THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF EDWARD VI'S REIGN AS VIEWED THROUGH THE SERMONS AND LETTERS OF HUGH LATIMER

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Sister Mary Teresita
Austin, R. S. M.

1961

THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF EDWARD VI'S REIGN AS VIEWED THROUGH THE SERMONS AND LETTERS OF HUGH LATIMER

By

Sister Mary Teresita Austin, R. S. M.

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Tudor England, in particular the reign of Edward VI, 1547-1553, will be the general subject of the following discussion. The political, economic, and social conditions of the age have been studied insofar as they are revealed in the sermons and other writings of Hugh Latimer, outstanding preacher and social critic of this Tudor era. In the interests of objectivity, every effort has been made to divorce from the text any consideration of the doctrinal controversy which, although it highlighted the period, might serve only to bias the modern reader.

Since the purposes of this paper have been to cast light upon the political, economic, and social institutions of Tudor England, as well as to examine their original critics and participants, the discussion has divided itself into three main parts. Within each of the three divisions an attempt was made to elaborate the details of Tudor politics, economy and society, respectively. These particulars are viewed as revealed to us in the preaching of Latimer and as substantiated by his words. Now, however, the task remains for us to briefly review the major areas, in order to see the overall picture Hugh Latimer paints of his England.

Viewing Edwardian political institutions focused the

reader's attention on monarchy and the prevailing attitudes with regard to the boy-king. Latimer's presentation of the ethical and religious basis of this single sovereign's rule comprised an important contribution on this subject. Likewise, the King's education, marriage, and the distribution of state financial resources entered into this consideration of monarchy. The trickery and connivance, which would seem to have characterized all too many of those who presumed to act in behalf of the youthful king, is exemplified in the case of the Lord Admiral. While Latimer found occasion in his sermons to criticize much that went on at court, his disapprobation of the Lord Admiral is both more extensive and caustic than anything else he has to say regarding the political scene. Either by command or choice, he delivered several sermons in defense of the Lord Admiral's riddance by way of attainder. This instance would seem to exemplify Tudor England's acceptance of the clergyman as critic in matters of political controversy.

Enclosure, high prices, coinage are the key words in any study of Tudor economy. Next to religious issue, nothing did more to induce rebellions than the enclosure movement. The son of a yeoman, Latimer had been raised close to the soil; his ideal England was an agrarian nation. In his mind, the human displacement resulting from enclosure could not be

justified, even in the light of his "new learning." Just as members of the court were objects of his barbs of political criticism, so too, contemporary businessmen (rent raisers, extortioners, usurers, etc.) felt themselves subject to his censure in matters of economy. Throughout the years of his preaching career at court, Latimer never ceased to advocate those changes that would help to bring equity into an inequitable existing order, in which the rich were magnificently ostentatious and the poor were starving and desperate. However, he most certainly did not consider the government's practice of clipping and debasing coins as among the justifiable solutions. For him, its only service was an apt analogy to the debased currency of Christian behavior.

While justice was of grave concern in Latimer's commentary on matters political and economical, it takes on even greater proportions in his social criticism. Here, more so than in some other areas, his sermonizing would seem to have had some influence--to the benefit of the poor. Not only the lack of justice, but also the decadent state of education provided topics for his sermons. In his mind, this decay was due to the loss of church revenues, the gradual extinction of the yeoman class, and lack of government support. In addition to those issues of obviously grave concern, the

sixteenth-century preacher comments upon seemingly less significant topics; such as, customs in London society, discipline, dress, marriage and funeral rites, the practice of medicine, and the prescriptions for fasting. In all of these he emphasizes the social, as well as spiritual implications.

Thus, whether in the briefest of phrases or the fieriest of sermons, the words of Hugh Latimer afford the modern student both fact and opinion--thereby clarifying his previous knowledge, deepening his understanding, and broadening his perspective of Tudor England during the reign of Edward VI.

The writer wishes to express her gratitude to all those who so selflessly have aided in the preparation of this research. To Doctor Marjorie Gesner who gave of her wide knowledge of Tudor history and Tudor literature, is owed the greatest debt. She has generously assisted, often at great personal sacrifice of time and convenience, in the preparation of this work. Also to Doctor Richard Sullivan, my sincerest thanks. He read the manuscript and made suggestions for revisions which were gladly adopted. Lastly, to the community of the Religious Sisters of Mercy who removed the obstacles which might have prevented the completion of this work.

II. PROFILE

A small house built near the church in Thurcastone, Leicestershire, was the birthplace of Hugh Latimer.[1] Rather fancifully we may imagine the Latimer family, in medieval times, had acquired by fortunate inter-marriage, extensive possessions in the neighborhood of Leicestershire. Some of the village churches in the vicinity still bear armorial remembrances of the Latimer family.[2] However, the Leicestershire Latimers cannot be traced as far as heraldry took cognizance of them. If Hugh Latimer's family can be traced at all, it is through the members of the younger branch, who had settled in Yorkshire and had allied themselves with the eminent Nevilles of State.[3] Hugh's family may have descended from this line. Perhaps a younger member of the family had been driven into exile, then had returned to settle in quiet at Thurcastone and to found a family of the yeoman Latimers. Hugh describes his family in a sermon

[1]Robert Demaus, Hugh Latimer (London, 1869), p. 12. The name Latimer is preserved in the village of Northampton near Kettering. Edward Arber, Sermon on the Ploughs (Westminster, 1895), p. 3.

[2]Demaus, p. 12. The seal was gold on a red field. The name Latimer, often spelled Latymer, means, according to etymologists, interpreter of Latin. James J. Ellis, Hugh Latimer (New York, 1893), p. 2.

[3]Isobel D. Thornley, England under the Yorkist 1460-1485 (London, 1920), p. 20.

before King Edward: "My father was a yeoman, and had no lands of his own, only he had a farm of three or four pound by year at the uttermost, and hereupon he tilled so much as kept half a dozen men. He had walk for a hundred sheep; and my mother milked thirty kine."[4] The important thing to remember about the Latimer family, however, is that Hugh, the offspring of the yeoman branch, was to capture the minds of many and was destined to fame of quite a different character.

The little village of Hugh Latimer's childhood numbered no more than a hundred persons in 1484 nor in 1491, whichever date is correct for his birth.[5] He was born either in the last days of Richard III's reign or in the beginning of that of Henry VII. Hugh was the youngest of the family. There were six sisters and several brothers.[6] None of the brothers lived beyond infancy, yet the sisters must have grown to womanhood because Latimer speaks of them in one of his sermons. "He married my sisters with five pounds or twenty nobles apiece, so that he brought them up in godliness, and fear of God."[7] The reader may recall that John of Gaunt was possibly

[4] The Works of Hugh Latimer, ed. George F. Corrie, 2 vols. (University Press, Cambridge, 1844-45), I, 101 -- hereafter cited as Works.

[5] Works, II, 137.

[6] John Foxe, The Acts and Monuments, ed. S. R. Cattley and George Townsend, 8 vols. (London, 1837-41), VII, 437.

[7] Works, I, 101.

a relative of Latimer, and had been a protector of Wycliffe. Wycliffe was an English clergyman who had attacked the abuses of the Church, and Gaunt sympathized with the attack.[8] Further than the quote above not much is known of Latimer's sisters. One can conjecture that they each married one or other of the neighboring yeomen. It is possible, also, that some of them married into the thriving citizenry of Leicester. Tradition has not preserved the names of their husbands.[9]

The youth of Hugh Latimer was, then, that of a yeoman. It is very likely that his early boyhood was spent tending the cattle and other animals. A rather homely allusion has been made to one of his daily duties. Hugh was not ashamed to speak of this incident before the king, Edward VI: "They say in my country when they call their hogs, 'Come mingle, mangle, come pur, come pur,' even so they made mingle mangle ot it."[10]

However, Hugh Latimer possibly did not participate, especially as he became older, in the strenuous work of the farm. If one can credit his biographers, he was a delicate, but precocious boy.[11] Recognizing this, his father undoubtedly

[8]Demaus, p. 15. John Stowe, Annals of England from the First Inhabitants until 1600 (London, 1926), p. 6.

[9]Foxe, VII, 438.

[10]Works, I, 290-7.

[11]Foxe, VII, 437.

charged him with the marketing. Relieved of the harder work connected with the farm, he had time for meeting people at the markets, and for attending the religious festivals of the day. From these experiences sprung his acute awareness of the England that was beginning to emerge from a medieval to a modern age. During these years America was discovered, and the Reformation and Renaissance were moving across the Channel to England. But as yet Hugh's life was untouched by the commercial prosperity that was to follow these movements. During those boyhood years stories were likely told in the evening around the Latimer hearth, of the exploits of Bosworth Field where many of the neighbors had fought. Even the memories of Agincourt and Crecy must still have dwelt in the minds of the older generation, and were related to the younger ones.[12]

On April 7, 1374 the Crown had presented to Wycliffe the rectory of Lutterworth in Leicester; and he held the pastorate there until his death in 1384.[13] Thus the shire in which Latimer was raised (Leicester) must have been exposed to Lollardism.[14] Nevertheless Latimer does not seem to have been too much influenced by the disputes of Lollardism. From his

[12]Foxe, VII, 437.

[13]Charles Knight, The Popular History of England (N.P., N.D.), II, 93.

[14]"Latimer", Catholic Encyclopedia, 16 vols. (New York, 1910), IX, 332.

earliest boyhood he had been trained by his father whom he describes as follows: "In my time my poor Father was as diligent to teach me to shoot as to learn any other things, and so I think other men did their children. He taught me how to draw not with strength of arms as other nations do but with strength of the badge. I had my bows bought me according to my age and strength as I increased in them, so my bows were made bigger and bigger, for men never shot well except they be brought up to it."[15]

Perhaps the father saw in his son a still greater gift, for he provided him with a good elementary education. Hugh may have shown, as Foxe says, an outstanding ability for learning very early in childhood.[16] It is reasonable to believe that this thirst for knowledge was abetted by the books which he was able to procure from the Abbey Library of Leicester, which held much good literature.

The first fifteen years of Hugh's life must have been rather uneventful except for the following occasion to which he alludes in one of his sermons. Henry VII had raised an army and young Hugh's father was enlisted. To the child it was a matter of pride that his father had been called into the King's army, and it remained always in his memory that

[15] Works, I, 197.

[16] Foxe, VII, 437.

he had buckled the armor on his father when he went forth to battle. From this expedition of his father, Hugh received his first picture of the kingdom and London,[17] the place that was to be so often in his sermons of later years.

Latimer's desire for learning, and aptitude for study led his father to send him to the University of Cambridge.[18] Early in his attendance at Cambridge Hugh was elected to a fellowship in Clare Hall. This recognition of talent so early in his college career may account for the reputation which he acquired for learning ability.

Though this is all that we know of Latimer's boyhood, we can assume that the piety of his parents and his own genuine vocation settled the matter of his life's work. He would become a priest. Accordingly he was in residence at Cambridge more or less continuously for the quarter of a century following his entrance. In February, 1510, supposedly at the age of eighteen, he received his bachelor's degree.[19]

As stated, Hugh had been elected to a Fellowship early in his university career. The income from this must have relieved

[17] Works, I, 101.

[18] Works, I, 100.

[19] Dictionary of National Biography, 34 vols. & supplements ed. Sidney Lee & Leslie Stephens (New York, 1930), XI, 632. Hereafter cited as D.N.B. and Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Edward VI and Mary. W. B. Trumbull, 2 vols. 1547-1580 (London, 1861), I, 16.

his father of some of the financial burdens entailed by his son's education. The graces for his degrees in Art still exist in the University Grace Book, and show that he was excused from part of the course. However, he proceeded, as was customary, to a Master of Arts degree in 1514.[20]

Latimer, in the years intervening, remained, presumably teaching in the university. He must have been ordained to the priesthood in this interval for he alludes to the ordination as follows: "I never preached in Lincolnshire afore, not come here afore, save once when I went to take order at Lincoln, which was a good while ago; therefore I cannot say much of Lincolnshire, for I know it not."[21] Early in his priestly career Latimer showed real talent for preaching since in the Proctor Books his name appeared in 1522 as one of the twelve men licensed. This was the first official recognition of the singular ability in that special field of labor for which he possessed such eminent qualifications and in which he was destined to play such an important part in Tudor history.

[20]Demaus, pp. 22-23. Latimer was likely preparing for his 12th term -- this was very early in his career to be elected. Most writers feel that he studied at Christ College and that this fellowship required him to move to Clare Hall to continue his studies. Harold S. Darby, Hugh Latimer (London, 1953), pp. 161-7.

[21]Demaus, 23.

In recognition of Latimer's ability, he was selected to carry the silver cross of the university in all solemn processions, to quote Strype, "For his gravity and years he was preferred to keep the Cross."[22] The custodian of the crucifix was responsible for its maintenance and safety and its presence on all ceremonial occasions. Many great personages who would play an important part in Latimer's career were received in reception by the cross-bearer. Among the most noteworthy were Wolsey in 1520;[23] Catherine of Aragon in 1520;[24] and finally, in 1522, Henry VIII.[25] Latimer received a modest sum of sixteen pence for performing his duty on the occasion of Henry VIII's visit.[26]

Custos crucis was also chaplain of the university's New Chapel, a post involving varied and important responsibilities

[22]John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols. in 6 parts (Oxford, 1822), II, Pt. 1, 15 (hereafter designated as Strype, Eccles. Mem.). "This magnificent silver crucifix was sold during Edward VI's reign for its 336 ounces of silver. The crucifix was elaborately ornamented. Rising above the staff were two rows of figures of various bishops and saints, above this scene was the Coronation of the Blessed Mother. The Blessed Mother and St. John stood at either side of the Crucified Christ." Allan Chester, Hugh Latimer (Philadelphia, 1954), 7.

[23]Strype, Eccles. Mem. III, 1, p. 368.

[24]Demaus, 13.

[25]Nicholas Ridley, The Works of Nicholas Ridley, ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge, 1833), p. 406.

[26]Demaus, 28.

although the primary duty was to say the anniversary masses for the souls of the university's dead benefactors. Certain fiscal responsibilities were also entailed: it was Latimer's duty to collect rents from local properties which had been bequeathed to the university and he supervised the expenditures of these properties. His accounts for these funds were subject to a yearly audit. Other of Latimer's duties were custodian of the university lecture rooms and keeper of the small treasure-house of books in the University Library.[27]

Simultaneously with the carrying on of these various duties at Clare Hall, he attained the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in 1524, but as it appears from the proctor's books he did not pay the customary fee and his right to the degree was afterwards denied. What was really of interest at this time was his disputation for the Bachelor's degree. It was directed against the doctrines of Philip Melanchton.[28] Another point of interest is that, on August 28, 1524, a deed was executed conveying

[27]Chester, 7. "Latimer's accounts were audited in 1523, 1526 and 1528. There are several records of payments for bearing the cross, and for his work as custodian of university buildings. Records show a salary for him as librarian and keeper of public school buildings in 1525, 1527 and 1528. Income from these likely amounted to about five pounds in 1529. He was replaced by Nicholas Heath, who later (1543-45) became bishop of Worcester in Latimer's place, and later Archbishop of York and Lord Chancellor of England during the years after Latimer's death." Works, I, 136. Gustave Constant, Reformation in England, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. by E.L. Watkins, London, 1942), I, p. 380.

[28]Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England, 3 vols. (New York, 1950-54), I, 52.

certain lands to Latimer and others in order to find a priest to celebrate mass in the Chapel of Clare Hall for the soul of John Bolton.[29]

The above two events in Latimer's life indicate that he still held firmly his belief in the Roman Catholic faith at this time. One of the listeners at the B.D. discourse who from this time on became his intimate friend and companion was Thomas Bilney, or Little Bilney (as Latimer affectionately spoke of him). He went to Latimer after the denunciation of the "new opinions" and began to instruct Latimer along the lines of thought that he was exploring at the time. Latimer became a companion to Bilney in his social work among parishioners and among the sick.[30] Shortly thereafter we hear of the incident of obtaining pardon for a Mistress Checke, which brought him before Henry VIII for the first time.[31] This momentous event led Latimer to the episcopal palace at Worcestershire, later to the pulpits of Windsor and Westminster and finally, even to the fires of Oxford. In the fall of 1524, the first of Latimer's extant letters was written appealing to Dr. Greene, the vice-chancellor of Cambridge, in behalf of

[29]Darby, Hugh Latimer (London, 1953), 29.

[30]Works, I, 334-35.

[31]Sermons of Hugh Latimer (London, 1906), 279.

Sir Richard Windfield, who was desirous of becoming steward of the university. Evidently Latimer was on his way to his home in Thurcastone as the letter was written from Kimbalton, October 14, 1524.[32]

Hugh Latimer formed an intimate friendship with Robert Barnes, prior of the Austin Friars at Cambridge. Previously to this Latimer had had some trouble with the Bishop of Ely over certain doctrines that he was preaching in his diocese. When the Bishop inhibited him from further preaching, Barnes exempted him from episcopal jurisdiction and lent him his pulpit on Sunday, December 24, 1525. Barnes at the same time preached a very violent sermon at St. Edward's Church. The abbot was soon after obliged to abjure before Wolsey as legate, and Latimer had to explain himself before the same authority. He conducted himself safely through the interview and was given a special privilege, liberty to preach throughout all England.[34]

[32] Works, II, 295-97.

[33] Foxe, VII, 451-452.

[34] Strype, Eccles. Mem. III, 1, 368. John Strype, The Life and Acts of Mathew Parker, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1840), I, 62. D.N.B. XI, 613, St. Mary's and St. Edward's were university churches and the latter served as chapels for the students of Clare and Christ Colleges. Chester, 23. Wolsey sensed Latimer's manliness and was impressed by his Englishness, his

However, it is worthy of note that Latimer had not turned aside entirely from orthodoxy at this time. The men whom Wolsey had selected for Cardinal College were not necessarily the best for their positions. Rather, they were men who were Wolsey's friends, upholders of Bilney's teaching and of the new learning. For three years all seemed quiet at Cambridge, but when the new ideas broke forth, controversy was in full flame, especially in Wolsey's new Christ College.[35]

By the time of Wolsey's death Latimer had come to the attention of the king.[36] During this time he preached his famous sermons On the Cards just before Christmas, December 19, 1529. He invoked criticism by these sermons and also incurred more disapproval because he was known to have favored King Henry VIII's divorce.[37] Latimer's name was included in the

bold demeanour and frank tongue. Perhaps secretly he enjoyed the "cut-and-thrust" duel with the two chaplains, the Doctors Capon and Marshal. Darby, 24.

[35]H. A. L. Fisher, The History of England, 1485-1558 (London, 1928), 276-8. As Papal legate (1475-1530) Wolsey had control of church property, he suppressed small monasteries, and took their revenues and endowments for new colleges; also he founded a new college at Oxford known as Christ Church.

[36]Francis Gasquet, Henry VIII and the English Monasteries, 2 vols. (London, 1906), I, 385.

[37]Works, II, 297, a letter, which may have been erroneously attributed to Latimer by Foxe, was written to Henry VIII, Dec. 1, 1530. Gardiner came to Cambridge and obtained a select committee of divines to report upon the validity of marriage to Catherine. Latimer's name is marked as favorable. He is listed as "Master of Theology" and is on the Doctor's list. D.N.B., XI, 613. Works II, 309.

list sent down from Cambridge as favorable to the King's purpose.[38] On March 13, 1530, he was invited by Henry to preach at Windsor, probably to the deep annoyance of his opponents; likewise, to the keen delight of his friends.[39] King Henry highly commended the sermon. The usual gratuity paid to a court preacher was paid to Latimer, and a further sum was added from the privy purse.[40] His travel expenses from Cambridge were paid through the benevolence of the vice-chancellor.[41]

At the end of the year 1530 Latimer was aware of the tension one might feel as a chaplain near royalty. Through the suing of his friends to Cromwell, now the man of the hour, he was given the parish of West Kingston, Wilts, on the farthest edge of the diocese of Salisbury.[42] At Kingston, Latimer

[38] Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47, ed. J. S. Brewer, James Gairdner, with R. H. Brodie, 21 vols. (London, 1862-1932), V, 317.

[39] D.N.B., XI, 613.

[40] Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, ed. Robert Lemon and M.A.E. Green, 12 vols. and an addenda (London, 1856-72), V, 749. Works, I, 1-24. "Significant enough to mention that the sum would just cover Latimer's two weeks in London." Chester, 61.

[41] Letters and Papers, V, 751.

[42] Chester, 64. Chester believes he was rewarded with the West Kingston living by Henry for his services in promoting the divorce. West Kingston had been made vacant by the death of William Dowlying. The living was in the gift of the Bishop

carried out his parochial duties in the peace and the quiet of a small parish. He spoke of the difficulties of his assignment due to the great fatigue he suffered, but he seems to have found satisfaction in it after the tumult of court life and his earlier years at Cambridge. Memories of childhood must have brought a certain nostalgia to Latimer as he traveled over the old Roman fosseway that led from Gloucester and Warwick on to Thurcastone, his distant home. There were other links to his native village. The manor of West Kingston, like Thurcastone, belonged to members of the same family, and the Marquis of Dorset was lord of Thurcastone. No doubt Latimer's father had paid the rent of three or four pounds for his small farm at Thurcastone to the Marquis of Dorset. The same coat-of-arms of the Leicestershire Latimers, of whom we can only presume that Hugh was an offshoot, hung in the village church of Kingston.

According to a survey of ecclesiastical incomes compiled in 1535 his pastorate carried an annual stipend of seventeen

of Salisbury, but appointment was by the Crown. Foxe, VII, 454. The statement by Foxe that the see of Salisbury at that time was left vacant by Campeggio as he was an absentee. This left the Crown free to dictate the provision to benefices nominally in the gift of the Italian bishops, such as Salisbury and Worcester, who represented Tudor interests in Rome. The parish of West Kingston is now in the dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol whose bishops are the patrons. Latimer, it was believed, was not yet the king's personal chaplain at this time.

pounds, one shilling, the equivalent of about eight hundred and fifty pounds money today. The register in Salisbury records that Latimer was formally instituted as rector by Richard Hilley, vicar general of the diocese, acting for Campeggio in absentia.[43]

There is no adequate record of Latimer's activity during this period, except that gleaned from his extant sermons and letters. From these one learns what stirred the authorities. It was a sermon preached in a nearby church at Marshfield, a town about eleven miles east of Bristol. The contents of this sermon gave great offense to Dr. William Sherwood, who dated his letters to Latimer from Derham, a village in Gloucestershire, very near West Kingston.[44] There was still another letter from Hubberdin, who preached against the new learning, to set him aright.[45]

[43]Foxe, VII, 773, it is recorded in appendix "Quarto decima die mansis Januarii, anno 1530 (1531), Magister Richardus Hilley, Vicarius Generalis, in domo residentiae infra, clausum canonicorum Sacrum situta Ecclesiasam parochialem de West Kingston in Archideaconatus Wiltes. Sacrum Deac., per . . . Domini Will. Dowlying ultimi reatus vocantem a . . . ad collationeum plena juro spectante, Magistri Hugoni Latymer, presbytero, Sacrae Theologiae Baccalauria, auctoritate qua fungebatur contulit, ad ipsum, Rectorem dictae Ecclesiae de canonica obedientia. SC. juratum instituit canonica in eadem cum suis juribus & C et Scriptim fecit Archideaconia Wiltes, et ejus officali pro ipsius inductine & C." Campeggio Register, f. 24 Printed in the Appendix to Foxe, VII, 773, 774.

[44]Works, II, 309-17, 468, 474. Foxe, VII, 478-480. Works, II, 468-474.

[45]Works, II, 317-322. Strype, Eccles. Mem. I, 2 , 175.

Both of the above mentioned letters are important in this brief account of Latimer's life because they show that he advocated that the Scriptures be translated into English. The more widespread reading of the Scriptures, because of their ease of access, brought about a social as well as a doctrinal change.

If Latimer wished for only a simple, daily round of parochial duties, with an occasional sermon to give support to his new beliefs, he should then have been a little less vehement in his words and manner against the traditional faith and practices. On March 8, 1531, he was called before a committee for interrogation.[46] This was occasioned by Latimer's sermon preached in London at St. Mary's Church. It appears that the king seemed not to have listened to the complaint at first; but soon after Latimer returned to his parish, he was again called to London. Latimer's patron, Sir Edward Boynton,[47] a personal friend of the king, accompanied the Rector to the Vice-Chancellor. Seemingly he

[46] Foxe, VII, 249.

[47] Foxe, VII, 478-84. Sir Richard Boynton was the head of an ancient and wealthy family of Wiltshire. He was a near relative of Cardinal Pole, was in favor with Henry VIII, and was vice-chamberlain to three of the King's queens. The property of Sir Edward lay within a few miles of Latimer's parish.

satisfied Dr. Hilley,[48] but later he was cited to appear, on January 28, 1532, to answer other matters. On March 1, 1532, he stood before the convocation, where he refused to sign the articles that were submitted to him.[49] Meanwhile, he was held in custody at Lambeth. Finally he signed two articles and was thereby absolved and warned to appear again on April 15, 1532.[50] Scarcely back to his duties, he gave new offense to William Greenwood, a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.[51] This offense he administered in a letter. Undoubtedly, this was the letter which caused him to be present at a convocation on April 19, 1532.[52] Latimer appealed to the King, whose supremacy over the church convocation the council had been obliged to acknowledge in the preceding years.[53] However, Latimer confessed that he had erred, not only in discretion, but in doctrine.

[48] D.N.B., XI, 614. Dr. Hilley, Chancellor to the Italian Bishop of Salisbury, Cardinal Compeggio, saw Latimer in the presence of Sir Richard Boynton after hearing the opinion of various points on which he was accused of heresy, thought it best to serve him with citation January 10, 1532, to appear before the Bishop of London at St. Paul's on the 29th of January.

[49] Foxe, VII, 455.

[50] Works, II, 353-4.

[51] Works, II, 356-57. Strype, Eccles. Mem. I, 2, 175.

[52] State Papers, XXXIX, 476.

[53] Works, II, 368. Foxe, VII, 486-7.

Henry took him back into favor on condition that he would not offend again.[54]

Latimer, free to return to Kingston, almost immediately preached, on March 9, 1533, a violent sermon, and this despite his recantation.[55] The matter was reported in convocation, with the recent recantation which had been sent down to Bristol; however, the two men Hubbardine and Powell who had called up Latimer to answer the charges, were in trouble themselves for forbidding prayers for Anne Boleyn, newly proclaimed queen. With the help of Latimer's friend, John Hillsey, who defended him and discredited his accusers,[56] the whole affair gained for him more popularity than before. He was honored with an appointment to preach before the King every Wednesday in Lent during the spring of 1534.[57] In 1535 he was named one of the nine commissioners to investigate the case of Thomas Patmer, a heretic. In the following summer he was honored by being elected to the episcopacy, and was given the Bishopric of Worcester.[58]

[54] Works, II, 356-57.

[55] Works, II, xv.

[56] Works, II, 357-366.

[57] Works, II, 367.

[58] Edward Arber, An English Garner, Tudor Tracts 1532-1588 (Westminster, 1903), 5.

Worcester had been held by Cardinal Jerome de Ghenucci, an Italian, who was deprived of his office by an Act of Parliament, for being a non-resident.[59] Latimer was duly elected about the middle of August, and consecrated bishop by Cranmer, in September.[60] He received the temporalities of his see on October 5, 1535.[61] However, before the new bishop could occupy his see he had to pay for the first fruits of the new office. As he was unable to meet these charges, Anne Boleyn advanced the sum of two hundred pounds to the newly-elect.[62] After this duty was discharged, events moved smoothly to the installation of Latimer in his episcopal see.

