
10. Bossy, 'The Mass', p 64.
11. I. Luxton, 'The Reformation and Popular Culture' in Heal and O'Day (eds) Church and Society, pp 57-77. Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 28, 45, 54. Phythian-Adams, 'Ceremony and the Citizen', pp 106-128.
12. Scarisbrick, English People, pp 2-12.
13. M. Spufford, Contrasting Communities (1974) pp 323-334. M.L. Zell, 'The Use of Religious Preambles as a Measure of Religious Belief in the Sixteenth Century'. Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research vol. L (1977) pp 246-9.
14. County Durham, of course, included a far smaller geographical area. The chantry returns of 1548 are contained in Depositions and Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes (ed.) J. Raine, Surtees

- Society Vol. XXII (1846) Appendix VI, pp lxix-lxxvi  
 Scarisbrick, English People, pp 19-39.
15. M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation in the Diocese of Lincoln under John Longland, 1521-47 (1981) pp 38ff.
  16. M. Tanner, The Church in Late Medieval Norwich, 1370-1532 (1978)
  17. Dickens, English Reformation, p 36
  18. Ibid, p 103
  19. John Foxe, Acts and Monuments, (ed.) G. Townsend (1965) vol. IV, pp 178, 622, 631, 633 for Cuthbert Tunstal's attempts as bishop of London to suppress Tyndale's New Testament.
  20. D.M. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions to the Reformation, 1530-70', in Heal and O'Day (eds) Church and Society pp 35-36.
  21. Bowker, Lincoln, p 61
  22. For early Lutheran influence in County Durham see below pp 39-41
  23. C. Haigh, 'Anticlericalism and the English Reformation', History, vol. LXVII, pp 391-407
  24. Ibid, pp 394-396
  25. Dickens, English Reformation, p 125
  26. J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (1968) p 246
  27. R. O'Day, The Debate on the English Reformation (1986) pp 147-50 for a review of current thinking about Henry's attitude to Protestantism.
  28. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, ch. 9
  29. P. Clark, English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution. Religion and Society in Kent, 1500-1640 (1977) pp 23-44.
  30. O'Day, Debate, pp 137-165
  31. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, pp 249ff. M.A.R. Graves, The Tudor Parliaments Crown Lords and Commons, 1485-1603 (1985) pp 65ff
  32. For the Edwardian changes see below ch. 4
  33. Graves, Tudor Parliaments, pp 65-98
  34. G.R. Elton, Policy and Police: Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell (1972) pp

171-262, 327-382

35. C.S.L. Davies, 'Popular Religion', pp 58-91. For the Pilgrimage in Durham see below, Chap.2.
36. Ibid, pp 82-88
37. Clark, Kent, p 45
38. R.W. Scribner, 'Incombustible Luther: the Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany' Past and Present (1986), pp 38-69
39. C. Haigh, 'The Church of England, the Catholics and the People' in C. Haigh (ed.) The Reign of Elizabeth I (1984), pp 195-219, Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 80-85. A. Dures, English Catholicism, 1558-1642 (1983) pp 1-8. And see below Chap 5.
40. Haigh, 'Some Aspects', pp 88-106
41. Ibid. O'Day, Debate, pp 137-165 and other authorities cited there. For the works of Elton, Dickens, Haigh, Scarisbrick see the bibliography.
42. Clark, Kent, passim. K.G. Powell, 'The Beginnings of Protestantism in Gloucestershire'. Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society (1971) vol. XC pp 141-157
43. Clark, Kent, pp 44-68
44. Haigh, 'Some Aspects' p 105
45. C. Haigh. Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire (1975) esp. pp 98-117, 139-158, 209ff. R. Manning, Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex (1961), pp 256ff. S.M. Keeling, 'The Reformation in the Anglo-Scottish Border Counties', Northern History vol. XV (1979) pp 24-42. A.L. Rowse, Tudor Cornwall (1941) pp 312-314.
46. Haigh, Reformation and Resistance, p 225
- 46a. Keeling, 'Border Counties', pp 24-42
47. W.J. Sheils, 'Religion in Provincial Towns: innovation and tradition' in Heal and O'Day (eds) Church and Society pp 156-176 and W.J. Sheils, The English Reformation (1989) pp 73-74
48. Haigh, 'Catholics and the People', pp 205-209
49. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', pp 46-52
50. Spufford, Contrasting Communities, pp 239-249

51. Bowker, Lincoln, p 181
52. Spufford, Contrasting Communities, pp 320-334
53. Ibid, p 324
54. Scarisbrick, English People, pp 2-12. Zell, 'The Use of Religious Preambles', pp 246-9
55. Spufford, Contrasting Communities, pp 333-334
56. O'Day, Debate, pp 157-8
57. E.g. Clark, Kent, pp 57-68
58. Dickens, English Reformation, pp 266-7
59. Haigh, Reformation and Resistance, pp 69-71, 194, 220-1, 227
60. Wills and Inventories (ed.) J. Raine, Surtees Society, vol. II (1835). Wills and Inventories, (ed.) W. Greenwell, Surtees Society, vol. XXXVIII (1860). Wills and Inventories, (ed.) J.A. Hodgson, Surtees Society, vol. CXII (1906).
61. E.g. *ibid*, p 74 for the will of Hugh Whitfield
62. Boldon Buke (ed.) W.M. Greenwell. Surtees Society, vol. XXV (1852) pp vii - viii
63. J. Conway Davies. 'The Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Durham' Durham University Journal, vol. XLIV (1951-52) pp 77-87
64. Durham Churchwarden Accounts, (ed.) Rev. J. Barmby, Surtees Society, vol. LXXXIV (1888) pp i-xvii
65. These sources are discussed below as and when they are used.
66. M. Bowker, Review Article Historical Journal (1972) pp 363-6. Thomas' functional distinction between religion and magic has also come under attack. See N. Davis, 'Tasks and Themes in the Study of Popular Religion' in C. Trinkaus and H. Obermann (eds) The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Religion (1974), pp 307-334
67. O'Day, Debate, p 164
68. B.N. Wilson. The Changes of the Reformation Period in Durham and Northumberland 2 vols. (PHD Durham University, 1939). D. Marcombe The Dean and Chapter of Durham, 1558-1603 (PHD Durham University, 1973). J. Hilton, Catholic Recusancy in County Durham, 1559-

1625 (M. Phil. Leeds University, 1974).

69. M.E. James. Society, Politics and Culture (1986) pp  
1-14
70. See Chap. 2 below
71. M.E. James. Family, Lineage and Civil Society: A  
Study of Society, Politics and Mentality in the Durham  
Region, 1500-1640 (1974)

## CHAPTER 1: Notes and References

1. See H.H.E. Craster, 'The Patrimony of St. Cuthbert'. English Historical Review, vol. LXIX (1954), pp 177-199, for the complex process whereby the community of St. Cuthbert came to acquire the properties which formed the endowment of the see of Durham.
2. G.T. Lapsley, The County Palatine of Durham (1900) pp 1-30. The 'bishopric' must of course be distinguished from the diocese of Durham, which included most of Northumberland and Durham counties and was subdivided into two archdeaconries. Furthermore, despite widespread belief, the 'Bishopric' did not in fact equate with the County of Durham, either, since it included Northhamshire, Islandshire and Bedlington in Northumberland along with the Manors of Northallerton, Howden and Crayke and other lands in Yorkshire. Although this thesis, therefore is primarily confined to the district represented by the modern County, these other 'member' areas of the bishopric will also be considered, along with Newcastle, which provides an extremely useful topographical and religious contrast to Durham.  
H.R. Leighton, Memorials of Old Durham (1910) p 1.  
J. Raine, History and Antiquities of North Durham (1852) p 1, 14-15.
3. Ibid., p 31-76. Surtees, History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, (1816-40) vol I, p 16.
4. See Haigh, Reformation and Resistance (1975) p 1ff for the influence of poor communications on Lancashire's religion.
5. M.H. Dodds 'The Topography of Durham' in Leighton, Memorials pp 14-43 and James, Lineage pp 1-7 for an introduction to the Durham regions topography and communications.
6. Surtees, Durham, vol IV p 25. R.B. Dobson, Durham Priory, 1400-1450 (1973) pp 33-50. The volume of

these maritime contacts with London and the continent was greatly increased with the rise of the coal export trade from Newcastle in the second half of the sixteenth century. H. Trevor-Roper, 'The Bishopric of Durham and the Capitalist Reformation', Durham University Journal, vol XXXVII (1945-6) pp 45 ff.

7. See ch. 2.
8. Milner, E. and Benham, E. (eds.), Records of the Lumleys of Lumley Castle (1904) pp 26-73 passim. James, Lineage, pp 11-16. The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543, (ed.) L. Toulmin Smith vol I (1906-8) pp 69-77.
9. The chantry returns of 1548 suggest a population of 2,600 for Durham city, while the Palatinate muster of 1569 suggests a figure of over 30,000 for the county as a whole. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, Appendix VI pp lix - lxxvi. James, Lineage, pp 7-11. Leland seems to have been singularly unimpressed with the counties' towns, reserving his main descriptions for the palace at Bishop Auckland, the manor house at Sockburn (the Conyers), Lumley Castle (the Lumleys) and Brancepeth and Raby Castles (the Nevilles). In part this seems to have reflected his primary interests in geneology and architecture, but he considered Staindrop to be little more than a 'small market town', while the 'towne selfe of Akeland is of no estimation, yet is ther a praty market of corne'. As for Durham itself, it 'stondith on a rokky hille: and stondith as men cum from the south cuntre on the (north) ripe of Were: the which water so with his course naturale in a botom windith about, that from Elvet a great stone bridge of fourteen arches it crepith about the towne to Framagate bridges also on Were, that ..... the towne except the lengtht of an arow shot is brought in insulam .....there be a three paroches churches mo in the suburbe ..... the

greatest suburb is by Elvet bridge, and hath  
 certen smaull streates ..... the building of Duresme  
 town is meately strong, but it is nother high nor  
 of costely werke ..... but the town itself with yn  
 the peninsula is but a small thing in respect of  
 cumpace of all the stately close: so that it  
 alonly may be caullid the wauillid towne of  
 Duresme'. Leland's Itinerary, pp 72-74.

10. R. Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation (1979).
11. Durham Depositions, pp 47-53.
12. James, Lineage, pp 51 ff, Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 189-197.
13. Letters and Papers, vol. VIII, 955.
14. W. Henderson, Folk-lore of the Northern Counties (1879) pp 12-16. Register of Richard Fox, Lord Bishop of Durham, 1494-1501 (ed.) M.P. Howden. Surtees Society, vol. CXLVII (1932) pp xxxv-xxxvii. Lord Dacre continued to use the same policy against the Tynedale raiders in the 1520s. Letters and Papers, vol. IV, 10.
15. Victoria County History, vol II, p 28. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App I, pp i-xl. The 1501 visitation was the last undertaken by an archbishop of York in the pre-reformation period.
16. A. Hamilton Thompson, 'Archbishop Savage's Visitation of the Diocese of Durham, sede vacante in 1501', Archaeologia Aeliana (1921) pp 43-52. Carver, for instance, appointed John Walker, vicar of Merrington, as his official in the consistory court of Durham and as commissary for proving wills in the archdeaconry. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. I, p i.
17. *Ibid*, pp viii-ix, xii.
18. *Ibid*, pp xxiv-xxvii (Newcastle), xviii-xix (Gateshead).
19. *Ibid*, pp xvii, xxx-xxxii.
20. Registers of Tunstall and Pilkington, (ed.) G. Hinde.

- Surtees Society, vol. CLXI (1946) pp 17-19.
21. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp xiv-xv.
  22. Ibid, p xvii.
  23. Index of Wills in the Probate Registry, Durham. vol I (1540-1599). Newcastle-upon-Tyne Records Committee (1927). Along with the index of the three thousand or so wills that existed in 1927 were collated (in another index) the contents of the wills originally contained in the three volumes of Durham 'Wills and Inventories' and Sir Cuthbert Sharp's will extracts. From this it can be deduced that approximately 1500 documents originally contained at the Registry have disappeared, (which were previously included in the works published by the Surtees Society).
  24. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. I, pp ii-viii, xxxiv-xl. Wills, vol I, pp 104-113.
  25. E.g. Ibid, pp 105-7, 107-8, 108-9, 109-110, 110-111.
  26. Ibid, pp 105-7.
  27. Ibid, p 112.
  28. Ibid, p 160.
  29. Scarisbrick, English People, pp 19-39.
  30. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. VI, pp lix-lxxvi.
  31. Scarisbrick, English People, p 31.
  32. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. VI, pp lxiv-lxv, lix-lxiii.
  33. Ibid, pp lxii-lxiii. Surtees, Durham, vol IV, pp 49, 60-1.
  34. Ibid, pp 32-36. Dobson, Durham Priory, p 48. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes. App. VI, P lxii.
  35. Ibid p lxi. Victoria County History, vol III, p 26. Surtees, Durham, vol IV, p 49.
  36. The Rites of Durham, being a description or brief declaration of all the ancient monuments, rites and customs belonging or being within the monastical

- church of Durham before the Suppression (1593), (ed.)  
F.T. Fowler. Surtees Society, vol CVII (1902).
37. Surtees, Durham, vol IV, p 21.
38. Ibid, p 22.
39. M.H. Dodds, 'The Northern Stage', Archaeologia Aeliana 3rd series, vol VI (1914) pp 31-64.
40. M.E. James, 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body in the late Medieval English Town' in M.E. James (ed.). Society, Politics and Culture (Cambridge University Press, 1986) pp 16-47.
41. Victoria County History, vol III, p 56. Historiae Dunelmensis. Scriptores Tres, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol IX (1839) pp ccccxxx-ccccxxxi.
42. Phythian-Adams, Ceremony and the Citizen, pp 106-128.
43. Thomas, Decline of Magic, p 31.
44. Rites, pp 106, 122, 292. Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, (ed.) R.T. Fowler. Surtees Society, vol C (1898) pp 414.
45. J. Raine, St. Cuthbert (1828) pp 115-117.
46. Ibid, p 117.
47. Durham Account Rolls, vol II, pp 420-483.
48. Catalogi Veteres Librorum Dunelm, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol VII (1838) pp xlii-lviii. B. Colgrave (ed.) Two Lives of St. Cuthbert (1940) pp 21-23, 31-33.
49. Ibid, pp 26, 28-29. S.L. Greenslade, 'The Last Monks of Durham Cathedral Priory', Durham University Journal, vol XLI (1948-9) pp 107-113. Todd became prebendary of the 5th stall in Durham in 1541 and was not deprived until 1567. Coincidentally, that same year, Leonard Pilkington (who also owned a copy of Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert) was instituted as prebendary of the 7th stall, a position that he retained until 1592.
50. C. Sturge, Cuthbert Tunstal: Churchman, Scholar, Statesman, Administrator (1938) pp 117-8.
51. Durham Depositions, p 45. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 34-5.

