



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Walker, Rebecca

"The Possessions of the Kingdome of Heauen Remaineth to Those That Harbor Strangers":
Protestant Approaches to Hospitality in Elizabethan England

Original Citation

Walker, Rebecca (2016) "The Possessions of the Kingdome of Heauen Remaineth to Those That Harbor Strangers": Protestant Approaches to Hospitality in Elizabethan England. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/28700/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

‘THE POSSESSIONS OF THE KINGDOME OF
HEAUEEN REMAINETH TO THOSE THAT
HARBOR STRANGERS’: PROTESTANT
APPROACHES TO HOSPITALITY IN
ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND

REBECCA WALKER

A thesis submitted to the University of
Huddersfield in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of MA by
Research

The University of Huddersfield

April 2016

Contents

Introduction	3
Chapter One - Historiographical Review	7
Chapter Two - Exhortations to Charity and Hospitality	24
Chapter Three - Hospitality in Practice	39
Chapter Four - Poverty and Hospitality	54
Conclusion	72
Bibliography	76

Word count with references: 28608

Word count without references: 25341

Introduction

Early modern hospitality has been described as comprising of the reception by the host of all who come to them no matter their social status or whether they be known to the said host.¹ It involved use of the household for the provision of food, drink and accommodation, with food and drink being the most important of these. The basis for this behaviour is clearly indicated by Felicity Heal with her statement that ‘the source of the duty to be hospitable is underlined: it is a Christian practice sanctioned and enjoined by the Scriptures on all godly men’.² It is the connection between religion and hospitality which acts as the starting point for this thesis. Early modern England experienced great religious change, including the move from the Catholic belief in achieving salvation through faith and good works to the Protestant belief in achieving salvation through faith alone. This is particularly relevant to the Elizabethan period upon which this thesis will focus. Such a change in theological position had significant consequences for how hospitality was approached during the Elizabethan period. The move towards Protestantism and amendment to the notion of good works removed the imperative to give indiscriminately and designated acts such as hospitality as fruits of the faith. In light of this it is how hospitality was approached through the prism of Protestantism in Elizabethan England and this amended notion of good works which this thesis will address. This also necessarily involves a focus upon the clergy, whose own approaches to hospitality in theory and practice will form the significant part of this examination.

Particular historians stand out as being especially key to any study of hospitality during the period concerned. Felicity Heal has looked at hospitality in early modern England from several angles including how hospitality was conceived as an idea, its relationship with honour and how it was ~~practiced~~ practised by successive Archbishops of Canterbury across the period.³ Heal’s *Hospitality in Early Modern England* also stands as the authoritative work on the subject. Heal covers how the language and symbolism of hospitality developed

¹ Felicity Heal, ‘The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England’, *Past and Present*, 102, 1 (1984), p. 67.

² *Ibid.*

³ Heal, ‘The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England’, pp. 66-93; Felicity Heal, ‘Hospitality and Honor in Early Modern England’, *Food and Foodways*, 1, 4 (1987), pp. 321-350; Felicity Heal, ‘The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33, 4 (1982), pp. 544-563.

across the period and how hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised amongst a range of groups including the elite, the pre and post Reformation clergy and the general populace. Heal comes to the conclusion that whilst the successful practice of hospitality was something which was aspired to, various barriers stood in the way of this aspiration including 'other objectives...the problems of the society, and...the rational calculation that early modern England was not a particularly sensible environment in which to feed and harbour all comers'.⁴ Heal also pin points the centralisation of early modern politics, the elite's reaction to this in terms of the move to London and the increasing concern with civility as factors in the decline of hospitality during the early modern period.⁵ The arguments of Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos concerning informal support such as hospitality, and the role that 'human exchange' between the recipient and giver had to play in such practices are also important. She argues that practices such as hospitality did not merely involve a one way exchange of food and drink from host to guest, but were a two way process with the host receiving something in return, such as emotional support.⁶ Ben-Amos's work gives greater depth to our understanding of the personal motivations driving those who provided hospitality, and brings attention to how hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised on a human and emotional level.

The main body of primary source material which will be used in this thesis consists of a number of printed sermons and pieces of prescriptive literature. This material looks at hospitality from a Protestant perspective. The sermons were delivered by clergy members of various standing, from Edwin Sandys ~~former~~ Archbishop of York to figures such as Henry Bedel with a background of working at parish level. For prescriptive literature, much of this was also produced by members of the Elizabethan clergy with additional pieces by other lay figures such as William Vaughan who also produced significant works looking at hospitality from a Protestant viewpoint. It should be acknowledged that the producers of this material did not represent a homogenous mass of Protestant thought, instead having their own opinions on what form the reformed religion should take. Nonetheless, this material does provide insight into how those in favour of the reformed religion felt hospitality should be ~~practiced~~ practised. Overall, these sermons and writings address key themes such as how

⁴ Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), p. 403.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, 'Gifts and Favours: Informal Support in Early Modern England', *Journal of Modern History*, 72, 2 (2000), p. 297.

the public were exhorted to hospitality, poverty and the religious status of guests. It is around these themes that much of this thesis will be based. In analysing how the clergy actually ~~practiced~~ practised hospitality, primary source material including letters, visitation articles and statutes will be consulted. The overall approach that this thesis will take will be that of a qualitative analysis, gauging the development of ideas and practice of hospitality amongst the clergy through the words of contemporaries who spoke and wrote about it.