Latimer was well acquainted with his new diocese, because his old parish of West Kingston lay just outside its southern border. The diocese was then much larger than it is today. It included the important towns of Worcester, Gloucester, and Bristol, as well as smaller, but equally well-known places like Tewkesbury, Warwick, and Stratford-on-Avon. The bishop held title to several "palaces" or residences in addition to

[59] Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, Vol. I-IX (1202-1603) ed. Rawden Brown, Cavendish Bentinck and Horatio Brown, 9 vols. (London, 1864-1898), IV, 971.

[60] Works, II, 368-71.

[61] Works, II, 368-369.

[62] Demaus, 205. Foxe, VII, 540. Latimer was consecrated according to the Roman Catholic ritual with the omission of the oath of allegiance to the pope. Chester, 104.

the manors and farms from which he derived the greater part of his income. His principal residence was at Hartlebury on the banks of the Severn, near Kiddeminster. He had other domiciles at Worcester, at Alvechurch, and at Kempsey on the Severn toward Tewkesbury. As bishop he also had a London residence in the Strand Place.[63] The revenues at Worcester were small in comparison with those of such wealthy sees as London or Winchester.[64] In 1533, two years before Latimer's accession, the income from the spiritualities was one thousand forty-nine pounds and nineteen shillings. It seems he never received a full income and was always in need;[65] he also asked for an assistant to lighten the burden of parish duties.

The first appearance of Latimer as a bishop in Parliament and Convocation was on February 4, 1536. He preached two sermons before the Convocation on June 9, 1536.[66]

He is known to have been in his diocese only three times. Letters written from Hartlebury or nearby show him to have been there from October until Christmas, in 1536; from late July until Christmas, in 1537; and from mid-June in 1538 until

[63] Demaus, 204.

[64] Darby, 108.

[65] Works, II, 412-13.

[66] Works, I, 56-57.

mid-January in 1539.[67]

During this period he made one trip at least to London. This was the occasion of Queen Jane Seymour's funeral solemnities, where he was asked to sing the solemn requiem mass and preach the sermon for the Queen.[68] Immediately after the funeral Latimer seems to have returned to Hartlebury, where he resumed the visitation of the monasteries.[69]

There are many letters to Cromwell during this period. The last is in behest of an old friend who had taken care of him during his illness, while in London, and now was in need of a favorable word in a lawsuit.[70]

Latimer's letters to Cromwell in the latter half of 1538 are taken up with such matters as destruction of shrines, repeated expressions of hope that some of the monasteries might be reserved for the reformed religion, and other matters for promoting the "New Learning." As one scans through the letters in chronological sequence, a note of increasing uneasiness can be detected.[71] Instead of the friendliness and self-confidence which had marked the earlier letters from

[67] Works, I, 33-58.

[68] Works, II, 386-387.

[69] Works, II, 388-389.

[70] Works, II, 417-418.

[71] Works, II, 380-381.

Hartlebury during the two preceding years, there is now often found a note of querulousness. The sparkle of humor is still there, but there is an overlay of complaining and often, too, even of anger.[72] It is as if Latimer saw the "handwriting on the wall," and somehow felt that he had slipped from the full confidence of the vicar-general;[73] likewise, that he detected within the government factions adverse to himself gathering force. Such suspicions, if he had them, were warranted, as events that follow will show.

After the last letter was written, Latimer was obliged to return to London to take part in the debate which led to the enactment of the Six Articles and, subsequently, to the loss of his bishopric. However, though he even lost support through the death of Anne Boleyn, the Seymour faction now favored him.[74] The king, however, seems to have cooled in his ardor for Latimer's preaching by this time.[75] In the three years following the Convocation Latimer was never invited to preach in London, although the king had not forgotten him, and had, in the autumn of 1538, sent to him at

[72] Works, II, 397-398.

[73] Works, II, 399.

[74] Works, II, 415-416.

[75] Works, II, 402.

Hartlebury, a stag shot in the king's forest.[76]

In 1539 Latimer was called to London to attend the Parliament, which met on April 28. Convocation opened at St. Paul's on May 2. Latimer was asked to act on a committee to draw up articles of uniformity of doctrine.[77] The members failed to agree within ten days and, under pressure from the king, the Act of Six Articles was passed on June 6.[78] During the next three days Latimer was absent from Parliament.[79] He was not safe, however, from the severities that attended a refusal to sign agreement to the Six Articles. On July 1 Latimer and Shaxton both resigned their bishoprics.[80] During the next year Latimer was kept in the custody of Dr. Sampson, bishop of Chichester. Henry gave Latimer a considerable pension of a hundred marks a year to be paid by the Court of Argumentations. Although this was not to be compared with the revenues of his bishopric, it made him financially better off than a parish priest. On September 29, 1539, he received

[76]Works, II, 404. Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 1, 562. Pt. 2, 371. The letter in gratitude was addressed to Cromwell: "And your lordship would have thanked the king's grace highness for my stag, in my name. I have been much bounden to you. I have made many merry in these parts."

[77]Works, I, 136.

[78]Works, I, 134.

[79]Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland of the Reigns of Henry, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth, ed. H.C. Hamilton, 5 vols. (London, 1860-1890), I, 234-5.

[80]Works, I, 136.

three months pension; and thereafter he had been paid semi-annually even into the reign of Edward VI.[81] After Dr. Sampson was confined to the Tower,[82] Latimer was released to leave London, but was prohibited from preaching either near the city or in the universities or in his own diocese.[83]

Of the next years little is known of Latimer's activities. Finally, with six years remaining of Henry's reign, Latimer was called before the Council of Greenwich to be questioned about Crome's book on new learning, and was placed in custody in the Tower. There he, in his own words, describes his days until Henry the Eighth's death.[84] "Cast into the Tower, and there to look daily for death."[85]

Latimer was released from the Tower in 1547.[86] This was achieved by the general pardon given upon the accession of Edward VI to the throne. For the first time in eight years, on January 1, 1548, he was allowed to preach.[87] From this

[81]Chester, 152.

[82]Constant, I, 380. Works, I, 164. Acts of the Privy Council, ed. John Roche Dasent, 32 vols. (London, 1890-1907), I, 417, 458. (Hereafter designated as APC.)

[83]Works, I, 164.

[84]Works, I, 276.

[85]Arber, 7.

[86]State Papers Domestic, I, 83,and Foxe, VII, p. 547.

[87]APC, II, 344; III, 382.

time until Mary's accession to the throne, Latimer preached frequently before the king and council and before the "little people" of the English realm.[88]

Latimer's renewed career was to be a very short five years. He was soon called to court during Mary's reign. In April, 1554, he was imprisoned in the Bocardo common jail at Oxford.[89] He was later tried by the Bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Bristol, commissioned by Cardinal Pole.[90] Finally he was condemned on October 1, 1555, and burned at the stake October 16, 1555.[91]

His memory has been kept alive by friends and enemies alike. But that which illumines this memory is the content of his sermons and letters. They are valuable to anyone

[88] Letters and Papers, Domestic, II, 5.

[89] Works, II, 435-555. Works, II, 345 and 444. An entry into Privy Council books, September, 1553, reads: "This daye Hugh Latymer, clerc, appeared before the Lordes, and for his seducious demeanor and was committed to the Tower." A letter to the Lieutenant of the Tower to deliver Sir John Williams "the bodyes of the late Archbishop of Canterbury." Doctor Ridley and Latymer were to be conveyed by him to Oxford." APC, IV, 340.

[90] James A. Müller, Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction (New York, 1926), 269-285.

[91] Foxe, VII, 247, 251. An interesting note on the expenses for Latimer's last days was found in Demaus: "Bread and ale, ii d.; oysters, i.d.; butter, ii d; eggs, ii d; lying, vii d.; Total ii d., vi d. three fagots of wood to burn Ridley and Latimer, 12, 0; one load of furze fagots, 3, 4; for the carriage of these four loads, 3, 0; a post, 1, 4; two chains, 3, 4; two staples, 6; four laborers, 2, 8. Total 25s, 2 d." Demaus, 517.

trying to achieve a deeper knowledge of the Tudor period. The greatest and most stirring dramas in human life are those which so often occur in the inner theater of the soul, hence sometimes escape the eyes of men. Hugh Latimer tried to externalize some of this travail on the part of his contemporaries in his sermons and letters.

III LATIMER'S SERMONS REFLECT THE CONTROL THAT THE REGENCY HAS OVER THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

"It hath pleased God to grant us a natural liege king and lord of our own nation; an Englishman; one of our own religion. God hath given him unto us, and [he] is a most precious treasure; and yet many of us do desire a stranger to be king over us."[1] Thus spoke Hugh Latimer on the occasion of a sermon before King Edward VI.

Edward VI was the son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, and was born in 1537. He was scarcely nine years old when he became king in 1547, and, of necessity, had to be ruled by others. His death at the age of fifteen added to the instability of the period. Even though Latimer could not fail to perceive this evil of his day, yet he cautions, "Now we have a lawful king; yet, nevertheless, many evils do reign."[2]

Since the political aspect of the reign of Edward VI is to be considered here, Latimer gives us his particular interpretation with a backdrop of England in the mid-sixteenth century. Edward's reign was entirely influenced by his protectors: Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, Duke of Somerset, and John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, Duke of Northumberland. Henry VIII's

[1] Works, I, 91.

[2] Works, I, 91.

design of prolonging his authority into the new reign had led him to appoint a council, of whom the above two mentioned men were members.

Even before the death of Henry VIII was made known, Seymour as protector to the young king, had placed himself at the head of the council. Obviously this was never intended by Henry VIII.

The other Lord Protector, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland (Warwick), had his eye on the throne for his own family. With this in mind he secured the marriage of his son, Guilford, to Lady Jane Grey. Having accomplished this alliance, he set about bringing into play events which caused the downfall of Somerset. He then induced young Edward to name Lady Jane Grey as his successor to the throne. However this occurred at the end of the reign of Edward VI.

Latimer can rightly be called the apostle of the England which really reflects the short period of Edward VI's reign -- a reign in which Latimer played such an important role. This role he assumed in the period of 1548-1552 when he literally hurled thunderbolts at the abuses of the government. These abuses were economic, social, political, and moral. These evils Latimer saw had infected the England which he loved so well. As few as five of the extant sermons belong to the period before 1525-1540, and thirty-eight belong to the period following. It is on these last sermons that his contemporary

reputation depends, rather than on the hundreds of earlier sermons.

The sermons before the young king were not delivered in the Royal Chapel. A pulpit was set up in the inner private garden, and Edward, due to his precarious state of health, listened to them through a window opening upon his bedroom.[3] Latimer spoke fearlessly, even though he must have known, or at least suspected, what this fearlessness would cost him. Latimer insisted that the king was the rightful monarch, despite the fact that he had to have councilors such as Seymour and Dudley. He says, "Therefore doubt not but the title of king is a lawful thing, is a lawful title, as of other magistrates. Only let the kings take heed that they do as it becometh kings to do, that they do their office well. It is a great thing, a chargeable thing."[4]

Even though Latimer put all authority in the king, he realized the greed of the men who now influenced him. Yet, the best government would have been severely tested in England during the years 1547-1558. The miseries of the country at that time defied remedies. Most of the abuses were inherited from Edward's father's reign, and were the result of Henry VIII's shortsightness and rapacity. Other abuses resulted

[3]Foxe, VII, 463.

[4]Works, I, 193.

from the emerging economic system. Although started in the reign of Henry VII, they were carried forward to a greater intensity in the reign of his son.

The reformers depended upon the strength of the king.[5] Emphasis was still on trust in the king and obedience to him. The right of rebellion as a means of securing political justice, if contemplated, was never expressed. From one point of view the Edwardian monarchial policy was to maintain old patterns, and to modify, but not to change them.

There was a good reason for Latimer's emphasis on obedience to the monarchy. Sir Thomas Smith, one of Somerset's few friends, and Secretary of State in the reign of Edward's youngest sister, declared: "The Prince is the life, the head and the authority of all things that be done in the realm of England."[6]

The whole period of Edward VI's reign can, perhaps, be best seen through sermons, especially those preached before the boy king. These spoken words reached thousands of listeners. They helped to shape both spiritual and political

[5]Edmund Goldsmith, A Collection of Historical Documents -- Illustrative of the Reigns of the Tudor and Stewart Sovereigns, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1886), II, 14-18.

[6]Keith Feiling, England under the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns (New York, 1927), II, Pt. 1, 67.

attitudes. The people who heard these official homilies could not help but be impressed by their ideas, as well as by their straight-forward simple diction. Hugh Latimer may have been unique in his direct, salty, idiomatic utterances from the pulpit to the multitude.[7] One fact that cannot be emphasized too often is that the listening public was interested in politics. Also these sermons were given out-of-doors, and thus afforded an opportunity for greater audiences to gather and listen. These sermons, as delivered, were an important means of disseminating propaganda, and were shrewdly used by authority.

Hugh Latimer used as text in his second Lenten sermon of the year 1549, "Woe to thee, O Land, where the king is a child"; and he followed this in another place by saying, "Blessed is the land where there is a noble king."[8]

But in the new monarchy the prince was the mainstay of the state,[9] and it was a serious thing for England that the successor of a powerful and resolute man should be a boy of nine years. Certainly the boy had more than usual ability; he had been trained to his office; he was already aware of

[7] Darby, 167.

[8] Works, I, 117. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 473-76.

[9] J. D. Mackie, The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558 (Oxford, 1952), 479.

his royalty, in spite of his youth.[10] Latimer noted this and, well aware of the comments on Edward's youth, blasted them with the following: "But let us pray God maintain and continue our most excellent king here present, true inheritor of this our realm both by nativity and also by the special gift or ordinance of God."[11]

Education of Edward VI

From the moment of his birth at Hampton Court on October 12, 1537, Edward had been surrounded with all the attention due to the long expected heir to the English Crown. The utmost care was taken of the King. At first he was brought up by women, but at the age of six he was turned over to the men. His household, which was considerable, was given a definite organization when his father went to France in July, 1544. He was taught deportment and horsemanship by the head of his household, his governor. As early as 1546 he played a part in the reception of the French ambassador, at which function he seems to have behaved with dignity.[13]

[10]Raphael Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Henry Ellis, ed., 6 vols. (London, 1807), III, 233.

[11]Works, I, 113. Foxe VI, 352.

[12]Holinshed, III, 920, 1107.

[13]A. F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth, 1547-1603 (London, 1929), 362.

Particular attention was paid to his physical health. In the spring of 1549 he was riding, running, and shooting. However, he never had the strength of his father nor a great interest in sport. Latimer, in his description of the king, states this about the sport of kings: ". . . and yet a king may take pastimes in hawking, or hunting or such like pleasure . . . use them for recreation when he is weary of weighty affairs."[14]

Most of his time, and evidently much of his interest, was devoted to his studies. He had a quick intelligence, and he was well taught. His principal tutor was John Cheke of Cambridge, a protégé of Butts, who was able to challenge Gardiner on the pronunciation of Greek.[15] His other teachers included Richard Cox, later bishop of Ely, and Anthony Cooke.[16] From these masters he learned English and Latin and Greek, according to the principles inculcated by Erasmus. Although some of his written work probably owed something to his masters, much of it seems to be his own, including his diary which

[14] Works, I, 120. R. Schuyler and H. Ausubel, The Making of English History (New York, 1952), 198-199.

[15] Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 2, 109. Patrick Frasier Tytler, England under the Reign of Edward VI and Mary, 2 vols. (London, 1938) II, 71. Gilbert Burnet, History of the Reformation, 3 vols. (London, 1865), II, 4.

[16] D.N.B., IV, 1001.

he began in 1550.[17] His penmanship he learned from Roger Ascham.[18] John Belmayne taught him French.[19] He had a German tutor, Randolph, and seems to have learned German well. The story that he was "not unversed" in Italian and Spanish lacks support.[20] It is very probable that the famous composer, Doctor Christopher Tye, was his musical preceptor; but he was taught the lute by Philip Van Wilder.[21]

The diary referred to above was a daily account of Edward's reaction to the times, as well as personal memoirs. It is hard for us in our modern day to realize that one so young could have such insight into the political turmoil of the times. His diary, appearing under the title, Journal of Edward VI, is almost cold-blooded in its impersonal attitude toward certain things. He is the only king to have left us an account of his personal feelings and attitudes.

Latimer can be deemed correct in the following statement made during one of his sermons, "I will tell you this, and I speak it even as I think; his majesty hath more godly wit and

[17]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 182.

[18]Stanley H. Kuvitz and Howard Haycraft, British Authors Before 1800 (New York, 1952), 13.

[19]Mackie, 479. Burnett, II, 34.

[20]Mackie, 479. Burnett, II, 34. Foxe, V, 702.

[21]Henry Ellis, Original Letters Illustrative of English History, 11 vols. (London, 1824-46), II, 130-137.

understanding, more learning and knowledge at this age, than twenty of his progenitors that I could name, had at any time of life."[24] Nor can it be denied that he had good school masters, for Edward's administrator hastens to add later in a sermon before the king, that ". . . he hath such school-masters as cannot be gotten in any realm."[25]

Edward had the Tudor talent; he understood theological discussions of his day, and his observations on such famous affairs show much good sense. Well informed on the ordinary political events, he certainly grasped much of their immediate significance, although he may not have comprehended all their meaning. All that he was conscious of was that he was king; and never did he betray signs of personal regard for men who served him, and who used his royalty to compass their own ends. He may have suspected the motives of his kinsmen and ministers, but he certainly noted, without signs of emotion, their risings and fallings, and even their executions. He merely noted in his diary the execution of Lord Somerset -- a man whom he evidently liked, and one who had been close to him and had treated him with kindness.[26] For the insurgent

[24] Works, I, 118. Burnet, II, 34. Foxe, V, 702.

[25] Works, I, 131. Constant, II, 299.

[26] Edward VI, Journal of King Edward's Reign (Cotton Library, 1844) entry on January 22: "The Duke Somerset had his head cut off on the Tower Hill between eight and nine in the morning."

peasants he showed little sympathy. From the moment of his father's death he was king. Latimer noted well this particular characteristic in the person of Edward VI when he said: "It hath pleased God to grant us a natural leige lord of our own nation; an Englishman; . . . God hath given him unto us, and [he] is a most precious treasure . . . ."[27]

Regency under Somerset

The work of ruling the land, which was in those days the personal concern of the king, could obviously not be accomplished by a child of nine. It must be done in his name, and the question was: who should wield the royal power until the child grew up? As was noted before Henry VIII had endeavored to provide for the time of the minority of his son by appointing, in his will, protectors and a council. But the word of a dead king could not prevail against the authority exercised in the name of a living monarch.[28] The question, as shown, was settled by the mere fact of power. The council was the general repository of executive power; and, at the moment of Henry's death, the council was dominated by a clique. This clique, though not truly protestant, was determined to at least maintain the reformation which Henry had effected, if not to carry it

[27] Works, I, 91. Burnett, II, 370-375.

[28] A. F. Pollard, England under Protector Somerset (London, 1900), 61.

further.[29] Throughout the whole reign of the boy king there was a constant struggle for power between ambitious politicians whose attitude toward economic and social questions was affected, not only by their own predilections, but by their search for popularity; and, in many cases, by their desire for personal gain.[30] Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford, became Duke of Somerset; John Dudley became earl of Warwick.

The first device was the establishment of a protectorate under Somerset. He, as the king's uncle, had some title to this office.[31] Latimer praises this council as he says: "And when had the king's majesty a council that took more pain both night and day for the setting forth of God's word, and profit of the commonwealth?"[32]

But Somerset proved unequal to the hour, and in the autumn of 1549 he was overthrown by Dudley, earl of Warwick, who had Somerset sent to the Tower. In February 1550, however, Somerset was released from the Tower, and for some eighteen months the rivals maintained an uneasy alliance. During this time Warwick gained an ascendancy over the young king. He finally

[29]J. G. Nicholas, Literary Remains of King Edward VI, 2 vols. (Roxburghe Club, 1857), I, 98.

[30]Pollard, Somerset, 207-08.

[31]John Strype, Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer, 3 vols. (London, 1853), II, 367.

[32]Works, I, 117-18.

persuaded young Edward that opposition to his plans (Warwick's) was treason against the royal person. And so in October 1551, Warwick was made Duke of Northumberland and Somerset was again sent to the Tower[33] to be beheaded there on January 22, 1552. Thereafter Northumberland did all for himself in the name of the king, who now appeared on the political stage.

From the beginning to the end Latimer's sermons, given on Friday , propounded his views on the Tudor theory of monarchy. The theory itself was commonplace. What is interesting in Latimer's treatment of it is the intensely ethical and religious undergirding which he provides. In a protestant commonwealth, released from obedience to the Universal Church, all authority, temporal and spiritual, rests with the monarch.[34] The king had his authority from God.[35]

As for worldly wealth, says Latimer, the king must have sufficient for his honor. As he puts it: "He shall not multiply unto himself too much gold and silver . . . and the necessity of it is that a king have a treasure always in

[33] Letters and Papers, October 16, 1551; also October 11, 1549, William Trumbull, Calendar of State Papers Foreign of the Reign of Edward VI, 1547, 1553 (London, 1861), 47.

[34] Feiling, 66-67.

[35] Charles Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England during the Reign of the Tudors, ed. William Hamilton, 2 vols. (London, 1875-1877), I, 178.

readiness."[36] As to the ways by which the king was to gain this necessary money to run the business of government, Latimer states that it should necessarily come from the people through taxes.[37] Latimer instructs the king on the theory of taxation by the state and the means of carrying it forth within its limits: "God appointed every king an sufficient living for his state and degree; and it is lawful for every king to some goods and possessions. But to exhort and take the right of the poor, is against the honor of the king."[38]

For a clear picture of the revenues granted to the king by order of Parliament we turn to Strype in his Ecclesiastical Memorials: ". . . an aid of twelve pences the pound of goods of his material subjects, and two shillings the pound of strangers. And this is to continue for three years."[39] The same Parliament gave Edward a second aid, of every ewe kept in several pastures three pence; and of every wether kept in the commons, three half-pence. The Hanse gave the king eight pence for three years, throughout all England.

[36] Works, I, 97.

[37] Works, I, 299-300.

[38] Works, I, 394, 508.

[39] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 155.

The need for taxation by Edward's government was due to the bankruptcy of Henry's treasury. This bankruptcy is often attributed to Henry's personal extravagances, as well as to the costliness of foreign wars. There was a progressive decline in the revenues of the Crown towards the end of Henry's reign. The ordinary royal income was still derived from the ancient taxes, consisting of tenths, fifteenths, and subsidies. Owing to the enclosures and the subsequent decay of small holdings, and the scarcity of meats and other provisions brought on by the excessive sheep farming, the right of purveyance had been greatly reduced. A similar fate had overtaken the tenths, fifteenths, and subsidies. These direct variable taxes had been derived from the tenth levied on cities, and the fifteenth levied on rural districts. This custom of assessing had come down from the mid-fourteenth century, and had not been increased in comparison to prices.[40]

While the government expenses rose there were not sufficient taxes being collected to cover these expenses. The government's debasing of coinage resulted from the discovery of gold and silver in America, and caused a sharp increase in prices. Somerset tried to remedy the matter by his efforts to restore

[40]Frederick Dietz, Finances of Edward and Mary, "Smith College Studies in History," No. 2 (Northampton, 1918), 77-91.

money to its original value, but it was practically impossible to do so.[41] The advice given to the king shows that Latimer felt it lawful for him to tax his subjects for all just purposes, but he must not tax so much that his subjects are impoverished, nor may he permit any of his subjects to have too much at the expense of those who are poorer than themselves. It rests with the king to determine equitably how much is sufficient either for himself or for any of his subjects.[42] Here again he may not trust his councillors in the government who are guided by self-interest. Latimer puts it this way: "And so, for a necessary and expedient occasion it is warranted by God's word to take tax of the subject. But if there be sufficient treasures and the burdening of the subjects for a vain thing, so that he will require thus much or so much of his subjects . . . then this covetous intent, and the request thereof is too much."[43] However the king must see to it that he has enough to redress cases of inequity. He must, also, always be ready to hear the complaints of his subjects, the little unimportant people, as well as the great.[44]

[41] Pollard, Somerset, 91.

[42] Works, II, 98.

[43] Works, I, 97, 98.

[44] Works, I, 126-127.

Another duty of the king was that he must see to it that the judges and magistrates also do justice, else he will be as guilty of injustice as they. For as the preacher says: "And why? Is he not supreme head of the church? What is the supremacy, a dignity and nothing else? Is it not accountable? I think it will be chargeable dignity [kingship] WHEN ACCOUNT SHALL BE ASKED OF IT."[45] All this imposes a heavy responsibility upon the king.[46]

Since the Friday sermons were addressed to the king and his court in 1549, it is not surprising that Latimer speaks more of the duty of kings and magistrates than he does of the duty of the subject. But the subject's responsibilities are clear by implication, and in the later sermons similar economic and social obligations are explicitly affirmed.[47]

The Marriages of Edward and His Sisters

Latimer, in his last sermon before Edward VI, gave the following admonition regarding the young king's marriage: "And here I would say a thing to your Majesty: I shall speak it of good will to your highness: I would I were able to do your Grace good service in any thing, ye should be sure to

[45] Works, I, 152.

[46] Works, I, 125, 130.

[47] Works, I, 265-266; II, 190-191.

have it. But I will say this: for God's love beware where you marry; choose your wife in faithful stock. Beware of this worldly policy; marry in God: marry not for the great respect of alliance, for thereof cometh all these evils of breaking of wedlock, which is among princes and noblemen. And here I would be a suitor unto your majesty; for I come now rather to be a suitor and a petitioner, than a preacher; for I come now to take my leave, and to take my ultimum vale, at leastwise in this place; for I have not long to live, so that I think I shall never come here into this place again; and therefore I will ask a petition of your highness. For the love of God, take an order for marriages here in England."[48]

A plot had already been laid for bringing about the marriage of Lady Jane Grey to the young king.[49] Still another plan was that he would marry Mary, Queen of Scots. Somerset had perpetrated this plan, acting upon the policy of the late king to bring about a union of the two realms. We have already seen that Latimer had advised the young king to marry an English woman. From such a union would come, he hoped, in the fullness of time, a true Englishman to the English throne.[50]

[48] Works, I, 243.

[49] Tytler, I, 131. Burnet II, Pt. 2, 242.

[50] Works, I, 94-97.

Latimer had to concede to Somerset's plan of the marriage of Edward VI to Mary, Queen of Scots.[51] There were numerous threats and promises to induce the Scots to carry out Somerset's project.[52] However, the scheme was unpopular with the Queen Dowager, Mary of Guise, both on religious grounds and on national party principles. The unfortunate Battle of Pinkie, in which the Scots were defeated, widened the breach between England and Scotland.[53] Mary was no longer safe in her own realm, and was removed to France.

In a letter which Sir Thomas Chamberlain wrote to the Council are found details of a conversation which he had with the French Ambassador. They concern the treaty of marriage between King Edward VI and the Princess Elizabeth of France. Princess Elizabeth was the god-child of King Henry VIII, and was at this time, only seven years of age.

In June, 1551, Edward VI had been made a Knight of the Garter; in July he was invested with the insignia of St. Michael; and on July 19, 1551, there was signed at Angers a treaty whereby Edward, resigning his claim to the hand of Mary of Scotland, betrothed himself to Elizabeth of France.

[51] Letters and Papers (July, 1547), II, 4.

[52] State Papers, Foreign, 140.

[53] State Papers, Domestic, I, 45. APC, II, 225.