52. Letters and Papers, vol VIII, 1005.
53. Victoria County History, vol III, p 23.
54. Letters and Papers, vol III (1) 1274.
55. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 132, 136, 138-9.
56. Ibid. Quoted p 135.
57. Rites, passim esp. pp 85-87.
58. Greenslade, The Last Monks, pp 107-113.
59. Letters and Papers, vol x, 183.
60. Ibid, 364 'Compendia Compertorum'.
61. The Durham Household Book; or the Accounts of the Bursar of the Monastery of Durham from Pentecost 1530 to Pentecost 1534, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol XVII (1844) p 346.
62. Letters and Papers, vol. VI, 419, 507.
63. Rites, pp 9, 30, 33, 105-6.
64. Ibid, p 2. Pevsner, N. and Williamson L. (ed.) County Durham. The Buildings of England (1983) pp 189-90.
65. Rites, p 4. An eleventh-century manuscript representation of St. Cuthbert's shrine is reproduced in Rev. J.T. Fowler, 'On the St. Cuthbert Window in York Minster' Yorkshire Archaeological Society, vol IV (1877) pp 249-377. It shows the stone substructure with a flowing cloth hanging about half way down, on which is set the shrine itself, with miniature windows, pannelled or jewelled sides and a tiled roof. Beneath the shrine (though not visible) were 'four seates or places convenient ..... for the pilgrims or laymen sittenge on their knees to leane and reste on, in time of their devout offeringes and fervent prayers to God and holy St. Cuthbert for his miraculous releife and succour'. Rites, p 4. For late medieval panel painting of such objects see P. Binski and J. Alexander (eds). The Age of Chivalry (1987) pp 131-6.
66. Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 27-58.
67. Scriptores Tres, p ccccxl. The roll is dated to 1426.

68. Thomas, Decline of Magic, p 29 n.4.
69. Rites, pp 30-33.
70. C. Eyre. History of St. Cuthbert (1858) p 206.
71. Scriptores Tres, pp cccxc-cccxc. John Ellys, from Brancepeth, was branded with the cross in St. Cuthbert's shrine before he departed on crusade in 1498.
72. Ibid, pp CLii-CLiii.
73. Stranks. This Sumptuous Church: the story of Durham Cathedral (1973) p 4. Also see pp 14, 23 for Cuthbert's renowned dislike of women and the pains that the latter suffered when trying to approach his shrine. Leighton, Memorials, p 122.
74. Rites, p 25.
75. Raine. St. Cuthbert (1828) pp 165-7. The author of the Rites describes the banner as 'goodly and sumptuous ..... with pipes of silver ..... on a staffe, beinge five yardes longe ..... ye saide banner cloth was maide of read velvet of both sydes most sumptuously embroidered and wrought with flowers of grene silke and golde, and in ye mydes of ye said ban clothe was ye saide holy relique and corporax cloth inclosed'.
76. Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 35-52.
77. Ibid, pp 36-40. Bossy, 'The Mass', passim.
78. e.g. Wills, vol I, p 118, vol III, p 1.
79. Rites, pp 9-10.
80. N.W. Apperley 'Folklore of the County of Durham' in Leighton Memorials, pp 44-64. For baptism in general see Bossy, Christianity in the West, pp 14-19 and Van Gennep, The Rites of Passage (1960) pp 93-96.
81. Ibid, esp. pp 116-145 (Marriage), 146-65 (Death).
82. Readers unacquainted with the Henrician reforms may choose to read the opening paragraph of ch. 3 before looking at the next chapter on the Pilgrimage of Grace.

CHAPTER 2: Notes and References

1. A.G. Dickens, 'Secular and Religious Motivation in the Pilgrimage of Grace' in G.J. Cuming (ed). Studies in Church History, vol IV (1967) pp 39-64.
2. M.E. James, 'Obedience and Dissent in Henrician England: the Lincolnshire Rebellion of 1536' Past and Present, vol XLVIII (1970) pp 3-84. G.R. Elton, 'Politics and the Pilgrimage of Grace' in Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government (1974) pp 183-215.
3. C.S.L. Davies, 'The Pilgrimage of Grace Reconsidered', Past and Present (1968) pp 54-56, and 'Popular Religion and the Pilgrimage of Grace' in Fletcher and Stevenson (eds) Order and Disorder in Early Modern England (1987) pp 58-91. See also Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (1968) pp 339-46.
4. C.S.L. Davies, 'Popular Religion', p 59.
5. Elton, 'Politics', pp 190-194.
6. C. Haigh, The Last Days of the Lancashire Monasteries and the Pilgrimage of Grace. Chetham Society, 3rd Series, vol XVII (1969) esp. chs. 5 and 6. R.B. Smith, Land and Politics in the England of Henry VIII: the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1530-46 (1970) ch. 5, esp pp 181-198.
7. Ibid. M.H. and R. Dodds, The Pilgrimage of Grace (1915) vol I, pp 212 (Lancashire), 192, 225, 370-72 (Cumberland and Westmoreland), 226 (Richmond).
8. As noted in the introduction there is no full existing study of the Pilgrimage in county Durham. No doubt this reflects the paucity of the evidence, but it is a marked gap give that the army at Doncaster did not include companies from all 'the north' but was really only drawn from Yorkshire and Durham.
9. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, chs. 4 and 5. A.J. Fletcher, Tudor Rebellions (1968), pp 21-24.
10. R.W. Hoyle, 'Thomas Master's Narrative of the Pilgrimage of Grace', Northern History, vol XXI

- (1985) pp 53-79, No. 5.
11. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 534, 618 and 665.
  12. Ibid, 838.
  13. Ibid, vol xii (1) 1022.
  14. Ibid, 789.
  15. Ibid, 369,22. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 153-4.  
Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol I, p 203.
  16. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1) 789.
  17. Hoyle, 'Thomas Master's Narrative', no. 31. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1) 369. C.S.L. Davies, 'Popular Religion', p 64 n. 16 suggests that 'Lord Neville' could not have been the twelve-year old Henry, who succeeded his father as Earl of Westmoreland in 1549, but was probably an elder brother.
  18. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1) 369.
  19. Ibid. Milner and Benham, Records of the Lumleys, pp 32-48.
  20. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1) 6.
  21. J. Raine, Priory of Hexham. Surtees Society, vol XLV (1863) pp cxxi-cxxvii.
  22. Letters and Papers, vol. XI, 449
  23. Ibid, vol XII (1) 1090.
  24. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol I, p 197.
  25. Ibid, P 198 for Sir Ingram Percy's sermons.
  26. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 467 and 351.
  27. Ibid, vol XI, 1207.
  28. Ibid, vol XII (2), 536. 18th August 1537.  
Tunstal to Cromwell. Bolden Buke, pp vii-viii.  
Although the spoliation probably took place during the events of the insurrection, its exact date is not known. Despite giving a clue to the loss of many of the muniments of the see, the destruction was not complete, as an entry in a roll of payments for 1536-7 reveals: 'Paid the morn after St. Luke's day to Marmaduke Clargenet (5 s) and other of his company, and Robert Lewyn (5 s) for helping to save the records in the chancery in time of staying of the same, 10 s'.

29. Durham Account Rolls, vol II, p 483.
30. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, p 205.
31. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 29, 789.
32. Ibid, 393, 392. For Darcy's complicity see Elton, 'Politics', pp 196-8 and Smith, West Riding, pp 167-170.
33. Ibid, 698, 892.
34. Ibid, 901, article 73.
35. Elton, 'Politics', p 197 argues that the 'production' of thousands of badges overnight provides 'overwhelming' evidence of earlier preparation for the rebellion. Certainly the extensive questioning of Darcy about the symbol in one interrogatory (Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 900. Articles 73-87) suggests that Cromwell refused to believe that the discovery of the store of badges at Pontefract was a coincidence. Rather, he thought they were specially made and now deliberately distributed 'to make the soldiers believe they should fight in defence of the faith'.  
For a photograph of the badge, said to be worn by Sir Robert Constable during the Pilgrimage and now preserved at Everingham, Yorkshire, see the frontispiece of E. Rose-Troup's, The Western Rebellion of 1549 (London, 1913). Appendix A. of the same work provides a discussion of the symbol.
36. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 393.
37. Ibid, 393.
38. Ibid, 29.
39. Ibid, vol XI, 909.
40. Ibid, vol XII (1), 6.
41. C.S.L. Davies. 'Popular Religion', p 61 n.8. Pilgrimage of Grace, vol I, pp 261-2, 264 also provides a discussion of the size of the Pilgrim army.
42. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 902.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid. '1. That the faith might be truly obtained.  
2. That the ancient liberties of the church

might be maintained.

3. That unpopular statutes might be repealed and that the law might stand as it did at the beginning of the King's reign "when his nobles did order under his highness".
  4. That "villein blood" might be expelled from Council and noble blood restored.
  5. That Cromwell, Riche and heretic bishops might be deprived and banished or otherwise punished as subverters of the laws of God and the Commonwealth'.
45. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol I, p 288. N.B. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 1017 in which Sir Brian Hastings reported to Suffolk as early as the 8th November that 'the false rebels Lord Darcy, Aske and Sir Robert Constable have made posts from Hull by Tempyll Hurst, York and Durham, to Newcastle, to prepare new money, that any soldier may, if needful, have 20 s in his purse'. This seems to indicate either that the Newcastle city authorities were playing a careful game of deception with the government or that the ruling obligarchy had not established effective control over the rebellious elements in the city.
46. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 955 (the pardon), 1155. The latter indicates the extent and organisation of the command structure established by the time of the York conference.
47. Ibid, 946. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol I, chs. 14 and 15 for the Council of Pontefract and the 'Articles'.
48. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 6.
49. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol II, p 24.
50. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 1294.
51. Ibid, 1371.
52. Ibid, 1276.
53. Ibid, vol XII (1), 50, 201.
54. Ibid, 11.
55. Ibid, 64, 67, 201. see Dodds, Pilgrimage of

Grace, vol II, ch. 17 for Hallam and Bigod's rising. For Sir Francis Bigod, see Dickens 'Secular and Religious Motivation', pp 49-50. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 259, a letter from Sadler, one of Cromwell's agents, to his master on 28th January, provides an important indication of popular fears: 'the country between York and Newcastle was reported to be very wild: but he found men in the Bishopric very desirous of quiet, except those who had nothing of their own and might gain of robbery. Yet there was some stir in the Bishopric, and only two or three days before his coming, musters made in Cleveland by bills and scrolls set on posts and church doors, suggesting that Norfolk came down with a great army and to hang and draw, from Doncaster to Berwick, notwithstanding the King's pardon, so the people of the north would be in worst case than the Lincolnshire men'.

56. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 201.
57. Ibid. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol II, pp 61-66.
58. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 148.
59. Ibid, 362.
60. See below pp 48-50.
61. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol II, p 80. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1) 138.
62. Ibid, 1083. For Bulmer's part in the Pilgrimage and his later attainder and execution, see M.A. Bulmer Hobson, 'Bulmer Family Chronicle: from before 1050 to 1936' (1937), pp 103-116. PRO:Durh 3/77/1/.
63. Victoria County History, vol II, p 32. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 155-58. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 666, 651, 615, 594.
64. Ibid 918, 478. The sixteen executed were John Hall, Thomas Blunt, William Sumerthwayte, Thomas Hulton, John Follanslye, Henry Brass, Michael Swayne, Leonard Atkinson, Denyse Hedelye, Henry

- Hindemarshe, John Conyers, James Hunter, Christopher Newton, Roland Stobbes, Christopher Sowbye and Martyn Clyver. Significantly, the first two named were both cooks in the Abbey, while Sumerthwayte was a cathedral porter.
65. Ibid, 1035 (also vol. XI, 805, 1080 for other instances of disrespect to the clergy).
  66. Elton, 'Politics', p.183.
  67. Hoyle 'Thomas Master's Narrative', no.29. see also Letters and Papers, vol XII (1) 1186.
  68. e.g. James, Lineage, p 46. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace, vol I, p 204.
  69. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 945.
  70. Hoyle 'Thomas Master's Narrative', no. 31.
  71. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 919.
  72. Ibid, 29.
  73. James, Lineage, p 44, Scarisbrick, Henry VIII pp 121, 364. Smith, West Riding, pp 173-4.
  74. Letters and Papers, vol IV, 1510.
  75. Ibid, vol XII (1), 1269. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace p 208.
  76. Letters and Papers, vol VII, 1082, vol XI, 178.
  77. Ibid, vol III (2), 2875 No. VIII. PRO:Durh 3/77/1. James, Lineage, p 45.
  78. Letters and Papers, vol XII (1), 901 (p 404).
  79. Bowes was a master of requests, Tempest a serjeant-at-law and Aske a lawyer at Gray's Inn. M.E. James, 'English Politics and the Concept of Honour' in Society, Politics and Culture, p 350.
  80. Letters and Papers, vol. XII (1), 6.
  81. Ibid, 945.
  82. James, 'Concept of Honour', pp 350-2. Letters and Papers, vol VIII, 1. Northumberland had made an approach to Chapuys to sound out the possibility of the Emperor's help for a revolt as early as January 1535.
  83. Ibid, vol XII (1), 1022.
  84. 27 Hen. VIII c. 24.
  85. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 1246.

86. Ibid, 1244.
87. Ibid, vol x, 515-6. T. Fordyce, The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, vol I (1785-94) p 64. D. Hay, 'The Dissolution of the Monasteries in the Diocese of Durham'. Archaeologia Aeliana, 4th series (1938) pp 93-99.
88. Letters and Papers, vol x, 364, 515-6.
89. Victoria County History, vol II, p 31. Two fragments of Reformation stanzas suggest perhaps that not all members of the clergy were disheartened by the prospect of redundancy. 'The Prior of Finkale has got a fair wife,  
And every Monk will soon have one'.  
'I'll be no more a Nun, Nun, Nun,  
I'll be no more a Nun,  
But I'll be a wife, and lead a merry life,  
And brew good ale by the Tun, Tun, Tun!'  
C, Sharp, The Bishopric Garland, or A Collection of Legends, Songs, Ballads etc Belonging to the County of Durham (1834) p 37. J. Raine (ed.) Priory of Finchale. Surtees Society, vol VI (1837) pp xxxi-ii. The last Prior of Finchale was William Bennett, who afterwards became prebendary of the 4th stall in the new cathedral chapter.
90. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 503.
91. Ibid, vol XII (1) 6, 900, 901, 945. Haigh, Lancashire Monasteries, p 55. Like Aske, who pointed out the loss caused by the withdrawal of 'hospitality now in those places kept' (particularly for 'strangers and baggers of corn'), the author of the Rites recalled how the priory at Durham 'offered entertainment to all states, both noble and gentle, and what degree so ever, that came thither as strangers, their entertainment not being inferior to any place in England, both for the goodness of the diet, the sweet and dainty furniture of their lodgings, and generally all things necessary for travellers ..... the Benevolence thereof with the relief and alms of the

whole convent was always open and free not only to the poor of the City of Durham but to all the poor people of the county besides'. Rites, pp 88-91.

