---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

which they have not yet recovered. But who was the man who carried out Savonarola's ideas and expressed them in the next generation? It was Michael Angelo. Compare Michael Angelo with Fra Angelico, and see how they stood as at the parting of two ways, as a man who connected the end of one period and the beginning of another. Compare the difference of the childlike soul resting upon God and finding peace, and Michael Angelo, who is dragging all the power of man's nature through manifold struggles to draw nigh to God. And thus the great issue of his life was only good. He dragged himself through the temptations and troubles of the world; and, being himself no longer in harmony with it, he dragged himself into God's presence at last, bearing the scars and marks of many a conflict, won through so many struggles and by so many elements.

M. LONDIN.

## ART. II.—PECOCK, FISHER, COLET, MORE.

OF these four distinguished men, whose names are so often mentioned in connection with each other and with the preludes of the English Reformation, Reginald Pecock stands in fact quite alone, apart from the other three. He died in 1460, a year after the birth of Fisher, the earliest of the others—if, indeed, Fisher was in fact born so early as 1459. Men born in England at the time of Pecock's death, and in the ten or twenty years following, lived their lives as grown men in the beginning of a new world, while he died very near the end of the old. Colet died in 1519; Fisher and More were executed in 1535.

The attitude of the four men to the great questions moving the thoughts of Englishmen, during the years in which England was ripening for a Reformation, may be described fairly in the following fashion.

Pecock was too early, by at least a whole generation, for the New Learning, which eventually shattered the fabric of ecclesiastical mediævalism, built up laboriously in the dark and ignorant ages. He knew nothing of it. Fisher fostered the New Learning, but was not greatly touched by it. To Colet and More it was the mainspring of their thoughts.

The disciplinary reform of the Church was the great demand of Pecock's time. To such demands he opposed arguments for things as they were, while allowing that there were matters for which the clergy were worthy to be blamed "in brotherly and neighbourly correption." Fisher favoured the demand

within limits. Colet and More were exceedingly outspoken in their advocacy of it.

The religious or superstitious practices of late mediæval times Pecock upheld. Fisher upheld them too. Colet and More desired reform, Colet at least in a highly trenchant manner.

Of the distinctive Roman additions to the Creeds, as eventually set forth in the creed of Pope Pius IV., I do not know that any of the four expressed doubts. My impression is that of Fisher, Colet, and More, Colet is the only one who might have joined the Reformers had he lived long enough. Pecock's rationalistic treatment was naturally turned in another direction, but I think that if he had lived later he might have been a reformer.

The supremacy of the Pope I do not think that any of them would have called in question. It had become by long iteration a rooted belief. Two of them died rather than deny it.

We may now proceed to some detail.

Pecock was a Welshman; Fellow of Oriel College in 1417, and a lecturer in Oxford; Master of Whittington College in London, near the Three Cranes in the Vintry, in 1431; Bishop of St. Asaph in 1444; Bishop of Chichester in 1450; condemned for heresy in 1459, and sent to live in confinement at Thorney Abbey. The authorities of Thorney received for his maintenance a capital sum, and he soon died. Had the payment for his maintenance taken the form of an annuity, he might have lived longer.

Pecock was condemned as a heretic; but that bare statement has led to complete misunderstanding of his position and views. He has been described as a forerunner of the Reformation; but he was a determined opponent of the Lollards, and he stoutly maintained, as we have said, the later mediæval practices. The accusations of heresy against him covered a wide field. They dealt with his views on the Descent into Hell, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the Infallibility of the Universal Church and of General Councils in matters of faith. He was accused of setting the natural law above the Scriptures and the Sacraments; of disregarding the authority of Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory; and of having written on great matters in English. The charges of heresy were in no small part untrue. We do not find him making erroneous statements as to the Holy Ghost; and as for the Holy Catholic Church, what he maintained was that the Creed declares belief in the fact of its existence, not in the authority which an extreme view claimed for it.

He wrote very boldly and freely on many subjects, and his

writings gave great and growing offence in high quarters, both lay and ecclesiastical. Near the end of October, 1457, Henry VI. held a Council at Westminster, at which were present a large number of Lords temporal and spiritual; among the latter, Pecock. The hatred long entertained against him and his opinions burst forth. Not one of the temporal lords would speak on the business of the Council so long as he was present. He had written, they said, on profound subjects in the English language; what else but mischief to the ignorant vulgar could be expected from such profaneness? He had vilipended and rejected the authority of the old doctors, saying that neither their writings nor those of any others were to be received, except in so far as they were agreeable to reason. When passages from their works had been produced against him, he had been known to say "Pooh! pooh!" He had even made a new creed of his own, and had denied that the Apostles' Creed was composed by the Apostles. He had written last year a letter to Canning, Lord Mayor of London, who had forwarded it to the King. The King had shewed it to some of them, there were in it signs, not ambiguous, of exciting England to a change of faith, and even to an insurrection; and, to crown all, he had therein asserted that many of the nobility agreed with him and his detestable writings. The divines demanded to see copies of his works. Pecock said that copies of all he had written in the last three years should be sent to the Archbishop; but he would not be answerable for books written before that time, because they had only been circulated among private persons, and had not received his final corrections.