This year witnessed a great exchange of civilities.[54] Mary of Guise, returning from a visit to France, was given a magnificent reception.[55]

So, while Latimer advised having Edward marry an Englishwoman, the King's counsillors, Somerset and Warwick, projected diverse plans. As Latimer states to Edward: "Therefore let our king what time his grace shall be so minded to like the wife choose him one which is of God; that is what is of the household of the faith."[56] Latimer concludes with other requirements for a good wife for Edward: love, chastity, and virtues to enthrone her in the heart of the king and of England.[57]

The preacher is concerned to ensure the succession of the crown, as likely he knows full well that, frail as Edward VI is, ought to consider marrying and having an heir. Otherwise one of his sisters, Mary or Elizabeth, will succeed him to the throne.[58]

[54]Calendar of Letters, Dispatches, and State Papers Relating to Negotiations between England and Spain. Preserved in the Archives at Vienna, Simancas, IX-XIII, ed. M.A.S. Hume & Royal Tyler (London, 1912), vols. IX, 227.

[55]Holinshed, III, 865.

[56]Works, I, 94.

[57]Strype, Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, ed. P. E. Barnes, 2 vols. (London, 1833), 296.

[58]Tytler, II, 154.

In the meantime Mary and Elizabeth were the king's living heirs. They must marry Englishmen.[59] If either married a foreigner, never let her come to the throne. For a foreign king would be the worst fate that Latimer could imagine for England, for it would bring back the strange religion. Latimer harps on this subject. "Oh what a plague were it, that a strange king, of a strange land, and of a strange religion, should reign over us . . . God keep such a king from us."[60] He warns his listeners that if such a plague would fall on them, it would be punishment for England's vices. "The king's grace hath sisters, my lady Mary and my lady Elizabeth, which by succession and course are inheritors of the crown, who if they should marry strangers, what would ensue? God knowest."[61] No one doubts Mary's right to succession. Plain in appearance, intense in feelings, half Spanish in temperament as in blood, she never looked for ideas or inspirations beyond the Catholic world of southern Europe as her mother had known it. She was deeply religious, and in a world where the most fervent Catholics saw that reform must touch the Papacy or all would be lost, she remained a complete Papist.[62]

[59]Holinshed, III, 913.

[60]Tytler, I, 113.

[61]Works, I, 91.

[62]Foxe, VI, 352.

Latimer defended the crown in his anxiety over the successor for the throne. All who instigated or sympathized with the increasing Protestantism of the Edwardian policy knew, as Latimer did, that should Mary ascend the throne, such an event might be fatal for them, as well as for their religious activities.

Latimer's Conflict with the Lord Admiral

The Protectorate was promoted and defended by Hugh Latimer. He especially protected it in his remarks concerning Thomas Seymour. Thomas Seymour was the brother of Edward Seymour (Lord Somerset, the young king's Protector). Thomas Seymour was an ambitious man. He imagined that he had not been sufficiently considered in the distribution of honors and estates made by the executors of Henry VIII. Since he was uncle to the young king, he persuaded himself that his authority ought to be second to that of his brother; and he secretly paid his addresses to the Queen Dowager, Catherine Parr.[63] This, of course, was done with the object in mind of increasing his own power. Admiral Thomas Seymour was a gallant, accomplished, and (if Holbein's brush has not flattered), a very handsome man. Catherine Parr, in her misguided notion that he loved her and not her jewels or her dowry, gave him her hand.

[63]Tytler, I, 54. APC II, 241-9.

The whole affair proves interesting in illustrating the rivalry that existed between the two brothers, and indicates that the Lord Admiral's (Thomas Seymour) towering ambition could be content with no common share of power. Marriage to the Queen Dowager (Catherine Parr) was the "rung" in the ladder of his ambitious climb to fame.[64] After the death of Catherine the Lord Admiral now aimed higher, and began secret addresses to the Lady Elizabeth.[65] He also, it was who laid a plot for accomplishing the marriage of the Lady Jane Grey to the young king.[66]

The ambition of the Lord Admiral, Thomas Seymour was restless. His intrigues, often detected and so often pardoned, became so frequent, and his resolution to bring about a change in the government became so manifest, that it was impossible for his brother, the Lord Protector, Edward Seymour, to overlook or despise.[67] This neglect (or call it indulgence) of his brother, seems to have served only to fire an ambition already devastating. It seems to have encouraged those fierce passions, which from the first had made Thomas Seymour tyrannical and domineering.

[64] State Papers, Domestic, 8. APC, II, 250.

[65] Tytler, I, 64-67. APC, II, 251-2.

[66] Tytler, I, 137-141. APC, II, 257.

[67] Tytler, I, 135. Burnett, II, 158. Ellis, II, 153, 157. APC, II, 254.

With the servants about the young king over whom the Lord Admiral maintained an undue influence, he continued his secret intercourse.[68] He had gained the heart of the Lady Elizabeth.[69] He courted popularity, kept an almost royal establishment, secretly amassed large sums of money, and was so unguarded as to throw off speeches by which it was evident that he contemplated some desperate strike against the government and his brother (Edward Seymour), the Lord Protector.[70] He was guilty of various kinds of corruption. He organized a faction within the Council in opposition to his brother. And it is certain that he hoped to become co-protector, if not to usurp Somerset's position altogether.

One of the Lord Admiral's minor offences was that he attempted to win the support of the young king by supplying him with money, a point noted here only because, in 1548, Edward VI used some of this money to pay Latimer for his court sermons.[71]

[68] Tytler, I, 138. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 187. APC, II, 251-2.

[69] Tytler, I, 135. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 187. APC II, 257.

[70] Tytler, I, 152. APC II, 255.

[71] Tytler, I, 150. Journals of the House of Commons, 1549, ed. T. Varden and T. E. May, 17 vols. (London, 1852), Card 1. APC, II, 253.

At last the Council prepared a set of charges against the Lord Admiral (Thomas Seymour); and, on March 4, 1549, he was accused of treason and condemned by the Act of Parliament.[72] Finally, on March 22, 1549, he was beheaded on Tower Hill. Ever since that time historians have been debating the degree of the Admiral's guilt, the legality of the procedure by which he was executed; and above all, the responsibility of his brother, Edward, the Lord Protector, for the Admiral's death.

Whatever the true answers to these questions may be, it was loudly asserted, immediately after the Lord Admiral's death, by certain members of his faction, that his execution was judicial murder, instigated by his brother, Edward, Lord Somerset.

Latimer in the last five of his Friday sermons before Edward VI, either undertook, or was assigned, to answer these charges.[73] In his sermon on March 24, 1549, two days after the execution of the Lord Admiral, he reproved those who challenged the decrees of the Council and Parliament, and exhorted his audience to accept the decisions of constituted authority by telling them: "I will not say but that the king and his council may err; the parliament houses, both the high

[72]Tytler, I, 152. Burnet, III, 205. APC II, 253.

[73]APC II, 410. Darby, 192.

and the low, may err; it becometh us, whatsoever they decree, to stand unto it, and receive it obediently, as far forth as it is not manifest wicked, and directly against the word of God. It pertaineth unto us to think the best, though we can not render a cause for the doing of everything; for caritas omnia credit, omnia sperat, 'Charity doth believe and trust all things.' We ought to expound to the best all things, although we cannot yield a reason."[74]

Latimer spoke precisely in answer to those who saw proof of innocence in the courage with which the Admiral went to his death. Latimer answers "This is no good argument, my friends: a man seemeth not to fear death, therefore his cause is good. This is a deceivable argument: He went to his death boldly, ergo, he standeth in a just quarrel."[75]

Latimer further alleged that while the Lord Admiral was in the Tower awaiting execution he had addressed letters to the Princess Mary and to the Princess Elizabeth in which he urged them to conspire against the Lord Protector, Somerset. In his fourth sermon before Edward VI Latimer says, "The man wrote certain papers which I saw myself. There were two little ones, one to my Lady Mary's grace, and another to my Lady

[74] Works, I, 148, 165. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 126.

[75] Works, I, 160.

Elizabeth's grace, tending to this end, that they should conspire against my Lord Protector's grace: surely, so seditiously as could be."[76] Latimer asserts that on the block the Lord Admiral turned to the Lieutenant of the Tower and said, "Bid my servant speed the thing that he wots of."[77] The words were overheard, and the letters were found in the servant's shoe. Latimer further charged, with grudging admiration, that the Lord Admiral had been able to manufacture both the pen and ink with which the letters were written. He tells how they were found: "They were sewed between the soles of a velvet shoe. He made his ink so craftily and with such workmanship, as the like hath not been seen. I was prisoner in the Tower myself, and I could never invent to make ink so. It is a wonder to hear of his subtilty. He had made his pen of the aglet of a point, that he had plucked from his hose, and thus wrote these letters so seditiously, as ye have heard, enforcing many matters against my Lord Protector's grace, and so forth."[78]

In the same sermon Latimer asserted that he had met, years before, a prostitute condemned for robbery, who, before she was hanged at Tyburn, confessed that her first fall from virtue

[76] **Works**, I, 152, 161-2.

[77] **Works**, I, 162.

[78] **Works**, I, 160-162. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 426-429.

had been brought about by the Lord Admiral. Latimer states, "A whore, a vain body was led from Newgate to the place of execution for a certain robbery that she had committed, and she had a wicked communication by the way . . . . This woman, I say, as she went by the way, had wanton and foolish talk . . . [And amongst all other talk she said that such a one (and named this man) had first misled her.]"[79]

In his sermon in the following week Latimer defended the Bill of Attainder, and argued that the Lord Admiral had received as much justice as if he had been tried by the Lords. He says, "By this ye may perceive it is possible for a man to answer for himself, and be arraigned at the bar, and nevertheless to have wrong: yea, ye shall have it in the form of law, and yet have wrong, too." . . . Paul was allowed to answer for himself . . . ."[80]

Two weeks after the above quoted sermon had been delivered, Latimer, in his Good Friday sermon, added another item to his list of the Admiral's particular faults. He asserted that the Lord Admiral had been a scoffer of religion as proved by his attitude toward family prayer in his wife's (Catherine Parr) household. Latimer says: "I have heard say, when that good

[79] Works, I, 164.

[80] Works, I, 181-183. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 188.

queen that is gone had ordained in her house daily prayer both before noon and after noon, the admiral gets him out of the way, like a mole digging in the earth."[81] And finally, Latimer completes his invectives against Thomas Seymour, the Lord Admiral, by the following: "He was, I heard say, a covetous man, a covetous man indeed: I would there were no more in England! He was, I heard say, an ambitious man: I would there were no more in England! He was, I heard say, a seditious man, a contemner of common prayer: I would there were no more in England! Well: he is gone."[82]

However, Thomas Seymour, the Lord Admiral was not without supporters in the faction-ridden court. Therefore, nothing could be more logical than to suggest getting rid of him by way of attainder. Latimer stood by the decision of the government of that day. His protestations as to the sanctity of government, as stated in the pulpit, held great weight with his listeners.[83]

The Lord Admiral, Thomas Seymour, was no coward, and had come to his death on Tower Hill with such boldness, as we have noted before, that those not favorable to his brother, the

[81] Works, I, 228-29. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 189.

[82] Works, I, 163.

[83] Works, I, 220. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 190-191.

Lord Protector, were quick to assert that he must have been innocent.[84] This criticism of the king and the council Latimer would not have; and it is obvious in what Latimer says that he is no mere mouthpiece of Lord Somerset.[85] The Lord Admiral represented the very type of men whom Latimer considered the greatest menace to honest living. What kind of counsel Latimer gave the Lord Admiral in his role as confessor a few days before the death of the Admiral, we shall never know. However, it is certain that Latimer could make no pleas in defense of his penitent.[86]

It is not surprising that Latimer's allegations of treason, fornication, and irreligion provoked the Admiral's faction to indignant protest. Latimer noticed that his sermons now were not listened to with the attention formerly given them, and complains: "Surely it is an ill misorder that folk should be walking up and down in the sermon time, as I have seen in this place this Lent: and there should be such huzzing and buzzing in the preacher's ear, that it maketh him oftentimes to forget his matter. O let us consider the king's majesty's goodness! This place was prepared for banqueting of the body; and his

[84] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. I, 195-9. Constant, II, 141. Innes, 198.

[85] Works, I, 185.

[86] Works, I, 183.

majesty hath make it for the comfort of the soul, and to have the word of God preached in it; showing hereby that he would have all his subjects at it, if it might be possible. Consider what the king's majesty hath done for you; he alloweth you all to hear with him. Consider where ye be."[87]

Specifically the Admiral's friends branded Latimer's statements as lies; and charged that he had been suborned by the Lord Protector and the Council. Latimer explains: "The council needs not my lie for the defense of that that they do. I can bear it of myself. Concerning myself, that which I have spoken hath done some good. You will say this: the parliament-house are wiser than I am, you might leave them to the defence of themselves. Although the men of the parliament-house can defend themselves, yet have I spoken this of a good zeal, and a good ground, of the admiral's writing; I have not feigned nor lied one jot, I take God to witness. Use therefore your judgment and languages as it becometh christian subjects. I will now leave the honourable council to answer for themselves. He confessed one fact, he would have had the governance."[88]

Some alleged, however, that Latimer had been suborned by the Duchess of Somerset, the Protector's wife, who was popularly

[87] Works, I, 204.

[88] Works, I, 184.

believed to have been piqued because protocol required her to yield precedence to the Admiral's wife, Catherine Parr, as former queen.[89] In either case, his enemies likened Latimer to Doctor Ralph Shaw. Doctor Shaw was the prebendary of St. Paul's, whose services Richard Crookback suborned to proclaim the illegitimacy of the sons of Edward IV.[90] "It behoves them of the parliament to look well upon the matter: and I, for my part, think not but they did well; else I should not yield the duty of a subject. Some liken me to Doctor Shaw, that preached at St. Paul's Cross, that King Edward's (Edward IV) sons were bastards."[91]

Latimer's statements must be judged in terms of his known sincerity of character. He maintains that religion can now be supported and strengthened only through the law (the king and his council), since there is no other outside authority except that of the Crown.

[89] Foxe, II, 15. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 92, 94, 141.

[90] Foxe, VI, 283.

[91] Works, I, 183-184.

IV. LATIMER'S VIEWS ON ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Among the many economic problems facing Latimer in the reign of Edward VI, perhaps the most important was that of enclosure. Enclosure is a generic term used to designate three different processes: (a) the substitution of large holdings for small ones, by the ejection of tenants with the consequent decay of their tenements; (b) the conversion of arable land and grazing land into sheep runs, the sheep being kept for their wool and not for their meat; and (c) the enclosure of common lands and wastes.[1]

Latimer had grown up familiar with the life of the farmer in medieval England. He was of yeoman stock, and never lost pride in the stock from which he had sprung. He always remained free from pretense and camouflage. He was happy in his memories of childhood days spent as a farmer's son. He now sees the picture gradually changing. "And the preacher has kept well enough in touch with the life of his native village to be able to quote the differences in rent and costs known by his father and the less fortunate man now tilling the same land."[2] He was always in touch with rural England of which he was proud to be a part.

[1]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 360.

[2]Darby, 9. Foxe, VII, 437.

The class of yeomen to which Latimer belonged had enjoyed a moderate prosperity in the later years of the fifteenth century. But from the turn of the sixteenth century it had suffered grievously from many economic abuses, especially those of enclosures.

The early sixteenth century witnessed a gradual transition in economics, as well as in the social and political fields. The Reformation had increased the speed of alterations within human society. These alterations had begun long before Henry VIII had mounted the throne of England. Those people who suffered from the consequent changes of the times attributed much of their less desirable position to the "new learning", and the rejection of old customs, now taking the form of the far-reaching enclosures of the land. The very fact of the people's discontent was of great concern to Latimer. He says in his last sermon preached before Edward VI, "I remember mine own self a certain giant, a great man who sat in commission about such matters; and when the townsmen should bring in what had been inclosed, he frowned and chafed, and so near looked and threatened the poor men, that they durst not ask their right."[3]

The social disorders of England came to a head during the reign of Edward VI. They were really the disorders of the

[3] Works, I, 248.

century; and seem to have threatened the very life of England. There was an uprising of the lower classes against the "nouveau riche". Consequent events in England prove that however much these rebellions might have been stimulated by economic change, they were not wholly the result of the "new learning". Like most uprisings the basic cause of discontent was the growing wealth of the gentry and the increasing poverty of the peasantry. The growing wealth of the gentry was caused by the enclosures, and thus enclosures continued to be a chief cause of discontent. Enclosures were constantly denounced, and more and more agrarian demands were made.[4]

Hugh Latimer's sermons and letters were directly pointed at some of the abuses of the time. He was aware of the human displacement caused by the enclosure movement; and succinctly described it as follows: "For where there have been a great many householders and inhabitants, there is now but a shepherd and his dog."[5] Concerning more indirect effects of the enclosures, Latimer warned: "For if ye bring it to pass that the yeomanry be not able to put their sons to school (as indeed universities do wonderously decay already), and that they be not able to marry their daughters to the avoiding of whoredom;

[4]Presevered Smith, The Age of Reformation (New York, 1920), 314.

[5]Works, I, 100.

I say, ye pluck salvation from the people, and utterly destroy the realm."[6]

The England that Latimer was looking back to with nostalgia was an agricultural England, where the towns were few and small; and all of them, including London, had their fields. Latimer could thus use the ploughmen and their ploughs as an image to reach the people. Part of the population lived in little agricultural communities called manors, each set in the midst of unfenced arable fields. Usually there were three of these fields, but sometimes only two, to which were attached some meadowland. The fields were divided into strips, often a furlong in length. These fields were tilled by various cultivators. The essential feature of the manor was that the lord kept his own land, a "demesne". His land, also, was sometimes in the form of strips, and he farmed it with the aid of dependents.

Latimer proudly describes his own particular manner of life on a manor. He contrasts it sharply with the present abuse of the land due to the enclosure system. He says: "He [Hugh's father] kept hospitality for his poor neighbors, and some alms he gave to the poor, and all this he did of the said farm, where he that now hath it payeth sixteen pound

[6]Works, I, 102.

by year, or more, and is not able to do anything for his prince, for himself, nor for his children, or give a cup of drink to the poor."[7]

By the year 1500 life in the manor had lost much of its old simplicity. Enclosure of the land in various forms was going on. There was enclosure of the waste and forest for agricultural purposes. There was enclosure of open field strips into a smaller number of hedged fields to promote better individual tillage. There was enclosure of village commons, and the enclosure of arable lands to be used for pasture.

Latimer says, "I read of late in an Act of Parliament; and this act made mention of an Act that was in King Henry's days, . . . ; yea, and such another business there was in King Edward's time, the second also. In this Parliament . . . the gentlemen and the commons were at variance, as they were now of late. And there the gentlemen that were landlords would needs have away much lands from their tenants; and would needs have an Act of Parliament, that it might be lawful for them to inclose and make several from their tenants, and from the commons, such portions of their lands as they thought good . . . at last it was concluded and granted that they

[7]Works, I, 101.

might so do; provided alway, that they should leave sufficient to the tenant . . . . Or who shall now judge what is sufficient? . . . ; if they had it then in their power . . . they would leave no more than sufficient . . . then if they had any more taken from them since that time, then had they now not sufficient."[8]

Many peasants had shaken themselves free from their burdensome personal services, and had thus lost their old security of tenure. The lease-holder was at the mercy of the lord when his lease expired, and was likely to have to pay a heavy fine for the privilege of renewal. He might, perhaps, have his rent increased. He was also liable to pay a fine every time that the estate passed from one holder to another. Some tenancies dated so far back, and had been consecutively passed through so many hands that it was impossible to determine who had been the original holder.[9] The position of the hired laborer, into which many of the smaller copyholders and customary tenants had sunk, was little better than vagrancy.[10]

Landlords became more and more astute businessmen; they managed their lands as a business. One result of the new spirit was rack-renting, unreasonable and tyrannous increases

[8]Works, I, 248-49.

[9]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 360.

[10]Pollard, Somerset, 30.

in rent.[11] The landlord with enclosures tended to turn arable land into pasture, substituting sheep-raising for tillage; and finally enclosed all the waste.[12]

The commoners were robbed by the forfeiture of the monastic lands. Both common fields and commons, no doubt, disappeared in many places; and the country saw the first notable installment of enclosure. The confiscation of the lands of the monasteries began as a decision of Parliament, on February 4, 1539. This decision was an outgrowth of the famous Merton-Westminster Statute as far back as the year 1235.[13]

After the abbeys had fallen the great woods were cut down and sold. Consequently, the poor had then great difficulty in getting wood for fire; and various small home industries disappeared. "We of the clergy had too much"; says Latimer, "but that is taken away, and now we have too little."[14]

Although the actual extent of the enclosure movement is debatable, it certainly changed the form of life from a better to a worse one. It was certainly an eventual change to a poorer people. The agrarian policies became a burning issue;

[11] Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 2, 360-361.

[12] Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 2, 361.

[13] John Alzog, Manual of Universal Church History, 4 vols. (Dublin, 1890), III, 319.

[14] Works, I, 100.

and Latimer comments, in his usual vigorous style, as follows: "Thus all the enhancing and rearing goeth to your private commodity and wealth. So that where you had a single too much, you have that; and since the same, ye have enhanced the rent, and so have increased another too much: so now ye have double too much, which is too, too much. But let the preacher preach till his tongue be worn to the stumps, nothing is amended. We have good statutes made for the commonwealth, as touching commoners and inclosers; many meetings and sessions; but in the end of the matter there cometh nothing forth."[15] Elsewhere in the same sermon Latimer states: "Furthermore, if the king's honour, as some men say, standeth in the great multitude of people; then these graziers, inclosers, and rent-rearers, are hinders of the king's honour . . . . My lords and masters, I say also, that all such proceedings which are against the king's honour (as I have a part declared before, and as far as I can perceive), do intend to make the yeomanry slavery, and the clergy shavery. For such works are all singular, private wealth and commodity."[16]

While the royal legislation formerly, as we have already stated, tried to restrain enclosure, the crown usually in the

[15] **Works**, I, 101. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 360.

[16] **Works**, I, 100.

final analysis, gave in by legalizing it. The summer of 1549 saw uprisings all over the country, which in Norfolk under Robert Ket reached the proportions of a major rebellion. The Lord Protector's (Edward Seymour) failure to deal firmly with these disorders ruined his credit, already shaken by the intrigues and execution of his brother, Thomas Seymour, the Lord Admiral. The Lord Protector was swept from power, but was readmitted to the council, April 1550. Upon his return he tried to slow down the pace of change against which Latimer had been so vehemently preaching. However, Warwick, who had won over the young king and had been made Duke of Northumberland, now packed the council and pushed through his agrarian statute. As a result Somerset was charged with a bogus plot, and executed in January, 1552. After his death the lords of Edward VI's Council destroyed any improvement that had been achieved on agrarian policy.[17]

Latimer was not alone in his outcry against the evils of enclosure. Note what Thomas Lever, a very grave preacher, contemporary of Latimer , has to say: ". . . one reason of this plenty of miserable object in London was the destruction of tillage in the country, the demolishing cottages there; whereby it came to pass that the poor had neither work or

[17]Frederick C. Dietz, Political and Social History of England (New York, 1942), 205.

harbour. And so having no subsistence in the tries, they were fain to come up to get bread, or beg for it in the city."[18] Lever continues in this strain, "O Merciful Lord, what a number of poor, feeble, halt, blind, lame, sickly; yes, with idle vagabonds, and dissembling catiffs mixed among them, lie and creep begging in the miry streets of London and Westminster. It is a common custom with covetous landlords, to let their housing decay, that the farmer shall be fain, for a small regard, or none at all, to give up his lease, that they taking the ground into their own hands, may turn all to pastures. So now old fathers, poorer widows, and young children, lie begging in the miry streets."[19]

There were a few besides himself, according to Hugh Latimer, who <u>did</u> try to forestall the abuses resulting from the enclosing of the land. He spoke of one such man in his first sermon before Edward VI, saying: "In this realm are a great many folks, and amongst many I know but one of tender zeal who at the motion of his poor tenants hath let down his land to the old rents for their relief."[20] The man referred to by Latimer was John Hales, "A royal commission had been

[18]Strype, <u>Eccles. Mem</u>., II, Pt. 2, 13.

[19]Strype, <u>Eccles, Mem</u>., II, Pt. 2, 147.

[20]<u>Works</u>, I, 102.

issued and acted upon in 1548 with a view to redress the grievances and misery occasioned by these inclosures: and Mr. Hales, one of the commissioners, attempted in the next session of parliament to have three different bills passed with the same view, "but in the end of the matter there came nothing forth."[21] John Hales was a commissioner of high quality and integrity, and for that reason had been appointed for inquiry into the abuses and hard pressures upon the poor. He was the most active instrument of the policy of purity.

Hugh Latimer goes on to pray that there be many more like him (John Hales) in the realm: "For God's love let not him be a phenix, let him not be alone, let him not be an hermit closed in a wall; some good man follow him, and do as he giveth example."[22]

In the first year of the reign of Edward VI a king's commission was formed. This was due entirely to the influence of the Lord Protector, Somerset. Among the principal members of the commission were Hugh Latimer, John Hales, and Thomas Lever. The commission drew up various articles or proposals which were based on the ideas of the Commonwealth Party.[23]

[21] Works, I, 101-102, Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 1, 145.

[22] Works, I, 102.

[23] State Papers, Domestic, I, 56.

The Commonwealth Party had been formed to investigate and overcome the evils arising from enclosure. An attempt was made to carry out their proposals by legislation. One of these proposals insured farmers and tenants against arbitrary eviction by the landlord. Another sought to prevent destruction of farms and the withdrawal of land from cultivation.[24]

After Latimer's "Sermon on the Plough", preached in January, 1548, there were attempts at insubordination, during the following spring, in several counties of England, as already mentioned. As a result of these uprisings petitions were presented to the king in May, 1548.[25]

Latimer, as has already been stated, was released from the Tower on the occasion of Edward VI's coronation. He was asked to preach the following year. He delivered four sermons, entitled "Sermons on the Plough", one only of which is extant. It is his most famous, and most often quoted sermon. It deals with the equality of man, and pleads with the landlords to treat their tenants with justice.

To return now to an account of the king's commission which was formed for the redress of enclosures, the commissioners addressed a proposal to Edward VI and Lord Somerset. The

[24]Constant, II, 113. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 235.

[25]Strype, II, Pt. 2, 148. Pollard, Somerset, 32. v. supra, p. 64.

proposal read as follows: ". . . by the universal consent of all the whole realm made for restitution, preservation and maintenance of the state, and policy of the same; and namely for the maintenance and keeping up of houses of husbandry, for avoiding destruction, for pulling down towns for enclosures and converting arable land into pastures; for limiting the number of sheep men could have, and the plurality and keeping of favors."[26]

Edward VI decided, with Somerset, to take action through the whole Council, although all of its members did not share his views on enclosures, and this on account of the fact of their own vested interests.

The first ordinance which Somerset proposed against enclosures was issued on June 1, 1548. It recalls, as has been mentioned before, the statutes of Henry VII and Henry VIII, and puts these statutes once more into force. Latimer says: "I read of late in an Act of Parliament; and this Act made mention of an Act that was in King Henry's days, the third I trow it was; yea, and such another business there was in King Edward's time, the second also."[27]

A Commission of Enquiry, similar to that appointed by

[26]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 349.

[27]Works, I, 243.

Wolsey in 1517,[28] was charged to report all enclosures effected since 1485.[29] In addition the Commission was to discover who made the enclosures at the time, the number of acres converted into pasture, and the profit occurring; who owned more than two thousand or occupied more than two farms in the same place, and whether those who had received monastic land maintained a farm of adequate size with a sufficient number of laborers as the statute directed.[30] The purpose of this commission was not the immediate punishment of offenders, but to secure information necessary to draft the bills intended to be laid before Parliament.

The reform bills were introduced during the session which opened on November 8, 1548. As Latimer says in his first sermon preached before Edward VI, "Furthermore, if the king's honour, as some men say, standeth in the great multitude of people; then these graziers, enclosers, and rent-rearers, are hinderers of the king's honour."[31] Some of these reform bills were passed. One of these was a tax on sheep. This was designed

[28]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 148.

[29]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 359.

[30]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 360.