92. N.B. English Historical Review, vol V (1890), pp 344-5 for the ballad, thought to have been composed in Lancashire by the monks of Sawley Abbey.

x	Alacke! Alacke!	xi	For ther they hadde
	For the church sake		Baith ale and breyde,
	Pore comons wake		At tyme of nede,
	And no marvell!		And succer grete
	For clere it is		In all distress
	The decay of this		And hevyness
	How the pore shall rys		And wel intrete.
	No tong can tell.		

93. 'Dialogue of "Plain Truth and Blind Ignorance"'. Percy's Ballads, No. 275. Quoted in Surtees, Durham, vol I, p 67.

94. Letters and Papers, vol x, 182. Elton 'Politics', p 202. Dickens, 'Secular and Religious Motivation', pp 51, 59-61.

95. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 1 ff. Fletcher, Tudor Rebellions, p 36.

96. CSL.Davies, 'Popular Religion', pp 68-74. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 768, 968, 1047.

97. Ibid, vol. XII (1) 6.

98. Ibid, vol XI, 1047, 1371. Vol XII, 918, 478 and above n. 64. Fletcher, Tudor Rebellions, pp 69-70.

99. Elton, 'Politics', pp 193-4, 207-14. C.S.L. Davies, 'Popular Religion', Appendix pp 89-91.

100. Letters and Papers, vol VII, 1206, vol. VIII, 1.

101. N.B. Milner and Benham, Records of the Lumleys, pp 32-48, which reveals that George Lumley went 'at Sir Thomas Percyes Commandment ..... to Sainct Saviors of Newburgh/to Bylande/Revieulx/Whitby/Malton, and Kirkeham and sent one John Lambert his servant to Maintgrave/Birlington and Guysborough: to move the Abbots or priors and two monks of every of those houses with the best crosse to come forwards in their best arraye ..... and all they answered that they could not come

theymsel/ but they had and wolde send theym all they furtherance and ayde they coulde and saith that there were sent afore that a certain of their brethren to the rest of the rebels at yorke out of every house'.

102. James, 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body', passim.

103. N.Z. Davis, 'Tasks and Themes in the Study of Popular Religion', pp 307-33.

104. Ibid.

105. Fletcher, Tudor Rebellions, p 106. Letters and Papers, vol XI, 705(4).

'Ye shall not enter into this our Pilgrimage of Grace for the Commonwealth, but only for the love that ye do bear unto Almighty God his faith, and the Holy Church militant and the maintenance thereof, to the preservation of the King's person and his issue, to the purifying of the nobility, and to expulse all villein blood and evil counsellors against the commonwealth from his Grace and his Privy Council of the same. And that ye shall not enter into our said Pilgrimage for no particular profit to yourself, nor to do any displeasure to any private person, but by counsel of the Commonwealth, nor stay nor murder for no envy, but in your hearts put away fear and dread, and take afore you the Cross of Christ, and in your hearts His faith, the Restitution of the Church, the suppression of these Heretics and their opinions, by all the holy contents of this book'.

Aske devised the oath on 17th November at York, where it was subsequently administered to all the pilgrims.

106. Milner and Benham, Records of the Lumleys, 28. CRO: D/SA/D 1249, D/CG 17/1, 19/9 and below ch. 5.

107. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (2) 353. 'The saying of Cuthbert Richardson of Durham afore my lord of Westmoreland touching the reckless words spoken by Sir John Pearson, priest of Corpus Christi guild within Durham on 27th July 29. Henry VIII. The accused came to a butcher's stall in Durham named Richard Dawson, and in presence of the aforesaid Cuthbert and Richard said he could tell them news. And being asked what news, said that King and his

Council had advised that every gentleman who was at  
Doncaster road in the time of the commotion should  
pay a years rent of his lands to the King, every  
yeoman 100 s and every commoner that sent forth a  
man as much as they gave at the man's setting  
forth'.

CHAPTER 3: Notes and References

1. Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, (ed.) W.H. Frere and W.M. Kennedy. Alcuin Club (1810) vol II, pp 1-11. And see above pp 10-12. Sheils, English Reformation, pp 17-24, 31-35.
2. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (1), 119.
3. Ibid, vol x, 594.
4. Ibid, vol ix, 491.
5. Ibid, vol x, 182, 183. In the latter, Layton added 'Would to God ye would send for the bishop of Durham and hear his advice for the utter extirpation of the said power, and how it might be extinguished for ever'. A month later, on Quinquagesima Sunday (February 27th, 1536) Tunstal preached at St. Paul's Cross in defence of the supremacy.
6. Ibid, 172.
7. E. Hall, The Triumphant Reign of King Henry VIII, (ed.) C. Whibley, vol II, p 269.
8. Rites, pp 102-3. Raine, St. Cuthbert, p 174. Also see R. Hegg, The Legend of St. Cuthbert, or the Historie of His Churches at Lindisfarne, Cunecasestre and Dunholm (1663, reprinted 1777-9) pp 27-8. 'It is to be remembered, that in the time of King Henry the Eight, the Sepulcre of St. Cuthbert, by certaine commissioners of the said King, was opened, and the Holy Corpes of St. Cuthbert, with all things about the same, was found incorrupted, whole, sweete, odiferous and flexible, the same was taken up, carryed into the Refectorie, viewed, touched and searched by sundry persons, both of the clergie and others, and afterwards laid in a new coffin of Wood, of which Premisses, many eye witnesses were of very late, and some are yet living'.
9. Ibid, pp 172-83. Victoria County History, vol I, p 251. Durham Account Rolls, vol III, pp 720-1, 741-3. On January 1st 1542 George Skeles was paid 15d

for two and a half days 'circa facturam putei S. Cuthberti'.

10. Surtees, Durham, vol I, p 352. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (1), 119, 1313.
11. Ibid (2), 750.
12. Elton, Policy and Police, pp 171 ff.
13. Ibid, pp 231-2. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 1-11.
14. Letters and Papers, vol. XIII (2), 953. Bernard Gilpin, A Sermon Preached in the Court at Greenwich, before King Edward the Sixth, the first Sunday after the Epiphany, Anno Domini 1552, p 25.
15. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 577 e.g. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p 32.
16. Letters and Papers, vol XIV (2) App. 7.
17. Ibid, vol X, 1141.
18. Ibid, vol XIV (2), 750.
19. Ibid, vol XII (2), 1181.
20. Elton, Policy and Police, pp 333-5.
21. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', pp 51-52. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp xi-xxxv.
22. Ibid, p xxv.
23. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (2), App. 7.
24. 27 Hen. VIII c.24. Lapsley, County Palatine, pp 196-8.
25. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (1), 757, 834.
26. Ibid, vol XII (1) 98, (2) 913-5, vol XIII (1) 1269. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 151, 154-5.
27. Ibid, pp 155-8. Letters and Papers, vol. XII (2) 741, vol XIII (2) 1010, vol XVIII (1) 800.
28. Ibid, vol XII (2) 229.
29. Ibid, vol XIII (1) 757. Dodds, Pilgrimage of Grace pp 271-2.
30. James, Lineage, pp 41-50.
31. Letters and Papers, vol XII (2) 651.
32. Ibid, vol XVII, 910, 650, 703, vol XVIII (1) 695, (2) 195, 236, vol XIX (1) 931, vol XX (1) 155, 272, 306, 456, 910, Lapsley, County Palatine, p 309.
33. Elton, Policy and Police, p 392.

34. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (1) 533.
35. Haigh, Reformation and Resistance, pp 109-110.
36. Elton, Policy and Police, p 396. Letters and Papers, vol XII (2) 741, vol XIII (1), 107, 705.
37. PRO:Durh 3/77/1. The Durham Nevilles seem to have played no overt part in the conspiracy led by Sir John Neville in Yorkshire in April 1541. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p 365.
38. Letters and Papers, vol XIII, 107.
39. Elton, Policy and Police, p 309.
40. The subject is dealt with fully by Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 1-227, Denys Hay 'The Dissolution of the Monasteries in the diocese of Durham'. Archaeologia Aeliana, 4th Series (1938) pp 69-114 and D. Marcombe, 'The Durham dean and chapter: old abbey writ large?' in R. O'Day and R. Heal, Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church in England, 1500-1642 (1976) pp 125-144.
41. Letters and Papers, vol x, 515-6. Hay, 'Dissolution of the Monasteries', pp 93-99.
42. Ibid. PRO:Durh 3/77/1. Letters and Papers, vol XII (2) 320, 323, 325.
43. Ibid XIV (2) 772. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 73, 92. W. Hutchison, History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, vol II (1823) p 142. The inspeximus of surrender made to Hugh Whitehead is contained in Collectanea Ad Statum Civilem et Ecclesiasticum Comitatus Dunelmensis, (ed.) G. Allan (1774-8), unpagged.
44. PRO:Durh 3/77/1. Hay, 'Dissolution of the Monasteries', pp 98-99. Marcombe, 'Durham Chapter', p 127. It also placed Tunstal in a more effective bargaining position. In November 1537, for instance, he appealed successfully to Cromwell on behalf of two cantarist-schoolmasters in Durham (formerly paid by Jervaulx Abbey), asking that they receive pensions from the Court of Augmentations. A. Kreider, English Chanties (1979), p 128.

45. Marcombe, 'Durham Chapter', pp 126-7. Greenslade, 'The Last Monks', pp 107-113. Letters and Papers, vol XVI, 421-2, 826-7, 878, 1493. See Hay, 'Dissolution of the Monasteries', pp 101-110 for the rapidity with which the ex-religious were absorbed into the parishes of the county. Of the fifty-four Durham monks (including those from the priory's cells) only five were simply pensioned off by the Court of Augmentations.
46. Statutes of the Cathedral Church of Durham, (ed.) A. Hamilton Thompson. Surtees Society, vol CXLIII (1929), pp 3-5.
47. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 145. Marcombe, 'Durham Chapter', pp 131-136. The patronage of the prebends was granted to Tunstal by May in February 1557. See Collectanea . . . . Dunelmensis, and below ch. 4.
48. Durham Account Rolls, vol II, pp 720-1, 727.
49. Quoted Marcombe, 'Durham Chapter', p 129.
50. Durham Statutes, pp 14-63. Letters and Papers, vol XVI, 421-2. Surtees, Durham, vol. 1 p 69. Henry restored all the possessions of the priory except those attached to the subordinate Priory of Finchale and the cells of Wearmouth, Jarrow, Lytham and Stamford.
51. Valor Ecclesiasticus. Temp. Henr. VIII. Auctoritate Regia Institutis, (ed.) J. Caley and J. Hunter, vol V (1810) pp 299-326.
52. Hay, 'Dissolution of the Monasteries', pp 99-101. Durham Household Book, passim.
53. Wills, vol. I, p 309. Surtees, Durham, vol III, p 64. Ann Forster 'Bishop Tunstal's Priests'. Recusant History, vol. IX, No 4 (Jan 1964) pp 175-204. In Northumberland, Robert Selby was also vicar of Norham from 1537-1567; Raine North Durham, pp 262-3.
54. Durham Depositions, p 175.
55. Visitation Articles, vol I, p 121. Letters and Papers, vol X, 364. The Royal Visitation of 1559

- (ed.) C.J. Whiting. Surtees Society, vol. CLXXXVII (1974), pp xiii-xiv.
56. Ibid, pp xiv-xv.
57. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 74-5 (nos 161, 164) Surtees, Durham, vol III, p 158.
58. Letters and Papers, vol XIV (2) 684, 723-4, 748-50, vol XV 31-2, 125, 131, 136, 160, 175, 191, 198, 748.
59. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p xxv.
60. Letters and Papers, vol XIII (2) 191. Collectanea . . . . Dunelmensis.
61. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp xx, 77, 87 (nos 184, 245).
62. Ibid, pp 78-82, 87-89.
63. Wills, vol I, p 187, vol III, p 132.
64. Ibid, vol I, pp 309, 187.
65. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 101, 133, 136, 384
- Significantly, all these oaths were registered either during Edward's or Elizabeth's reign.
66. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 35-36.
67. Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 3.
68. Wilson, Reformation Changes, ch. 10.
69. Visitation Articles, vol III, pp 3, 280.
70. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 600 n. 1 lists the eighteen examples.
71. Inventories of Church Goods, (ed.) W. Page, Surtees Society, vol ICVII (1896) pp 141-46. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. V, pp li-lviii.
72. Visitation of 1559, pp xiv-xv. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 133-5. Visitation Articles, pp 44-52. Durham Account Rolls, vol III p 726.
73. Letters and Papers, vol XIV (2), App. 6.
74. Ibid (1), 897, (2), 301, 796.
75. Wills, vol I, pp 113-128, vol III, pp 1-5.
76. Visitation Articles, vol II, p 6 n.
77. Wills, vol I, p 121.
78. Ibid, vol III p 1. For similar provisions see p 1

(1543/4), p 4 (1545), p 5 (1547) and vol III, p 118 (1541), p 121 (1554), p 122 (1545), p 124 (1546).

79. Ibid, vol I, p 118.
80. Ibid, vol III, p 5. See also p 5 (1545), vol I, p 113 (1545), p 118 (1543) for other examples.
81. Ibid, vol III, pp 4-5.
82. Ibid, vol I, pp 117-8.