On November 11 he brought nine of his works; they were found to have many corrections, and passages written anew. The Archbishop (Thomas Bouchier) and his three episcopal assessors (Waynflete of Winchester, Chadworth of Lincoln, and Lowe of Rochester) received the report of twenty-four doctors on them, in spite of Pecock's claim to be tried by his peers in learning. The report was that the writings contained many errors and heretical opinions. George Neville, elect of Exeter and brother of the Earl of Salisbury, told him the just judgment of God suffered him to incur these reproaches, for having himself reproached those holy doctors Augustine and Jerome, and for denying the truth of their sayings. Pecock replied that he regretted he had so written, not being sufficiently informed on the matters in question. This was not a bad answer from a man of his age, and great learning, and wide knowledge of the Fathers, to a gay young nobleman who had only the year before been elected Bishop, being then only twenty-three years of age. We may compare with it the reply of Sir Thomas More

to Cardinal Wolsey. "You shew yourself a foolish counsellor," Wolsey said to More when he opposed the creation of a new office, that of "supreme constable." "I thank God," More replied, "the King hath only one fool on his Council." Pecock was condemned for asserting in his "Book of Faith" the falseness of St. Gregory's saying that "faith, of whose truth human reason gives proof, hath no merit." His "Repressor" was objected to because in it he maintained that the property of Churchmen was as strictly their own as is the property of laymen; his sermon at Paul's Cross, because it taught that payments to the Pope for "provisions" were lawful. On the Descent in Hell, the authority of the Catholic Church, the sense of Scripture, he was condemned. The Archbishop gave him his choice between public abjuration and being delivered, after degradation, to the secular arm to be burned. "Choose one of these two, for the alternative is immediate in the coercion of heretics." He replied, "I am in a strait betwixt two, and hesitate in despair as to what I shall choose. If I defend my opinions and positions, I must be burned to death: if I do not, I shall be a by-word and a reproach. Yet it is better to incur the taunts of the people than to forsake the law of faith and to depart after death into hell fire and the place of torment. I choose, therefore, to make an abjuration, and intend for the future so to live that no suspicion shall arise against me all the days of my life." The answer does not give the modern reader a very high idea of the depth of Pecock's opinions, the height of his courage, or the breadth of his logic. But the modern reader has not the advantage of standing over against a truculent Archbishop of Canterbury with a good will and ready mind to have him burned, and that speedily. An experience of that kind might stimulate some of us to a less unsympathetic view of Pecock's decision.

The two best-known evidences of Pecock's attitude towards the attacks of the Lollards upon the late mediæval system are his sermon at Paul's Cross and his important book called the "Repressor of over much blaming of the Clergy."[1]

The sermon at Paul's Cross was preached in 1447, three years after he became Bishop of St. Asaph. It offended both the Churchmen and the hostile favourers of Church reform. It justified the Bishops, who did not preach, who absented themselves from their dioceses, who received their bishoprics from the Pope, and paid to the Pope first-fruits. At a later

[1] Rolls Series, No. 19, 1860. It is curious that he should use this Latin word for his title. We might have expected *agen-squeezer*. He will not use the word "Redeemer," preferring *agen-buier*—as, in a well-known title, "Remorse" appears as *agen-bite*.

time he explained under the first of these heads that he would not have the Bishops preach like those pulpit-brawlers, the Friars, but would have them expound like the Fathers. Millington, the first Provost of the King's College in Cambridge, replied in a sermon at Paul's Cross, denouncing Pecock as a national danger, and declaring that England would never suffer those who patronized Pecock to prosper. To enter upon the confused politics of the time would lead us off our line: but it may be remarked that the promotion of Pecock to Chichester proved to be the last act of the political life of William de la Pole, the first Duke of Suffolk. Pecock's promotions were entirely Lancastrian; but in 1455 he signed, as one of the Privy Council, the documents empowering Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, to act as Protector in the "illness" of Henry VI.

In his "Repressor of over much blaming of the Clergy," published in 1455, Pecock sets himself to confute the Lollards' objections on eleven points. The points are these: (1) Images; (2) pilgrimages; (3) clerical property in land; (4) various ranks among the clergy[1], as the Papacy and Episcopacy; (5) the framing of ecclesiastical laws or statutes by Papal and Episcopal authority; (6) the institution of the religious orders; (7) invocation of saints; (8) rich adornment of churches; (9) ceremonies of the Mass and Sacraments generally; (10) taking of oaths; (11) upholding of war and capital punishment.

One or two examples of his treatment of these points must suffice.