[31]Works, I, 100.

to discourage the conversion of arable land into pasture. But the proposal remained a dead letter. Latimer says: "But to extort and take away the right of the poor, is against the honour of the king. If you do move the king to do after that manner, then you speak against the honour of the king; for I full certify you, extortioners, violent oppressors, ingrossers of tenements and lands, through whose covetousness villages decay and fall down, the king's liege people for lack of sustenance are famished and decayed, -- they be those which speak against the honour of the king."[32] In fact all the bills specifically directed against enclosure were rejected by Parliament.[33]

One such bill proposed that landowners rebuild farms which had been allowed to fall into ruin. Latimer pleads: "Surveyors there be that greedily gorge up their covetous goods; hand-makers; honest men I touch not; but all such as survey, they make up their mouths, but the commons be utterly undone by them; . . ."[34] The landlords are urged to maintain agriculture and to employ the necessary labor.[35] Another bill made it obligatory to raise two cows and a calf for every

[32] Works, I, 93-94.

[33] Journal, 35. May 12, 1550.

[34] Works, I, 102.

[35] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 360.

hundred sheep.[36] A third forbade dealers to buy and sell the same livestock without keeping it for a prescribed period.[37] The bill against monopoly of farms was not even read in Parliament; and a majority vote threw out a bill which ordered destruction of large private parks. Against this abuse of monopoly Latimer raises his voice, saying: "Which evils, I fear me, are much used in these days, in the marriage of noblemen's children; for joining lands to lands, possessions to possessions, neither the virtuous education nor living being regarded . . ."[38]

However, in 1549, King Edward VI again directed commissions to investigate and act against unlawful enclosures. He gave extensive instructions for each county.

One of these commissions for the redress of unlawful enclosures and other abuses was directed by such men as Hugh Latimer, John Hales, John Arscot, John Mersche, and Henry Hawkes. These commissioners were empowered to reform all manner of things as put forth by the laws. They also received the right to try to correct all abuses.

[36]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 356.

[37]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 352.

[38]Works, I, 95.

The men responsible for the unlawful enclosures were highly indignant at the commissioners for examining into the wrongs committed against the commoners. They even went so far as to accuse John Hales of inciting the people to rebellion.[39]

In giving powers to the commissioners King Edward VI issued a directive specifying that the commissioners amend and correct all abuses. While the commissioners were attempting to carry out instructions, another uprising took place in the West.

The landowners to whom the commissioners were sent were, as already stated, indignant about examinations and any questions on the reasons why poor men's commons and livings had been taken away. Latimer lashes out at them: "Of this 'too much' cometh this monstrous and portentous dearth made by man, notwithstanding God doth send us plentifully the fruits of the earth, mercifully, contrary unto our desserts: notwithstanding, too much which these rich men have, causeth such dearth, that poor men, which live of their labor, can not with the sweat of their face have a living, all kind of victuals is so dear;"[40] The landowners pretended that these things were mere innovations, and, of course, could not be

[39]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 268.

[40]Works, I, 99.

altered. They blamed John Hales for the inquiry and for the instructions to the king and his councilors.[41]

The landowners thus examined tried by every means to get a favorable report, or to invalidate any evidence against themselves. Some of the commoners were threatened with the loss of their holdings if the Commission decreed against them. Others were indicted for telling the truth.[42] In spite of all the "sleight of hand" maneuvers, the commissioners obtained sufficient testimony of abuses to present to the council, so that they could proceed to an address of their wrongs.[43]

John Hales prompted the king, Edward VI, to grant a general pardon to all transgressors against the enclosure laws.[44] He fondly hoped that, as a result of this leniency, the enclosers would, in turn, reform their actions. The pardon had the opposite effect and made the greedy become greedier than before. Latimer rather tersely notes the futility of the efforts of John Hales in the following:

[41]J. M. Cowper, The Decay of England (London, 1871), 73.

[42]Works, I, 137. John Hales, A Discourse of the Common Weal of This Realm of England, ed. Elizabeth Lamond (Cambridge, 1893), repr. 1929, was attributed to William Stafford until it was shown by Miss Lamond, E.H.R., VI (1891), 284-305, to be derived from a MS by John Hales written in 1549.

[43]Works, I, 178.

[44]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 261.

". . . many meetings, and many sessions, but in the end of the matter there cometh nothing forth."[45]

In order to defeat the statute some owners, instead of pulling down the houses, kept them standing either without tenants; or, occasionally, having them occupied by a shepherd or a milkmaid.

The commission had tried, also, to convert the land back to agriculture. This was evaded by plowing and sowing a single furrow down through a hundred acres of ground, leaving the remaining land in sheep pasturage. Other landlords, in order to dissimulate the number of sheep that they actually possessed, had their kinfolk, relatives, and servants take them for a while.[46]

These efforts to deceive the commissioners who were sent out to benefit the commonwealth did not escape the keen eye of Hugh Latimer. As we have noted previously, he addressed the king and council on the uselessness of preaching on the subject.[47]

[45] Works, I, 101.

[46] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 362.

[47] Works, I, 101.

When the Act of Uniformity was first enforced on Whit Sunday, June 9, 1549, the commoners revolted almost simultaneously, in the following counties: Wilts, Sussex, Hants, Berks, Kent, Gloucester, Somerset, Suffolk, Warwick, Essex, Hertford, Leicester, Worcester, and Rutland. They revolted, not entirely because of the change in religion, but to make an occasion to voice their feelings against other abuses.

In the first of these counties Sir William Herbert put himself at the head of a body of troops, dispersed the insurgents, and executed martial law on the guilty.[48] In the other counties tranquility was restored by the exertions of the resident gentry, and the persuasions of the moderate among the yeomanry. The people wanted simply an immediate return to the order of things by which the nations had been blessed, and the prosperity, unity, and concord which they had formerly experienced. So they by their very intelligence revived the hopes of the discontented; they assembled again in numerous bodies, and proceeded to do justice without commissioners.[49] In general they acted without concert and without leadership; and, as a result their enthusiasm was soon lost and died away.

[48] Journal, 6.

[49] Strype. Eccles. Mem., II Pt. 2, 131.

In Oxford, Norfolk, Cornwall, and Devon, the uprising assumed a more dangerous shape. Armies were formed, threatening and boldly defying the government, and challenging it to remedy matters. Mercenary troops, raised in Italy, Spain, and Germany, finally suppressed this insurrection. However, men had rallied to the leader, Robert Ket,with surprising loyalty. The twenty-four hundred who had joined him in Norfolk, had swelled to a force of twelve thousand. Although Ket had been idealistic in his endeavors, he was conquered by the Earl of Norwich; and both he, as the captain of the insurgents, and his brother as accomplice, were hanged for sedition.

Although Hugh Latimer was always in full sympathy with the poor commoners, and their wrongs were apparent to him at all times, he never took their part against the government.[50] The commoners wanted their own way, i.e., their grievances redressed, while the gentlemen commissioners wanted affairs settled in the way that they had worked out.[51]

In 1552, there was another insurrection in Buckinghamshire, under Isaac Herne, with the same demands and complaints as those of the commoners in 1548 and 1549.[52]

[50] Journal, 7-8. Wriothesley, II, 77.

[51] Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 2, 114.

[52] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 2.

The abuses were not to run their full course in the reign of Edward VI. Neither was Hugh Latimer ever to see any benefits achieved from his pleadings, reiterated again and again against the abuses of the times, especially that of the enclosures.[53] Regardless of the futility of his efforts, Latimer dared to speak out before the king and the council regarding the abuses social and economic that had been brought upon the "little" people of the nation that he loved. He was not, however, without hope for the future when he said: ". . . that the king's majesty when he cometh of age will see a redress of these things so out of frame; giving example by lettering down his own lands and then enjoining his subjects to follow him."[54]

Latimer did not think it amiss to comment, in his court sermons, on the great evils of the day, especially that of enclosures and their social and economic effects on the people.

As a preacher of the Tudor period, whose opinions reached throngs of people, Latimer denounced the Act empowering a judge to determine, and to state, just what was sufficient land allotted to a tenant to insure him a decent living.

[53]Foxe, III, Letters relating to the Suppression of the Monasteries, 7-13; and 384.

[54]Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 1, 143.

However, the voice of Latimer was scarcely heard above the tumult of the clamor raised by the lords and the gentry, who insisted upon enclosing as much as they pleased. As stated before, Latimer had called those who were effecting enclosures "giants" who sit in the commission and intimidate and threaten poor men.[55]

Even in his last sermon preached before Edward VI and his council, Latimer pleads with the enclosers to treat the peasantry with honesty and brotherly love. Concluding this section on enclosures, let Latimer's own words bear weight: "Oh, it is a great matter, when brethren love and hold well together!"[56]

Coinage

Land enclosure was certainly a major abuse; but closely allied to it, and affecting the poor just as seriously, was the debasement of coinage. The reducing the amount of land in the possession of the crown had lessened the amount of revenue pouring into the crown's treasury from the crown's lands, but had set a bar on their future earning potential. Thus really began the defeat of Henry VIII's great plan for

[55] Works, I, 270.

[56] Works, I, 271.

turning the chief form of wealth of the country of England to the support of the state.[57]

It had been the policy of both the grandfather of Edward VI, and of his father to surround themselves with men as highly trained and as highly skilled as possible. Thus such unscrupulous officials as Dudley, Paget, and Wriothelesy had been advisors to Henry VIII, and had enriched themselves upon the spoils obtained from the enclosures and the seizure of monastic lands. This channelling of the funds into their own pockets, instead of into the treasury of the realm, had brought about a state near bankruptcy, and the inflation of the coinage. It was this same group -- Dudley, Paget, and Wriothelesy -- that now clustered about the youthful Edward VI. It was they who were to bring the kingdom out of the financial crisis which it encountered between the years 1547 and 1553.

A fruitful expediency was the debasement of the coinage, which was already at a very low standard. The clipping and debasing of the coins enhanced the prices of all commodities. This situation , which will be considered later in discussions of the cost of living problems, was another of the abuses which Latimer noticed.

[57] Works, I, 137.

In a court sermon preached before the councillors and officials of Edward VI, Latimer, with righteous indignation, blasts the court as follows: "Thy silver is dross; it is not fine, it is counterfeit; thy silver is turned, thou hadst good silver."[58]

The price revolution and the debasement of coinage were so inextricably interwoven that it does not seem possible to disentangle them. They, too, are closely associated with the other social and economic abuses which occurred during the reign of Edward VI. The general rise in prices, due to the above causes, was a serious thing for the government.[59]

The crown lands had been rented on long-term leases. It was impossible for the government to increase the rates of rent before the expiration of the leases. However, with the lower value of money, it was imperative that the rents be increased. And so, growing pains in a period of change may be said to have lain at the bottom of the debasement of coinage.[60]

There was a sort of poetic justice in the economic situation of the reign of Edward VI. The crown, with its

[58] Works, I, 137.

[59] Dietz, Finances, 73-76.

[60] Mackie, 607.

hungry land-grabbers, had cheated the people by debasing the coinage to get immediate funds. And yet it had to take back the poor money in revenues at its face value. It also had to pay an increased value on all of its supplies; while the real value of the revenues, expressed in terms of purchasing power, was seriously reduced. Latimer bitterly points up the fact when he says: ". . . So no doubt the fall of money hath been here in England the undoing of men."[61]

The society of Latimer's time was rapidly changing. It was passing from a wide distribution of land among the peasants, at easy rents, to a gradual abolition of peasant holdings. This definitely affected the debasement of coinage problem because, whereas before the peasant could get his living almost entirely from the land, he was now forced to purchase certain commodities with much cheaper money. Consolidation of farm lands into larger rented farms implied a replacement of mere "subsistence agriculture". Such an agricultural system would produce only for the market. The prices of wheat, barley, oats, and cattle rose to two and three times their previous costs. At the same time wages, which had been fixed by law, remained close to their former level.[62]

[61] Works, II, 41.

[62] Journal, September 9, 1551, 45.

To understand the financial straits of Edward VI's time, it is necessary to glance quickly at the reign of his father, Henry VIII. The wars which Henry VIII had carried on with France and Scotland had seriously drained the government's resources, long before Edward VI and his council had attempted to take over the financial burden.[63]

Thus war debts, the permanent reduction of royal revenues, the alienation of crown land, the increased expenditures induced by the rise of prices; and finally, the growing debt abroad, had caused this financial crisis. One may also include here, added to this list of financial woes, the heavy burden of the upkeep of the English fleet recently placed upon the state, as well as the cost of the upkeep of the garrisons and fortifications at Calais, Berwick, and other places.[64]

The chantries were confiscated, their lands and goods sold, and new taxes were enacted. But even so, not enough was raised to cover the domestic and foreign bills. Shifts were made to use funds for normal charges; and so, in the end, the entire government became deeply involved in debt. Loans for funds were solicited from Flanders,[65] from the

[63]Dietz, Finances, 76.

[64]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 57.

[65]State Papers, Foreign (September 5, 1549), 46.

Fuggers,[66] and from banking institutions in Antwerp.[67]

As a last resort to escape this heavy burden of debt, the government further debased the coinage. It is recalled that this process of debasement had preceded and followed the reign of King Edward VI. An enormous amount of base gold and silver coin was in circulation, which it now seemed impossible to redeem. Executors in the reign of Edward VI maintained the same methods as their predecessors.[68] The alloy was increased until it was necessary to call in all moneys and recoin them.[69] At last the council resolved to resume the coining of money in standard values. Edward VI took an enormous interest in the change of coinage.

Since this account is primarily concerned with the abuse of the debasement of coinage, rather than the process of debasement, let us note how this abuse affected the people of England. Hugh Latimer has this to say: "And they say the evilness of money hath made all things dearer."[70] It is true

[66] Ibid. (September 11, 1549), 199. Journal, 66.

[67] The Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI, 1547-1553, 5 vols. and an Index, vol. VI, ed. R. H. Brodie (London, 1924-9), III, 135.

[68] Journal, May 9, 1551, 39. C. R. Markham, King Edward VI (London, 1907), 30.

[69] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 187. Journal, August 17, 1551, 43.

[70] Works, I, 68.

that the debasement of coinage afflicted the poor classes with still greater deprivations and sufferings. Another class, too, people who heretofore had probably never been tempted to dishonesty, were now caught up in this mad rush for quick riches, and took to counterfeiting coins.

While in office as Vice-Treasurer of the Mint at Bristol, Sir William Sherington had coined a large quantity of testors of base alloy and under-standard value. By this means he had enriched himself, but had defrauded the government.[71] This same Sir William Sherington had been associated with Lord Thomas Seymour's tampering of the funds from the royal mint for the purpose of aiding him to get the money to work against his brother, Edward, Lord Protector.

Hugh Latimer mentions the open restitution of Sherington, saying: "I am not afraid to name him; it was Master Sherington, an honest gentleman, and one that God loveth. He openly confessed that he had deceived the king, and he made open restitution."[72] It is true that Hugh Latimer called Sherington an "honest" gentleman, even though he knew that he had been a counterfeiter; but, no doubt what Latimer had in mind in thus referring to Sherington was that he was honest in admitting his guilt, and making restitution.

[71] Works, I, 452.

[72] Works, I, 263. Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 2, 190 (Confession of Sherington), Nov. 5, 1549.

Latimer refers, also, to acts of secret restitution. In Acts of Privy Council, II, 239-40, there is a reference that the preacher (Latimer) had just given in the amount of one hundred and eighty pounds to the king's council. The Act reads: "Mr. Doctour Latymer brought in ciiij^{li} into the Council Chamber which he had recovered of one that had concealed the same from the Kinges Majestee."[73]

Another note entered in the Acts of Privy Council, March 27, 1550, tells of a secret restitution given to the reformer (Latimer). It states: "This daye, Sir Mychall Stanhopp, knight, by commandment and order of the Lord Protectour's Grace and Counsoil, received of Mr. Latymer of suche the Kinges money as come of concelement and now delivered by exhortacion of the said Mr. Latymer, the somme of three hundred lxxiij^{li} whereof they appointed presently fifty pounds by way of his attendance at Courte used for payments in his charge."[74]

That the King's good servant, Mr. Latimer, did much to persuade people to make restitution can well be attested from numerous references to it in his sermons to all classes of people. Latimer used, as a text for his sermons at this time,

[73] APC, II, 266.

[74] APC, I, 404-5.

the effect that such evils as counterfeiting and the other evils mentioned, would eventually have upon Christian living. He called such depraved morals the debased currency of Christian behavior.[75]

The cases of counterfeiting are far too numerous to mention in total here; but that it was a great evil can be attested to by convictions mentioned in the Acts of the Privy Council.[76]

"But I tell you," says Latimer, "that if any man or woman hath stolen or purloined away somewhat from his neighbor, that man or woman is bound to make restitution and amends. And this restitution is so necessary that we shall not look for forgiveness of our sins at Christ's hand, except this restitution be made first; else the satisfaction of Christ will not serve us: for God will have us to restore or make amends to our neighbor, whom we have hurt, deceived, or have in any manner of ways taken from him wrongfully his goods, whatsoever it be."[77]

[75] R. E. Routh, They Saw It Happen (An anthology of witnesses' accounts of events in British history, 1485-1688) (Oxford, 1956), 35.

[76] APC, II, 538. III, 331, 387, 400. IV, 36, 38, 44, 79, 80. APC, IV, 259, April, 1553.

[77] Works, II, 13.

Thus Latimer's awareness of the havoc which was played upon the whole nation by those in high places stooping to counterfeiting and to otherwise debasing coinage, had a direct effect upon his preaching. This keen awareness, shining through his sermons, adds colorful overtones to a drab picture on minting, and the changing and re-evaluating of the Edwardian money. As said, he was not unaware of the evils; but, by his naivété, he came close to the real truth when he lay all the blame on the covetousness of man, saying: "No, no, covetousness was joined with it. Covetousness followeth lechery, and commonly they go together . . . and that must be gotten by covetousness . . . for they oppressed the poor . . . . Covetousness is the root of all evil: . . . covetousness was the cause of rebellion this last summer."[78]

Inflation

Chief among the causes of the malaise during the reign of Edward VI was the irregular rise of prices. Prices were raised arbitrarily without any consideration of supply and demand. Naturally, this had a bad effect on various classes of men. Such an evil led Hugh Latimer to aim telling shafts at the habitual business practices of men of his age.

[78] Works, I, 245-6, 247.

The portion of the peasantry that was lucky enough to have long leases on farms, or that had copyhold tenures of the low but unbreakable kind, reaped profits from the soaring prices of their products. Profits accrued to these peasants because their rent could not be raised. Landlords could raise the rack-rents and collect heavy fines for the renewals of leases from other less fortunate members of the peasantry, and from farmers whose leases were renewed annually, or who had fallen into debt after a period of years.[79]

The result was that one group of peasants was profiting without paying a penny of rent, while another group, not socially distinguished except by date of their leases or legal forms of their tenure, was being oppressed the more. And this oppression was a result of compensating for the immunity from tax enjoyed by the other group.[80] Meanwhile, the yeoman freeholder, who paid no rent or a purely nominal one to the lord of the manor, was selling his corn and cattle for three times the price that his grandfather had been able to procure.[81] Thus, while some men flourished exceedingly;

[79]Wriothesley, II, 30. Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 2, 482. Tytler, I, 367-371.

[80]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 131.

[81]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 153. Tytler, I, 365-369.

others, including many lords and squires, were in real distress during the reign of King Edward VI.

A great number of people throughout the English realm were in dire need because of the scarcity of food of all kinds. The land of England was virtually in the hands of the sheep-growers. The peasants became more like to slaves than the ancient yeomanry of the realm. The laborer could not earn enough on which to live decently. Wages remained the same although the price of foodstuffs had tripled as the result of the agricultural crisis.

Latimer had this to say of the prevailing conditions, ". . . this covetous farmer or landed man of the gospel bought corn in the markets to lay it up in store, and then sell it again . . . some farmers will regrate and buy up all the corn . . . and lay it up in store and sell it again at a higher price, when they see their time."[82]

Latimer pleads with the king to appoint informers such as were appointed in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. These informers would let Edward VI know how the officers of the realm were participating in his plans for economic reform.[83] Edward VI must have attempted the reforms pleaded for by

[82] Works, I, 279.

[83] John U. Nef, Industry and Government in France and England, 1540-1640 (New York, 1940), 26.

Latimer. The following Proclamation was issued on November 20, 1551:". . . set prices of Beef, Oxien, and Muttons, which was meant to continue but to November; when as Parliament should have been to abbrogate that, and to appoint certain Commissioners to cause the Grafters, to sell at prices reasonable and that certain Overseers should be besides to certify if justice was being done." An entry in Edward VI's Journal, May 20, 1551, states, "This yeare at Easter flesh was at excessive prices, for beeffe was sold at thre pence the pounde, a quarter of veale at fower shillinges, mutton a quarter of the best at iii s. iiii d. so that my Lord Maior and Aldermen were greatie exclamed of the people; but they could not remedy it, for the grasiers sold their cattell at so high prices that the butcher could not sell it at meane prices. Also wheat was sold at xxvi's. viii d. the quarter, and other graine after the same rate."[84]

The exceedingly large proportion of foods carried out of the land was one of the principal causes of the high prices. Proof of the fact that food was being exported is shown by the king's Proclamation: ". . . according to the laws of the land no one should carry and convey lamb, pork, butter, cheese, corn, grain, wool, coal, ale, beer, tallow,

[84]Journal, May 20, 1551, 53.

hides, or any other kind of victual."[85] This same proclamation stated further that transporting of victuals to Scotland was forbidden. At no time does it appear that there was a crop failure, so that the abuse must have been great is testified by these numerous proclamations against exporting England's produce.

Certainly, Hugh Latimer, in his denunciations, had in mind, not only the rent raisers, the oppressors of the poor, extortioners, bribetakers and usurers, but he denounced the manufacturers as well.[86] In support of this denouncing the manufacturers we have the quote from Wriothesley who refers to Latimer as having referred to "everie craft", which certainly means the manufacturers.

The poor classes in the towns were more affected by the high prices and by the fraudulent dealings of the manufacturers than they were by the debasement of the coinage. The poor unemployed bitterly complained against their employers, who sought laborers in the cheapest market, and preferred the unmarried apprentice to the married journeyman; and this, of

[85] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 346. Proclamations issued on May 7, 1550, 1551, to continue until the Feast of All Saints (November 1), followed by another on July 3, listing all fells, leather, bell-metal (only to Calais-Castles of Guines and Hammer excluded in this time), September 24, 1550, Journal, 26.

[86] Works, I, 279.

course, because the wages of the former would be less.[87]

However, as fast as the prices rose, so rose the rent of the peasant class. In fact shrewd men bought up whole rows of houses. The landlords doubled, tripled, and even quadrupled the cost of rent. In London, nine-tenths of the family dwellings were owned and "let" by the middlemen.

These price increases entailed the gravest social consequences, being, as they were, advantageous for certain classes, and disastrous for others. Until some equilibrium and stability of price control were reached, the rich were enabled to corner a considerable amount of the nation's wealth. They were able to embark on commercial adventures on a grand scale, and thus to display in their lives an ostentation and magnificence unknown to previous ages.[88] Latimer tells of a merchant who had "travailed all the days of his life in the trade of merchandise, and had gotten three or four thousand pounds by buying and selling; but . . . he would (now) get a thousand pounds a year by only buying and selling of grain here within this realm."[89] Strype, evidently from his perusal of the sermons of Latimer, arrives at the same conclusions regarding the monopoly of

[87]Mackie, 460. Pollard, History, 30.

[88]Works, I, 261.

[89]Works, I, 279.

the nation's wealth.[90]

Latimer bluntly refers to these get-rich-quick "nouveau riche" when he says: "Ye are known well enough, what ye were afore ye came to your office, and what lands ye had then, and what ye have purchased since, and what buildings ye make daily."[91]

Here he pauses and throws in a jibe, saying that if they must make the best of their money by charging exorbitant prices, they should: ". . . so build, that the king's workmen may be paid. They make their moan that they can get no money. The poor labourers, gunmakers, powdermen, bow-makers, arrow-makers, smiths, carpenters, soldiers, and other crafts, cry out for their duties. They be unpaid, some of them, three or four months; yea, some of them half a year: yea, some of them put up bills this time twelve months for their money, and cannot be paid yet."[92]

In the time of Edward VI's father Acts had been passed to protect the people from the treacheries practised in clothing-making and the manufacture of other products. These Acts attempted to guard against short-weight, short measure,

[90]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 134-135.

[91]Works, I, 261.

[92]Works, I, 262.

and undue shrinkage and stretching.[93] However, in the reign of Edward VI many of the proclamations issued against these abuses, were being disregarded. Latimer draws the attention of King Edward VI to this fact. He says: "I hear there is a certain cunning come up in the mixing of wares. How say you? Were it no wonder to hear that cloth-makers should become poticaries?"[94]

Latimer also has this to say: "If his cloth be seventeen yards long, he will set him on a rack, and stretch him out with ropes, and rack him till the sinews shrink again, while he hath brought him to eighteen yards."[95]

The cloth manufacturer had shaken himself free from local custom, and had emerged into a wholesale businessman, operating his enterprise on a competitive basis. The new clothier found an ally in the grazier who supplied the wool in bulk; and in their new alliance the industry came into contact with agriculture.

Latimer goes further and tells how the manufacturers thicken the cloth with flock-powder, making it substantial

[93] Commons Journal, 91. Making of Woolen Cloth, January 3, 1550.

[94] Works, I, 138.

[95] Works, I, 138.

looking, yet deceptive.[96] He complains, "Oh, that so goodly wits should be so ill applied. They may deceive the people, but they cannot deceive God. They were wont to make beds of flocks, and it was a good bed too: now they have turned their flocks into powder, to play the false thieves with it."[97]

Even when Latimer was preaching his last sermons as an old man, he still insists upon measure for measure for all. Listen to his words: "Let every one, therefore, have a measure, and let no man abuse the gifts of God."[98] Again we note his earnestness in a letter to a certain gentleman: "What theft is; that is to take or detain by any manner of way another man's good against his will that is the owner as some define it . . . the sin is not forgiven, except the thing be restored again that is taken away."[99]

To reforming preachers like Latimer, and to laymen whose views he tried to shape, the economic distress of the mid-sixteenth century was far more than an economic problem. Although all seemed to be aware of the inexorable economic

[96]Commons Journal, January 8, 1550. Bill for Merchants and Artificers. The Bill for Perfect Making and Dying of Cloth to Mr. Gasnolde, December 12, 1550.

[97]Works, I, 138.

[98]Works, II, 15.

[99]Works, II, 427.

forces, such as enclosures, debasement of coinage, and the subsequent inflation which brought on such social evils as scarcity of food, of labor, and of housing, Latimer's approach to the problem was primarily moral and religious. The open Bible was the textbook through which Latimer spoke; and, as he thought, should have driven out the old corruption and ushered in a new era of righteousness.

V. LATIMER LAMENTS SOCIAL CONDITIONS

Although the economic problems of his age were of deep concern to Hugh Latimer, he was more deeply affected by social problems. Latimer, as well as his predecessors, believed that the sin of covetousness lay at the root of many of the evils of the day. Latimer thought that "Godly preaching" would bring about the reforms that he hoped for, and so never ceased to preach to accomplish this end. He says in a sermon which he preached at Stamford, "Yes, he is angry with covetous men, with ambitious men; . . ."[1]

Thus the pulpit became the means through which many of the people who hitherto were not too much concerned about the seeming lowering of moral standards, were reached. Hugh Latimer used the Scriptures from which to draw illustrations and instances which would teach a moral lesson. His sermons were never dull. He used picturesque stories and pithy language. He salted his explanations with many descriptions. He offered his listeners a keen, critical view of society. He exposed the fashionable pretensions of the world. The social evils of the day upon which Latimer so frankly preached, did not escape comment in the London pulpits in general. Preachers were apt to indulge in slightly dangerous and personal remarks

[1] Works, I, 385.

on current affairs, especially when their congregations nodded approval.