#### CHAPTER 4: Notes and References

1. See the works of the 'slow Reformation' school on Lancashire, Sussex, the Borders etc. cited in the introduction.
2. Visitation Articles, vol I, pp 134ff, vol II, pp 114ff.
3. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 89-91.
4. Visitation of 1559, pp xv-xvi.
5. Kreider, English Chantries, pp 186-210.  
Scarbrick, English People, pp 65-68.  
1. Edward VI c.14. It appears that the Act did not include guilds and chantries whose lands were held copyhold, such as the guild of St. Giles, Durham. Thus the latter was still described as existing in the episcopal records of 1575-77 ("St. Giles Gilde in St. Giles Churche vii l. iiii s. ii d."). Memorials of St. Giles, Durham, (ed.) Rev. J. Barmby. Surtees Society, vol xlv (1895) pp xxxv-xxxvi. see also CRO:D/Sa/D 1248 for a royal lease of 21 years to the Earl of Westmoreland (granted in 1549) of the 'Chantry of Jesu' in Brancepeth, with its lands in Staindrop, Bishop Auckland and Ovington.
6. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. III, pp lxx-xxvii.
7. D.M. Loades, 'The Collegiate Churches of Durham at the Time of the Dissolution', in G.J. Cuming (ed.) Studies in Church History, vol IV (Leiden, 1967), pp 65-75.
8. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', p 197.
9. Loades, 'Collegiate Churches', p 74.
10. M. Thomas, 'Tunstal - Trimmer or Martyr'. Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol xxiv, No. 4 (1973), p 342.
11. Acts of the Privy Council of England, (ed.) J.R. Dasent (1890) vol 2, pp 7, 8, 12, 14, 28-9, 34, 38, 62, 70, 406, 475, 515. Tunstal seems to have stopped playing an active role on the Council after 21st March 1547. Up to that point he had

been busy acting as an executor of Henry's will. He was not to reappear until December 1549 and then early the following year (ibid pp 3, 364, 367, 372, 377).

12. D. Hoak, 'Rehabilitating the Duke of Northumberland: Policies and Political Control, 1549-53' in J. Loach and R. Tittler (eds.) The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540-1560 (1980) p 47.
13. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 281-84
14. Ibid, pp 284-5. Surtees, Durham, vol I, pp 70-71. D.M. Loades, 'The Last Years of Cuthbert Tunstal, 1547-1559', Durham University Journal, vol LXVI (1973) pp 10-21.
15. Ibid, pp 13-17. H. Trevor-Roper, 'The Bishopric of Durham and the Capitalist Reformation', Durham University Journal, vol. xxxvii (1945-6) pp 45ff, Sturge, Tunstal, pp 285-96.
16. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth and James I (1547-1625), (ed.) R. Lemon and M.A.E. Green (1856-72), vol 1, p 33. Privy Council Acts, vol 3, pp 381, 407. Acts and Monuments, vol V, p 704, vol VI, pp 124, 126, 137, 188-90.
17. PRO:SP 10/13/49. Cal. State Papers, vol 1, p 47. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 291-2. Privy Council Acts, vol 4, p 127.
18. Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of it, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I, by John Strype (1822) vol II (2), pp 66, 236, vol III (1) p 44. Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward VI (1924-9), vol V, p 175. Surtees, Durham, vol I, p 70. 7. Edward VI c.10, c.12. The act dissolving the diocese claimed a religious as well as administrative purpose, describing itself in the preamble as a bill for 'suppressing the Bishopric of Durham ..... for the better preaching of God's Holy Word in those parts, which for lack of good preaching and learning, were grown wild and

barbarous'.

19. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp xi-xiv, xvi-xxvii. Privy Council Acts, vol 4, p 191. Significantly, the winding-up operation was in the hands of the conservative Chancellor Dr Hindmer (head of the see's administration) who was ordered by the Privy Council to go to Durham and 'gather in to his handes suche rentes and arrearages as remayneth unpayed due to the See of Durham, and with part thereof to satisfy the late Bysshopes' servaintes there of theyr fees'.
20. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', p 40. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 118-22. It should be pointed out that the literary English of the new services was probably no more comprehensible to Durham people (who used a broad variety of Northumbrian dialects and accents in the sixteenth century) than the Latin of the old services. There was, for instance, even a marked difference between the dialects of Lower and Upper Weardale. Boyle, Durham County, p 122. Stranks, Sumptous Church, p 42.
21. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, App. VI, pp lix-lxxvi.
22. Inventories of Church Goods, (ed.) W. Page. Surtees Society, vol IC (1896) pp ix-xviii. The only extant evidence for any such early spoliation (before 1551) in the Rites, (pp 69, 104), states that 'in the first yeare of King Edward the 6th ther was certaine commissioners apoynted ..... whose names were Doctor Harvey and Doctor Whitby, who did deface a goodly and rich shrine in St. Nicholas' churche ..... with many other ornamentt'.
23. Privy Council Acts, vol 3, p 480. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 122-3.
24. Rites, pp 68-9, 76-77.
25. Inventories, pp 141-46. There may also have been an earlier attempt to prevent some of the

cathedrals more valuable possessions being removed to London. On 11th May 1550, Hilton and Sir Robert Bowes reported to the Privy Council that a large amount of treasure had been deposited in the dean's chamber, although there are no clues as to subsequent events. Stranks, Sumptuous Church, p 42 n. 2.

26. Inventories, p xvi, 141.
27. Scarisbrick, English People, p 87 and n.
28. Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 21. Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 58-59.
29. The Works of James Pilkington, BD, Lord Bishop of Durham, (ed.) J. Scholefield. Parker Society (1842) pp 177, 563.
30. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 114-30.
31. For baptism see Bossy, Christianity in the West, pp 14-19, 115-118 and Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 63-4 n. 16, 17.
32. W. Henderson, Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties (1879) pp 12-16. Boyle, County Durham, p 132. N.W. Apperley 'Folklore of the County of Durham', in Leighton, Memorials, pp 44-64.
33. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 114-130.
34. Ibid p 175, vol III, p 271. Luxton, 'Popular Culture', p 70.
35. James, 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body', p 47.
36. Ibid, pp 38-48.
37. Phythian-Adams, 'Ceremony and the Citizen', pp 106, 122-3.
38. See above ch. 1.
39. Scriptores Tres, pp ccccxxx-ccccxxxi. Visitation Articles, vol II, p 126. Durham Depositions, p 172.
40. Henderson, Folk-Lore, p 86. Henry Bourne, Antiquities Vulgares: or the Antiquities of the Common People (1725) ..... printed in Observations on Popular Antiquities, by John Brand (1810). pp 90, 95, 255-6, see also pp 262-66 for the continued practice in the eighteenth century of

carrying palms on Palm Sunday processions in Newcastle, 'a relick of the ancient Superstition of the Papists'.

41. Surtees, Durham, vol IV, pp 22-3. For the wider urban social changes leading to the decline of Corpus Christi see James, 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body', esp. pp 44-47.
42. Rites, p 41.
43. M.H. Dodds, 'The Northern Stage'. Archeologia Aeliana, 3rd series, vol VI (1914) p 36. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, 413. J. Brand, History and Antiquities of Newcastle upon Tyne (1789) vol II, pp 359, 370-1. Also Henderson, Folk-Lore, pp 86-7 who records that the procession of the trades companies in Durham on Corpus Christi day continued in an entirely secular mutilated form until c. 1800.
44. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 122, 145. Privy Council Acts, vol 3, p 480 Cal. Pat Rolls Edward, vol 3, p 293. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p 95.
45. Gilpin, Court Sermon, pp 6-7. Carleton, Life of Gilpin p 419. Marcombe, 'Bernard Gilpin', pp 24-5.
46. Victoria County History, vol II, p 33. Visitation of 1559, pp xv-xvi. Nor, conversely, is there any evidence of popular involvement with the destruction of images and stained glass (as took place in London and Essex in 1548) or of spontaneous hostility to the ritual observances of the medieval church (as occurred in Gloucestershire and London). Palliser 'Popular Reactions', p 40. Luxton, 'Popular Culture', p 70. See J. Phillips, The Reformation of Images: Destruction of art in England, 1535-1660 (1973) for an attempt to 'see iconochasm in the terms that its perpetrators comprehended'.
47. Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549, (ed.) N. Pocock. Camden Society, New Series, vol

xxxviii (1883-4) passim. N.B. p 43 for the proclamation issued to all JPs in July 1549 to be in readiness for the suppression of any rising. Also see Visitation Articles, vol II, p 190 for Hooper's description of the way the first Prayer Book was used, even in the south. In December 1549 he informed Bullinger that 'the public celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the order and institution of our Lord. Although it is administered in both kinds, yet in some places the supper is celebrated three times a day. When they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the Mass of the Apostles, they now have the Communion of the Apostles ..... They still retain their vestments and candles before the altar ..... that Popery may not be lost, the Mass-Priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the papacy'.

48. Rites, pp 68-9, 75-7. Marcombe, 'Durham Chapter', p 127. Forster's, 'Tunstal Priests', pp 181-3.
49. Privy Council Acts, vol 43, pp 277, 314, 326, 381, 406, 410.
50. See below n.
51. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 87-102.
52. Ibid, pp 94-5. Brand, Newcastle, vol I, p 304.
53. Durham Depositions, pp 54-58. Sp. Cal, vol x, p 166. Loades 'Last Years', p 12.
54. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 78-120. For the rest of Edward's reign, it appears that as vacancies occurred they were either filled by the lay patrons of cures (or occasionally left vacant), while those formerly in the gift of the monasteries were filled by the Crown.
55. Ibid, pp 87-89. Wills, vol I, pp 366-67.
56. Durham Depositions, pp 159-60, 199.
57. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 101-2,

133-4.

58. Ibid, p 104. Wills, vol II, pp 64-6. Surtees, Durham, vol III, p 86. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 587.
59. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 122-3.
60. See above ch. 3. Visitation of 1559, pp 71-73. Apart from installing bibles, there was also the problem of removing the 'old books of the church'. Thus Edward wrote to the bishops in 1549 ordering the Dean, Prebendaries, Vicars, Curates and churchwardens 'of every Parish within your Diocesses, to bring and deliver ..... at such convenient place as ye shall appoint, all Antiphones, Missalles, grayles, Processionalls ..... and all other Books of service the keeping whereof should be a lett to the using of the said book of common prayers'. That these instructions were carried out, at least in the cathedral (probably by Dean Horn after 1551), is revealed by the reference at n. below. The 1549 Troubles, pp 127-9.
61. Gilpin, Court Sermon, pp 17-25. The Durham preacher also identified two particular institutional problems 'which by spoile and robberies doe hide the Gospel ..... First of all the dispensations of Non-residents have brought forth farming of benefices to gentlemen, lay men, wherein they have found such sweetnesse and worldly wealth, that Preachers cannot have them ..... which hath opened a gap for the Heathen ..... (secondly) the cruel Philistines abroad, enemies to Christ's Gospell, have stopped up the strings of faithfull Abraham ..... looke upon the two welles of this Realme, Oxforde and Cambridge, they are almost dried up ..... the decaye of students is so great (that) in seven yeares more, there shall be almost none at all, then may the Divell make a triumph'.
62. The 1549 Troubles, p 136. Privy Council Acts, vol

2, p 378. 'Letters several to the Bishop of Duresme and Ely to appoint in their several dioceses their chaplains and such persons and curates within the same dioceses to preach as by their discretions they shall think meet, the Proclamations and restraints notwithstanding'. This suggests that Tunstal was still trusted by the Council, even at this late stage.

63. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, pp 400-401. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', p 41. Surtees, Durham, vol I, p 167. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p xxv. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, pp 287-9.
64. Wills, vol I, pp 125-41, vol III, pp 5-10.
65. Ibid, vol I, p 135.
66. Ibid, pp 140-1.
67. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, p 281. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', p 186, 199.
68. Wills, vol I, p 130, vol III, p 7.
69. Acts and Monuments, pp 389, 557. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 130-2. Durham Account Rolls, vol III, pp 730-1. 'Expenses maid the day that the proclamac'on and bonefyres war maid for the Recevyng of the Pope in this Realm agayn as folowith. First paid for Three potelles of wyn in Doctor Watson's chamer, xij d . . . . Two gallons of Ayle . . . . It'm paid for two mynstralles viii d'. This positive enthusiasm for the restoration was matched elsewhere in the north, in Lancashire and Yorkshire. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', p 43.
70. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', App. III, IV.
71. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 292, 297. Victoria County History, vol II, pp 33-5. Thomas, 'Trimmer or Martyr', p 346.
72. I Mary c. 2.
73. Cal. Pat Rolls, Mary, vol 1, pp 377-8. Sturge, Tunstal, p 298.
74. Surtees, Durham, vol II, pp 111-12. The lease is contained in Collectanea . . . . Dunelmensis, (dated 28th May 1554).

75. Privy Council Acts, vol 4, App. I, p 423. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 301-5. R.H. Pogson, 'The Legacy of the Schism: Confusion, Continuity and Change in the Marian Clergy' in Mid-Tudor Polity, p 123 points out that Tunstal was on close terms with Pole, and that the Durham bishop probably played some part in the London synod of 1555, which drew up the twelve influential reforming deveses.
76. Loades, 'Last Years', p 20. State Papers, Foreign vol II, p 107.
77. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 309-12.
78. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p xxxiii. Also Collectanea . . . . . Dunelmensis, for the grant of the prebends.
79. Privy Council Acts, vol 5, pp 153-4. These included 'causing a Proclamation to be made in the parishe churches for repressing of the same booke'. The following year, in 1556, Tunstal, Dr Hindmer (the chancellor) and Sir Robert Brandling were also instructed by the Privy Council to examine a witness 'of the profe of such matter as is comprised in a book recently sent unto them'. Ibid, vol 6, p 65.
80. Ibid, vol 5, pp 148, 166, vol 6, pp 72, 77, 79, 80, 87, 261-2, vol 7, pp 39, 42-3, Cal. State Papers, vol 6, pp 452, 456, Scot. Cal vol I, pp 198-216.
81. Ibid, pp 198, 204. Cal. Pat Rolls, Mary, pp 39-40. Cal. State Papers, vol 6, pp 469-70, Privy Council Acts, vol 6, p 250. In so doing, Mary also helped establish a political link between the Nevilles and Spanish Crown that was to re-emerge a decade later in 1569. Due to the favours he received, Westmoreland apparently commented that 'as long as God shall preserve my master and mystrys togyther, I am and shalbe a Spanyard to the uttermost of my powre'.
82. Sturge, Tunstal, p 309.
83. Acts and Monuments, vol VI, pp 593-4, 646-7,

686-90, vol VII, p 22, Vol VIII, p 636. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p xxvii. Tunstal also saved Bernard Gilpin from persecution and prosecution in 1558. Having been appointed archdeacon of Durham and rector of Easington by the bishop in 1557, Gilpin preached an extensive series of sermons at Newcastle in favour of clerical marriage, achieving salvation through Christ alone and against pluralism and non-residence. As a result he admitted (in a later letter of his brother George in 1575) that he had 'procured to my selfe many and heavy enemies thereby, for I had preached against plurality of benefices and non-residency ..... others were much displeased with me for that I had preached repentance and salvation by Christ. They laid to my charge that I did not make whole sermons about transubstantiation, purgatory, holy water, the worshipping to images, the invocation of saints and the like'. Eventually he was denounced as a 'heretick' by John Tunstal (rector of Houghton-le-Skerne) but 'the bishop could not indure to shed blood, and therefore dealt mildly with him and preserved him from the projects of his enemies'. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, pp 397, 415-6.