The Lollards, speaking against the endowments of the clergy, declared that on the day of the donation of Constantine an angel's voice was heard in the air, saying: "In this day venom is hild out [poured] into the Church." Against this he advances four arguments: (1) The original authority for the story is Giraldus Cambrensis, about A.D. 1200, and Giraldus says it was a devil whose voice was heard: if it was a devil, endowments are good; (2) the whole thing is fabulous from one end to the other, for there was no such donation: this we might have thought was enough, but (3) no ancient authority now extant supports Giraldus: this again we might have supposed to be expressed in (1); (4) if there was any such voice, it was because the Church was then first endowed absolutely, or then first abundantly endowed; and both of those are untrue, for the Church of Rome had endowments in the time of Pope Urban, A.D. 220-230, and the Church of England still earlier, in the time of King Lucius,

[1] The Lollards would have only priests and deacons, not Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, and Popes.

A.D. 180, and Constantine's gifts to the Church were only small, the donation being all fictitious. He follows this up by a lengthy historical argument against the truth of the story of the donation, a really acute and critical exposure of a fable which in those days it was dangerous to call in question. A similar remark may be made with regard to his rejection of books of the Apocrypha, a rejection so trenchant that it would have gone hard with him if he had lived in the times of the Council of Trent. He explains that "in the beginning of the Church, soon after Christ's Passion," there was such a scarceness of holy books and such a desire for them, that men wrote into their Bibles the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; and this practice has continued in later times, though men knew they were not Holy Writ. "And yet hereby is not the authority of those books raised higher than it was before." The Council of Trent, in its fourth session, specially recited the two books here mentioned among the books of the Old Testament, and declared, "If any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition . . . let him be anathema." Another sharp criticism of the Apocrypha will be mentioned later on.

In favour of pictures, relics, images, etc., he argues that they are commanded by Scripture. For Scripture bids man love God, and in so bidding bids him love all that God loves, and use ways and means for knowing and remembering what these things are; that is, bids him use these outward means—images, and so on. He illustrates this by his own case when he bids his servant go from Whittington College to hear a sermon at St. Paul's. The man must go out of the college gate, though he is not told to do so. He must choose one out of the many ways to St. Paul's, though not told to do so. He must avoid a dangerous way—as, for instance, if a man is lying in wait to kill him in one street. When he gets to St. Paul's, he must listen. When he leaves St. Paul's, the sermon must improve him. And all this and much more is contained in the single command, "Go and hear the sermon at St. Paul's."

> "For why, if I, being at London in the College of Whitington (*sic*), bid or counsel or witness to my servant there being with me that he go to Paul's Cross for to hear there attentively a sermon to be preached, it must needs be granted that I in so bidding counselling or witnessing bid counsel and witness that he learn or remember somewhat by the same sermon, and that some manner of new disposition (less or more) he take into his affection upon something of that sermon. For why, all this followeth out of the attentive hearing of the sermon. Also it must needs be granted that I in so

bidding counselling or witnessing bid counsel or witness that he go forth out of the College's gate. For why, unless then he go forth from me at the gate he may not come to Paul's Cross for to hear the sermon. Also, since from the said College be many ways to Paul's Cross, and of which each is speedful and good enough to lead to Paul's Cross, it must needs be granted that in so bidding counselling or witnessing I witness that which ever of these ways he take I it allow; and if cause be found in any of those ways that by doom of reason this way ought to be left (as if peradventure in one of these ways a man lieth in wait for to slay my said servant), certis this way is not, as for then, one of the speedful ways for him into Paul's Cross. And also it must be granted that in so bidding counselling or witnessing I will and allow rather that he go and choose the better of those ways than the less good of those ways, and that he in better manner hear the sermon than that he in less good manner hear the same sermon"

In opposition to the Lollard claim that everything must be referred to the Word of God and settled thereby, he argues:

"Thou shalt not find expressly in Holy Scripture that the New Testament should be written in English tongue to laymen or in Latin tongue to clerks; neither the Old Testament; and yet each of these governances thou wilt hold to be lawful, and to be a meritory, virtuous, moral deed for to thereby deserve grace and glory, and to be the service of God, and therefore to be the law of God; since by no deed a man hath merit, save by a deed which is the service and the law of God; and each moral virtue is the law of God, as it is proved well in other place of my writings."

Here, again, is a bold, and at that time a very dangerous, assertion—the meritoriousness of English versions of the Scriptures.

With equal boldness, in pursuance of the same argument, he makes the assertion that it is meritorious to brew ale and beer and to drink them:

"Where is it expressed by word or by any person's ensampling in Holy Scripture that men should make ale or beer, of which so much horrible sin cometh, much more than of setting up of images, or of pilgrimages; and the defaults done about images and pilgrimages be much lighter and easier to be amended than the defaults coming by making of ale and of beer. And also herewith it is true that without ale and beer, without cider and wine and mead, men and women might live longer than they do now, and in less jollity and cheerty of heart for to bring them into horrible great sins. And yet thou wilt say that for to make ale and beer and for to drink them is the service of God, and is meritory, and therefore is the law of God."