Knowledge of the people who lived in Latimer's day is available to us through his sermons and letters. He was keenly aware of the life of the times, as his reference to worldliness shows: ". . . they study and do what they can to buckle the gospel and the world together, to set God and the devil at one table."[2]

Latimer as a reformer became the most absorptive and responsive instrument of his times. He was sensitive to existing conditions, and revealed hidden depths of social awareness hitherto unexplored. The evil, as well as the good, which he saw, he portrayed faithfully; and he emphasized the things that would improve the people whom he loved so completely. That he was often disappointed in the results achieved is demonstrated by the fact that he thought that morals were no better under the "new learning" than under the old. He had hoped that the open Bible would be a means of reform. In a letter to Hubbardine[3] he writes: "Ye said that it was plain that this "new learning" (as ye call it) was not the truth, and so not of God; but contrariwise that it was lies,

[2] Works, I, 529.

[3] Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 2, 175.

and so surely of the devil. This your assertion ye proved by two manner of conjectures: the one is, that the professors of it live naughtily; and the other is that priests be prosecuted of them."[4]

The open Bible, Latimer held, was a symbol of the Reformation, and, as the textbook of the Reformation should have driven out all the old corruptions, and have ushered in a new era of righteousness. That this result was not accomplished, and that he did not meet with success was a source of distress to him. However, he looked for a solution in the faith that was in him.[5] He complains: "And again, she (charity) is sorry to hear of falsehood, of stealing, or such like, which wickedness is now at this time most commonly used: yea, there was never such falsehood among Christian men as there is now at this time . . . and they that have experience report it so, that among the very infidels and Turks there is more fidelity and uprightness than among Christian men."[6]

Latimer seems to be inconsistent in insisting that the "new learning" will right social ills, and then agreeing that it has not done so. But since conflicts and contentions dominate the reign of Edward VI, naturally these led to

[4]Works, II, 318.

[5]Chester, 171.

[6]Works, I, 451.

confusion in social conditions. Latimer found the age one of paradoxes and enigmas, which gave him occasion for profound expression.

Regarding the social wrong concerning marriage he exclaims: "For the love of God take an order for marriages here in England. For here is marriage for pleasure and voluptuousness, and for goods; and so that they may join land to land, and possessions to possessions: they care no more here in England. And that is the cause of so much adultery, and so much breach of wedlock in the noblemen and gentlemen, and so much divorcing. And it is not now in the noblemen only, but it has come now to the inferior sort. Every man, if he have but a small cause, will cast off his old wife, and take a new, and will marry again at his pleasure; and there be many that have so done."[7]

Regarding charity, Latimer asserts that, as at one time, love was regarded as an all-powerful force, it is now debased and for it is substituted lust and concupiscence. In a sermon preached at Grimsthrope, October 28, 1552, he quotes Saint Paul, "'This I command you that you love one another'; and, 'He that loveth fulfilleth the law'."[8] But, continuing in another sermon, he admonishes his hearers to marry purely in God (not)" to marry for their own fleshly lusts, and for their

[7] Works, I, 243-244.

[8] Works, I, 447.

own phantasy. There was never such marrying in England as is now. I hear tell of stealing of wards to marry their children to. This is a strange kind of stealing; but it is not the wards, it is the lands that they steal. And some there be that knit up marriages together, but not for any love of godliness in the parties, but to get friendship and make them strong in the realm, to increase their possessions, and to join land to land."[9]

Latimer, who had been silent after losing his bishopric in the reign of Henry VIII, began to preach again in the reign of Edward VI. Large audiences heard his biting descriptions of social abuses. These abuses Latimer conceived of as offenses against God. In season and out of season, Latimer enunciated remedies in his discourses, alike to royal audiences and to the humble folk of the kingdom.

Latimer expresses the vehement conviction that the decadence of the age exceeds that of any other existing before his time. It is true that justice, vagabondage, the low ebb in education and morals, were all subjects of controversy and their solution was essential. But, it is true, also, that absorbed in the study of the social evils cited, the controversialists may have lost sight of other controversial matters.

[9]Works, I, 169-170.

Principles of Right Dealing

A student of today dealing with the reign of Edward VI is a distant observer, and must guard against the fatal lure of over-simplification. So it is in studying the question of justice; the laws are written large; but the manner of their administration is quite another thing. Latimer gives us a clue to the real situation when he states: "Now then there be special laws, which teach us how every man and woman shall live in their calling, whereunto God hath called them. These laws teach how magistrates shall do their duty; execute justice, punish the wicked, defend the good; to see that the common-wealth be well ordered, and governed; that the people live godly, every man in his calling."[10]

The period was a contentious time; and the people, being of a contentious frame of mind, often ran to the law simply for the sake of vexing each other. But, more often the citizenry was driven to seek justice at its proper source, the magistrates of the courts of the day.[11] Justice for the ordinary Englishman was in the hands of the justices of the peace under royal administration.[12] These men were not paid, so they

[10] Works, II, 6.

[11] James A. Williamson, The Tudor Age (London, 1953), 204.

[12] Albert Venn Dicey, The Privy Council (London, 1887), 80-85.

combined their private business with the king's service; and they often subordinated the king's interest to their own by giving sparingly of their time to their official duties. Especially in this mid-decade of the sixteenth century, they gave lukewarm response to orders from the privy council, especially if these orders interfered with their own business.[13]

Latimer's request for justice, embodied in all the sermons preached throughout the year, was heard in the courts. He gives a typical example of how he begs for justice, and exposes injustice, in the following: ". . . about their own profit there are no more diligent men, nor busier persons in all England. They [judges] trudge, in the term time, to and fro. They foreslow [loiter] no time. They follow assizes and sessions, leets, law-days, and hundreds. They should serve the king, but they serve themselves. And how they use, nay rather abuse their office in the same, some good man will tell them thereof."[14]

It is not difficult to realize that, if the justices could not be counted upon to give disinterested service to the government, the same might well be even truer of their subordinates and assistants. The latter had always a great deal

[13] Works, I, 110.

[14] Works, I, 110.

more work to do than they could possibly do well.[15] These assistants were especially bound to arrest criminals and suspects, and to maintain good order in general.[16]

From a perusal of Latimer's sermons one senses how the unlettered, helpless people felt when they appealed to the type of "justice" referred to above, in contrast to the personalized interest and providence of feudal times. Latimer felt this cold treatment of the poor keenly. He faced King Edward VI and the Lord Protector with it, pleading: "I beseech your grace that ye will look to these matters. Hear them yourself. View your judges, and hear poor men's causes. And you, proud judges, hearken what God said in His holy book, 'Hear them, . . . the small as well as the great, the poor as well as the rich.' Regard no person; fear no man; . . ."[17]

The society of Edward VI's reign was disturbed by changes in ownership of the land: "In this Parliament that I [Latimer] speak of, the gentlemen and the commons were at variance, as they were now of late. And there the gentlemen that were landlords would needs have [taken] away much lands from their tenants; and would needs have an act of Parliament, that it might be lawful for them to enclose and make several from their

[15]E. F. Heckscher, Mercantilism, Trans. Mendel Shapiro, 2 vols. (London, 1935), I, 246-250.

[16]Dicey, 81.

[17]Works, I, 127.

tenants, and from the commons, such portions as they thought good. Much ado there was about this act: at last it was concluded and granted that they might so do; provided alway, that they should leave sufficient for the tenant."[18] It was to uproot covetousness, the evil that sprang from enclosure, corruption in the government and in private morals, that forced Latimer to continue in this strain: "Well; it was well that they [the landlords] were bound to leave sufficient for them [the tenants]. But who should be the judge to limit what was sufficient for them? Or who shall now judge what is sufficient? Well; I for my part cannot tell what is sufficient. But me-thought it was well that the tenants and poor commons should have sufficient. For if they had sufficient, thought I, they had cause to be quiet. And then fell I to make this argument within myself: if at that time it were put in their will and power to enclose, leaving to the tenant that were sufficient for him; if they had it then in their power, thought I, that they might this do, they would leave no more than sufficient. If they left to the tenants and poor commons no more in those days but sufficient."[19]

Latimer believed that the rich should labor the more arduously in order to have the means to give to the poor.

[18] Works, I, 248.

[19] Works, I, 248-249.

In this way covetousness would be overcome. Yet he says of the idle person who expects charity without working: "'He that laboureth not, let him not eat.' Therefore those lubbers which will not labour, and might labour, it is a good thing to punish them according unto the king's most godly statutes. For God himself saith: 'In the sweat of thy brow [face] thou shalt eat thy bread.' Then cometh in St. Paul who saith; 'Let him labour the sorer that he may have wherewith to help the poor.' . . . So Christ and all his apostles, yea the whole Scripture admonisheth us ever of our neighbour, to take heed of him, to be pitiful unto him: but God knoweth there be a great many which care little for their neighbors . . . . So these rich franklings, these covetous fellows, they scrape all to themselves, they think they should care for nobody else but for themselves: God commandeth the poor man to labour the sorer, to the end that he may be able to help his poor neighbour: how much more ought the rich to be liberal unto them!"[20]

Latimer again reverts to his theme of giving generously to the poor for justice sake. He says: "And I pray you, tell me, have ye heard of any man that came to poverty, because he gave unto the poor? Have ye heard tell of such a one? No, I am sure you have not. And I dare lay my head to pledge for it, that no man living hath come or shall hereafter come to poverty,

[20]Works, I, 408.

because he hath been liberal in helping the poor."[21]

Latimer continues on in the same vein. He is heavily ironic about the matter, and speaks scathingly to those who are standing before him. He tells the Council, now headed by Northumberland, to live righteously and to govern justly while the king is in his minority. He says: "I think there is a great need of such men (promoters) of godly discretion, wisdom, and conscience, to promote transgressors, as rent-raisers, oppressors of the poor, extortioners, bribers, usurers. I hear there be usurers in England, that will take forty in the hundred; but I hear of no promoters to put them up. We read not, this covetous farmer or landed man of the gospel bought corn in the markets to lay it up in store, and then sell it again. But, and if it please your highness, I hear say that in England we have landlords, nay step-lords I might say, that are become graziers; and burgesses are become regraters; and some farmers will regrate and buy up all the corn that cometh to the markets and lay it up in store, and sell it again at a higher price when they see their time."[22]

It is small wonder that Latimer was not invited to preach at court again, for Northumberland was not the man to encourage

[21] Works, I, 408-9.

[22] Works, I, 279.

direct criticism of his government. It was, indeed, impossible to close one's ears and conscience to Latimer's inference when he addressed the Council: "I hear say, that there be some amongst you, which are given to picking and stealing; and so I shewed you the danger of it, and told you how you should make restitution secretly, without any open shame: for it is no shame to forsake sin, and to come to godliness. For no doubt restitution must be make either in effect or affect; that is to say, when thou art able, then thou must make it in effect; when thou are not able, then thou must be sorry for it in thy heart, and ask God forgiveness."[23]

Latimer had too much sense of humor to believe that the laity unanimously shared his enthusiasm for justice. Yet he believed that in preaching lay England's hope. It was necessary, he thought, to drive home lessons in justice, and to preach against that basest form of injustice, which is bribery. He says: "Bribery is a princely kind of thieving. They will be waged by the rich, either to give sentence against the poor, or to put off the poor man's causes. This is the moble theft of princes and of magistrates. They are bribe-takers. Now-a-days they call them gentle rewards: let them leave their colouring, and call them by their christian name, bribes: . . ."[24]

[23] Works, II, 41.

[24] Works, I, 139.

In chiding and trying to reform the irregularities of the magistrates Latimer certainly believed in calling a "spade a spade". In voicing his views he was firmly convinced that if a cunning man of law joined hands with the unscrupulous new gentry or with a scion of some well established house, there was almost no limit to his power of illegal action. This was especially true if the lawyer was a judge. Latimer says: "Are civil offices bought for money? . . . God forfend that any such enormity should be in England, that civil offices should be bought and sold; whereas men should have them given them for their worthiness."[25]

The sermons of Hugh Latimer on justice, its miscarriage, and the resulting pain and sorrow which injustices entailed, depict the age in which Latimer lived, and are mines of information not easily duplicated. No injustice does Latimer fail to bring to the ears of his listeners. The bribe-takers are taunted with their crimes, and are threatened with their subsequent punishments here and in the next world. Latimer says that each man and woman needs two weapons to build up the character in the matter of truth or justice. He explains: "This is now the first armour that we should have, namely, truth . . . . Now the second weapon is to be just, to give

[25]Works, I, 185.

every man that which we owe unto him; to the king that which pertaineth to him; to our landlords what we owe unto them; to our curate or parson what pertaineth unto him; and though be unlearned and not able to do his duty, yet we may not withdraw from him, of private authority, that thing which is appointed unto him by common authority."[26]

The numerous references, in Latimer's sermons, to the topic of bribes and bribing are significant evidence of what the people of that time had to endure from the unscrupulous hands of the ministers of justice. Latimer spoke with his usual frankness when he said: "There was a certain woman who was a suitor to a judge [Luke XVIII] . . . When the judge saw her so importunate . . . granted her request. But our judges are worse than this judge was; for they will neither hear men for God's sake, nor fear of the world, nor importunateness, nor anything else."[27] So Hugh Latimer plainly tells his courtly audience that the judges of his day are afraid to hear a poor man against a rich man, and reminds them again of their acceptance of bribes.

To illustrate the manner of the judges in hearing the poor against the rich, Latimer recalls the story of Cambyses, and

[26]Works, I, 503.

[27]Works, I, 128.

compares him to the men of England: "Cambyses was a great emperor, such another as our master is: he had many lords-deputies, lords-presidents, and lieutenants under him. It is a great while since I read the history. It chanced he had under him in one of his dominions a briber, a gift-taker, a gratifier of rich men; he followed gifts as fast as he had followed the pudding; a hand-maker in his office, to make his son a great man; as the old saying is, 'Happy is the child whose father goeth to the devil'."[28]

But lest he should judge the judges too harshly, Latimer, in one of his sermons, asks his audience to spare the judges in their judgment because they are the representatives of the king. He admonishes: "I will monish you of a thing. I hear say ye walk inordinately, ye talk unseemly, otherwise than it becometh christian subjects: ye take upon ye to judge the judgment of judges. I will not make the king a pope; for the pope will have all things that he does taken for an article of faith. I will not say but that the king and his council may err; the parliament houses, both the high and the low, may err; I pray daily that they may not err. It becometh us, whatsoever they decree, to stand unto it, and receive it obediently, as far forth as it is not manifest wicked, and

[28]Works, I, 146.

directly against the word of God . . . . Let us not therefore judge judges."[29]

In this same sermon, turning to the judges, Latimer warns them concerning the manner, the kind, and the promptness of their justice. He draws an example from the great judge, Solomon, saying: "This place of judgment, it hath been unperfect: it was never seen that all judges did their duty, that they would hear the small as well as the great. I will not prove this by the witness of any private magistrate, but by the wisest king's saying that ever was; 'I have seen under the sun,' that is to say over all, in every place, where right judgment should have been, 'wickedness'; as who would say bribes-taking, defeating of justice, oppressing of the poor; men sent away with weeping tears without any hearing of their causes: and 'in the place of equity,' saith he, 'I have seen iniquity'. No equity, no justice; a sore word for Salomon to pronounce universally, generally."[30]

Latimer declares that an injustice is an injustice, whether it be committed in Westminster Hall, Guild Hall, Judges Hall, or any place in England or elsewhere. He reminds his hearers, however, that people often cry out without a cause, saying: "There was bribes-taking, money-making, making of hands, quoth

[29]Works, I, 148.

[30]Works, I, 156.

the prophet, or rather Almighty God by the prophet; such is their partiality, affection, and bribes. They be such money-makers, enhancers, and promoters of themselves."[31]

In upholding the virtue of justice, Latimer again reverts to what he himself has seen in the way of bribery. In his fourth sermon on the Lord's Prayer, he tells: "I myself did once know where there was a man slain of another man in anger: it was done openly, the man-killer was taken and put in prison. Suit was made to the quest-mongers: for it was a rich man that had done the act. At the length every man had a crown for his good-will: and so this open man-killer was pronounced not guilty. Lo, they sold their souls unto the devil for five shillings, . . ."[32] In this same sermon preached before Lady Katherine, duchess of Suffolk, Latimer says: "For truly it is a marvel that this realm sinketh not down to hell headlong. What perjuries, swearing, and cursing is everywhere, in every corner!"[33]

The reader can easily judge that injustices, due to wrong administration of justice, had caused great social disturbance in the England of Latimer's time. There runs through

[31] Works, I, 156.

[32] Works, I, 380.

[33] Works, I, 380.

his discourses a unity of purpose, which is to help the people to endure the wrongs incurred by the many social abuses. Perhaps this picture is at times distorted; but essentially it offers an intimate, breathing explanation of what was really taking place.

Hugh Latimer sincerely tried to improve his age--an age in which one could rob his neighbor by legal chicanery, could take bribes in the performance of his duties, and could set aside justice in order to promote his own interests. He endeavors to show the populace of England that an age, violent and corrupt as it was, could be improved by the practice of the virtue of justice. We hear him plead: ". . . the subjects ought to be obedient to their king and magistrate: and again, the king ought to do justice, to see that justice have place. Finally, one neighbour ought to have justice with another; that is to give him what pertaineth unto him; not to deceive him in any thing, but to love him, and to make much of him. When we do so, then we are sure we have the second part of this armour of God."[34]

Latimer, in one of his sermons preached at Lincolnshire in 1552, exhorted the people of all classes to be just. He says, "So likewise between married folks there shall be

[34]Works, I, 503-504.

justice; that is to say, they shall do their duties: the man shall love his wife, shall honour her, shall not be rigorous, but admonish her lovingly; again, the wife shall be obedient, loving, and kind towards her husband; not provoking him to anger with ill and naughty words. Further, the parents ought to do justice to their children, to bring them up in godliness and virtue; to correct them when they do naught: likewise the children ought to be obedient to their parents, and to be willing to do according unto their commandment. Item, the masters ought to do justice unto their servants, to let them have their meat and drink, and their wages: again, the servants ought to be diligent in their master's business; to do them truly, not to be one-eyed servants."[35]

And so, Hugh Latimer's sermons on justice reached thousands, either directly or indirectly. They must have influenced his hearers to shape, not only their spiritual lives, but to build better social attitudes towards their neighbors. And even though these sermons might have been tissues of imaginative creations containing prejudices, instead of the facts, they do offer sufficient evidence of what concerned the common people of Latimer's era.

[35]Works, I, 503.

The Poor and the Vagabond

We have seen that the period of Edward VI's reign was a period of great distress. Organized charity had suffered a great loss in the extinction of the monasteries. The amount of charity distributed by the monks is disputed; but there can be little doubt but that alms to the poor was greatly diminished when this source no longer existed.[36] Daily doles to the poor tenant peasants and neighbors had been freely meted out; and the gift of month's mind (a gift at the end of thirty days after a soul had departed) had done much to alleviate the distress of the poor.

Those who took over the monasteries--the gentry--inadequately supplied any substitute for the monastic generosity. In addition to the poor who had been dependents, and to the personal attendants at the monasteries, there was a whole class of laborers. These consisted of cooks, bakers, barbers, gate porters, custodians of the chapels and of the cemeteries, laundresses, personal servants, and old incapacitated servants. Naturally, these persons were not readily absorbed into the new type of society.[37] Added to those just enumerated, there were great numbers of religious--monks and nuns--who were rendered absolutely helpless

[36]Frances Rose-Troup, The Western Rebellion of 1549 (London: 1913), 117-118.

[37]Hume, III, 119.

and homeless. All were practically destitute with no means of adding to their meager pensions.[38]

That it was a time of extreme crisis, as well as a period of suffering for the masses, is undoubted. Writers and preachers of the period draw a vivid picture of the distress which was suffered. They attribute the distress of the period to various causes, other than the suppression of the monasteries. Some of the causes mentioned are enhanced rents, the injustices resulting from the inclosure of the common lands, and the enforcement of a wage scale fixed at the landlord's pleasure. One writer draws a horrible picture of the commons by saying that their children were brought up only to "garnish gallow trees".[39]

There were other subsidiary causes, such as the debasement of the currency, court extravagances, wars, and the low level of the administration of justice. The general effect of the whole complex movement was a social dislocation almost unparalleled in English history. It is estimated that nearly twenty thousand people were out of employment. However, this estimate might come closer to three hundred thousand if we should include those who were thrown out of work or of any

[38]Douglas Jerold, England: Past, Present and Future (New York, n.d.), 74.

[39]Burnet, II, 234.

means to earn a living.[40]

Added to the general distress was the fact that the enclosure of so much land prevented the raising of the food so much needed for maintenance of thousands.[41]

Latimer's great love for the poor made him defend them by telling the gentry how little their selfishly acquired riches--acquired through enclosing--will eventually benefit them. He says: "Our good is not so ours that we may do with it what us listeth; but we ought to distribute it unto them which have need."[42] Latimer further states that the rich man obtained his riches through the prayer of the poor man, and therefore the poor should share in the wealth of the rich.[43]

Bishop Ridley, companion in Latimer's death, divided the poor into classes distinguished by different degrees of poverty. They are: the poor by impotence, the poor by casualties, and the poor by thriftlessness. The class of the poor by impotence can again be broken down into three divisions: the fatherless of poor men; the aged, blind and lame; and persons diseased with leprosy and dropsy. The poor by casualty are also subject to a triple classification: the wounded soldier, the diseased householder, and the

[40]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 481-2.

[41]Pollard, Somerset, 210-212.

[42]Works, I, 407.

[43]Works, I, 476-479.

grievously sick. And finally, there are the shiftless poor, namely, the rioter, the vagabond, and the indigent.[44]

Both the man on the road and the man in the street struck Hugh Latimer as rightful recipients of Christian charity; and so he appealed to every man, both the rich and the poor, to aid in counteracting the seemingly greatest evil of sixteenth century England -- the vagabonds. He says: "No doubt it is a good thing to give to other men warning of such a man, that they may take heed of him. As for an ensample: there be a company of thieves sworn together to be true one to the other, and not to disclose one another. Now I am amongst them, and after some mischief done, I am taken and condemned by the law to be hanged. Shall I not now disclose my company, and give to the magistrates warning of them? Yes, I would think that that man that is in such a case doth well to disclose his company; for it pertaineth to a good end, and is a charitable deed; else his company may do much harm afore they be known. No doubt that man should do well; and I think he ought to do it. And I would God that all thieves in England were so persuaded in their hearts, that when one were taken, that he should disclose his fellows too! No doubt we should have better rest; thieves would not so much trouble the commonwealth

[44]Holinshed, III, 1061.

as they do."[45]

The relief of the poor in Edward VI's day was either a matter of civic duty, or the business of royal administration. If the statutes of England and the by-laws of the municipalities had secured the object for which they were formed, every man able or willing to work would have had his place in society, though not, perhaps, the place which he would have chosen if left to himself.

Latimer realized all these evils, and said what he could to alleviate them. We read in Strype that ". . . all the world saw, that the Act by the King's Majesty and his Lords and Commons in Parliament, for the maintenance of learning and the relief of the poor, had served some as a fit instrument to rob learning, and to exploit the poor."[46]

Realizing the unemployment situation, Latimer's concern grew for the sturdy men without jobs. For, as he saw it, a man ". . . must labour that labour which God hath appointed for him to do: for God loveth not slothfulness."[47] Latimer found few of the rich gentry who were willing to equalize their wealth and expend their effort in assisting that class of poor who had been made so by lack of physical strength or vigor. He appeals, however, but without too much success,

[45] Works, I, 519-520.

[46] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 101 and Pt. 2, 402

[47] Works, II, 39.

saying: "So will you have Christ? Where shall you find him? Not in the jollities of this world, but in rags, in the poor people. Have you any poor people amongst you in your town or city? Seek him there amongst the rags, there shall you find him. And I will prove it on this wise. He saith himself with his own mouth, 'Whatsoever ye do to these little ones, minimis, that do ye unto me.' By these words appeareth manifestly, that whatsoever ye do unto the poor people which are despised in this world, ye do it to himself. Therefore I say yet again, when ye will seek Christ, seek him in the rags, seek him in the manger amongst the poor folk: there ye shall find him."[48]

The infirm poor were left to the capricious methods of the overseer of the poor who sometimes acted against the needy, instead of for them.[49] Latimer says: "Our good is not so ours that we may do with it what us listeth; but we ought to distribute it unto them which have need."[50]

The third class, the shiftless poor, were the greatest concern of the government. This class was made up of the

[48] Works, II, 127.

[49] Works, I, 317.

[50] Works, I, 407.

vagabonds and idle rogues, who had no work, nor did they accept labor of any kind. They were a great danger to the commonwealth during the reign of Edward VI. These vagabonds and rogues formed into troops, and roamed the countryside under a sort of organized rebel government of their own. The writers of that time tell us that there were various types of these organized thieves.[51] The cleverest and best trained of these rogues stole horses, sheep, or any available animals. They refused to work, even though, at times they might have been able to do a household chore for one whom they approached for a meal. Latimer speaks of their sloth in the following strain: "Amongst these may be numbered all slothful persons, which will not travail for their livings; they do the will of the devil. God biddeth us to get our living with labour; they will not labour, but go rather about a begging, and spoil the very poor and needy. Therefore such valiant beggars are thieves before God. Some of these valiant lubbers, when they came to my house, I communed with them, burthening them with the transgression of God's laws."[52]

Latimer sharply differentiates the unfortunate poor from the vagabonds in these terms: "Again, this petition is a

[51] Holinshed, III, 1061.

[52] Works, I, 376.

remedy against this wicked carefulness of men, when they seek how to live, and how to get their livings, in such wise as if there were no God at all. And then there be some which will not labour . . . to sell false ware, and to deceive their neighbours; or to steal other men's sheep or conies: those fellows are far wide."[53]

Again Latimer refers to his personal experience with these vagabonds, and of how he tried to win them to a better way of life. He reminds them of how they are transgressing God's laws, attempting to appeal to their latent manhood.[54]

". . . I may not eat my neighbour's meat, but it must be my own meat. I must have gotten it uprightly or else by buying: . . . I may not steal it from my neighbour; when I leap over this hedge, then I sin damnably."[55] Thus spoke Hugh Latimer in the sixth sermon preached on the first Sunday of Advent, 1552. He was again appealing to his listeners to live honest lives; and he was addressing especially the vagabonds. Latimer lets it be known, however, that even with careful words, he could not change the illiterate vagabond from his way of life. He says, quoting the beggars,

[53]Works, I, 400.

[54]Works, I, 376.

[55]Works, II, 15.

"'Is this not a great labour . . . to run from one town to another to get our meat? I think we labour as hard as other men do.' In such wise they go about to excuse their unlawful beggary and thievery."[56]

Latimer did not fail to remind his listeners that there were other kinds of thievery aside from that of the thieving vagabonds. He reiterates again and again that oppressors of the poor are thieves, saying: "There are some men which think there is no other kind of theft but only taking of purses, and killing men by the way, or stealing other men's goods. These men are much deceived; . . ."[57]

Laws in England at this time were unmercifully severe. Capital punishment was unsparingly inflicted. Yet these harsh measures had little effect in repressing acts of violence. A rude and licentious state of manners, and imperfect methods for preserving the public peace, naturally, gave rise to such acts.[58]

During the reign of Edward VI the number of vagabonds had increased, so Latimer gives this advice, ". . . idle lubbers that will not labour, that they should not eat neither: for no doubt, if they were served so, it would make

[56]Works, I, 376.

[57]Works, I, 414.