Marcombe, 'Bernard Gilpin', pp 24-27.

84. Durham Account Rolls, vol III, p 728.
85. Surtees, Durham, vol III, p 381. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p 103.
86. Wills, vol I, p 141.
87. Eyre, History of St Cuthbert, p 182.
88. J. Strype, Annals of the Reformation, and Establishment of Religion, and other Various Occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign, 4 vols (1824), vol II (2) pp 681-2 for Horne's Apology. Also see p 690, 'What would this unsatiabable bloodsucking hypocrite have cared, to have wrought my destruction, whom he took to be an enemy to his

- devilish devices? ..... he caused two noblemen to charge me with preaching, as he termed it; heresy ..... he himself accused me that I had infected the whole diocese with new learning ..... that I had brought a wife of mine own into that church'.
89. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 103-4, xxxiii-xxxv.
  90. Sturge, Tunstal, p 309, Durham Statutes, passim.
  91. *Ibid*, pp lii-lxi.
  92. *Ibid*, pp 105-15.
  93. *Ibid*, pp 175-77. Scriptores Tres, p cccclvi  
Visitation Articles, vol I, p 146, vol II, pp 412-14.
  94. Collectanea ..... Dunelmensis. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp xxxiii-xxxv. Marcombe, 'Durham chapter', pp 125-144 and see below ch.5.
  95. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', App. II. Wills, vol II, pp 64-66. Surtees, Durham, vol III, p 86. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 553. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', p 42. In London nearly one in three of the clergy were deprived for having married, in York one in ten, and in Lancashire one in twenty.
  96. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 104-5.
  97. *Ibid*, pp 105-121. Haigh, Reformation and Resistance, pp 195-208. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', App. IV.
  98. *Ibid*, pp 192-194 (and see below chs. 5 and epilogue).
  99. *Ibid*, App. III.
  100. The fifteen were Roland Blenkinsopp, Hugh Ile, Robert Pearson, William Ustayn, Roger Venys, George White, Bartholomew Bartley, John Foster, Richard Hartburn, Robert Leighton, William Melmerby, John Raymes, William Watson, Ralph Dacke, John Pearson. *Ibid*, App. III, IV, V passim.
  101. Durham Statutes, pp 87, 103, 108-9. The statutes also provided for the setting up of a cathedral grammar school, with two masters, eighteen

- scholars and a divinity reader.
102. Visitation Articles, vol II, pp 412-14. Quoted Sturge, Tunstal, p 264.
  103. Wills, vol I, pp 146 (1555), 155 (1557), 168, 172, 174, vol III, p 15 (1558).
  104. Ibid, vol I, p 148.
  105. Ibid, pp 141-180, vol III, pp 11-16 (see vol I, p 160 for the will of Richard Leigh).
  106. Ibid, pp 174-6, 141-2.
  107. Ibid, pp 156-159.
  108. Inventories, p xvi.
  109. Churchwarden Accounts of the Town of Ludlow in Shropshire, from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth (ed.) T. Wright. Camden Society, vol CII (1869-70) p 58.
  110. Scarisbrick, English People, p 88-108.
  111. Ibid, p 95 n. 2. Letters and Papers. vol XII (1) 481, vol XIII (2) 518.
  112. Inventories, pp xi-xiii.
  113. Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 42.
  114. Wills, vol I, pp 171-2.
  115. Durham Depositions, p 198. Pogson, 'Legacy of the Schism', pp 120, 132. Ludlow Churchwarden Accounts, pp 52-55.
  116. e.g. Ibid, pp 52-59, 93-94. In 1553-4, for instance, 2s.6d. were spent on a 'tonaculle to carry holly water', 4d. on the 'settynge up of the rood', 6d. on 'timber for the pascalle', 4d. for 'mendynge of the ffonte', 13d. 'for the hangynge of the pixe over the aulter' and 23s.4d. for the 'glasynge' and 'mendynge' of 'windowes'. Then in 1559-60, 6d. was paid to workmen 'for takynge downe the rowde', while 3s.4d. was given to 'Walter Bolde for iiiij dayes worke takynge downe of the auters'.
  117. CRO: EP/Pi (1558-1699), EP/Ry (1597-1638), EP/Ho (1595-1670). Durham Churchwarden Accounts pp i - xvii
  118. Haigh, Reformation and Resistance, p 144. Wills,

vol I, pp 141, 146, 155, 156, 161. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, p 128. Visitation of 1559, pp 71-73.

119. Durham Depositions, pp 129ff and see below ch. 6.

CHAPTER 5: Notes and References

1. James, Lineage, pp 51ff. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, p 417.
- 1a. C. Sharp, Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569 (1840), pp 5-9, 18, 20 and below ch. 6  
n.6. For rumours in other counties see Haigh, 'Catholics and the People', pp 196-7. In 1562, for instance, the Bishop of Carlisle said that 'every day men look for a change'. Quoted Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', p 44.
2. 1 Liz c.1 and c.2. Visitation of 1559, pp xvi-xvii.
3. Sturge, Tunstal, pp 318-9.
4. Sp.Cal, vol I, pp 89-90.
5. M. Thomas, 'Trimmer', pp 346-355.
6. Quoted Sturge, Tunstal, p 323. Visitation Articles, vol III, pp 1-7 (the Articles) and pp 10ff (the Injunctions).
7. *Ibid*, pp 323-7 and App. XX for Tunstal's will. State Papers, Foreign, vol II, 4, 423.
8. Visitation of 1559, pp xvi-xix.
9. 'You shall sweare that you shalbe faiythfull and obedient unto the Quene's Majestie, her heires and successors, and to the uttermost of your power undrestanding and learning you shall mainteign and set furth all statutes and lawes and the religion received by her Grace or her heires or successours and the Injunctions at this present time exhibited by her Grace, her officers or Commissaries, and that you shall make true presentment of all such thinges as arr to be presented in this visitacion, so helpe you God and by the contentes of the booke'. *Ibid*, App. II, p xxxii.
10. *Ibid*, pp 21-23 (f. 29r-31r). See pp xx-xxii for the visitation procedure and App. III, p xxii for the Table of Sessions. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', pp 192, 181, 182, 202.
11. *Ibid*, pp 181-202. Visitation of 1559, pp 23-26 (f. 32r-f. 36r).

12. Ibid, p 27 (f. 37r). Two days later, on the 25th September, at St. Nicholas Church, William Carter, archdeacon of Northumberland, also refused to subscribe to the articles and was deprived of his office, being confined to within ten miles of Thirsk. He was described as being 'not unlearned but very stubborn and to be considered'. He later arrived at the English College at Douai in 1571, where he spent his last years. Ibid, pp 28-29 (f. 39r). Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', p 189.
13. Victoria County History, vol II, p 35. See Visitation of 1559, pp 102-3 (f. 160r-f. 161r) for the list of absentees and pp 47-50 (f. 66r-f. 70r) for Rudd and Atkinson.
14. R. O'Day, 'The Reformation of the Ministry, 1558-1602' in O'Day and Heal, Continuity and Change, pp 55-75.
15. M.H. Curtis, Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, 1558-1642, (Oxford 1959) pp 3, 150 cited in P. Tyler, 'The Church Courts at York and Witchcraft Prosecutions, 1567-1640'. Northern History, vol IV (1969) p 95.
16. Quoted Marcombe, Dean and Chapter of Durham, pp 169-70.
17. Visitation of 1559, pp xxvi-xxx.
18. Visitation Articles, vol III, pp 1-7.
19. Visitation of 1559, pp 71-73 (f. 106r-f. 109r).
20. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 132-3. This unusual procedure was taken because of the vacancy of the archbishopric of York.
21. Ibid, p xiii. n 5.
22. Narratives of the Days of the Reformation, chiefly from the Manuscripts of John Foxe the Martyrologist, (ed.) J.G. Nichols. Camden Society, vol LXXVII (1860-1) p 50. Victoria County History, vol II, pp 34-5.
23. Cal. State Papers, vol I, p 149. PRO:SP 12/11/16. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, p 355.
24. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 133-7.

- Marcombe, Dean and Chapter of Durham, p 168.
25. Ibid, pp 169-71. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 143-5. Life of Mr William Whittingham, Dean of Durham (ed.) M.A.E. Green, Camden Society (Miscellany vol VI) New Series, vol CIV (1870-1), pp 9-10, 21, 26.
  26. Ibid, p 6. The only clues to the authorship of the life are that the writer was a student at the Temple in 1576, and that he wrote his account after 1595.
  27. Marcombe, Dean and Chapter of Durham, pp 111, 120, 245 ch 5, passim.
  28. Ibid, pp 20-5. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 167, 172.
  29. Tudor Parish Documents of the Diocese of York (ed.) J.S. Purvis (1948) pp 10-11 and see Visitation Articles, vol III, pp 30-48 to compare the tone of the Durham Injunctions with those issued for other visitations.
  30. Life of Whittingham, p 23 n. 1, 30.
  31. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 581.
  32. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, p 447.
  33. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp cv-cvi, cx-cxiv.
  34. Visitation Articles, pp 18-19.
  35. Wills, vol II, pp 8-11, 14-19 for the wills of Pilkington and Whittingham. The parochial clergy who married are listed in Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 587 n 1.
  36. The Works of James Pilkington, BD, Lord Bishop of Durham (ed.) J. Scholefield. Parker Society (1842) pp 658-662. Whittingham also wrote a protest letter to the Earl of Leicester in 1564, referring to the enforced use of 'old papish apparel' in similar terms. Life of Whittingham, p 21 n. The question, of course, was not whether 'Popish' chasubles etc should be retained, but whether the surplice should be worn instead of the black Genevan gown. Art. 12 of Archbishop

- Parker's Advertisements in 1566 enjoined that the Dean and prebendaries wear a surplice with silk hood in the choir, while Arts. 33 and 34 ordered the use of cap and gown in all services. Visitation Articles, vol III, pp 171-180.
37. The relevant extracts from the Ecclesiastical Commission Act Book are contained in Tudor Parish Docs., pp 153-155. Life of Whittingham p 22 and n 1.
  38. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p 165. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 452.
  39. Visitation Articles, vol III, p 293.
  40. Rites, pp 68-69, 60-1.
  41. Life of Whittingham, pp 32-33 n. 1.
  42. Rites, p 27.
  43. Pèter Draper, 'Architecture and Liturgy', in Age of Chivalry, pp 83-91. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 147-8. Some of this iconoclasm may have been carried out for financial rather than religious motives. Whittingham, for instance, was reported to have made a profit of £20 by taking down and selling the high leaden roof in the Frater-House or refectory and turning it into a flat roof instead. Since this accusation is only made by the author of the Rites, however, it might be received with some scepticism, since he clearly regarded Whittingham as the great enemy and philistine destroyer 'who could not abide anything that pertained to the monastic life'. Rites, pp 60-61. For the motives of the iconoclasts see J. Phillips, The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660 (1973).
  44. Life of Whittingham, p 23. The continuance of church music was also allowed by Art. 49 of the Royal Injunctions of 1559.
  45. That some of these items had been hidden by parishioners is suggested by the 1564 inventory of Margaret Cotton, a widow living in Gateshead,

which reveals that she had two vestments, two tunicles, two stoles and one alb (valued at 20s) hidden in her living room. Wills, vol I, p 223. Significantly, Art. 47 of the 1559 Injunctions had ordered churchwardens to deliver inventories of such vestments and capes (along with plate, grails and hymnals) to the visitors, while Art. 35 specifically enjoined 'that no persons keep in their houses any abused images, tables, pictures, paintings and other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry or superstition'. Visitation Articles, vol III, pp 10ff.

46. Quoted Sharp, Memorials p 377 n.
47. Durham Depositions, pp 118, 20. Wills, vol I, p 270.
48. Cal. Pat. Rolls, vol 4, p 248.
49. PRO:SP 12/20/5. Cal. State Papers, vol I, p 187.
50. PRO:SP 12/20/5. Cal. State Papers, vol I, p 188.
51. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', pp 175-204. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 143-5 and see below.
52. Victoria County History, vol II, pp 34-5. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 558.
53. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 146-7.
54. Quoted Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 589.
55. Cal. State Papers, vol 1, p 163. PRO:SP 12/14/45, 15/12/108. Welford Newcastle, vol II, p 402.
56. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, p 400. Victoria County History, vol II, pp 35-6.
57. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 145-8.
58. Ibid, pp xviii-xix.
59. Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 8.
60. D. Marcombe, 'Bernard Gilpin: Anatomy of an Elizabethan Legend' Northern History, vol XVI (1980) pp 20-39. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, pp 400-401. 'For the parsonages being in the possession of laymen, there remained not maintenance for a minister: for the laymen sought out for poore base priestes, who were onely able

to read prayers to the people morning and evening: nor did the one use to require, or they take great care to performe any more ..... this desolation of the church and ignorance of the common sort much troubled the holy heart of Mr Gilpin. He therefore purposed ..... to do his owne duty to the best of his endeavours ..... for in these quarters (i.e. Northumberland and Redesdale) the word of God was never to be preached amongst them but by Mr Gilpin's ministry ..... he got himselfe a great deale of estimation and respect amongst this people both by preaching and by distribution of monies to the poore in his journey'.

- 61. Works of Pilkington, p vii.
- 62. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, p 392.
- 63. J. Bossy, 'The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism' Past and Present, vol XXI, (1962) pp 39-59.
- 64. M.E. James, 'The Concept of Honour and the Northern Rising, 1569' in M.E. James (ed.) Society, Politics and Culture (1986) pp 16-47. For 'Lordship' and the 1569 rebellion see below ch. 6.
- 65. For the strength of conservative interests in Durham local government see below n. 106, 107. Victoria County History, pp 35-6. A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishop to the Privy Council in 1564 (ed.) M. Bateson. Camden Society (Miscellany vol IX) New Series, vol LIII (1895) pp 66-67.
- 66. Ibid.
- 67. J.A. Hilton, 'Catholicism in Elizabethan Northumberland', Northern History, vol. XIII (1977) p 45. Significantly, these Durham exiles must also have been in touch with those Marian bishops, including Scott, Goldwell, Cristopherson, Clynog and Pate, who had gathered at Louvain after refusing to accept the 1559 Settlement. Pogson, 'Legacy of the Schism', p 127.

68. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, pp 329, 394-5.  
Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', p 191.
69. These recusant connections between gentry and clergy/intellectuals are best revealed in the sureties for bonds given by the prebends who refused the oath in 1559. Visitation of 1559 pp 21-27.
70. Cal. State Papers, vol 6, pp 521-24. Marcombe, Dean and Chapter of Durham, pp 169-71.
71. Sharp, Memorials, pp 212-13.
72. Ibid pp 203-5 and see below ch. 6.
73. Durham Depositions, pp 118-20.
74. Ibid pp 111-12.
75. Ibid pp 93-94 and also pp 73-6, 94-5, 104 for other examples.
76. Tudor Parish Docs., p 86. The 1565/6 Ecclesiastical Commission Act Book reveals that five men actually 'plaied at the foote ball within this Cathedrall Church of York'. See also pp 82-86 for general instances of disorder reported to the Commission.
77. Works of Pilkington, p 6. Collinson, Religion of Protestants, p 203. Durham Depositions, p 64
78. Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 43.
79. Thomas, Decline of Magic, p 193. Gilpin had also noted in his 1552 sermon that 'ambition and greedy avarice have taught ministers to seeke and contend for livings, who might climbe the highest by utter contempt of their office' Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 8.
80. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, p 419.
81. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 64-5.
82. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp 81-91.
83. Sheils, 'Religion in Provincial Towns', pp 156-176.
84. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p xix.
85. Welford, Newcastle, vol II, pp 370-2, 374, 382-3, 396, 409.

86. A. Smith, The Corporation of Durham (1938) p 8. Life of Whittingham, p 23 n. 1, 30. Dobson has described the city before the charter as 'less indeed a coherent city than a bizarre and crablike geographical conjuncture of five separate burghal jurisdictions'. R.B. Dobson, 'Cathedral Chapters and Cathedral Cities: York, Durham and Carlisle in the Fifteenth Century' in Northern History, vol xix (1983) pp 32-3.
87. PRO:Durh 3/81/1. Zell, 'Will Preambles', pp 236-9. Heal, Continuity and Change, pp 26-8, 77-94 for the central role of the chancellor and registrar in diocesan administrations.
88. Wills, vol I, pp 180-312, vol II, pp 1-6, vol III, pp 16-48.
89. e.g. ibid vol I, p 235.
90. Ibid, pp 214-5. For the other examples see ibid, pp 194, 196-7, 211, 214, 217, 222, 242, 259, 262-3, 272, 284, 292, 294, 305, 307, 311.
91. Ibid pp 272-3.
92. See above pp 14-17. Zell, 'Will Preambles', pp 236-9.
93. Visitation Articles, vol III p 286. Thomas, Decline of Magic, p75.
94. Wills, vol I, p 186. Also p 214, 232.
95. Ibid, pp 186, 206, vol III p 18. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', p 197.
96. Ibid. Wills, vol II, p 26.
97. Ibid, vol I, p 256.
98. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, p 16.
99. Tyler, 'Witchcraft Prosecutions', p 90.
100. Apperley, 'Folklore of the County of Durham' in Leighton, Memorials, pp 44-64.
101. Brand, Popular Antiquities, pp 22-30. Henderson, Folk-lore, pp 55-57.
102. It seems, indeed, that for the government, recusancy in the 1560s was considered as a political and national problem to be treated by national measures and legislation. The Privy

Council's inquiry into the sympathies of JPs in October 1564, for instance, was carried out on a nationwide basis. See Letters from the Bishops, passim

103. PRO:SP 12/20/5. Cal. State Papers, vol I, p 187.
104. P. Tyler, 'The Significance of the Ecclesiastical Commission at York'. Northern History, vol II (1967) pp 36-40. 'Tudor conciliar government rested upon the leasing out of royal authority in return for minimum good authority in the provinces. The greatest contribution of the north was that it should not disturb the Tudor Crown's concern with affairs in the southern counties ..... the north knew "no other king, but a Percy" in terms of real power until the crushing 1569 rebellion'.
105. Durham Depositions, pp 58ff. The evidence is collected and discussed in P. Rushton, 'Women, Witchcraft and Slander in Early Modern England: Cases from the Church Courts of Durham, 1560-1675' Northern History, vol XVIII (1982) pp 116-32.
106. Letters from the Bishops, pp 66-7. The fifteen were Sir George Conyers, William Bellasis, Robert Tempest, John Blakiston, Robert Swift (chancellor), William Hilton, Thomas Mydellton, Francis Bambrugge, Robert Bowes (sheriff), Christopher Chayter, Gerard Salvin, Edward Parkinson, William Smyth, John Swinburn and Robert Lawson.
107. Cal. State Papers, vol I, p 188. PRO:Durh 12/20/25. J.H. Gleason, The Justices of the Peace in England, 1558-1640 (1969), pp 47-67, App. F, pp 224-226. The Durham members included on the 1562 patent-roll for the North Riding commission of the peace were Henry Neville (the Earl of Westmoreland), Lord Lumley, George Bowes, Ralph Skinner (dean of Durham) and Sergeant Robert Mennell (seneschal of the Palatinate). Gleason shows that Cecil gave some consideration to the

personnel of this commission, and points out that several Catholics on the libri pacis of 1559 and 1561 do not appear on the patent-roll of 1562, such as Richard Whalley and Richard Norton (who were both closely involved in the 1569 rebellion). Nevertheless Lord Lumley, Leonard Dacre and Sir Christopher Danby - all leaders in the Northern Rising - along with Rokeby, Sayer and Catterick, all continued in office despite being regarded by Archbishop Young as 'no favourers of religion'. Similarly Robert Mennell carried on serving as seneschal of the Palatinate, and as a justice on both commissions, despite Pilkington's dislike of his 'bad character', while Robert Tempest was appointed sheriff of the bishopric in 1561 (despite being a prominent conservative who also played a part in the 1569 rebellion).

PRO:Durh 3/82/2. Letters from the Bishops, p 17.

108. PRO:Durh 3/81/1. Sharp, Memorials, p xviii. The Earl of Northumberland suffered particularly harshly at the hands of Elizabeth. He was replaced by Sir John Foster (an aggressive Protestant) as warden of the Middle March, in 1560, and by the Earl of Bedford as warden of the East March in 1561. Cal. Pat.

Rolls, vol I, pp 327, 348, vol 3, pp 85, 87.

109. Cal. State Papers, vol I, p 335. Cal. Pat.  
Rolls, vol 4, p 282. Rather than relying on the Nevilles, Pilkington also made of lawyers from the Inns of Court to fill the gaps in the Palatine administration. Thomas Layton was appointed Attorney-General of the Palatinate, while William Fleetwood, of the Middle Temple, was granted the post of excheator later the same year. PRO:Durh 3/81/1 Cal. State Papers, vol 1, p 187 PRO:SP 12/20/5, 13/8/2.

## CHAPTER 6: Notes and References

1. A.M.C. Forster, 'An Outline History of the Catholic Church in North-East England from the Sixteenth Century', Northern Catholic History, Part III, vol. 3, (Spring 1976) pp 3-9. G. Thornton, 'The Rising in the North, 1569', Northern Catholic History, vol. XVII (1983) pp 3-9. Scarisbrick, English People, pp 145-47.
2. James, Lineage, pp 51 ff and also 'The Concept of Order and the Northern Rising, 1569' in M.E. James (ed.) Society, Politics and Culture (1986) pp 270-307.
3. For what follows see Cal. State Papers, vol. 7, Sharp, Memorials, Fletcher, Tudor Rebellions, pp 82-92 and Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 484-499.
4. Cal. State Papers, vol. 7, pp 51, 91, 402-8 (The Earl of Northumberland's confession in June 1572) also in Sharp, Memorials, pp 189-213. Northumberland was probably intriguing with Mary, Queen of Scots (due to his connection with the Lennox faction) as soon as she arrived in England. On May 18th 1568, he wrote to Elizabeth hoping to have her placed under his custody, while on May 22nd, he met Mary at Carlisle and 'demanded delivery of her highness' from Richard Lowther and the royal troops. The same day, John Willock described to Cecil how 'the people in this north ... moche to rejoice at the libertie of the Quene of Scotte's, and many utter their good minds to her'. Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, (1547-1603) (ed.) J. Bain, W. Boyd, A. Cameron and J.D. Mackie. 13 vols (1898-1969) vol II, pp 165, 410, 412, 579-882. Northumberland was also intriguing with the duke of Norfolk and forming links with the Spanish embassy by the end of the year. He visited De Spes in disguise for the first time on the 8th January 1569, and by 9th May he had promised to declare himself on Spain's behalf 'when your Majesty pleases to signify your approval'.

- Significantly, the Spanish ambassador believed that 'there are numberless others with the same desires. All the north and Wales are, for the great part, Catholic, and many of the people are attached to the Queen of Scotland'. Sp. Cal, vol II, pp 95-6, 147.
5. Sharp, Memorials, pp 280-2. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, p 390.
  6. These latter reports were false, and in the Earl of Northumberland's case, seem to have been deliberately spread by his own servants. Surtees, Durham, vol 1, p 73. The new rumours about the reintroduction of Catholic religion, which appear to have been widely circulated, must also be distinguished from earlier rumours about Mary, Queen of Scots and the Norfolk marriage, which had been heard in the summer fairs. Sharp, Memorials, pp 5, 7, 8, 9, 18, 20.
  7. Cal State Papers, vol 7, p 155. Although the rebellion clearly misfired prematurely, in the condition of panic caused by the Earl's summons to court, a letter in the Spanish State Papers reveals that Northumberland and his, 'friends in the north had agreed to liberate the Queen of Scotland' in general terms as early as the 22nd September, for 'thereby they would assure the Catholic religion, and return to amity and alliance with your Majesty (i.e. Philip II), which they so much desire'. Sp. Cal, vol II, p 195.
  8. Life of Whittingham, pp 23-5. Works of Pilkington, p ix. Whittingham apparently had word of what was brewing a week before the rebellion, and having warned the bishop, rode to Newcastle where he persuaded the mayor and aldermen to shut the gates and fortify the town. He then fled south on Thursday 10th before the rebels rose on November 14th. Similarly, Bernard Gilpin fled to Oxford from Houghton because he 'perceived (the rebellion) before hand by certaine evident signes' (he was of course a close friend of Pilkington's). Stranks,

- Sumptuous Church p 47. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, pp 409-10. All three (the Bishop, Dean and Gilpin) had their houses spoiled by the rebels.
9. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 107-8.
  10. Sharp, Memorials, pp 41-2.
  11. Ibid, p 45. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 107-110, 112.
  12. Sharp, Memorials, pp 52-3.
  13. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 111-12. Probably not the host of 'thirteen thousand' given in the famous ballad 'The Rising of the North'. Bishoprick Garland, p 11.
  14. Sharp, Memorials, p 61.
  15. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 114-17.
  16. Ibid, pp 128-9.
  17. Durham Depositions, p 136. Sharp, Memorials, pp 78-83. C. Sharp, History of Hartlepool (Hartlepool, 1851) pp 51-2.
  18. Sharp, Memorials, pp 78-82, 85-6, 83 (Sadler's letter). Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 131-5. N.B. 'The Rising in the North' in which the rebels are described as using the emblem of the Five Wounds. Bishoprick Garland, p 11.
  19. Sharp, Memorials, pp 97-8, 99-101, 103.
  20. Ibid, pp 103-4 and n. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 147, 150-53. Welford, Newcastle, pp 428-32.
  21. Ibid, pp 154-6. Sharp, Memorials, pp 104-7.
  22. For the aftermath of the rebellion see Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 518-49, Scot. Cal, vol III, pp 43-51.
  23. Surtees, Durham, vol I, p 76. Sharp, Memorials, pp 112-13, 119.
  24. Ibid, pp 121, 133-5, 140 n. H.B, McCall. 'The Rising in the North', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol XVIII (1904-5) p 76.
  25. Sharp, Memorials, pp 143, 153, 159-60. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 172-3, 188.
  26. Sharp, Memorials, pp 130-1, 135.
  27. McCall, 'Rising', pp 77, 83. See also

- Cal. Pat Rolls, vol 5, pp 81-114 for the large number of lesser men who were simply fined and pardoned for their participation in the rebellion.
28. Sharp, Memorials, pp 36-7, 52-5.
  29. Durham Depositions, pp 139-40. Swift was prebendary of the 1st stall in the cathedral, while Pearson, significantly, also acted as chaplain to the Earl of Westmoreland.
  30. *Ibid*, pp 136-162 for events in the cathedral.
  31. *Ibid*, pp 170-1, 173-4.
  32. *Ibid*, pp 162-66 (St. Nicholas').
  33. *Ibid*, pp 172-4 (St. Margaret's).
  34. *Ibid*, pp 169-72 (St. Oswald's) Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', App. IV, pp 192-4.
  35. Durham Depositions, pp 166-69 (St. Giles').
  36. *Ibid*, pp 175-7 (Pittington).
  37. *Ibid*, pp 194-7 (Long Newton)
  38. *Ibid*, pp 118-20.
  39. Sharp, Memorials, pp 250-2 for a list of those 'appointed' to be executed in each town or village.
  40. Durham Depositions, pp 183-193 (Sedgefield).
  41. *Ibid*, pp 197-8 (Billingham and Hartlepool).
  42. *Ibid*, pp 179-82 (Bishop Auckland).
  43. *Ibid*, pp 177-8 (Brancepeth).
  44. *Ibid*, pp 198, 182. Sharp, Memorials, p 45. T. Sowler, A History of the Town and Borough of Stockton-on-Tees, (Teeside, 1972), pp 50-51. H.D. Pritchett, History of the Parish Church of St Cuthbert, Darlington (1924) p 27. In the latter church the mass had to be taken without the wearing of vestments, as these had all been removed by the authorities in 1559-60.
  45. Durham Depositions, pp 198-9, 203.
  46. *Ibid*, pp 162-3 (St. Nicholas'), 167 (St. Giles'), 180 (Auckland), 173 (St. Margaret's), 197-8 (Billingham), 196 (Long Newton), 142, 138-9, 151, 155 (Durham Cathedral), 183-4, 194 (Sedgefield).
  47. James, 'Concept of Order', esp. pp 291-307 and Lineage, pp 49-51. Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp

470-78.