One other quaint example, under this head, of the non-sufficiency of Holy Scripture as a rule of life in all detail:

"Furthermore, for to justify their bathing, washing, and anointing, women may not allege the story of Susannah, Daniel xiii.; for that process and story is not Holy Writ but Apocrif; and the very book of Daniel (as much as is Holy Writ) is ended with the twelfth chapter of the same book, as Jerome the translator witnesseth. And yet in that story is no mention made of all the women's deeds now re-

hearsed, save only of bathing and washing with oil and soap, and yet not of these by way of commending or by way of ensampling that other persons should do the same."

Bishops had much the same experience then as now:

"Well I wot, as for my part, that how men have judged me and my governance anent my diocese hath come to mine ears. And yet I know the wits and dispositions of the same judgers, that if all the causes and motives and intents, means, helps, and lets, and many other circumstances of the same governance which they blame were opened to them, and if they were made privy to them, they would be of the first which should counsel me to keep and fulfil the same governance."

Fisher was born at Beverley in Yorkshire, probably in the year which saw Pecock sent to Thorney to die. He was student, fellow, and eventually (in 1497) Master, of Michael House, the most important of the ancient collegiate foundations on which Henry VIII., at the very end of his life, established Trinity College in Cambridge. In 1494 he was Senior Proctor, and in that capacity he attended the Court of Henry VII. at Greenwich, and was introduced to the notice of the Lady Margaret, the King's mother, Countess of Richmond and of Derby by two of her three marriages, great-grand-daughter and heiress of John of Gaunt, widow of Edmund Tudor the half-brother of Henry VI. She made Fisher her confessor in 1497, and for twelve important years he guided the actions of her life. In those same years he made a mark upon Cambridge, and upon the studies of the English Universities, which can never be forgotten. They had sunk very low; he raised Cambridge to a much higher standard. In 1503 the Lady Margaret founded at Cambridge a Chair of Divinity, and made him Professor, to give gratuitous instruction in theology. About the same time, and still under his guidance, she founded the Lady Margaret Preachership, for supplying the laity in London and in certain parts of the country with instruction in the Gospel, to be delivered in English, which had fallen into general disuse for pulpit utterances. In 1504 he was appointed by Henry VII. to the bishopric of Rochester, for his great and singular virtue. In 1505 he was made President of Queens' College, in order, it is said, that he might have a residence in Cambridge while he superintended the building of the Lodge of Christ's College. This college the Lady Margaret founded under Fisher's guidance, and in the Lodge she herself lived for some three years, practically for the rest of her life.

Near the end of her life her Oxford friends petitioned her to found a college in that University also, but Fisher per-

suaded her in favour of Cambridge, and she obtained from her son the royal license to refound St. John's in 1508. Next year she and the King died, and Henry VIII. endeavoured to appropriate the funds left for this her latest foundation. Fisher was her executor, and he resisted the young King stoutly, obtaining at last a peremptory Bull from the Pope. Henry paid off his grudges in full in the course of time.

Fisher had, apparently, not expected the difficulties which the King put in the way of his grandmother's intentions, for in his sermon on the death of Henry VII., only three months before the Lady Margaret's death, he spoke thus of the young King in describing the last moments of his father's life:

> "This noble prince let call for his son the king that now is our governor and sovereign, endued with all graces of God and nature and with as great abilities and likelihoods of well doing as ever was in king, whose beginning is now so gracious and so comfortable unto all his people that the rejoicing in him in manner shadoweth the sorrow that else would have been taken for the death of his father."

This "so gracious and so comfortable" a Prince eventually cut off Fisher's head. But the Bishop's high estimate of Henry's character is completely borne out by other contemporary records, especially the letters of Erasmus and the secret report of the Venetian Ambassador.

Fisher was a man of very strict life. He hated the pompful and worldly life of Wolsey, and opposed him in Convocation. He was a warm admirer of the new Biblical criticism which the knowledge of Greek had introduced. He did all he could to foster the study of that much-suspected language, of which a friar, preaching in London, declared that it was the language spoken by the devils in hell. In a letter from Louvain in 1519 Erasmus contrasts the two Universities, Cambridge and Oxford. "In both," he says, "Greek is taught; but in Cambridge peaceably, because the head of that school is John Fischer, Bishop of Rochester, who, not in learning only, but in life, studies God. But at Oxford, when a certain youth of no ordinary learning professed Greek fairly well, a certain barbarian in a public harangue waxed wanton against Greek letters. The King, however, himself by no means unlearned, happened to be in the neighbourhood, and when More and Pace [who succeeded Colet as Dean of St. Paul's] told him of it, he denounced the opposition, and bade them accept the study of Greek willingly and with pleasure. Thus silence was imposed upon those brawling pettifoggers."