[58]Henry Hallam, Constitutional History of England (London, 1864), 60-61.

them apply their bodies to a better use than they do."[59]

Since conditions were such, savage legislation was passed against rogues and vagabonds. If a prisoner was convicted by two justices of the peace, he might be branded and reduced to slavery for two years.[60]

Did Latimer and his contemporaries accomplish anything in trying to assist the impatient poor, and to curb the ever-increasing number of rogues and vagabonds? It seems that they did, for the Act of 1552 confirmed the earlier Acts against vagabondage, and directed an increase in the charitable fund from which the poor were to be relieved. The charitable fund, entered in the parish registry, was doled out weekly to the poor.[61]

Education

Hugh Latimer bemoaned the fact that the education of his day was not accomplishing its goal in furnishing righteous and learned men to preach the gospel of the "new learning", and to guide the government in such a way that this "new learning" would become firmly established. Using the plough as a metaphor

[59] Works, II, 40.

[60] Strype, Eccles. Mem. II, Pt. 1, 263-4.

[61] J. R. Tanner, Tudor Constitutional Documents A.A. 1485-1603 (Cambridge, 1922), 471.

Latimer says: "And as diligently as the husbandman plougheth for the sustentation of the body, so diligently must the prelates and ministers labour for the feeding of the soul: both the ploughs must still be going as most necessary for man. And wherefore are magistrates ordained, but that the tranquility of the commonweal may be confirmed, limiting both ploughs?"[62]

Latimer feels that the ministers of the gospel, as well as the magistrates, are far too much concerned with worldly living to concentrate on the duties of their offices, and to carry out these duties faithfully. He says, in this same "Sermon on the Plough": "But now for the fault of unpreaching prelates, methink I could guess what might be said for excusing of them. They are so troubled with lordly living, they be so placed in palaces, couched in courts, ruffling in their rents, dancing in their dominions, burdened with ambassages, pampering of their paunches, like a monk that maketh his jubilee; munching in their mangers, and moiling in their gay manors and mansions, and so troubled with loitering in their lordships, that they cannot attend it. They are otherwise occupied, some in the king's matters, some are ambassadors, some of the privy council, some to furnish the court, some

[62]Works, I, 67.

are lords of the parliament, some are presidents, and comptrollers of mints . . . . Should we have ministers of the church to be comptrollers of the mints?"[63]

Hugh Latimer's continual lament was that the funds and buildings of these extensive properties had been diverted to secular purposes other than education, the education of men in the "new learning." Since these funds had formerly been used for education, Latimer pleads: "God will not devise any new way, . . . but would have us to use this way ordained already. This preaching way we ought to use, and not to look for any new way. This office of salvation we ought to maintain, and not look for any other."[65] So Latimer, like other idealists, dreamed of a perfect system for educational and social services.

Thomas Lever, a contemporary of Hugh Latimer, says: "Howbeit convetous officers have so used this matter, that even those goods, which did serve to the relief of the poor, the maintenance of learning, and to comfortable necessary hospitality in the commonwealth, be now turned to maintain worldly, wicked, covetous ambition? You have gotten these goods from

[63] Works, I, 67.

[64] Strype, Eccles. Mem., Pt. 2, 402-409.

[65] Works, I, 291.

evil to worse, and other goods. No, from good until evil, be ye sure it is even you that have offended God, beguiled the King, robbed the Church, spoiled the poor, and brought the commonwealth to a common misery."[66]

Other educational resources were also destroyed or lost to the purpose for which they were intended. John Bale, a writer of the period, and quoted by Herbert Butterfield, lamented passionately the destruction of manuscripts, and writes that there is "so greate an oversighte in abbeys and fryeries, when the most worthy monuments of this realm so miserably perished in the spoyles . . . not yet Englyshe people under the Danes and Normanes had every such damage of their learned monuments as we have seen in our time."[67]

An order was given in Council for the removal from Westminster Library of all missals, legends, and "superstitious" volumes. By so doing the Council hoped to purge the literature of Edward VI's reign of all suspected objectionable doctrine for the orthodoxy of one reign becomes the heresy of the next. This was a drastic blow to education, destroying many sources of research. Hume, the English historian, gives the full description of this purge.

[66]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 409-10.

[67]Herbert Butterfield, The Englishman and His History (Cambridge, 1945), 46.

He explains, "Many of these books were plaited with gold and silver, and curiously embossed; and this finery was probably the "superstition" that condemned them. Great havoc was likewise made on the libraries at Oxford. Books and manuscripts were destroyed without distinction; volumes of divinity suffered for their rich binding; those of literature were condemned as useless; those of geometry and astronomy were supposed to contain nothing but necromancy."[68]

The universities had not the power to oppose losing their own revenue, and so expected every moment to be swallowed up by the government. Latimer asked the lords not to be so greedy and outrageous in their demands, for it is not possible for the government to support vocations to the ministry, or to provide the colleges with the necessary funds to continue.[69] He describes the college of his earlier learning thus: "It would pity a man's heart to hear that I hear of the state of Cambridge; what it is in Oxford, I cannot tell. There be few do study divinity, but so many as of necessity must furnish the colleges; for their livings be so small, and victuals so dear, that they tarry

[68]Hume, III, 133-134.

[69]Works, I, 102.

not there, but go other where to seek livings; and so they go about. Now there be a few gentlemen, and they study divinity. Alas! What is that? It will come to pass that we shall have nothing but a little English divinity, that will bring the realm into a very barbarousness and utter decay of learning."[70]

By the first year of Edward VI's reign the new Cambridge University labored under the fears of encroachments of the town upon the University's privileges. The University, likewise, feared curtailment of revenues, or at least of having them diminished. These fears put Cambridge in a state of decay; and the study of literature began to be neglected. It seemed that the learned men were seldom noticed, or had honors conferred upon them. Neither were scholars now of any reputation or value, so that few, either rich or poor, now dwelt at the University to attain to any degree of advanced learning. The poor could not afford it; and the rich chose rather a career of another sort, due, no doubt, to the general neglect and a lack of appreciation of higher learning.[71]

Latimer laments the lassitude of the rich gentry toward learning. He recalls how, formerly, rich men left legacies to the universities. Not so now. He says: "In times past, when any rich man died in London, they were wont to help the

[70] Works, I, 178-179.

[71] Strype, Cranmer, I, 234.

poor scholars of the Universities with exhibition."[72] It would seem that there was a growing indifference to a fuller education, not only in the higher realms of learning, but in the schools of basic training as well. The grammar schools were also in disuse, and parents were choosing any calling for their children, rather than the career of letters. Says Thomas Lever: ". . . many grammar schools . . . now be taken away by reason of a greedy covetousness of you . . . to take away the schoolmaster's livings . . . ."[73]

Latimer asserts that, because the revenues have been taken from the universities, and few if any legacies are given them, they have dropped into decay. He says, "indeed universities do wonderously decay already."[74] He gives the same information about learning in general, begging that provisions be made for better schools: "And if the nobility be well trained in godly learning, the people would follow the same train. For truly, such as the noblemen be, such will the people be."[75]

It seems that some of the well-born were indifferent to learning, and preferred to stay that way. John Shelton

[72]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 415-16.

[73]Ibid., 415-16.

[74]Works, I, 102.

[75]Works, I, 69.

compresses the essence of a century of criticism into a capsule of doggerel that runs in this fashion:

> Noblemen born
> to learn they have a scorn,
> but hunt and blow a horn,
> leap over lakes and dikes
> set nothing by politics.[76]

Latimer voices the same sentiments when he preaches to an audience standing in the shrouds of the Church of St. Paul's Cross. He says: "And now the only reason why noblemen be not made lord presidents, is because they have not been brought up in learning."[77]

Although in his "Sermon on the Plough", January, 1548, Latimer, with members of the gentry undoubtedly present, had flatteringly said, "Thanks be unto God, the nobility otherwise is very well brought up in learning and godliness, to the great joy and comfort of England; so that now there is good hope in the youth, that we shall another day have a flourishing commonweal, considering their godly education."[78] Yet, later, as he investigated and better understood the condition of learning in the realm, he criticizingly says: "I wish it were better looked into and provided for, and that patrons and bishops should see more diligently to it . . . .

[76]Ausubel and Schuyler, 215.

[77]Works, I, 69.

[78]Works, I, 69.

Schools are not maintained; scholars have not exhibition; the preaching office decayeth."[79] Latimer seems to be voicing his thoughts about the fact that the noblemen, and not the churchmen, should be the lord presidents, the masters of the mint, the judges; and that the churchmen should be devoting their scholarship to advancing the "new learning", and not to business enterprises.

John Hales, friend of Latimer, introduced the first bill of Edward VI's reign regarding the education of the poor men's children. The bill embodied a suggestion of Brynkelow that a certain number of poor men's children should be educated at the public expense.

Latimer, in a letter to Cromwell, December 13, 1538, when the monastery lands were beginning to be confiscated, does not forget to mention that five hundred marks could be found for the King and two hundred for Cromwell, if the Priory of Malvern could be left to teaching, preaching, studying, and praying. However, the intent was never the same as the result. Chantry lands, granted to the crown for the endowment of education, were regranted in 1552, or were sold wholesale to private parties for inadequate sums. Thus the ready cash was to help finance the government.[80]

[79] Works, I, 291.

[80] Works, II, 411.

"Let us maintain the necessary office of salvation"; says Latimer, "pay to the ministers the things appointed them; maintain scholars and schools; . . ."[81] He complains that there were now fewer students than there had been twenty years before. "I think there be at this day ten thousand students less than were within these twenty years, and fewer preachers; . . ."[82]

The chantries and other foundations which had been conferred upon Henry VIII, but had not been suppressed by him, were now, despite the strong opposition of Latimer and others, for the most part, abolished. However, a niggardly portion of church property acquired in the reign of Edward VI, was re-apportioned to educational purposes. This was in the way of restoring the pre-existing endowments.[83]

The decay of schools and universities followed directly on the decay of the yeomanry. For yeomen evicted from their homes could not afford to send their children to school as his father in his time had sent him. The increased rents demanded from those who retained their holdings is alleged, by contemporary writers, to be the reason why these parents were compelled to put their children "to labour instead of

[81] Works, I, 307.

[82] Works, I, 269.

[83] Arthur Donald Innes, England under the Tudors (New York, 1926), 193.

setting to learning."[84]

It cannot be assumed that the Edwardian Age saw a great expansion in the total number of schools, although Edward VI acquired a reputation as a founder of schools because his name was attached to some of them which survived, or were refounded.

It would seem that a great opportunity had been missed; for, if all, or even half of the chantry money had been (during his reign) devoted to schools; and, if the schools had been left with their old endowments, England's history might have been changed for the better. But instead, Latimer shows us a lack of sufficient schools, and of proper training for the youth with the necessary support. He says: "But this much I say unto you, magistrates: if ye will not maintain schools and universities, ye shall have a brutality. Therefore now a suit again to your Highness. So order the matter that preaching may not decay: for, surely, if preaching decay, ignorance and brutishness will enter again. Nor give the preachers' livings to secular men."[85] Another time, Latimer says: "I hope he (God) will put it into the hearts of magistrates to consider these things; . . ."[86] To Latimer

[84]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 407.

[85]Works, I, 269.

[86]Works, I, 418.

any impediment to education was an impediment to godliness, and thus his anxiety for education runs through his sermons.[87]

London

"Now what shall we say of these rich citizens of London? What shall I say of them? Shall I call them proud men of London? Malicious men of London, merciless men of London? No, no, I may not say so; they will be offended with me then. Yet I must speak."[88]

Latimer's description of the famous city of London pictures life in all of its varied phases. It was here that Latimer preached at St. Paul's Cross to attract the attention of the motley crew who strutted, either for the sake of business, or for the sake of their own criminal purposes, up and down the Cathedral's middle aisle. Here bulls and bears were cruelly baited; here the plague descended with its death terrors. It is difficult to catch the rhythm of movements in what is essentially a portrait. In the case of London, however, it is easy to grasp the pulsating rhythms of the life that was lived in London. One can easily imagine the ups and downs of the people who made up the

[87] Works, I, 208.

[88] Works, I, 63.

population of that teeming city. One can realize how plagues and epidemics would decimate the city; and how it would rapidly refill with people from the countryside. No other town in England came anywhere near the size or importance of London.

Latimer sees the city from two viewpoints; thus exists the living paradox of London. He sees the palaces, the towers, the theatres, the fair houses and beautiful gardens; but he sees, also, the usurers. Note his warning, "For all they that live of usury, they have their gains by the devil."[89] He sees the death of a pauper in the city streets, ". . . for in London their brother shall die in the streets for cold, . . ."[90] He continues, ". . . he shall lie sick at the door between stock and stock, and shall perish there for hunger."[91] It is thus that he speaks of the slums; and referring to the patched and hungry vagabonds, he says: ". . . every man shall work for his living, and shall not be a sluggard, as a great many be:"[92] And to the Londoners in general, concerning these conditions, he addresses this stinging warning: "For is there not reigning in London as much pride, as much covetousness, as much cruelty, as much oppression and as much superstition, as was

[89] Works, II, 42.

[90] Works, I, 64.

[91] Works, I, 64.

[92] Works, I, 63-64.

in Nebo? Yes, I think, and much more too. Therefore I say, repent, O London; repent, repent."[93]

The same sentiments were voiced by another close contemporary of Latimer, Thomas Lever, who said that the chamberlains of London provided a home for twenty or thirty dogs, with a yearly cost of ten pounds for the caretaker; but they would not provide ten pence a year toward a foundling home for a poor child.[94]

Also the tax collections for "grey cloaks" or Court Aldermen were absorbed for personal benefits, while a request for a spring for city water, the cost-burden for which the commons must bear, was refused.[95] Thus the city officials used their positions for personal gain. Another of the reformers said solemnly about the condition of the fair city of London: "O what a number of poor, feeble, halt, blind, lame, sickly, yea with idle vagabond and dissembling caitiffs mixed with them, lie and creep begging in the merry street of London."[96]

In Latimer's sympathy for the poor and neglected of London, he lays the blame on the wealthy citizens there, and says that they have lost the sense of pity and compassion. He says, "Now

[93] Works, I, 63-64.

[94] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 2, 228.

[95] Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 1, 227.

[96] Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 228.

what shall we say of these rich citizens of London? . . . proud men of London, malicious men of London, merciless men of London? . . . And, you rulers and officers, be wise and circumspect, look to your charge, and see you do your duties; and rather be glad to amend your ill living than to be angry when you are warned or told of your fault."[97]

Latimer defends the speaker who called the burgesses of London "butterflies".[98] "Lord, what ado there was for that word! And yet would God they were no worse than butterflies! Butterflies do but their nature; the butterfly is not covetous, is not greedy, of other men's goods; is not full of envy and hatred, is not malicious, is not cruel, is not merciless."[99] In fact Latimer says that these men were worse than butterflies; and he goes on to say: "London cannot abide to be rebuked; such is the nature of man. If they be pricked, they shall kick; if they are rubbed on the gall, they will wince; but yet they will not amend their faults, they will not be ill spoken of."[100]

[97] Works, I, 63-64.

[98] Works, I, 64.

[99] Works, I, 64.

[100] Works, I, 64.

Latimer also warns the bishops of London who were neglecting their divine services.[101] He warns them: "And ye that be prelates, look well to your office; for right prelating is busy labouring, and not lording. Therefore preach and teach, and let your plough be doing."[102]

Referring to those who, in secret places in London, still frequented the old Catholic rites not allowed in England, Latimer fearing for the new rites, says: ". . . and now that the knowledge of God's word is brought to the light, and many earnestly study and labour to set it forth, now almost no man helpeth to maintain them."[103]

Regarding the sin of adultery which had increased so alarmingly in London, Latimer says: "And it is now not in the noblemen only, but it is come now to the inferior sort. Every man, if he have but a small cause, will cast off his old wife, and take a new, and will marry again at his pleasure; and there be many that have so done. I would therefore wish that there be a law provided in this behalf for adulterers, and that adultery should be punished with death; and that might be a remedy for all this matter. There would not be then so much adultery, whoredom, and lechery in England as

[101] Strype, Cranmer, I, 293.

[102] Works, I, 65.

[103] Works, I, 65.

there is. For the love of God, take heed to it, and see a remedy provided for it . . . ; and that the woman being an offender, if her husband would be a suitor for her, she should be pardoned for the first time, but not for the second time: and the man, being an offender, should be pardoned if his wife be a suitor for him the first time, but not for the second time, if he offend twice. If this law were made, there would be not so much adultery nor lechery used in the realm as there is. Well, . . . I trust once yet, to see the day that lechery be punished."[104]

Latimer continues to bewail the lack of morality, saying: "'Immunity, impunity': what should I call it? A privileged place for whoredom. The lord mayor hath nothing to do there, the sheriffs they cannot meddle with it; and the quest they do not inquire of it: and there men do bring their whores, yea, other man's wives, and there is no reformation of it."[105]

Because the clergy, says Latimer, had failed to do their duties of preaching and administering the sacraments, the untrained world took the occasion to lapse into great moral degradation. In speaking to the clergy (and he spoke in Latin)

[104] Works, I, 244.

[105] Works, I, 196.

Latimer says: ". . . to keep every one in good order. This is their duty. Further, we pray that the priests, the spirituality, or the churchmen, as they call them, do their duties: to preach God's word, to live godly, and to give good ensample by their conversation; . . ."[106]

Against the vice of gambling then prevalent in London, Latimer says: "There being such dicing houses also, they say, as hath not been wont to be, where young gentlemen dice away their thrift; and where dicing is, there are other follies also."[107] Even in the simple game of backgammon, with double boards and dice, there were opponents who became so angry that they would slay each other in the heat of the game.[108] The simple game of chess, in those of strong passions, and lack of self-control, often gave rise to constant quarrels and hot disputes, not infrequently ending in bloodshed.[109] Here, indeed, amongst this growing immorality in England, was work aplenty for the reformers and moralists, and they did not fail to answer the need. Tippling houses had sprung up like mushrooms; and there were many other vile places and

[106] Works, I, 350.

[107] Works, I, 196.

[108] Strype, Cranmer, I, 95-96.

[109] Emily Pearson, Elizabethans at Home (California, 1950), 304.

gambling dens where illegal gambling was carried on.[110]

Latimer, realizing the difficulty of the older people to come over to the "new learning" was not too hard on those who found his sermons dull -- as dull they must have been, and boringly long. He tells of having met a woman who, not recognizing him on his way to preach, and being asked by a neighbor where she was going, was especially frank. Thus the story: "Mistress," said the neighbor, "whither go ye?" "Marry," said she, "I am going to St. Thomas of Acres to the sermon; I could not sleep all this last night, and I am going thither; I never failed of a good nap there." Latimer adds that he should rather "ye should go napping to the sermons, than not to go at all."[111]

But, on another occasion he is not so placable. After he had sent word to London that he would preach in the town the next morning, he arrived and found the church locked. He relates: ". . . at last the key was found, and one of the parish comes to me and says, 'Sir, this is a busy day with us, we cannot hear you; it is Robin Hood's day. The parish are gone abroad to gather for Robin Hood: I pray you let them

[110]M. B. Synge, A Short History of the Social Life in England (New York, 1906), 96.

[111]Works, I, 201.

not.'"[112] With this incident Latimer leaves us a picture of another sort of amusement which the people must have enjoyed. We see Robin Hood as the chief personage in the ancient celebration of May-day; and the gathering for Robin Hood is duly recorded in the parish registers. The town went wild with joy when appeared the Maypole with morris dancers and taborers, accompanied by Robin Hood and Little John, Maid Marian, the Hobby-horse, and the Dragon.[113]

A depraving sport, made popular at this time among the ranks, and played on the various holidays including May-day, was bear-baiting.[114]

Manners and Morals

The short reign of Edward VI is one of conflicts, contrasts, and violence. During his reign the economic changes kept the whole of society in a state of flux. Ragged rogues haunted the countryside; and rogues in satin plagued the towns. Even if one is prepared to believe some of the reformer's statements, which seem a trifle exaggerated, we cannot ignore the records of the time.

[112] Works, I, 208.

[113] Ellis, I, 147.

[114] Works, I, 547.

Many murders were committed; and all too frequently the murderers escaped punishment because of the favors and affection of the judges. One instance reported was of a king's searcher who, in executing his office, displeased one of the town's merchantmen. And, consequently, in endeavoring to collect the custom money due his majesty, lost his life. Latimer, in his down-to-earth view of the people, and of the current administration of justice, says: "They told me the tale say it [the murder] is winked at; they look through their fingers, and will not see it. Whether it be taken up with a pardon, or no, I cannot tell; but this I am sure, and if ye bear with such matters, the devil shall bear ye away to hell. Bloodshed and murder would have no bearing. It is a heinous thing, bloodshedding, and especially voluntary murder and prepensed murder."[115]

Popular stories about Robin-Hood-like characters may have prevented the law from taking drastic measures against all of these thieves when caught; but few, if any of them deserved this leniency on the part of the government. There were the sons of nobles and the sons of the new gentry among the ranks of the rogues. These had friends and relatives who, not infrequently, pleaded for them, even though they were caught

[115] Works, I, 189-90.

red-handed. If these culprits could convince the judge that they were merely following the call of adventure, or that they had been dispossessed of their estates and wealth, they might be rescued from the toils of the law; and would later appear as men of good social standing.

To Latimer the solution to the murder problem was the death sentence for the murderer. He says, "It is the office of king to see such murders punished with death; for non frustra gestat gladium."[116] According to existing statutes, capital punishment was to be applied for voluntary murder only; but Latimer says, "If ye be man-qyellers, murderers, and transgressors, look for no bearing at my hands."[117]

To point up the injustice of the times, Latimer tells the story of a wealthy woman who murdered her children, but who was found not guilty; while a poor woman was hanged for stealing a few rags off a hedge.[118]

For so boldly speaking out against these injustices, Latimer was criticized; so, he took occasion on the next Sunday, April 12, 1549, to clear up the matter. He said, "I spake it to advertise ye to beware of bearing with wilful

[116] Works, I, 190.

[117] Works, I, 191.

[118] Works, I, 190-191.

and prepensed murder."[119]

Sermons were made to play a prominent part in both hindering and helping the Council's aim to enforce religious innovations at all costs. Feeling ran so high, however, that often during the services free-for-all fights occurred in the church. A contemporary describes such a scene. During one of the Lenten periods when Latimer was preaching at St. Margaret's, Westminster, a riot took place during the sermon. From many a pulpit there came violent, even foul language against the new religion.[120]

During the latter years of his preaching Latimer seems to have mellowed considerably, even though he gave in not one iota to the loose morals of the day. In a sermon preached on the fifth Sunday after Epiphany, 1552, we hear him say: ". . . (ye) shall be received and placed among the number of the godly, and shall enjoy with them everlasting life."[121] He is here speaking to those who have been generous enough to forgive their enemies, and those who have wronged them. He speaks at another time of the grave necessity of right conduct on all occasions, and especially of the duties of parents to children, advising, ". . . love of the parents

[119] Works, I, 195.

[120] Rose-Troup, 323.

[121] Works, II, 195.

toward their children is the good gift of God."[122]

Latimer's sermons dealing with one's servants differ very little from the advice given for maintaining right relations among members of a family. Particularly does he address himself to husband and wife, or to the master and mistress; and thus he includes the servants and children. Actual conditions, as Hugh Latimer sees the question, are controlled by the householders, be they responsible or irresponsible. Chance may sometimes alter the picture by mixing up human elements without regard for human wishes. Thus good servants sometimes find themselves in evil households; and bad servants, in good homes. However, the influence of the servants was much stronger when servants actually became members of the family, as so often occurred in Tudor establishments.[123]

The stress which Latimer placed on good and kind household management resulted in such close ties that the master became a brother's keeper to his male servants, just as the mistress became the good angel to her maids.[124]

[122] Works, I, 535.

[123] Works, II, 158.

[124] Works, I, 19.

In an Advent sermon preached in Lincolnshire, Latimer said, ". . . let parents take heed how they speak in the presence of their children; and masters ought to take heed how they give ensamples unto their servants; for there be some masters and parents, that will speak so lecherously and filthy before their servants and children, that it is out of measure."[125]

Securing service with a good master was not easy during this era when unemployment was an economic problem. Especially was this true of the apprentice and the domestic servant. Because unscrupulous masters were likely to use apprentices as servants, requiring them to be subject to their will, and even to their dishonesty, Latimer warns: "The craftsman, or merchantman, teacheth his prentice to lie, and to utter his wares with lying and foreswearing . . . . So likewise, prentices can do nothing but lie; and the better he can lie, the more he is regarded of his master, . . . You may see now how necessary a thing it is to be in the truth, to be upright in our dealings; . . ."[126] And Latimer goes on to tell that even written contracts are no longer honored with every man working craftily for his own interest. ". . . every man

[125] Works, II, 79.

[126] Works, I, 500-501.

worketh craftily with his neighbor."[127]

Latimer now turns to the servant and the apprentice and gives them advice on how to treat with their masters: "But God knoweth that many things are now promised, and nothing performed. Every man is more liberal in speech than in deed; whereas it should be contrary . . . servants are not angels when they deal deceitfully with their masters, and when they are slothful in their doings, not regarding their promise made unto their masters."[128]

Latimer would have the householders take the care of their servants much to heart, and especially, to watch over their moral behavior. He felt that any ungodly, profane, or wicked language should never be permitted, and that servants who would thus offend should be dismissed.[129]

At the same time Latimer, worldly-wise as he was, knew only too well that young minds would not be too much influenced if the precepts of manners and morals were crammed into them. He realized that the example of good moral living, seen in the older people around them, would be the best teacher of the youth. He believed that parents should serve as worthy examples

[127] Works, I, 501.

[128] Works, II, 90.

[129] Works, I, 485-6.

for their children. "Therefore parents ought to take heed," says he, "and especially such as be rulers over houses or be officers: . . ."[130] He continues to say that children learn to tell falsehoods "prettily" from their parents; and here he urges a little corporal punishment as a punishment for lying. He advises: "When you hear one of your children to make a lie, take him up, and give him three or four good stripes, and tell him that it is naught: and when he maketh another lie, give him six or eight stripes; . . ."[131]

Lest the people of the period become too taken up with the pleasures of the age, which, for the privileged class were hunting, eating, drinking, and sleeping, Latimer cautions: "But those sluggards which spend their time vainly in eating and drinking and sleeping, they please not God; . . . lest the devil, or the world, or our own flesh get the victory over us. We are allowed to take our natural sleep . . . . But . . . we must not play the glutton . . . or over-much sleeping; . . ."[132]

[130] Works, II, 79.

[131] Works, I, 501.

[132] Works, II, 61.

Dress

The mid-sixteenth century Englishmen were compounded of paradoxes. They could witness apparently, merely as interested spectators, the hanging of a neighbor or acquaintance. They could set out in small ships to discover new worlds and face unknown dangers. And yet, they were terrified by witchcraft, they still used the most impossible potions in cases of illness, and they grumbled and growled over the dirt of the London street, and the price of meat or the poor grade of fish. Their very persons reflected these extremes, especially the lack of fastidiousness beneath gorgeous exteriors. For example, baths were considered unnecessary and unhealthy; fresh air, bad for the lungs.

There were those who deplored the way in which the country lady and gentlemen were, for the sake of rich clothing of silks and brocades, ruining their estates and losing interest in the fulfillment of their spiritual needs.

The love of show became visible in the dress of the people. Clothing was gay in appearance and of the best material. All classes were eager to dress themselves and their servants well. Though the law stipulated that people must dress according to their station in life, there was much complaint that even "players and cutpurses" dressed like gentlemen.