48. Cal State Papers, vol 7, p 390.
49. Ibid, pp 99-100. Sharp, Memorials, p 196.
50. Ibid, pp 8-10, Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 114-5.
51. Sharp, Memorials, p 50.
52. Ibid, pp 8, 204, Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 94-5.
53. Letters from the Bishops, pp 66-7. Wills, vol III, p 45. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, p 139.
54. Valor, vol V, p 81. Wilson, Reformation Changes, p 479.
55. James, Lineage, p 60.
56. Durham Depositions, pp 141, 142, 158-9, 167, 175-6, 187-8, 196.
57. James, Lineage, p 60.
58. Sharp, Memorials, p 20.
59. Durham Depositions, pp 160, 161, 164, 183-93.
60. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, p 139.
61. Durham Depositions, p 167. Sharp, Memorials, p 228.
62. Ibid, pp 140, 250-2.
63. Ibid.
64. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 276 (Norton's confession), 128, 134 (Darcy's letter). 'Their footmen are very weary, and mostly destitute of armour other than staves, and their lamentation great for want of pay; hitherto they have had none, but allowance from the townships whence they came, which wax weary'.
65. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, pp 110-111.
66. Ibid, p 256.
67. James, 'Concept of Order', pp 291-306. Sharp, Memorials, p 185.
68. Cal. State Papers, vol 7, p 139.
69. Sharp, Memorials, pp 140, 250-2.

EPILOGUE: Notes and References

1. Scot. Cal, vol. II, p.513. Tyler, 'Witchcraft Prosecutions', p 90. Visitation Articles, vol. III, p 253
2. Bossy, 'Elizabethan Catholicism', pp 39ff
3. Dures, English Catholicism, pp 1-8
4. State Papers, Foreign, (1569-71), p 556
5. Cal. State Papers, vol. 7, p226. Scot. Cal vol.III, pp 45-51 Foreign State Papers, (1569-71), p 185
6. Cal. State Papers, vol. 7. pp 361-3
7. Surtees, Durham, vol. I, p 77. Sharp, Memorials, pp 263-73 for the list of attainders.
8. James, Lineage, pp 51,67ff
9. Although the Nevilles' property should have been vested in the see of Durham (which still retained under the Act of Resumption of 1536 a right to forfeitures for treason within the Palatinate) Elizabeth obtained an Act confirming the attainders of the Earl and his supporters and vesting all forfeitures within the bishopric upon the Crown. CRO : D/CG 19/9. Victoria County History, vol. II, pp 36-8. In turn, she was able to reward the landowners who had remained loyal to her during the rebellion. Sir George Bowes, for instance, was granted on 4th November 1572 the fee simple of Bradley Manor as well as other lands in Yorkshire and Sunderland that had belonged to Robert Tempest and John Swinburne respectively (who had both been attainted of treason). CRO : D/CG 17/1. Cal. Pat. Rolls, vol. 5, pp 357-8. Similarly, the lordship of Winlanton was conveyed from the Earl of Westmoreland to Robert Anderson and Richard Hodgson, both Newcastle aldermen, while on 5th July 1572 Percival Gunston, a Yorkshire loyalist, was given lands in Brancepeth, Chester-le-Street, Ravensworth, Whickham and the parish of St. Margarets, Durham, presumably for his service during the previous decade. Ibid, p 331 CRO : D/CG 19/8

On the whole, however, these royal supporters were granted short leases rather than the freehold of

the rebels' property. On 26th September, 1571, for example, William Knolles was given a thirty-one year lease of the 'capital mansion' of Owton in the bishopric (that had formerly belonged to the rebel Robert Lambert) 'for his service at the time of the rebellion in the North', while a year later Oswald Wilsthrop, a knight, was given a thirty-one year lease of lands in Newbiggin and Middleton 'for long service' Cal. Pat. Rolls, vol. 5, p 338. This meant that most of the rebel families were not deprived in the long term of their property in the county, and in some cases it was made clear in the original grant that the owners' heirs retained the reversion to the freehold. On 18th January, 1572, for instance, John Warde, a Yorkshire yeoman, was granted a twenty-one year lease of lands in Harworth and Oldaker, but it was specified that the properties would revert to John Swinburn's heir and eldest son John. Ibid, p 384.

10. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, p 172
11. The Nevilles had apparently held part of the abbey's lands at a yearly rent since the fourteenth century. Most of the priory's estates were also usually supervised by the Nevilles or their clients, and as late as 1549 the Earl of Westmoreland received an annuity of £10. Above all, the Nevilles were great patrons and benefactors of the abbey, and in 1355 Ralph Lord Neville presented an entire set of vestments (in red velvet with images of the saints in tabernacles) along with two altar cloths and a cope. Similarly, in 1372, Ralph's son John provided for the construction of the Neville Screen between the high altar and the shrine of St. Cuthbert, probably as a memorial to his father. In return for their patronage and military support, several Nevilles were buried before the Jesus altar, and in 1367 Ralph (the 4th Baron Neville) was honoured by being the first layman to be buried inside the cathedral, for the part he played in defending the patrimony of St. Cuthbert

during the battle of Neville's Cross in 1346. Finally, an interesting entry in the monastery's accounts suggests that the prior and other members of the abbey would have attended and conducted the more important ritual services (i.e. baptisms, marriages and funerals) in the lives of the Neville family: '1539-40. In the expense of the Lord Prior and his attendants at Brancepeth, at the baptising of the daughters of Earl of Westmoreland, 2s 4d'. Durham Household Book, pp 33, 91, 334. Pevsner, County Durham, p 196 Stranks, Sumptuous Church, pp 22-27 British Archaeology Assoc. Transactions for 1977. Medieval Art and Architecture in Durham (1980) pp 90 - 101.

12. Gleason, Justices of the Peace, pp 227-30. The administrative grip of the Commission had also been tightened during this time. A larger proportion (thirty out of sixty-three) served on the Council of the North, while there was a vast increase in the numbers of professional lawyers. Twenty-eight members of the Commission were readers or benchers of the Inns of Court.
13. F.J. Child (ed), The English and Scottish Popular Ballads (1957) pp 404-8
14. Bishopric Garland, pp 7-13
15. Sharp, Memorials, p. 164
16. Durham Depositions, pp 127-35. See also Cal. Pat. Rolls vol. 5, pp 81-114 for a list of those fined and pardoned for their participation in the 1569 rising.
17. Visitation Articles, vol. III, pp 284-5
18. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, p 24
19. Ibid, pp 113-142
20. Durham Depositions, p 199. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', App. V
21. Ibid, App. III, IV, V. Sharp, Memorials, pp 230-1. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp cxvii - viii (Melmerby's 1583 will)
22. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 169-170

23. Forster, 'Tunstal's Priests', App. III, IV, V
24. Durham Depositions, p. 163
25. Ibid, pp 201-5
26. Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, pp 171-2, Surtees, Durham, Vol. II, pp 362-4, vol. III, pp 211, 251.
27. J.A. Hilton, 'The Counter-Reformation in the North-East' Northern Catholic History, vol. V (Spring 1977) pp 3-12. 'Catholicism in Elizabethan Northumberland' Northern History, vol XIII (1977) pp 44-58. Catholic Recusancy in County Durham 1559-1625 (M. Phil. Leeds University, 1974).
28. Ibid, Wilson, Reformation Changes, pp 524, 536, 547-9. See note 9 above for the disposition of the rebels' lands after the rising.
29. Annals of the Reformation, and Establishment of Religion, and other Various Occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign, John Stype, 4 vols. (1824) vol. II, p 108
30. Tudor Parish Documents, pp 12-15
31. Marcombe, 'Bernard Gilpin', p 33
32. Some historians have doubted the continuity of late medieval orthodoxy through conservative survivalism to Elizabethan recusancy: 'continuity on a large scale has yet to be proved and to expect it in many districts would be to lack faith in the possibility of conversions in large numbers'. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', pp 54-5. For the full debate see Dures, English Catholicism, esp. pp 1-20 and the authorities cited there.
33. Bossy, 'Elizabethan Catholicism', pp 39ff
34. Hilton, 'Catholicism in Elizabethan Northumberland', p 48.
35. Victorian County History, vol.II, p 39
36. Ibid, pp 36-7. Works of Pilkington, p xiii
37. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp 29-62
38. Ibid, pp 11-23. Durham Churchwarden Accounts, pp xiv-xv
39. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp 14-16

40. Ibid, pp 81-91
41. Marcombe, 'Bernard Gilpin', p 33 Collinson,  
Religion of Protestants, p 118
42. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp 20-  
21, 72-75
43. Durham Churchwarden Accounts, pp 11-12
44. Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, pp 124-  
5, 119, 116
45. Wills, vol. I, pp 312-391 (p324 for Collingwood's  
will) vol. II, pp 6-11, vol. III, pp 48-66
46. Welford, Newcastle, vol. III, p 33
47. E.g. Wills, vol. I, pp 357, 385, 386 etc.
48. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions', p 36
49. Wills, vol. I, pp 357-9, vol. III, p 65
50. Carleton, Life of Gilpin, p 420
51. Ibid, pp 424-34
52. Scarisbrick, English People, p 163
53. Thomas, Decline of Magic, pp 90-178
54. Gilpin, Court Sermon, pp 21-22
55. Luxton, 'Popular Culture', pp 70-71
56. Rushton, 'Durham Witchcraft', pp 116-32
57. Ibid, pp 119-20. Durham Depositions, pp 99-100, 117-  
8. Henderson, Folklore, pp 234-5
58. Gilpin, Court Sermon, p 21
59. Victoria County History vol. II, p 39
60. Collectanea ... Dunelmensis contains extracts of the  
relevant debates from the journals of the House of  
Commons in 1651.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

Acts of the Privy Council of England, (ed.) J.R. Dasent. 32 vols. (London, 1890).

Annals of the Reformation, and Establishment of Religion, and other Various Occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign, John Stype. 4 vols (Oxford, 1824).

A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council in 1564, (ed.) M. Bateson (Miscellany vol IX) New Series, Vol LIII (1895).

Bolden Buke, (ed.) W.M. Greenwell. Surtees Society, vol xxv (1852).

Henry Bourne, Antiquities Vulgares: or the Antiquities of the Common People (1725) ... printed in Observations on Popular Antiquities, by John Brand (Edinburgh, 1810).

Calendar of Spanish Letters and State Papers, Related to English Affairs, preserved in, or originally belonging to, the Archives of Simancas, (1558-1603), (ed.) M.A.S. Hume. 4 vols. (London 1892-1899).

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth and James I, (1547-1625), (ed.) R. Lemon and M.A.E. Green. 12 vols. (London 1856-72).

Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, (1547-1592), (ed.) W.B. Turnbull and R.B. Lemon. 26 vols. (1861-1969).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward VI, 6 vols (1924-9), Philip and Mary, 4 vols (1936-9), Elizabeth I, 1st 5 vols (1944-1966).

Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, (1547-1603), (ed.) J. Bain, W. Boyd, A. Cameron, and J.D. Mackie. 13 vols (1898-1969).

George Carleton, Life of Bernard Gilpin (1629) in Ecclesiastical Biography, or Lives of Eminent Men, connected with the History of Religion in England, C. Wordsworth. vol III (London, 1853. Reprinted 1970) pp 374-440.

Catalogi Veteres Librorum Dunelm, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol VII (1838).

Churchwarden Accounts of the Town of Ludlow in Shropshire from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, (ed.) T. Wright. Camden Society, vol CII (1869-70).

Collectanea Ad Statum Civilem et Ecclesiasticum Comitatus Dunelmensis, (ed) G. Allen (Darlington, 1774-8).  
CRO : D/CG. Durham County Record Office. Clayton and Gibson Collection.  
CRO : D/Sa/D. Durham County Record Office. Salvin Collection.  
CRO : EP/Ho/Pi/Ry. Durham County Record Office. Churchwarden Account Books of Houghton-le-Spring, Pitlington and Ryton.

Depositions and Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol XXII (1846).

Depositions and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings from the Courts of Durham, extending from 1311 to the reign of Elizabeth, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol XXI (1845).

Durham Churchwarden Accounts, (ed.) Rev. J. Barmby. Surtees Society, vol LXXXIV (1888).

Durham Civic Memorials, (ed.) C.E. Whiting. Surtees Society, vol CLX (1952).

Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of it, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I, John Stype. 3 vols (Oxford, 1822).

Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, (ed.) R.T. Fowler. 3 vols. Surtees Society, vol IL, vol C, vol CIII (1898-1900).

Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis. A Survey of the Estates of the Prior and Convent of Durham compiled in the Fifteenth Century, (ed.) W.M. Greenwell. Surtees Society, vol LVIII (1871).

John Foxe, Acts and Monuments, (ed.) G. Townsend. 8 vols (New York, 1965).

Bernard Gilpin, A Sermon Preached in the Court at Greenwich, before King Edward the Sixth, the first Sunday after the Epiphany, Anno Domini 1552. Printed copy in British Museum.

Historiae Dunelmensis. Scriptores Tres, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol IX (1839).

Inventories of Church Goods, (ed.) W. Page. Surtees Society, vol IC (1896).

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. J.S. Brewer, J. Gardner and R.H. Brodie. 21 vols (1862-1932).

Life of Mr William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, (ed.)  
M.A.E. Green. Camden Society, (Miscellany vol. VI) New  
Series, vol. CIV (1870-1).

List of Documents relating to Legal Proceedings among the  
Records of the Palatinate of Durham and Bishopric Estates  
deposited by the Church Commissioners in the Prior's  
Kitchen, The College, Durham, (ed.) N.M. Million. Univ.  
of Durham. Dept. of Palaeography and Diplomatic (1960).

Memorials of St. Giles, Durham, (ed.) Rev. J. Barmby.  
Surtees Society, vol XCV (1895).

Narratives of the Days of the Reformation, chiefly from  
the Manuscripts of John Foxe the Martyrologist, (ed.) J.G.  
Nichols. Camden Society, vol LXXVII (1860-1).

Priory of Finchale, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol  
VI (1837).

Priory of Hexham, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vols  
XLIV-VI (1863-4).

PRO : Durh. Public Record Office. Records of the  
Palatinate of Durham.

PRO : SP. Public Record Office. State Papers.

Register of Richard Fox, Lord Bishop of Durham, 1494-1501  
(ed.) M.P. Howden. Surtees Society, vol. CXLVII (1932).

Registers of Tunstal and Pilkington, (ed.) G. Hinde.  
Surtees Society, vol CLXI (1946).

Statutes of the Cathedral Church of Durham, (ed.) A.  
Hamilton Thompson. Surtees Society, vol CXLIII (1929).

Statutes of the Realm. 11 vols (London 1801-28).

The Bishoprick Garland, or A Collection of Legends,  
Songs, Ballads etc. belonging to the County of Durham,  
(ed.) Sir C. Sharp (London 1834).