In the same letter we have another story: A certain theologian preached before the King, and impudently and stolidly waxed wanton against Greek letters and the new

interpreters. Pace, who was Reader in Greek at Cambridge under Fisher, looked at the King to see how he took it. The King smiled pleasantly at Pace. After the sermon the theologian was called before the King, and More was set to defend Greek against this Trojan. When More had said many things most eloquently, and it was the theologian's turn to reply, he went on to his knees and begged for pardon, having only this to say for himself, that while he was preaching some spirit possessed him and he poured forth this attack upon Greek. "But that spirit of yours," said the King, "was not the spirit of Christ, but of folly." And he asked: "I suppose you have not read anything of Erasmus's?" for the King saw that he was hitting at me. "No," he said, "he had not read anything." "But," the King retorted, "you openly declare yourself fatuous, to condemn what you have not read." The theologian said he had read something called "Moria." Here Pace interposed. "That, most serene King, suits him exactly." At the end the theologian called to mind another argument to soften his offence: "I am not so very hostile to Greek letters, because they have their origin from the Hebrew tongue." The King was astonished at the folly of the man, and told him to go away and never come there to preach again.

Fisher was a great reformer in the matter and manner of preaching. He wished preaching to be no longer on words and quibbles, but of life. His own sermons were marked by the free introduction of natural similes. He describes the varying phases of weather; tells of the sun calling into life the creatures and plants and trees that had seemed to be dead. He illustrates the force of the direct rays of the sun by the effects of the normal and the oblique impact of a ball upon the wall in a game; and in another simile he uses the principle of the burning-glass. He began his famous sermon against Martin Luther, preached before Warham and Wolsey, thus:

> "Full often when the day is clear, and the sun shineth bright, riseth in some quarter of the heaven a thick black cloud that darketh all the face of the heaven and shadoweth from us the clear light of the sun, and steereth an hideous tempest, and maketh a great lightning, and thundereth terribly, so that the weak souls and feeble hearts be put in a great fear and made almost desperate for lack of comfort."

He was urgent against those who neglected their cure of souls. Preaching on Ps. xxxviii. 11, "My kinsmen stood afar off," he spoke as follows:

> "They that had cure of my soul stood afar from me. Truly those be very wretches whom sins do subdue and put under the miserable

yoke of servitude or bondage. They be also thrust down into a more straiter corner of misery when their friends and neighbours will not admonish and reprove their wickedness, but suffer them so to continue, when also prelates and parsons do not correct their misliving and shortly call them to amendment, but rather go by and suffer their mis-governance. What then, truly the soul being glad of his destruction and in manner running on his own bridle, not helped by his friends, nothing cared for of the bishops and such as hath cure of soul, must needs come into the devil's power, which as wood [raging] enemies and ramping lions go about seeking whom they may devour, they do the uttermost of their power, they go sore to the matter, and many times overcome such as be very strong. Therefore what marvel is it if the devils catch the miserable soul, void and utterly destitute of all help, and so taken draw it into the deep pit of hell?"

His view as to the headship of the Church was very decided. He was appointed "by the assingnment of the moost reuerend father in god, the lord Thomas Cardinall of Yorke and Legate ex latere from our holy father the pope," to make a sermon "within the octaves of the ascensyon again the pernicyous doctryn of Martin luuther." He takes the position "that the pope iure divino is the heed of the vnyuersall chyrche of christ." "Luther," he remarks, "will say that he cannot conceive duos summos" (two heads—Christ and the Pope). But

"St. Paul maketh many heads, saying the head of the woman is the man, and the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God. So here be three heads unto a woman, God, Christ, and her own husband; and beside all these she hath an head of her own. It were a monstrous sight to see a woman without a head, what comfort should her husband have upon her. If then the woman, notwithstanding she hath an head of her own to govern her according to the will and pleasure of her husband, yet she hath her husband to be her head, and Christ to be her head, and God to be her head. How much rather our mother holy Church, which is the spouse of Christ, hath an head of her own, that is to say the Pope, and yet nevertheless Christ Jesu her husband is her head, and Almighty God is her head too."

In the "Spiritual Consolation, written by John Fyssher Bishop of Rochester to his Sister Elizabeth," when he was in the Tower awaiting death, there are many very striking passages. Here is one:

"O ye that have time and space to make your provision against the hour of death, defer not from day to day like as I have done. For I often did think and purpose with myself that at some leisure I would have provided, nevertheless for every trifelous business I put it aside, and delayed this provision alway to an other time, and promised with myself that at such a time I would not fail but do it, but when that came an other business arose, and so I deferred it again unto an other time. And so (alas) from time to time, that now death in the mean time hath prevented me; my purpose was good, but it lacked execution; my will was straight, but it was not

effectual; my mind well intended, but no fruit came thereof. All for because I delayed so often and never put it into effect, that, that I had purposed. And therefore delay it not as I have done, but before all other business put this first in surety, which ought to be chief and principal business. Neither building of Colleges, nor making of Sermons, nor giving of alms, neither yet any other manner of business shall help you without this. . . . Be you your own friend, do you these suffrages for your own soul, whether they be prayers or almsdeeds, or any other penitential painfulness. If you will not effectually and heartily do these things for your own soul, look you never that other will do them for you, and doing them in your own persons, they shall be more available to you a thousandfold than if they were done by any other."