Latimer speaks of this provision of the law when he says to his flock: "There be laws made and certain statutes, how every one in his estate shall be apparellel; but God knoweth, the statutes are not put in execution."[133]

It is undoubtedly a fact that clothes never meant so much to people as to those of this age. The increase of wealth and the growing power of the middle class gave a greater prominence to wearing apparel. Great expenditures were made upon clothes; the fashions were rich and costly; and the custom was to make an ostentatious display of one's wealth. Not only did the ladies wear rich dresses, but they prided themselves upon possessing a great number of them; in fact, as many as they could afford.[134]

In speaking of this vanity, Latimer refers to Christ's Mother, saying; "She was not trimmed up as our women now-a-days . . . for she used no such superfluities as our fine damsels do now-a-days."[135]

The rapidly changing styles and the straining of the lower classes to approximate some of the extravagances of

[133] Works, II, 19.

[134] Besant, II, 304-305.

[135] Works, II, 108.

the rich, resulted in a clothes-consciousness from which scarcely any could break free. This coveting of the apparel of the rich spread almost like a disease.[136]

Although many sober-minded people were disturbed by so wide-spread an infatuation for dress, they saw that the majority of those following this trend, were more or less victims of fashion. However, Latimer worried over the situation. He says: "Yea, it is now come to the lower sort, to mean men's wives; they will rule and apparel themselves gorgeously, and some of them far above their degrees, whether their husbands will or no."[137] On another occasion he says: "Here I might have occasion to speak against this excess of apparel, which is used now everywhere, . . ."[138] A contemporary writer makes comparison of the Tudor apparel with the apparel of other lands, saying, ". . . more light than the lightest French, and more sumptuous than the proudest Persian."[139] In a word an English Tudor lady was more the fine lady and much more artificial than was her grandmother; but, albeit, much less beautiful. Who

[136] Pearson, 576.

[137] Works, I, 252.

[138] Works, II, 19.

[139] Pearson, 576.

is it who has said, Beauty lies in simplicity?

Here it may be well to describe the dress of the mid-sixteenth century lady and gentleman, and compare this dress to the picture drawn for us by Latimer. Several different types of headgear were worn by both men and women. The art of the goldsmith and of the hairdresser combined to make a most artistic head piece of the velvet fold to form a hood. The head covering was set off with gold and jewels, and was worked over a sheer coif.[140] It was known as the French hood.[141]

Latimer does not approve of this vain headdress, and gently reproves: "They must wear French hoods, and I cannot tell you, I, what to call it. And when they make them ready, and come to the covering of their head, they will call and say, 'Give me my French hood, and give me my bonnet, or my cap.'"[142] The English version of the hood as Latimer describes it, had various other appellations: the gable, diamond-shaped, and kennel dress, and it was worn as late as 1550.[143]

[140] R. Turner Wilcox, The Modes of Hats and Headdress (New York, 1945), 80.

[141] Dion Clayton Calthrop, English Costume, 1066-1820 (London, 1950), 281.

[142] Works, I, 253.

[143] Wilcox, 81.

The coif of sheer linen, stiffly starched, became popular at this time. A Flemish woman named Van der Plasse came over to England (London), and set up a business as a starcher of ruffs. She charged five pounds for teaching English women how to use starch. Interestingly enough, the mere mention of starch made Stubbes furiously angry; he is known to have exclaimed that the ruff was a "master devil" and that the devil himself invented starch.[144]

There were endless fashions for wearing the hair. It was curled into innumerable curls; it was crisped; it was built up over a frame or cushion; it was laid over the forehead. From England to France in 1545 came the first wire hairpins. These replaced the fine, flexible wooden pins formerly used.

Latimer decried the coverings for the head and the fashionable hair-do's. To him a woman lost her feminine power when her head was subjected to excessive head covering or to fashionable hair-do. He had this to say: "I would wish that the women would call the covering of their heads by the terms of the Scripture: as when she would have her cap, I would she would say, 'Give me my power'. I would they would learn to speak as the Holy Ghost speaketh, and call it by such a name as St. Paul doth. I would they would (as they

[144]Besant, II, 304. F. W. Tichnor, Social and Industrial History of England (London, 1936), 285-6.

have much pricking) when they put on their cap, I would they would have this meditation: 'I am now putting on my power upon my head.' If they had this thought in their minds, they would not make so much pricking up of themselves as they do now-a-days. But now here is a vengeance devil: we must have our power from Turkey, of velvet, and gay it must be; far fetched, dear bought; and when it cometh, it is a false sign. I had rather have a true English sign, than a false sign from Turkey."[145]

As seen from the above quote, materials for the new English costumes were imported from all parts of the globe. Goods arrived from France, Spain, Italy, and the Far East. Latimer considered all this extreme: "We must have our power from Turkey, . . ."[146] But still the styles prevailed in mid-sixteenth century England, and Latimer's words seem to have had little effect.

Latimer bewails the hair styles that, he believes, prevent women from retaining their feminine grace. He says, "For if they would keep it under power as they ought to do, there should not any such tussocks nor tufts be seen as they be; nor such laying out of the hair, nor braiding to have it

[145] Works, I, 253.

[146] Works, I, 253.

open."[147]

False hair had been in vogue periodically over the centuries, but the revival of it during this age is not missed by Latimer, for he says: (Here he quotes the first letter of St. Paul to Timothy.) "'Not with laying out the hair artificially;' . . . 'Not with laying out the tussocks.'"[148]

Various Spanish styles had also been brought into the country. Chief among these was the varthingale or farthingale. Also, during this reign, the custom of wearing a whale bone to impress the figure down to the hips, was begun. The stomacher was much worn. It descended in front, and from it stood out the farthingale horizontally. It was a hideous thing. Gowns were made of silk velvet, grosgrain, taffeta, or fine cloth, commanding ten, twenty, or even forty shillings a yard.[149]

Latimer, although lamenting these styles, gives us a real picture of the costumes of the day, when he says: ". . . or to those jolly damsels with their vardingals, with their roundabouts, or with their bracelets? No, no; they had so many lets to trim and dress themselves, . . ."[150]

[147] Works, I, 254.

[148] Works, II, 108.

[149] Besant, II, 108.

[150] Works, II, 118-19.

Pleated petticoats, with the full creaseless effect, were probably obtained by the padding at the hip, and by a stiffened hem. Numerous petticoats were worn. The general tendency of the age, with the advent of the farthingale, was a wider hem.

From players who were decked out as giants, Latimer learned more of the fashions, and complains: "I warrant you they had bracelets and vardingals; and were trimmed with all manner of fine raiment; like as there be many now-a-days amongst us, which study nothing else but how they may devise fine raiment; and in the mean season they suffer . . . poor people . . . to perish for lack of necessities."[151] In his fears for the results that the vanity of women's apparel would have on the morals of the age, Latimer gives us a better picture than could otherwise be obtained.

Burial Customs

So long as big towns did not exist, it was easy to obtain (usually by gift) additional land for church yards. These church yards, in this period, and for many years to come, were used for burial places. Tombstones were almost unknown;

[151] Works, II, 108.

and the use of coffins was exceptional. Thus in cities and towns the churchyard became, only too often, a contracted plot of ground, in the midst of dwellings, and literally packed with bodies. It finally became impossible to dig a grave without disturbing bones. Also, the earth in these burying grounds was so saturated with foul fluids and noxious emanations that each cemetery was a focus for disease.[152] From this condition the dangers against sanitation were realized, and there rose a public protest.

Hugh Latimer, however, social mirror of Edward VI's day, gives us a little different picture of the current burial customs. His concern seems to be primarily with the hasty burials of the dead. In one of his sermons preached at Lincolnshire before the common folk of the countryside, he says: ". . . there be many now-a-days very hasty to bury their friends, yea, sometimes before they be well dead."[153] He continues with a gruesome tale about a young woman, who, being carried to her grave, began to stir. ". . . and so finally the woman recovered." He adds another story about a young man in the time of Saint Augustine. This patient had lain in an unconscious state for seven days; but finally awoke

[152]Herman Levy and Arnold Wilson, Burial Reform and Funeral Cost (London, 1938), 15.

[153]Works, I, 538.

awoke and recovered. Latimer adds this admonition, "I tell this tale, to the end to give you warning not to be too hasty with sick folks."[154]

As has been indicated, burial followed speedily after death. Although the burials sometimes occurred secretly at night, they more normally were accompanied by a ceremonial pageant to the place of interment.

Many of the bereaved seemed compelled to hide any trace of sorrow. Latimer explains, "In the time of popery before the gospel came amongst us, we went to burials with weeping and wailing, . . . but since the gospel came unto us, . . . grinning and flearing, . . . we should keep a measure in all things."[155]

Burials usually occurred on the day following death. Preparations, especially for ostentatious processions, required haste. The pageant, preceded by a band of musicians, passed from the house of death to the church, and thence to the churchyard. If the deceased was a young maiden, her closest friend carried before the casket a garland made of sweet smelling herbs and flowers. This was later left in the church to symbolize the girl's virginity. At times the streets were

[154] Works, I, 539.

[155] Works, I, 547.

strewn with flowers in front of the procession. Poor people were sometimes hired as mourners that they might add to the impressiveness of the pageant.[156]

This pageantry certainly did not seem to strike Latimer as fitting in mood to the advent of the "new gospel". He says: "I have heard say, that in some places they go with the corses grinning and flearing, as though they went to a bear-baiting; which thing no doubt is naught."[157]

The Tudor widows as a rule, were given little time for mourning, especially if they were young. As soon as the widow's husband was laid in the grave, she was expected to bury her grief. Most new widows "modestly" put themselves into the hands of their nearest kin, who might proceed to launch them into matrimony again.[158] Latimer mentions the uncomeliness of persons forgetting their mates in such haste. "Here I might have occasion to speak against those women which so soon forget their husbands that be departed; which thing I cannot very well allow, for it is a token of an unperfect love."[159] However, aware of the hazards that surrounded them in mid-sixteenth century England, harrassed

[156]Pearson, 480-541.

[157]Works, I, 547.

[158]Pearson, 500-1.

[159]Works, I, 547-548.

widows yielded more or less readily to the hasty marriages arranged for them by their families or protectors.

The matter of the hazard-breathing cemeteries was brought to a head by the plagues which struck London and other cities at this time. As we have said, the state of cemeteries and churchyards in London was deplorable. Latimer comments on this condition; and praises the custom of burying the dead at a distance from the city.[160] Latimer says: "And here you may note, by the way, that these citizens had their burying-place without the city, which, no doubt, is a laudable thing: and I do marvel that London, being so rich a city, hath not a burying-place without; for no doubt it is an unwholesome thing to bury within the city, especially at such a time when there be great sicknesses, and so many die together."[161] Latimer is of the further opinion that many persons contracted serious diseases from attending funerals because contagion filled the air. He says, "I think, verily, that many a man taketh his death in Paul's church-yard."[162]

[160] Works, II, 66-67.

[161] Works, II, 66-67.

[162] Works, II, 67.

Marriage Rites

In the minds of the people of the mid-sixteenth century marriage altered the destinies of two or more people forever. The ring, although a simple ornament, had great significance for the sixteenth century. It is a circle, therefore has no beginning and no end. As such it is an emblem of the indissolubility of marriage. It is used in the marriage rite to indicate just that -- an unbreakable union; and it introduces the bride and groom into the intricate pattern of society -- the family. Latimer realized the sanctity of marriage, and says: ". . . for it here appeareth that marriage is a most honourable and acceptable thing in the sight of God; yea, God Almighty Himself is the author of it, as the Scripture saith, 'Those that God hath joined together man shall not separate;' meaning that all those that come together by the appointment of God and His holy institution, such shall not man separate, nor put asunder."[163] Only in the tales of romance, thought these people, was marriage to be entered into for the dream of love and its satisfaction. The bond of marriage is a privilege, a duty, a matter of family policy. It was, moreover, God's instituted plan for satisfying the insistent demand of the flesh to propagate children.

[163] Works, II, 160-61.

Thomas Becon, a contemporary of the age, called marriage a bond, knitting "together one man and one woman in flesh and body, of one will and mind in all honesty, virtue and godliness, to spend their lives in the equal partaking of all such things as God shall send them."[164] The ceremony of joining hands and exchanging rings is indicative of a bond that unites two people spiritually, legally, and physically in a relationship of complete community of life for the establishment of a family.

In general, the Tudors felt that affection came into the blessing of matrimony. The religious part of the ceremony was very important to the people of that day. The Church was closely allied to civil authority by means of its power to add validity and sanctity to the contract.[165]

Latimer speaks of the duty of married people to one another. "So likewise married folks have their special calling and laws. There is appointed in Scripture how the man should nourish his wife, rule her with leniency and friendliness; the woman, likewise, shall obey her husband, be loving and kind towards him."[166]

[164] Pearson, 281.

[165] Works, I, 162.

[166] Works, II, 6.

In the mid-sixteenth century the mutual consent of the parties to a marriage was taken for granted as one of the things ascertained before preparations were actually begun for the wedding. From immature people, or those to be joined in marriage for political reasons, this consent was sometimes obtained after slight acquaintance. Sometimes it was not sought at all.[167]

Hugh Latimer knew the type of contract into which many of the people to whom he preached had entered, and so he admonishes them: "So likewise between married folk there shall be justice . . . they shall do their duties; man shall love his wife, shall honour her, shall not be rigorous, but admonish her lovingly; and again a wife shall be obedient, loving, kind toward her husband; not provoking him to anger with ill and naughty words."[168]

The primary concern of Latimer and other reformers of his day was the fast growing number of marriages that were being dissolved by the people who had contracted them. Latimer says: "And it is not now in the noblemen only, but it comes now to the inferior sort."[169]

[167] Works, I, 366.

[168] Works, I, 503.

[169] Works, I, 244.

Fearing that this divorce evil would spread beyond control among the common people, the king's Council recommended to the bishops that they take cognizance of the growing number of cases among the nobility.[170] It had become far too frequent for noblemen, for the slightest reason, to put away their wives and marry others. The first of these divorces, as reported in the Calendar of Rolls, was that of the Earl of Northampton, divorced from Ann, daughter of the Earl of Essex. Having put her away, he married Elizabeth, daughter of the Lord of Cobham.[171]

Adultery, divorcing, and even attempting to remarry without divorce increased greatly. The situation became a great scandal to the new religion, and gave Latimer and others great sorrow. Anything that endangered the bond of matrimony took on real emotional significance: "There was never such marrying in England as is now. I hear tell of stealing of wards to marry their children to."[172]

Latimer asks the king to take the matter into his hands. It was adherence to the idea of the binding sanctity of marriage which made the question of divorce such a burning

[170] Calendar of Patent Rolls, I, Pt. 4, 260, April 17, 1547.

[171] Calendar of Patent Rolls, I, Pt. 4, 138, March 24, 1547.

[172] Works, I, 169-70.

issue in Edward VI's reign. In appealing to the king Latimer says: "For the love of God take an order for marriages here in England. For here is marriage for pleasure and voluptuousness, . . . so much breach of wedlock in the noblemen and gentlemen, and so much divorcing."[173] Hugh Latimer felt that to break the laws of matrimony and its sanctity, was to court damnation.

Before the time of the Tudors the Church had been prevailed upon to grant the so-called "separation from bed and board". Then, during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, the leading ecclesiastics had drawn up the "Reform Law" to abolish "imperfect divorce", and to substitute for it "complete divorce".

The new plan permitted the innocent party to remarry only in cases of adultery, desertion, or cruelty. Quoting from the Jewish law in reference to a Jewish king, Latimer says to Edward VI, "'Let him not prepare unto himself too many wives.'"[174] Though the plan for "complete" divorce failed, its principles were carried out in individual cases. It is not surprising, then, that the divorce of Henry VIII should have precipitated a deluge that spilled over into the

[173]Works, I, 243. See also Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 1, 138.

[174]Works, I, 94.

reign of his son. And, since there was no punishment meted out to Henry VIII for his flagrant outrages, is it any wonder that the whole nation suffered an upheaval in regarding the institution of marriage with reverence?

And so the innovations of a generation or two can easily sweep away long generations of thinking and feeling. The depravity of the Tudor Age, as Hugh Latimer saw it, is expressed in his, "What place should there be, then, within a Christian realm left for to dishonour God?"[175]

In fact, conditions of morals in London and the realm had become such a grave scandal that many of Latimer's contemporaries agreed with him that adultery should be punished by death.

However, although in the minds of Latimer and his contemporary reformers, there was consternation for a while, they never entertained the thought of giving up the battle against evil. Since adultery and divorce were the "worms" eating at the heart of civilization in England, there was great need that these men of courage (Latimer and his contemporary preachers) should give strong moral guidance to a poor, weak, afflicted nation. Naturally, individuals were thus affected by the intensity of the consequent sermons, and questions of

[175] Works, I, 133.

morality were raised where none had existed before. Thus there continued to be havoc and confusion in individual lives.

Medicine and Physicians

During Edward VI's reign medical knowledge was still largely a matter of superstition and luck. There were neither antiseptics nor anesthetics. The standard remedy for almost every illness was physic, cupping, and bleeding. Plague, smallpox, and measles were prevalent all over the country.[176] Few seemed to link the appalling dirty conditions, the numerous fleas, and the lice, with the constant recurring epidemics.

Concerning this state of affairs, Latimer spoke to his people in homely words -- words which the simple people could understand. He faced realities with the people. Latimer seems to realize it is not in the ups and downs of statecraft, but in the daily existence of hundreds of lowly people, that the real life of a nation either progresses or retrogresses.

In this England so ignorant regarding the proper care of the body, when people were so ill that they had to go to bed, they were confined to airless sickrooms, and were given violent

[176]A. M. Low, England's Past, Presented (New York, 1953), 128.

purges and emetics. It was believed that the use of some particular herb would prevent disease. This belief was known as the Doctrine of Signatures: bladderwort for the bladder, and liverwort for the liver.

Latimer regrets very much that each remedy placed by God in nature was not known sufficiently by the ordinary person; but he believes that trained physicians were meant by God to supply this lack of knowledge. He says, "If we knew the virtue of every herb, we might be our own physician: but we know them not; therefore God hath ordained that some should give themselves to the knowledge of such things, and then teach others."[177]

The fees of the surgeons and the physicians were so exorbitant that the poor could not afford their services nor their remedies. This selfish use of these professional men's talent disgusted Latimer. He complains: "But now at our time physic is a remedy prepared only for the rich folks, and not for the poor; for the poor man is not able to wage the physician. God, indeed, hath made physic for rich and poor; but physicians now-a-days seek only their own profits, how to get money, and not how they might do good unto their poor neighbor."[178]

[177] Works, I, 540.

[178] Works, I, 541.

Since the handiest remedy for curing ills was the use of the home remedy, many strange concoctions were suggested. Undoubtedly some of these "home remedies" sent many a soul into eternity. Among others used were leeks mixed in cream, conserve of cowslips and parsley warts, fresh cuchooflower heads; cloves, cinnamon, nutmeg, and pepper brewed in aqua vita. But lest the common folks should depend on these home remedies alone, Latimer suggests that they petition the Great Physician to assist them: "We must beware when we go to physic, that we trust not too must in physicians, and forget God in the mean season; . . . We may use God's provisions and remedies which he hath left for us; yet for all that we may not trust in them."[179]

Latimer likely realized that those in the medical profession sought their patients from the well-to-do class, who rarely suffered from the dangerous disease of the plague. When their rich clients fled from the plague-stricken areas, the physicians fled also. They did not condescend to give gratuitous advice to the poor even in the most pressing circumstances. As has already been said, they worked for profit, rather than for the good of poor patients.[180]

[179] Works, I, 541-2.

[180] Works, I, 541.

One method of preventing the spread of disease the Tudor Age did use -- the quarantine. There were bills drawn up, which still exist today, showing that citizens were warned of parishes that were "clear" or "not clear".[181] As a further precaution the door of an infected house was marked with a wisp which later developed into St. Anthony's cross, painted on a small piece of canvas together with the words, "Lord have mercy on us". Another means of sanitation was ordered by Lord Somerset, when he decreed that on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday twelve bucketfuls of water be drawn and cast into the channels of the streets to cleanse them of filth and debris.

Fast and Fish

The story of fish-and-fast days reflects the changing economy of England. Likewise it bears upon the government's encouragement of a navigation policy that gave the Atlantic maritime regime a crucial position in the struggle for survival of Europe's mercantile system.

The claiming for England, of the northern portion of the United States, by John Sebastian Cabot, brought immediate advantages to the English. The fertile fish-inhabited waters, more than a thousand miles across the Atlantic, offered their

[181] Synge, 147.

challenge to the courage and daring of English seamen. Fish-and-fast days became of great importance, for they helped to pay for the imports and the exports of fish bought with specie. They trained sailors. They were the indispensable foundation of the fleet. They were really the maritime power.[182]

It was essential to provide as large an internal market as possible for fish, not only as a good thing in itself, but as a basis for exports, and for the economizing on the scarce supply of meat. We have touched before on the fact that the enclosures had lessened the raising of cattle and sheep for food. And so, in order to have more fish consumed, an Act had been passed in 1548 appointing Fridays and Saturdays as enforced fish days, upon which days no meat was to be eaten.[183]

So the fact that the nation had ceased to be Catholic meant that, not less, but more fish-days were created; and that this was done for the best and most sensible reason. Later on Wednesdays were added to the number of fish days, plus Ember days,[184] and the days of Lent.[185] Thus more than

[182] A. L. Rouse, The England of Elizabeth (New York, 1951), 140.

[183] J. C. Drummond and Anne Wilabraham, The Elizabethan Code of Canon Law (London, 1948), 60.

[184] Stanislaus Waywood, A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law (London, 1948), 60.

[185] Waywood, 61-2.

half of the days of the year had become fish days.

While these fast-and-fish laws caused little privation to the poor, who ate little meat anyway, they did fulfill the purpose of preserving the nation's livestock.[186] The well-to-do classes, upon whose shoulders fell the responsibility for their country's welfare, made the sacrifice, and enforced it upon themselves.

On "fysshe dayes" appointed by the church, meat was replaced by salt fish of various kinds: herring, salmon, eels, sprats, etc., and, to a lesser extent, fresh fish. To eat flesh on "fysshe days" was sometimes a serious offense.[187]

London's fresh fish came from the rivers, brooks, and ponds of the surrounding country. In 1548 there was "a great store of very good fish of divers sortes" available from the "towne ditch" outside the walls of London, and from the nets which were set in the Thames in the vicinity of London Bridge.[188] The latter were controlled by regulations fixing the size of the mesh in order to prevent depletion of the stock.

Latimer would have called this a protective barrier, and explained that civil laws, the king's statutes, and ordinances, which are God's laws and commandments, safeguard man's rights.[189]

[186]Drummond and Wilabraham, 60.

[187]Drummond and Wilabraham, 60.

[188]Drummond and Wilabraham, 61.

[189]Works, II, 17.

There was little doubt about the effect of the government's measures to increase the fishing industry, and least of all was there doubt in the minds of those who knew, the government itself and parliament. So the weeks were divided between flesh days and fish days. For the gentry, on fish days there would be, instead of chine of mutton, salt fish or buttered eggs.

"Scrambling" days in Lent were Mondays and Saturdays when the servants depended for their food on whatever was left from the high table.[190]

Some had very definite ideas about fasting, especially in Lent, and the keeping of the fast. They supposed it to be a papal encroachment upon the liberty of Christians, to whom all meats were lawful. But the king showed the lawfulness of his edict (Act). He required a strict observance of this ancient ecclesiastical custom, and other fasting times, by a proclamation dated January 16, 1548. It was drawn up by the pen of Archbishop Cranmer. The preface of this proclamation runs as follows: "He who now is king has the only cure and charge of his realms, not only as king, but as a Christian king, and is supreme head of the church of England and Ireland. That he has a desire to lead his people in such rites, ways,

[190]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 345-6.

and customs, as might be acceptable to God, and the farther increase of good living. That is his gospel through the infinite clemency and mercy of God, by the means of his Majesty and his most noble father."[191]

Latimer submits to the Proclamation, although a little ungraciously. It seems to irk him that it smacks of the old learning; and he tells his people, "Now, therefore, we dwell in a realm, where it hath pleaseth the king's majesty to make an Act that all his subjects shall abstain from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays, and other days which are expressed in the Act; unto which laws we obey and that for conscience's sake, except we have a privilege, or be excepted by the same law. And although scripture commandeth me . . . there is a civil law and ordinance made by the king's majesty, and his honourable council, we ought to obey all their ordinances, except they be against God."[192]

But, notwithstanding the orders for keeping Lent, extravagant dispensations were granted by the king's patent.[193] For this action of dispensing Latimer has an uneasy explanation and a hidden dislike. He says: ". . . we may eat flesh on Fridays by God's word, if there were not a law made by the

[191]Strype, Eccles. Mem., I, Pt. 1, 240.

[192]Works, I, 17. Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 127.

[193]Works, II, 17.

king and his most honourable council: if there were no law, I say, then I might eat flesh upon Friday; yet for all that we must use our liberty so that the use of it may edify our neighbor, or intermit it when it may do harm . . . . But we cannot do so here in England; for our indifferency is taken away by a law."[194]

The keeping of Lent was now called into the controversy, and led to the assertion that it was not to be observed on a religious account. It was said to be a papist thing, and in ridicule of it, a set of rhymes was written which disturbed the council no end.

However, Lent was encouraged at the Court and by the Lord Protector. Preparations for the king's diet were accordingly made in this Lent of 1549 by the Lord Protector. The Protestants were for the keeping of Lent upon a political account, not on a religious one.[195] But the greater portion of the people could not be convinced by this distinction; so that preachers were fain to be employed.

Latimer preached thus: "God . . . teacheth us . . . how we should behave . . . towards the magistrates and their laws: . . . There be laws made of diet, how we shall feed our bodies,

[194]Works, II, 80-81.

[195]Works, II, 80-81.

what meat we shall eat at all times; and this law is made in policy, . . . that fish might be uttered as well as other meat. Now as long as it goeth so in policy, we ought to keep it. Therefore all except those that be dispensed withal, as sick, impotent persons, woman with child, or old folks, or licensed persons, all the rest ought to live in ordinary obedience to those laws, and not do against the same in any wise."[196]

In spite of the preachers of Edward VI day, fish does not seem to have been distasteful to the appetites of the people. The supply of fresh fish to the inland towns was, of course, limited to what could be caught in the immediate locality; but, even with this limitation, fish seems always to have been popular. Andrew Boorde speaks of the variety of fish eaten in England. He says: "Of all nacyons and countries, England is best serued of fysshe. Not only of all manner of see-fysshe, but also of fresh-water fysshe, and all manner of sorts of salt-fysshe."[197]

Transportation of fresh fish was, at that time, lacking in refrigeration, over any distance, impractical. Most of the fish landed at Queenhythe, the chief water-gate of the

[196] Works, I, 372.

[197] Drummond and Wilabraham, 36.

city of London. Here the market was situated; and here the fish was salted or pickled. Fish received from the fishing grounds off the nearby Essex or Kentish coasts was usually sold fresh.

There was a fine imposed for non-observance of the fish-and-fast act. The fine was three pounds or "three months close imprisonment". It was, however, possible to obtain a special license to eat flesh on fish days.[198]

We learn that "Lords of Parliament and their wives shall pay for a license, 26/8 yearly to the poor man's box in their parish; knights and their wives shall pay 31/4; persons of lesser degree, 6/8. (This was) provided that no license extend to the eating of beef at any time of the year, nor the eating of veal between Michaelmas and May 1st. Provided also that all persons which by reason of notorious sickness shall be enforced for Recoverye of Helthe to eat flesh for the time of their sickness, shall be sufficiently licensed by the Bisshope of the Dyoces, or by the Parson, Vicar, or Curate of the Parishe where such person be sicke."[199]

Latimer did not feel that the law still held, nor did he feel obliged to keep it. However, he still felt that he

[198]Strype, Eccles. Mem., II, Pt. 1, 129.