The Durham Household Book; or the Accounts of the Bursar  
of the Monastery of Durham from Pentecost 1530 to  
Pentecost 1534, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol XVIII  
(1844).

The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, (ed.) F.J. Child.  
5 vols (New York, 1957).

The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-  
1543, (ed.) L. Toulmin Smith. 5 vols (London, 1906-8).

The Rites of Durham, being a description or brief  
declaration of all the ancient monuments, rites and  
customs belonging or being within the monastical church

of Durham before the Suppression (1593), ed. F.T. Fowler. Surtees Society, vol CVII (1902).

The Royal Visitation of 1559, (ed.) C.J. Kitching. Surtees Society, vol. CLXXXVII (1974).

The Works of James Pilkington, BD, Lord Bishop of Durham, (ed.) J. Scholefield. Parker Society (Cambridge, 1842).

Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549, (ed.) N. Pocock. Camden Society, New Series, vol. XXXVIII (1883-4).

Tudor Parish Documents of the Diocese of York, (ed.) J.S. Purvis (Cambridge, 1948).

Valor Ecclesiasticus. Temp. Henr. VIII. Auctoritate Regia Institutis, (ed.) J. Caley and J. Hunter. 6 vols (1810).

Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, (ed.) W.H. Frere and W.M. Kennedy. Alcuin Club, 3 vols (London, 1910).

Wills and Inventories, (ed.) J. Raine. Surtees Society, vol II (1835).

Wills and Inventories, (ed.) W. Greenwell. Surtees Society, vol XXXVIII (1860).

Wills and Inventories, (ed.) J.A. Hodgson. Surtees Society, vol CXII (1906).

### Secondary Works

- ALLAN, R.H - Historical and Descriptive View of the City of Durham (Durham, 1824).
- BINSKI, P and ALEXANDER, J. (eds)
- The Age of Chivalry (Royal Academy of Arts, London 1987).
- BOSSY, J
- 'The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism'. Past and Present, vol. XXI (1962) pp 39-59
  - 'The Mass as a Social Institution, 1200-1700'. Past and Present, vol C (1983) pp 29-61.
  - Christianity in the West (Oxford University Press, 1985).
- BOWKER, M
- The Henrician Reformation in the Diocese of Lincoln under John Longland, 1521-47 (Cambridge University Press, 1981)
- BOYLE, J.R - A Comprehensive Guide to the County of Durham (London, 1891-2).
- BRAND, J - History and Antiquities of Newcastle upon Tyne. 2 vols. (London, 1789).
- BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY ASSOC. TRANSACTIONS for 1977
- Medieval Art and Architecture in Durham (Leeds, 1980).
- BULMER HOBSON, Mary A
- Bulmer Family Chronicle: from before 1050 to 1936 (1937).
- CLARK, P
- English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution Religion, Politics and Society in Kent 1500-1640 (Sussex, Harvester 1977).
- COLGRAVE, B (ed.)
- Two Lives of St. Cuthbert (Oxford University Press, 1940).
- COLLINGWOOD, C.S
- Memoirs of Bernard Gilpin (London, 1884).
- COLLINSON, P
- The Religion of Protestants: the Church in

English Society, 1559-1625 (Oxford University Press, 1982).

CONWAY DAVIES, J

- 'The Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Durham'. Durham University Journal, vol XLIV (1951-2) pp 77-87.

CONYERS SURTEES, H

- History of the Parish of Brancepeth (1930).

CRASTER, H.H.E

- 'The Patrimony of St Cuthbert'. English Historical Review, (1954) pp 177-199.

DAVIES, C.S.L

- 'The Pilgrimage of Grace Reconsidered'. Past and Present, vol XLI (1968) pp 54-76.
- Peace, Print and Protestantism, 1450-1558 (London, 1976).
- 'Popular Religion and the Pilgrimage of Grace' in Fletcher and Stevenson (eds.) Order and Disorder in Early Modern England (Cambridge University Press, 1987) pp 58-91.

DAVIS, N.Z - 'Tasks and Themes in the Study of Popular Religion' in C. Trinkaus and H. Oberman (eds.) The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Religion (London, 1974) pp 307-338.

DICKENS, A.G.

- The English Reformation (London, 1964).
- 'Secular and Religious Motivation in the Pilgrimage of Grace' in G.J. Cuming (ed.) Studies in Church History, vol IV (London, 1967) pp 39-64.

DIXON, R.W - History of the Church of England, 6 vols (London, 1878-1902).

DOBSON, R.B - Durham Priory, 1400-1450 (Cambridge University Press, 1973).

DODDS, M.H. and R.

- The Pilgrimage of Grace ..., 2 vols (London, 1915).

- DODDS, M.H - 'The Northern Stage' Archaeologia Aeliana, 3rd Series, vol VI (1914) pp 31-64.
- DURES, A. - English Catholicism 1558 -1642 (Longman 1983)
- ELTON, G.R - Policy and Police: Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell (Cambridge University Press, 1972).  
 - 'Politics and the Pilgrimage of Grace' in Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government (Cambridge University Press, 1974) pp 183-215.  
 - Reform and Reformation: England 1509 - 1558 (Arnold 1977)
- EYRE, C - History of St Cuthbert (London, 1858).
- FLETCHER, A.J  
 - Tudor Rebellions (Longmans, 1968).
- FLETCHER, A.J and STEVENSON, J. (eds.)  
 - Order and Disorder in Early Modern England (Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- FORDYCE, T - The History and Antiquities of the County Palatinate of Durham, 2 vols (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1785-94).
- FORSTER, Ann  
 - 'Bishop Tunstal's Priests'. Recusant History, vol IX, No 4 (Jan, 1964) pp 175-204.  
 - 'An Outline History of the Catholic Church in North-East England from the Sixteenth Century'. Northern Catholic History, Part I, vol 1 (Spring 1975) pp 3-9. Part II, vol 2, (Autumn 1975) pp 3-8. Part III, vol 3 (Spring 1976) pp 3-9.
- FOWLER, Rev J.T  
 - 'On the St Cuthbert Window in York Minster' Yorkshire Archaeological Society, vol IV (1877) pp 249-377.
- GLEASON, J.H.  
 - The Justices of the Peace in England, 1558-1640 (Oxford, 1969).

GRAVES, M.A.R.

- The Tudor Parliaments. Crown, Lords and Commons, 1485-1603 (Longmans, 1985).

GREENSLADE, S.L.

- 'The Last Monks of Durham Cathedral Priory' Durham University Journal, vol XLI (1948-9) pp 107-113.

HAIGH, C

- The Last Days of the Lancashire Monasteries and the Pilgrimage of Grace. Chetham Society, 3rd Series, vol xvii (1969).
- Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire (Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- 'Some Aspects of the Recent Historiography of the English Reformation' in W.J. Mommsen (ed.). The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation German Historical Institute, vol V (London, 1980) pp 88-106.
- 'Anticlericalism and the English Reformation'. History, vol LXVIII (1983) pp 391-407.
- (ed.) The Reign of Elizabeth I (London, 1984).

HAMILTON THOMPSON, A.

- 'Archbishop Savage's Visitation of the Diocese of Durham, sede vacante in 1501' Archaeologia Aeliana, 3rd Series, vol XVIII (1921) pp 43-52.

HAY, Denys

- 'The Dissolution of the Monasteries in the diocese of Durham'. Archaeologia Aeliana, 4th Series (1938) pp 69-114.

HEAL, F and O'DAY, R (eds.)

- Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I (London, 1977).

HEATH, P

- The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation (London, 1969).

HEGG, R

- The Legend of St Cuthbert, or the Historie of his Churches at Lindisfarne, Cunecasestre and Dunholm (London, 1663. Reprinted Darlington 1777-1779).

HENDERSON, W.

- Folk-lore of the Northern Counties (London, 1879)

HILTON, J.A.

- Catholic Recusancy in County Durham 1559 - 1625 (M.Phil., Leeds University 1974)
- 'Catholicism in Elizabethan Northumberland' Northern History, vol XIII (1977) pp 44-58.
- 'The Counter-Reformation in the North East' Northern Catholic History, vol V (Spring 1977) pp 3-12.

HOULBROOKE, R

- Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation 1520-70 (1979).

HOYLE, R.W - 'Thomas Master's Narrative of the Pilgrimage of Grace' Northern History, vol XXI (1985) pp 53-79.

HUTCHISON, W

- History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham. 3 vols (Durham, 1823).

JAMES, M.E

- Family, Lineage and Civil Society: a study of Society, Politics and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1500-1640. (Oxford University Press, 1974).
- 'Obedience and Dissent in Henrician England: the Lincolnshire Rebellion of 1536'. Past and Present, vol XLVIII (August, 1970) pp 3-84.
- 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body in the Late Medieval English Town' in M.E. James (ed.) Society, Politics and Culture (Cambridge University Press, 1986) pp 16-47.

KEELING, Susan M

- 'The Reformation in the Anglo-Scottish Border Counties'. Northern History, vol XV (1979) pp 24-42.

KREIDER, A - English Chantries: The Road to Dissolution (Cambridge Mass 1979).

LAPSLEY G.T

- The County Palatine of Durham (London and New York, 1980).

LEIGHTON, H.R. (ed.)

- Memorials of Old Durham (London, 1910).

LOACH, J and TITTLER, R (eds.)

- The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540-1560  
(Cambridge University Press, 1980).

LOADES, D.M - 'The Collegiate Churches of Durham at the Time of the Dissolution' in G.J. Cuming (ed.). Studies in Church History, vol IV (London, 1967) pp 65-75.

- 'The Last Years of Cuthbert Tunstal, 1547-1559'. Durham University Journal, vol LXVI (1973) pp 10-21.
- The Reign of Mary Tudor (1979).

LUXTON, Imogen

- 'The Reformation and Popular Culture' in F. Heal and R. O'Day (eds.) Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I (London, 1977) pp 57-77.

MARCOMBE, D - The Dean and Chapter of Durham, 1558-1603  
(PHD Durham University, 1973).

- 'The Durham dean and chapter: old abbey writ large?' in R. O'Day and F. Heal Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church in England, 1500-1642 (Leicester University Press, 1976) pp 125-144.
- 'Bernard Gilpin: Anatomy of an Elizabethan Legend' Northern History, vol XVI (1980) pp 20-39.

MCCALL, H.B - 'The Rising in the North' Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol XVIII (1904-5) pp 74 ff.

MILNER, E and BENHAM, E (eds.)

- Records of the Lumleys of the Lumley Castle  
(London, 1904).

O'DAY, R - The Debate on the English Reformation  
(Cambridge University Press, 1986).

O'DAY, R and HEAL, F

- Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church of England, 1500-1642 (Leicester University Press, 1976).

PALLISER, D.M

- 'Popular Reactions to the Reformation, 1530-70' in F. Heal and R. O'Day (eds.) Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I (London, 1977) pp 35-56.

PEVSNER, N and WILLIAMSON, L (ed.)

- County Durham. The Buildings of England 2nd edn. (Penguin, 1983).

PHILLIPS, J - The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660 (University of California 1973).

PHYTHIAN-ADAMS, C

- 'Ceremony and the Citizen: the communal year at Coventry, 1450-1550' in P. Clark (ed.) The Early Modern Town (1976) pp 106-128.

POGSON, R.H - 'The Legacy of the Schism: Confusion, Continuity and Change in the Marian Clergy' in J. Loach and R. Tittler (eds.) The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540-1560 (Cambridge University Press, 1980) pp 116-136.

POWELL, K.G - 'The Beginnings of Protestantism in Gloucestershire'. Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society, vol X (1971) pp 141-157.

PRITCHETT, H. D

- History of the Parish Church of St Cuthbert Darlington (Darlington, 1924).

RAINE, J - Saint Cuthbert (Durham, 1828).  
- History and Antiquities of North Durham (London, 1852).

REID, R.R - The King's Council in the North (Longmans, 1921).

RUSHTON, P - 'Women, Witchcraft and Slander in Early Modern England: Cases from the Church Courts of Durham, 1560-1675'. Northern History, vol XVIII (1982) pp 116-132.

SCARISBRICK, J.J

- Henry VIII (London, 1968).
- The Reformation and the English People (Oxford, 1984).

SHARP, Cuthbert

- Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569 (London, 1840).
- History of Hartlepool (Hartlepool, 1851).

SHEILS, W.J - 'Religion in Provincial Towns: innovation and tradition' in F. Heal and R. O'Day (eds.) Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I (London, 1977).

- The English Reformation, 1530-1570 (London, 1989).

SMITH, R.B - Land and Politics in the England of Henry VIII: the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1530-46 (Oxford University Press, 1970).

SMITH, J.Z - Imagining Religion (Chicago, 1982).

SOWLER, T - A History of the Town and Borough of Stockton-on-Tees (Teeside, 1972).

SPUFFORD, M - Contrasting Communities (Cambridge University Press, 1974).

STEPHEN, L and LEE, S

- Dictionary of National Biography 22 vols (London, 1908-9).

STRANKS, C.J

- This Sumptuous Church: The story of Durham Cathedral (1973).

STURGE, C - Cuthbert Tunstal: Churchman, Scholar, Statesman, Administrator (Longmans, 1938).

SURTEES, R - History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham 4 vols (London, 1816-40).

THOMAS, K.V - Religion and the Decline of Magic (London, 1971).

THOMAS, Morley

- 'Tunstal - Trimmer or Martyr' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol XXIV, No. 4 (October, 1973) pp 337-355.

THORNTON, G - 'The Rising in the North, 1569' Northern Catholic History, vol XVII (1983) pp 3-9.

TREVOR-ROPER, H.R

- 'The Bishopric of Durham and the Capitalist Reformation' Durham University Journal, vol XXXVII (1945-6) pp 45 ff.

TYLER, P

- 'The Significance of the Ecclesiastical Commission at York' Northern History, vol II (1967) pp 27-44.
- 'The Church Courts at York and Witchcraft Prosecutions 1567-1640', Northern History, vol IV (1969) pp 84-109.

VAN GENNEP

- The Rites of Passage (London, 1960).

VICTORIA COUNTY HISTORY OF THE COUNTY OF DURHAM (ed.) W. Page. 3 vols. (London, 1905-28).

WELFORD, R

- History of Newcastle and Gateshead 3 vols. (London, 1884-7).

WILSON, B.N

- The Changes of the Reformation Period in Durham and Northumberland 2 vols (PHD Durham University, 1939).

ZELL, M.L

- 'The Use of Religious Preambles as a Measure of Religious Belief in the Sixteenth Century', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol L (1977) pp 246-9.