His sermon on the death of the Lady Margaret, the grandmother of Henry VIII., through whom her son, Henry VII., drew such title as he had to the throne, sets before us his ideal of a devout lady, given to good works. We might have expected that he would dilate upon the munificence of her endowments for the advance of learning; but the only reference I find to this very striking part of her work is in the brief statement: "Weep the Universities, to which she was as a mother." He compares her throughout to Martha, and first, quaintly enough, in nobleness of blood. The Lady Margaret "had xxx kinges and queenes within the iiii degree of maryage unto her, besyde erles, markyses, dukes, and princes," and "the blessyd Martha was a woman of noble blode, to whom by inheritance belonged the castel of bethany, and this noblenes of blode they haue which descende of noble lygnage."

"As to nobleness of nature, first she was of singular wisdom far passing the common rate of women, she was good in remembrance, and of holding memory. A ready wit she had also to conceive all things, albeit they were right dark. . . . Full often she complained that in her youth she had not given her to the understanding of latin, wherein she had a little perceiving, specially of the rubrysshe [rubrics] of the ordinal for the saying of her service, which she did well understand. . . . Her sober temperance in meats and drinks was known unto all them that were conversant with her, wherein she lay in as great wait of herself as any person might, keeping alway her strait measure, and offending as little as any creature might, eschewynge bankettes, reresoupers, joncries betwyxe meales. As for fasting, for age and feebleness albeit she were not bound, yet those days that by the church were appointed she kept them diligently and seriously, and in especial the holy Lent, throughout that she restrained her appetite till one meal and till one fish on the day, besides her other peculiar fasts of devotion, as Saint Anthony, Mary Maudeleyn, Saint Katheryn, with other. And thorough out all the year the Friday and Saturday she full truly observed. As to hard clothes wearing, she had her shirts and girdles of hair, which when she was in health every week she failed not certain days to wear, sometime that one, sometime that other, that full often her skin I have heard her say was pierced therewith. As for chastity, though she alway continued not in her virginity, yet in her husband's days

long time before that he died she obtained of him licence and promised to live chaste, in the hands of the reverend father my lord of London, which promise she renewed after her husband's death into my hands again: whereby it may appear the discipline of her body."

Nor were her devotions less remarkable:

"First in prayer every day at her uprising, which commonly was not long after v of the clock, she began certain devotions, and so after them with one of her gentlewomen the matins of our lady, which kept her to then she came into her closet, where then with her chaplain she said also matins of the day. And after that daily heard iiii or v masses upon her knees, so continuing in her prayers and devotions unto the hour of dinner, which of the eating day was x of the clock, and upon the fasting day xi. After dinner full truly she would go her stations to three altars daily. Daily her diriges and commendations she would say. And her evensongs before supper, both of the day and of our lady, beside many other prayers and psalters of David throughout the year. And at night before she went to bed she failed not to resort unto her chapel and there a large quarter of an hour to occupy her in devotions. No marvel through all this long time her kneeling was to her painful, and so painful that many times it caused in her back pain and disease. And yet nevertheless daily when she was in health she failed not to say the crown of our lady, which after the manner of Rome containeth lx and three aves, and at every ave to make a kneeling. . . . Her marvellous weeping they can bear witness of which here before have heard her confession, which be divers and many, and at many seasons in the year lightly every third day; can also record the same those that were present at any time when she was houseled, which was full nigh a dozen times every year: what floods of tears there issued forth of her eyes she well might say, 'My eyes gush out with water.'"

It may be of interest to note that Fisher kept fairly close to his time in preaching. The funeral sermon on the Lady Margaret takes about sixty-two minutes to read, that on Henry VII. about sixty minutes.

Fisher's death was a martyrdom for conscience' sake. But if the King had got possession of the secrets of the Spanish Ambassador, he could justly have had him executed as a traitor. Fisher took the so-called divorce of Catharine of Arragon so much to heart that he urged the invasion of England by the Emperor, her nephew, promising that the people would rise against Henry. His death was brought about unfairly. An Act of Parliament settled the succession to the throne upon the children of Anne Boleyn, and another Act ordered that all English subjects should swear to the succession before the Royal Commissioners. This, it appeared in the end, Fisher would have done. But the oath tendered by the Commissioners went far beyond the conditions authorized by the Act. It compelled the assertion that the marriage with Catharine was invalid, and the repudiation of

any oath taken in the past to any foreign authority, prince, or potentate. The refusal of the oath was, under the Act, misprision of treason, and the Commissioners declared that their greatly enlarged oath was the oath under the Act. Fisher replied that he would swear to part of it, not to all, and he was sent to the Tower. This was in April, 1534. In January, 1535, he was deprived of his bishopric.

Early in June he was charged with high treason; on June 17 he was condemned to die; on June 22 he was executed.

Colet was born two or three months after his friend Erasmus, in the end of 1466. In 1485, at the age of nineteen, he was instituted to a rectory and a vicarage. After the fashion of the time, benefices were piled up upon him, long before he was ordained deacon. We shall see how strongly he spoke against this at a later period of his life.