[199]Drummond and Wilabraham, 60-62.

should observe the fast and abstinence if he were travelling in the North Country where the old faith was still practised. He says in this regard: ". . . when I should come into the north country where they be not taught, and there I should call for my eggs on a Friday or for flesh, then I should do naughtily; for I would destroy him for whom Christ suffered. Therefore, I must beware that I offend no man's conscience, but rather travail with him first, and shew him the truth; when my neighbor is taught, and knoweth the truth, . . .[200]

And so we may say of Hugh Latimer that he was vitally concerned with all that concerned mankind. We find him preaching to the learned and the unlearned, to the rich and to the poor; and always we find him, even though he may have been in error in some of his tenets, having the courage of his convictions. Forthrightly and honestly he preached for, and stood for the right; and his honesty and fidelity to principle finally cost him his life.

[200] Works, II, 16.

V CONCLUSION

Hugh Latimer played the role of a reformer during the mid-sixteenth century, especially during the reign of Edward VI. His power of keen observation made him aware of the evils of the times. He was a lover of all mankind, and interested enough, particularly in the men and women of Tudor England, to do something about their condition.

Latimer mirrors his age through the sermons which he preached in opposition to the wrongs and injustices which he felt were being practiced. He raised his voice in protest against the wrong use of marriage. He urged the young king to marry in God, and to choose a wife who would assist him to live a life proper to a monarch.

The part which, in all justice and fairness, should be played by a righteous monarch, Latimer outlined for the life of Edward VI in the sermons which he preached before him. He begged the king to attend to matters of justice himself, and to personally hear the complaints of the poor when they sought for justice. He pleaded with the king to be a king in deed and in truth, an ideal king, since he was the head of both the church and the state.

In his anxiety to form a right character in the king, Latimer did not, however, neglect his duty of exhorting

the subjects of the realm to live rightly. In his Friday sermons addressed to Edward VI and his court, in 1549, he speaks more of their duties, naturally, than he does those of the subjects; but the betterment of the people of England was always his whole concern.

Latimer understood thoroughly the trials and difficulties of the "little people", since he himself had been born a yeoman. He seemed to feel the pulse of his age, and could sense the social change that was gradually destroying the yeoman class, -- the class which was the backbone of the England which he loved. He is particularly severe against enclosers whom he accuses of injustice to the yeomen. He has no sympathy at all for the practice of enclosure, or for any manner of social injustice.

An intelligent, fearless critic, Latimer lashes out uncompromisingly against unjust persons in power, including both monarchs and council. With his intense, Tudor-like respect for the authority of the monarchy was combined his heartfelt desire to right the wrongs of the common people. Thus his feelings were torn between two loyalties.

Latimer's keen mind ferreted out the destruction overshadowing England due to the oppression of the poor.

He sees, also, and deplores scathingly the poorer class copying the vanities and vices of the rich. Especially was this condition true regarding enforced marriages and divorce. Perhaps these evils were no greater than in any given period before or after the reign of Edward VI; but Latimer gives us a picture of how they existed in that day.

Typical of the evils of the times in many English cities were those existing in London. Latimer portrays conditions of disease-infested cemeteries, dirty streets, pest-laden tenements where the poor were left to die. He storms against the hard-hearted and mercenary physicians who fled the plague-ridden cities. He tells of the unscientific use of medicines, and the resulting misery. He exhorts parents to so train their children and household members that eventually good subjects of the realm will satisfy his desire for the "new learning". He decried extravagance and vanity in dress, fearing that such worldly practices would weaken the practice of the social ideals which he was urging upon them.

The increasing lack of opportunities for education for the children of the yeomen troubled Latimer greatly. His hope was that well-educated gentlemen would be placed near

the king to assist in just government, and that many young men would be educated for the ministry. These students had formerly come from the yeomanry; but, with the removal of benefices from the universities, families could no longer afford this education. Latimer's concern was that there would be no preachers to advance the "new learning".

Latimer throughout his life continued to be the every-day man, a defender of the simple people, but withal an upholder of the authority of the monarchy. He was an energetic, disciplined, and economical scholar. No schools carry his name as founder; and, as far as he ever knew, no disciples followed him. And yet, he is one of the greatest preachers of the "new learning". Those who had heard his sermons remembered and discussed his choice phrases long after his remains had been laid to rest. His terse, picturesque speech concerned everyday life in the home, in business, in the court; and they carried with them eternal values.

In later life Latimer's sermons took on a calm certainty, the fruit of his convictions. The troubles which he had had to endure had produced a maturity beyond his years.

Latimer's greatest disappointment was that the open Bible did not bring into everyday life more concern for the poor, greater charity, and more care for education. But, he lit a fire. As he himself said to Ridley as they stood chained together at the stake, " . . . We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."[1]

[1] Burnet, II, 641.

APPENDIX

Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer

Sermon preached at Stamford

Residue of the same Gospel declared in the Afternoon

Sermons on the Lord's Prayer, 1552
- Dedication
- Sermon the First
- Sermon the Second
- Sermon the Third
- Sermon the Fourth
- Sermon the Fifth
- Sermon the Sixth
- Sermon the Seventh

Sermon on the Gospel for St. Simon and St. Jude's Day, 1552

Sermons preached in Lincolnshire, 1552
- On the Parable of a King that married his son
- On the Gospel for all Saints
- On the Gospel for the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity
- On the Epistle for the Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity
- On the Gospel for the Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity

Sermons preached in Lincolnshire, 1552
- The Sixth: On the Epistle for the First Sunday in Advent
- The Seventh: On the Gospel for St. Andrew's Day
- The Eighth: On the Gospel for the Second Sunday in Advent
- The Ninth: On the Gospel for the Third Sunday in Advent

Sermon preached at Bexterley on Christmas Day, 1552

Sermon preached at Grimsthorpe on St. Stephen's Day, 1552

Sermon preached at Grimsthorpe on St. John the Evangelist's Day, 1552

Sermon preached at Grimsthorpe on Twelfth Day, 1553

Sermon preached the First Sunday after the Epiphany, 1552

Sermon preached the Second Sunday after the Epiphany

Sermon preached the Third Sunday after Epiphany

Articles to which Mr. Latimer was required to subscribe, March 11, 1531

Articles devised by the Bishops, for Master Latimer to subscribe unto

Concerning Mr. Latimer's Communication with Mr. Rainham in the Dungeon at Newgate

Articles Untruly, Unjustly, Falsely, Uncharitably Imputed to Me, (Hugh Latimer) by Dr. Powell

Injunctions by Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, to the Prior and Convent of St. Mary House in Worcester, 1537

Injunctions Given by the Bishop of Worcester in his Visitation to all Parsons, Vicars, and other Curates of his Diocese, the Year of Our Lord God MDXXXVII, Anno Regis Henrici Octavi XXIX

Bishop Latimer's Arguments Against Purgatory with King Henry VIII's answers

The Disputation had at Oxford, the 18th Day of April, 1554, between Mr. Hugh Latimer, answerer, and Mr. Smith and others, Opposers

Sermons on the Card, about 1529
    Sermon the First
    Sermon the Second

Sermon on the Epistle for the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity, 1535

Letters

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Latimer's biographers and historians generally have dealt with the subject of religion and given scant notice to the political, economic, and social aspects of his sermons. The volumes used for the preceding study are The Works of Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555, edited by George E. Corrie, 2 vols., The Parker Society (Cambridge, 1844-5). This is the complete collection of all the works of the author. They were preserved through the piety of one Thomas Some, of whom nothing is known except that he was of the reformed religion, that he was an ardent admirer of Latimer, and that he was adept at some kind of shorthand writing. Some's admiration of "good father Latimer" was boundless. But his shorthand, as he ruefully confessed, was inadequate to keep pace with the torrent of Latimer's eloquence. In spite of their incoherence, it is not difficult to perceive the central topics of the sermons. Some dealt with the office and function of a king. The others, with many digressions, were an attack on those who deplored the fact that a boy was sitting on the throne of England. Still others are pleas for upright magistrates, with incidental replies to the critics of the preceding sermons. Latimer seems to reiterate

the themes of previous sermons. Perhaps the most incoherent of all, were those which were primarily a defense of the royal supremacy. Latimer's sermons overlap in content; the same topics recur again and again. It was more illuminating to consider leading ideas and specific problems as they were treated in the sermons collectively.

The sermons were then collected by Latimer's servant Bernher. The first collection of Latimer's sermons edited by Bernher was published by John Day. Its title-page reads in part: 27 Sermons Preached by the Right Reverend Father in God and Constant Martyr of Jesus Christ, Master Hugh Latimer, as Well Such as in Times Past Have Been Printed, as Certain Other Coming to Our Hands of Late, Which Were Yet Never Set Forth in Print. A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad (1475-1642), compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London, 1926). The volume is in two parts. Part One contains Thomas Some's dedication to the Duchess of Suffolk and all the sermons which had previously appeared in print (that is, the Convocation Sermon of 1536, the Sermon on the Ploughers, the sermons before King Edward VI, and the sermon at Stamford, the last-named having been separately printed by Day in 1550). Part Two has a separate title-page, which reads as follows: Certain Other Sermons

Preached by the Right Reverend Father in God, Master Hugh Latimer, in Lincolnshire, the Year of Our Lord 1553. Collected and Gathered by Augustine Bernher an Helvetian: and Albeit Not So Fully and Perfectly Gathered as They Were Uttered: Yet Nevertheless Truly, to the Singular Commodity and Profit of the Simple Ignorant, Who with Fervent Zeal and Diligent Reading, Desire To Be Better Taught and Instructed. In this context "Lincolnshire" probably means Grimsthorpe, since Bernher indicates in the dedication that all the sermons in the volume were preached there. The date "1553" is palpably incorrect, as will appear in a moment. This part of the collection, with the dedication by Bernher to the Duchess of Suffolk, consists of seven sermons on the Lord's Prayer and nine sermons on texts from the Gospels or Epistles for the following days: the 20th, 21st, 23rd, and 24th Sundays after Trinity; All Saints Day; St. Andrew's Day (November 30th); and the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Sundays in Advent. At the end of the sermons on the Lord's Prayer is the specific statement that they were preached at Grimsthorpe in 1552. The other nine sermons are described merely as having been preached in Lincolnshire, and they are not dated. It is obvious that these sermons could not have been preached in 1553, for all of these Sundays fell later than September 13th, by which time in the year 1553 Latimer was imprisoned in the Tower.

On the other hand, if the sermons were all preached on the days to which the texts are applicable, they could not all have been preached in 1552, for, as Robert Demaus, Hugh Latimer, a Biography (London, 1869), on page 470 pointed out, there were only twenty-three Sundays after Trinity Sunday in that year. They could all have been preached in 1550, when there were twenty-five Sundays after Trinity, or in 1551, when there were twenty-seven. But although there is a certain continuity in the sermons (for example, back-references to the preceding sermon), it is by no means certain that they were all preached in the same year. All that can be said with certainty is that Bernher, like Latimer's later editors, arranged the sermons according to the calendar of the Christian year.

In 1571-72 the printer John Day put out an enlarged collection of Latimer's sermons, again with Bernher as editor. This volume bears the title Fruitful Sermons Preached by the Right Reverend Father and Constant Martyr of Jesus Christ M. Hugh Latimer, Newly Imprinted: with Others, Not Heretofore Set Forth in Print, also listed in Pollard and Redgrave as above. The first eleven sermons in this 1562

collection were evidently based upon earlier printed copies, with some editorial revision by Bernher.

Bernher referred to Latimer as his "master" and to himself as Latimer's "servant." The relationship was certainly as much that of friends between whom there was a great difference in age as that of the master and servant. He looked up to Latimer as the "apostle to the English," and out of that devotion collected the entire sermons and saw them through the press. From these two volumes of Latimer's sermons edited by George E. Corrie, as stated before, as the material used, the author has emphasized the political, economic and social aspects, disregarding controversial and religious, to try to give a picture of the time.

Other collections of sermons that were useful to this study were: Seven Sermons Before Edward VI in Each Friday of Lent, 1549 (London, 1869), and Sermons by Hugh Latimer (London, 1906). A volume published by W. Clowes for the Religious Tract Society (London, n.d.), Select Sermons and Letters and Sermons on the Plough, edited by Edward Arber (Westminster, 1895). Sermons of Hugh Latimer, J. M. Dent, editor (London, 1906), was also used.

There are biographies of Hugh Latimer of more recent date which proved very helpful. Some of them are Harold Darby, Hugh Latimer (London, 1953), and Chester Allen, Hugh Latimer

collection were evidently based upon earlier printed copies, with some editorial revision by Berner.

Berner referred to Latimer as his "master" and to himself as Latimer's "servant." The relationship was certainly as much that of friends between whom there was a great difference in age as that of the master and servant. He looked up to Latimer as the "apostle to the English," and out of that devotion collected the earlier sermons and saw them through the press. From these sources of Latimer's sermons edited by George E. Corrie, as noted before, as the material used, the author has reconstructed the doctrinal, economic and social aspects, disregarding the controversial and religious, to try to give a picture of the time.

Other collections of sermons that were useful to this study were: Seven Sermons before Edward VI in Each Friday of Lent, 1549 (London, 1549) and Sermons by Hugh Latimer (London, 1906). A volume published by W. Clowes for the Religious Tract Society (London, n.d.), Select Sermons and Letters and Sermons on the Plough, edited by Edward Arber (Westminster, 1895). Sermons of Hugh Latimer, ed. G. E. Corrie, editor (London, 1906), was also used.

There are biographies of Hugh Latimer of more recent date which proved very helpful. Some of them are Harold Derby, Hugh Latimer (London, 1933), and Chester Allen, Hugh

(Philadelphia, 1954), both written in memory of the four hundreth anniversary of the bishop's death in 1555. An account of his life was edited by N. C. Brownson, entitled Hugh Latimer, English Essays, the Early Reformation of England (London, 1885). Hugh Latimer (Boston, 1899), by R. M. and A. J. Carlyle, was written from the standpoint of Latimer's doctrinal point of view.

From the above the author selected material on the political, economic, and social phases of the history of the period. All were rich in such information, in spite of the predominance of controversy, which was put aside because it was not of particular interest to this work. To substantiate what Latimer said in his sermons, other works were consulted, regarding the king, court, judges, society and customs of the period of Edward VI's reign. The Works of Nicholas Ridley by himself and edited by Henry Christmas (Cambridge, 1833) was a particularly valuable source.

The Journals of the House of Commons, 1547, 17 vols. edited by T. Varden and T. E. May (London, 1852) presenting a day by day brief record of procedures in the house, was of some assistance in the study. It is on microcard at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. John Seymour, clerk for twenty years from the first parliament

of Edward VI in 1547, is credited with keeping the first record for the Journal of Commons. He notes merely the reading of the bills in this period.

An extremely interesting account of the period, although scantily told, is Edward VI's Journal of King Edward's Reign, written by his own hand, taken from the original (Clarendon Historical Society, n.s., 1884). A copy is in the Detroit Public Library, Detroit, Michigan. We know Edward's mind better than that of any other Tudor, for we have a daily journal of his reign. On certain matters, notably the trial of Somerset, the boy's writings are by far the best surviving evidence. He showed an obviously intelligent grasp of diplomatic matter and, likewise, an understanding of the very complicated question of currency reform. Mingled with affairs of state may be found accounts of his pastimes and sports.

The Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Edward VI and Mary -- 1547-1553, edited by William B. Turnbull, 2 vols. (London, 1861), constitutes an abstract of official correspondence transmitted abroad for the information of the English government during the reign of Edward VI. They date from two days after Henry VIII's death to 1553. The papers deal almost exclusively with the relations of England with continental powers, during this period (1546-1553). While

the chief interest to the author of this paper was domestic affairs, and not foreign, the series nevertheless added to certain phases of the study. Moreover, the papers give a clearer picture of the negotiations of the Lord Protector Somerset, who was acting upon the policy of the king.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47, edited by J. S. Brewer, vols. i-iv; James Gairdner, vols. v-xiii; and R. H. Brodie, vols. xiv-xxi, 21 volumes in 3 parts (London, 1862-1910); by R. H. Brodie, vols. i in 3 parts, London, 1920. Addenda vols. i, parts i and ii (London, 1929-32), include numerous letters and other papers, an adequate summary of French, Scottish, patent, and supplementary rolls, signed bills and privy seals and wardrobe accounts. This source was not too valuable for this research, other than to substantiate Latimer's preachings.

Robert Lemon and M. A. E. Green were the editors of The Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1547-90, vols. i and ii. Also vols. iii and iv (1591-1603), an addenda and vols. vii-xii, and addenda (1566-1625) (London, 1856-72). This was of great interest in elucidating the intrigues of Thomas Seymour, of Somerset, and of Northampton. Rich in the particular departments of biography, genealogy, and local history, each separate document briefly states the leading

facts, and the persons and places to which it relates are mentioned sufficiently to indicate to what particular work it refers.

The Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI, 1547-1553, 5 vols. and vol. VI, index, edited by R. H. Brodie (London, 1924-29) comprises a calendar of royal grants beginning with the reason for making it, which was either in reward of good service, for a price, or both. These grants shed some light on the reign of Edward VI; however, they fail to give reference to the way church lands came to the Crown by surrender of monasteries, dissolution of chantries, and the like; and they omit the appurtenances of manors, rectories and parks. The above would have given a little clearer picture regarding the subject of educational resources during Edward's reign.

The Acts of Privy Council of England, edited by J. R. Dasent, 32 vols. (London, 1890-1907), was illuminating for the work on justice and especially the subject of coinage. It is a brief journal of all council meetings; however, it does not record all the business transacted by the council.

Calendar of Letters, Dispatches and State Papers Relating to Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives of Vienna, Simancas and Elsewhere, edited by Royall Tyler, vols. IX-XIII, 1550-8 (London, 1912) corroborated other evidence found in the calendars.

Neither should such writers as John Foxe, in Acts and Monuments, edited by S. R. Cattley and George Townsend, 8 vols. (London, 1837-41), be overlooked. Foxe simply re-emphasized the material given by Latimer on Edward VI's times. However, Foxe was not one of the most faithful and authentic historians. Nevertheless, his work is wonderfully rich in authentic papers relating to Latimer, many of which would have been lost if he had not preserved them.

Gilbert Burnet, History of the Reformation, 3 vols. in 6 parts (London, 1865) is written in a partially caustic, but interesting manner. His greatest value lies in his range of subjects, other than those that were controversial. Although he wrote hastily, on political and economic matters in the reign of Edward VI, he lent much information for this work.

One of the most helpful sources to substantiate Latimer's sermons was John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols. in 6 parts (Oxford, 1822) and his Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, 2 vols., edited by P. E. Barnes (London, 1833). Also The Life and Acts of Mathew Parker, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1840). Strype was an industrious collector of literary antiquities. His works afford ample illustration of ecclesiastical history and biography, at periods of deep national interest and importance. They can well be ranked among the valuable English standard memorials. However, for the researcher, Strype was difficult

to follow, due to the carelessness of recording. Often Strype was unmethodical in his arrangement of material. One serious mistake in his critical work led him to attribute to Edward VI the foundation of many schools which actually existed long before the king's reign. To a student looking for political, economic, and social phases of the mid-sixteenth century the fact that he quoted Latimer and Ridley extensively made him of great value.

Charles Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors, edited by William Hamilton, in 2 vols. (London, 1875-7), was helpful. Charles Wriothesley was a Windsor Herald who kept the chronicle, as was the custom. He was valuable for the information on enclosures and the consequent suffering of the poor people under Edward VI.

Patrick Fraser Tytler, England under the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth, 2 vols. (London, 1839), compiled a complete collection of letters of the period. He was most informative on the Lord Admiral's love affairs, intrigues with councilors, and the final springing of the trap on his intrigue. Likewise valuable was the work of Sir Henry Ellis, editor of the Original Letters Illustrative of English History, 11 vols. (London, 1824 - 1846).

Raphael Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 6 vols. (London, 1807-8), form a valuable repository

of historical information. The style is clear, although never elevated. The chronicles fully justified Holinshed's claim to have had an eye unto the turn of things. His curious memorial of the existing domestic history of the times made it a valuable source.

Albert Frederick Pollard's History of England from Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (New York, 1913) and England under the Protector Somerset (London, 1900), both gave a detailed picture of the political and economic scenes in Edward VI's reign.

Frances Rose-Troup, The Western Rebellion of 1549 . . . . (London, 1913). This work is a graphic portrayal of the insurrections in Devonshire and Cornwall against religious innovations of Edward VI, while James Arthur Muller's Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction (New York, 1926), is a scholarly work that gives an excellent background for the study of the monarchy during Latimer's active career.

Edmund Goldsmid, A Collection of Historical Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereign 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1886); Sir Walter Besant, London in the Time of the Tudors (London, 1904) seem to record ably the events of the great city's sixteenth century history. Besant had an especially accurate knowledge of the earlier conditions of London. Another helpful aid was Joseph Tanner's

Tudor Constitutional Documents, 1485-1603 (Cambridge, 1940). J. C. Drummond and Anne Wilbraham, The Englishman's Food: A History of Five Centuries of English Diet (London, 1939), gave a good idea of the diet of the period and revealed the importance of fish in the Tudor menu. A. M. Low, England's Past, Presented (New York, 1953) lends a knowledge of the medicines and cures of the day, as also does M. B. Synge, A Short History of the Social Life in England (New York, 1906). A good description of how the Englishman conducted himself in regard to rites of burial ceremony is presented by Herman Levy and Arnold Wilson, Burial Reform and Funeral Cost (Oxford, 1938). Regarding marriage rites, Emily Lu Pearson, Elizabethans at Home (Stanford, 1957), gave a good description of the Tudor manners in general. M. A. S. Hume is the editor of the Chronicle of King Henry VIII of England, written in Spanish by an unknown hand. This is a contemporary record of some of the principal events in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI (London, 1889), and is interesting as it contains some relative material though it is not too reliable a source on the reign of Edward VI. James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, 12 vols. (London, 1856-1870). (Revised edition 12 vols. London, 1912). This is a classic for the period, based as it is on very wide research in English and continental archives, though it is not accurate

in detail. Though it is colored throughout with a strong anti-Catholic bias it is still valuable.

Henry Hallan's Constitutional History of England, Henry VII to the Death of George II, 2 vols. (London, 1827-1846-1912), has gone through many editions and revisions, and still has considerable value. Frederick C. Deitz, Political and Social History of England, (New York, 1942), is a good account of the period with some emphasis on Edward VI and contains a good bibliography. K.W.M. Pickthorn, The Early Tudor Government, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1934). Volume two was useful. J. Meadows Cooper, The Decay of England, (London, 1871), is a good description of social changes in the sixteenth century as reflected in decay of laboring classes during reign of Edward VI. Philip Hughes, Reformation in England, 3 vols. (New York, 1950-1954), of which volume two and three presented excellent accounts of the new religion being established in England in 1547. It is a good Roman Catholic account of the reformation and how it took place. J. U. Nef, Industry and Government in France and England 1540-1650 (New York, 1940) is important for the discussion on landholding, the staple and foreign trade. R. E. Routh, They Saw It Happen (Oxford, 1956) contains an account of eye witnesses to events under the Tudor Monarchy. A few descriptions

of the short reign of Edward VI are C. R. Markham, King Edward VI an Appreciation (London, 1907) (Slight and biased) and James A. Williamson, The Tudor Age (London, 1953), which is a very good account of the age. The author pays particular attention to the social and political conditions of the times and treats reign of Edward VI rather fully. Albert and Vern Dicey, The Privy Council (Oxford, 1860-1887), presents a very good account on the subject of the council and the part it played in Edward's reign. Frederick Windham Tichnor, A Social and Industrial History of England (London, 1933), is a general account of the social life of the Tudor period. H. D. Traill, Social England, 6 vols. (London, 1897, 1901-1904), has a mass of information on all phases of the economic and the social life of the reign of Edward VI. M. B. Synge, A Short History of the Social Life in England (New York, 1906), is a general discussion of social practices in England. It gives a good picture of English humanism and the Tudor aristocracy and is excellent on the subject of marriage customs, dress, discipline, and society in general. Arthur Donald Innes, England Under the Tudors (New York, 1926), is not too reliable a source but offers some pertinent material scattered throughout the book. Sharon Turner, The Modern History of England,

2 vols. (London, 1826), has miscellaneous but good material on the period. Frederick C. Deitz, "Finances of Edward VI and Mary" Smith College Studies of History, III, (Northhampton, 1918), contains introductions which are scholarly and invaluable for this particular study. Stanislaus Hayward, A Practical Commentary on the Code of Cannon Laws (London, 1948), was consulted for information on the Catholic teaching on fasting and abstaining. Allardyce Nicoll, The Elizabethan Introduced (Cambridge, 1951), is a picture document history and contains relative information. Gustave Constant, The Reformation in England, The English Schism Henry VIII 1509-1549 (Trans. E. L. Walkins, London, 1942) 2 vols. (London, 1934), is impartial and scholarly. H.A.L. Fisher, History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Henry VIII (New York, 1906), remains one of the best modern works consulted in this field, and contains a useful bibliography. Francis Gasquet, History of the English Monasteries, 2 vols. (London, 1888-1889, 1906), gives the Roman Catholic viewpoint, and is also excellent on the economic aspects of this subject. David Hume, History of England Under the Tudors, 2 vols. (London, 1759), though not too reliable contains interesting bits of information

on the period. Keith Feiling, England Under the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns (New York, 1927), is a general account of the Tudor period and contains helpful material on the conditions existing in England during Edward VI's reign. John Duncan Mackie, The Earlier Tudors 1485-1558 (Oxford, 1952), is useful, though thin on the reign of Edward VI. It is valuable chiefly on foreign affairs, and gives an excellent background for the economic condition existing at the times. A. L. Rowse, The England of Elizabeth (London, 1950), deals mainly with the structure of society which holds also for Edward VI's reign. It is brilliant but strongly coloured by the author's social and religious attitudes.

Stanley J. Dunitz and Howard Haycraft, British Authors before 1800 (New York, 1952), is scholarly but not too informative for this particular period. Dion Clayton Calthrop, English Customs 1066-1820, 4 vols. (London, 1906) (1 vol. 1923). The one volume was used for this research as a valuable source on women's dress in the period of Edward VI's reign. Simon Fish, A Supplicacon for the Beggars, edited by J. Meadows Comper (London, 1871), and also edited by Edward Arber for the English Text Society. Scholar's Library (London, 1878), was directed to Henry VIII, and deals with the ignorance and worldliness

of the clergy. Isobel D. Thornley, England Under the Yorkist 1460-1485 (London, 1920) had information relative to the background of Latimer's family. An article in The Dictionary of National Biography, Sidney Lee and Leslie Stephens, editors, 34 vols. and supplements (New York, 1930), contains solid information. Also used were: John Alzog, Manual of Universal Church History, 4 vols. (Dublin, 1890) which is a general history of the Church. Charles Knight's The Popular History of England (N.P.N.B.) 6 vols. is not always reliable. Charles Herbermann, Catholic Encyclopedia, 16 vols. (New York, 1910), furnished much general knowledge regarding the Catholic Church. John Hales, A Discourse of the Common Weal of This Realm of England, ed. Elizabeth Lamond (Cambridge, 1893), repr. 1929, was attributed to William Stafford until it was shown by Miss Lamond, E.H.R., VI (1891), 284-305, to be derived from a MS by John Hales written in 1549. Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, vols. I-IX, 1202-1603, was especially valuable for the reign of Henry VIII and of Edward VI and Mary and contains the dispatches from Venetian ambassadors at European Courts. J. G. Nicholas, Literary Remains of King Edward VI, 2 vols. (Roxburge Club, 1851), contains much fresh material about the young king. Of more limited use was Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland of the Reigns of

Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth, ed. H. C. Hamilton, 5 vols. (London, 1860).

James A. Muller, Stephen Gardner and the Tudor Reaction (New York, 1926) is scholarly. Douglas Jerold, England: Past, Present, and Future (New York, n.d.) is a fairly good reference, though very general. Herbert Butterfield, The Englishman and His History (Cambridge, 1945), furnished general knowledge.