In or about 1493 Colet travelled in Italy, much as Grocyn and Linacre had done shortly before. Being the son of a wealthy father, he could travel as he pleased and stay as long as he would. In foreign Universities he studied the Fathers, and learned to prefer Dionysius, the so-called Areopagite, Origen, Ambrose, Cyprian, Jerome, over Augustine, Duns Scotus, Aquinas, and the other schoolmen in vogue in the English Universities. He probably began to learn Greek at the same time; he never became very proficient in that tongue. In 1496 he was back in England. On December 17, 1497, he was ordained deacon; on March 25, 1498, priest. By that time all his twenty-one younger brothers and sisters were dead, and he was only thirty-one years old. In 1504 he became Dean of St. Paul's. In 1505 his father's death made him a very rich man, and in 1509 he founded St. Paul's School for 153 scholars. There were normally, in a Cathedral of Dean and Canons, three schools—the School of Song, the School of Grammar, and the School of Theology. Colet, as I believe, revived the St. Paul's Cathedral School of Grammar, which had died out, set it up again in the precincts, and gave it and his noble endowments into the charge of the Mercers' Company, mistrusting the Deans and Canons of his own time, and relying upon the care of secular married business men. His confidence has proved to be well placed. He died in 1519, at the early age of fifty-two.

Colet's life was throughout chaste, temperate, and simple, though his natural inclinations and his wealth pointed in an opposite direction. He exercised careful and serious discipline to keep the flesh in subjection, and guarded himself at all points. His mother was a remarkable woman. Among many other ecclesiastical preferments, he held the vicarage of

Stepney, in the Hall of which place his father lived. One of his letters to Erasmus is dated from his mother's house "in rural Stepney." In it he describes her as growing old beautifully, and very often making joyous and sweet mention of her friend Erasmus. Years after she had lost the last of her twenty-two children, the man perhaps of greatest promise then in England, a son handsome and well grown, Erasmus describes her as approaching her ninetieth year (in 1532), and so hale in aspect and so cheerful in spirit that it might have been supposed she had never shed a tear nor borne a child. She was Christian Knyvet, of gentle birth, daughter of Sir John Knyvet, of Ashwellthorpe, and his wife Elizabeth, daughter of the second Baron Clinton.

Colet's chief mark on the thought of the time was made by his sermons in St. Paul's. They were, in fact, courses of lectures on continuous portions of the New Testament, treated in the new light of the New Learning. We are told that his hearers were chiefly those who were inclined to Lollardism. His freedom of thought and expression gave great alarm to the Bishop of London of the time, an aged man, trained in the straitest sect of the schoolmen, one who could not conceive that anything which he had learned in his youth could be wrong; his whole thoughts were completely confined within the narrowest limits of late mediævalism. Colet was accused of dangerous doctrines, of heretical preaching, and even of heretical purposes in his new school. But the King (Henry VIII.) and the Archbishop (Warham) gave him their firm support. In the end, he told his friend Erasmus that the persecutions of the old Bishop (Fitzjames) made him desire to retire from public life and make his home among the Carthusians at Sheen. As a matter of fact, he did die there.

In 1512, when Convocation was summoned to consider the recrudescence of Lollardism, Warham appointed Colet to preach the Latin sermon. It was a bold appointment, considering the liberality of his views; but no doubt Warham, with his kindly breadth of view, desired that Lollardism should now be met on the new ground, in the light of the new knowledge, and no longer on the old ground, so much of it untenable. Certainly Colet astonished the assembled Bishops and clergy by saying much more about their own need of reform than about the erroneous views of the Lollardists. The sermon was immediately published in an English translation. The tone of it may be gathered from a few sentences. Evidently some great change or some great catastrophe was near, and Colet would have it the change, not the catastrophe.

"We wish that ye would remember your name and profession, and would mind the reformation of the Church's matter. Never did the state of the Church more need your endeavours. The spouse of Christ whom ye would should be without spot or wrinkle, is made foul and evil favoured, as saith Esaias, 'The faithful city is made an harlot.' Be you not conformed to this world. Priests and bishops are conformed to this world by devilish pride, by carnal concupiscence, by worldly covetousness, by secular business.

"How run they, yea, almost out of breath, from one benefice to another! There is nothing looked for more diligently of the most part of priests than that doth delight and please the senses. They give themselves to feasts and banquetings, they spend themselves in vain babbling, they give themselves to sports and plays, they apply themselves to hawking and hunting, they drown themselves in the delights of this world. Procurers and finders of lusts they set by. What other thing seek we now in the Church than fat benefices and high promotions? We care not how many, how chargeful, how great benefices we take, so that they be of great value. O covetousness! St. Paul justly called thee the root of all evil. Of thee cometh this heaping of benefices upon benefices. Of thee, so great pensions from many benefices resigned. . . . We perceive contradiction of the lay people; but they are not so much contrary unto us as we are our selves. We are nowadays grieved of heretics, men mad with marvellous foolishness; but the heresies of them are not so pestilent and pernicious unto us and the people as are the evil and wicked lives of priests."

Then, turning to the Bishops, he exclaimed:

"This reformation must needs begin of you. You are our heads: you are an ensample of living unto us. First taste you the medicine of purgation of manners, and then after offer us the same to taste."

Erasmus wrote an account of Colet in 1520, soon after Colet's death. Some notes from it will tell us much of his views. Erasmus says of him:

*Of Monasteries.*—"To monasteries (which, for the most part, are now falsely so called) he was in no degree well inclined . . . not that he entertained any hatred of the religious orders, but because their members do not act up to their vows."

*Of Celibacy.*—"He was wont to remark that he had never found morals less corrupted than amongst married people, because the natural affections, the care of children, and household affairs, act as it were as barriers to restrain them from lapsing into every kind of vice."

*Of his Tolerance.*—"He had derived some things from Dionysius and the other early theologians, upon which he still did not so absolutely rely as to induce him ever to contend against the decrees of the Church, but yet so far that he was less opposed to such as do not approve the all-prevailing image worship in churches, whether as paintings, or in wood, stone, brass, gold, or silver; and also to such as doubt whether a priest, notoriously and openly reprobate, should perform any

sacramental function; by no means favouring the erroneous judgment of such thinkers, but indignant at those who, by a life openly and unbecomingly corrupted, afford occasion for this kind of doubt."

*Of Colleges.*—"The Colleges which with great and magnificent expense are established among the English, he used to say were an obstacle to efficient study, nor were anything more than the lounging places of idle fellows."

*Of Confession.*—"Whilst he strongly approved of secret [or auricular] confession, asserting that he had never derived from any other source so much spiritual consolation and support, he equally strongly condemned its anxious and too frequent repetition."

*Of Frequent Masses.*—"Although it is customary with the priests in England to perform Mass almost every day, yet he was content to do it only upon the Sundays and Feasts, or, at least, on very few days besides these."

*His Dissent from Received Opinions.*—"There are numberless things now most fully maintained in the public schools from which he very far dissented; of these he was accustomed sometimes to debate among his friends, though with others he was more reserved, from fear that whilst on the one hand he might effect no alteration, unless for the worst, he might also on the other suffer loss of influence himself.

*His Study of Heretical Writings.*—"There was no book so heretical that he had not attentively read; saying that he occasionally derived more profit from such than from those authors who so mystify everything as often to cajole their followers and sometimes even themselves."

*His Love for Children.*—"He delighted in the purity and natural simplicity of children, remembering how Christ had called upon His disciples to be like unto them; and used to compare them to the angels." So Erasmus tells us. We should have known that it was so from the wonderful sweetness and simplicity of the introduction to his Latin Grammar for St. Paul's School. He calls it his "little preface" to his "little work" for making learning "a little more easy to young wits," for "nothing may be too soft nor too familiar for little children." "In which little book I have left many things out, of purpose, considering the tenderness and small capacity of little minds;" "whom, digesting this little work, I had alway before mine eyes, willing to speak things often before spoken, in such manner as gladly young beginners and tender wits might take and conceive." "Wherefore I pray you, all little babes, all little children, learn gladly this little treatise, trusting that of this beginning ye shall come at the last to be great clerks. And lift up your little white hands

for me, which prayeth for you to God. To whom be all honour, empire, majesty, and glory. Amen."

There remains Sir Thomas More. It is quite in the spirit of More's time to say with all gravity, "There is no room for more."

G. F. BRISTOL

## ART. III.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

### JOHN MOORE.

THE *Annual Register* for 1805 begins its biography of our present subject thus: "This amiable prelate was a native of the city of Gloucester, where his father was a butcher, and in circumstances that would not permit him to give his son that liberal education which he desired and deserved. He was therefore brought up at the free-school of his native city; and on account of the docility of his behaviour and promising talents, some friends procured him a humble situation in Pembroke College, Oxford, whence he some time afterwards removed to Christ Church in that university." This summary of his early years has, however, been in part disputed. A descendant, if I mistake not, of his, the late Canon Scott-Robertson, once wrote to me with reference to a short paper of mine, "You are mistaken in supposing that Archbishop Moore was the son of a butcher." I could only reply that I found it in the *Annual Register*. His rejoinder was very short: "He was not the son of a butcher." The reader must weigh the evidence for himself. On the one hand we have a biography written at the time of the prelate's death, when there must have been plenty of living memories of his young days. On the other, the testimony of one who probably had family archives. His father, Thomas Moore, is called "Mr." in the parish register, and "gent" in the Gloucester municipal records in 1761, where John's name was entered on the freemen's roll. All probability seems to point to his having been, like Shakespeare's father, a possessor of some land and a grazier, with which he combined the business of a butcher. The son was baptized in St. Michael's, Gloucester, on January 13, 1730, educated at the Free Grammar School of St. Mary de Crypt in the same city, and then, assisted by whomsoever it may have been, to Pembroke, Oxford, where, however, he also assisted himself by gaining a scholarship. He took his B.A. degree in 1748, and his M.A. in 1751. Meanwhile a somewhat