It is through looking at this evidence that it becomes clear that the way in which hospitality was preached and written about in Elizabethan England moved towards a revised view which advocated a selective approach to the practice. It is the contention here that this was a result of religious change. Elizabethan England's move towards Protestantism brought with it the stance that salvation could be achieved through faith alone, rendering hospitality as a fruit of the faith and removing the spur to indiscriminate giving. One can see that there was an attempt in these sermons and pieces of literature to take ownership of the idea of hospitality, and set out a Protestant ideal for its practice. It is clear that this ideal involved these preachers and writers advocating guests should be selected on the basis of their religious standing, or in the case of the poor whether they fit into the category of being deserving or undeserving of assistance. However, it is also clear that the rhetoric of the sermon or of prescriptive literature on hospitality did not necessarily match the reality of how hospitality was delivered in practice by those in charge of delivering the Protestant message in the first place. Whilst many of the Elizabethan clergy desired to ~~practice~~ practise hospitality, for some factors such as financial constraints or a lack of inclination stood in the way. Nonetheless, whilst the ideal and reality may have differed a strong attempt was made to reshape ideas, with preachers and writers putting forward a substantial case for the provision of hospitality as a selective undertaking.

Chapter one will assess the historiography of hospitality in early modern England, looking at the various angles from which historians have looked at the topic including how it was ~~practiced~~ practised by different sections of society and during particular times of year. How hospitality has been viewed within the context of early modern charity will also be considered, overall providing a historiographical context from which Protestant approaches to hospitality in Elizabethan England can be assessed. Chapter two shall consider the

messages given out by preachers and writers within sermons and prescriptive literature as they attempted to exhort the public to provide hospitality. This chapter will also consider how the notion of the 'household of faith' was employed by certain preachers and writers, with some arguing that primacy in the practice of hospitality should be given to those of certain religious standing. Chapter three will deal with the actual practice of hospitality by the Elizabethan clergy, considering the scenarios in which it took place and the circumstances that affected their ability to ~~practice~~ practise hospitality. The fourth chapter will look at how the issue of poverty and hospitality was preached and written about, considering how this developed across the Elizabethan period and the circumstances which influenced the views put forward. Following this some conclusions will be made.

Historiographical Review

The subject of early modern hospitality is one which has been covered in the work of a variety of historians, looking at the subject from various angles and within different contexts. These include hospitality as ~~practiced~~ practised by the elites of society and within the great household, and by those lower down the social scale in other locations. The question of how far the period experienced a decline in hospitality and the role that honour had to play in its actual practice have been discussed, particularly in the work of the foremost historian of early modern hospitality Felicity Heal.¹ The practice of hospitality during Christmas, how it was approached during a time of religious pluralism and the 1596 campaign for general hospitality have also received attention.² How hospitality fared during the early modern period is also closely related to the historiography of early modern charity. The changes and developments in how charity was ~~practiced~~ practised during the time in question and the implications of this for hospitality have been considered. Further to this, the importance of individuals and their own motivations in charitable giving, and the mutual benefits for both giver and receiver in the provision of hospitality have been clearly demonstrated in more recent historiography.³ In addition the role of the clergy in the practice of hospitality across the early modern period has received some attention, namely by Heal.⁴ However it is in relation to the dissolution of the monasteries and the question of a supposed resultant loss of monastic hospitality that early modern hospitality has often been discussed.⁵ In consideration of the central role the clergy had to play in ~~practicing~~ practising and exhorting hospitality outside of the monastic sphere, and its continued importance beyond the dissolution and through the Elizabethan period as evidenced by

¹ Felicity Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102, 1 (1984), pp. 66-93; Felicity Heal, 'Hospitality and Honor in Early Modern England', *Food and Foodways*, 1, 4 (1987), pp. 321-350; Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990).

² Ronald Hutton, *The Stations of the Sun: A History of the Ritual Year in Britain* (Oxford, 1996); Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2006); Steve Hindle, 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms: The Campaign for General Hospitality in Late Elizabethan England', *Past and Present*, 172 (2001), pp. 44-86.

³ Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, 'Gifts and Favours: Informal Support in Early Modern England', *Journal of Modern History*, 72, 2 (2000), pp. 295-338.

⁴ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, pp. 223-299; Felicity Heal, 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33, 4 (1982), pp. 544-563.

⁵ John Pound, *Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England* (London, 1971); A. L. Beier, 'The Social Problems of an Elizabethan Country Town: Warwick, 1580-90', in P. Clark (ed.), *Country Towns in Pre-Industrial England* (Leicester, 1981).

such material as sermons, it is the clergy and hospitality which emerges as the area with room for further research to be made into.

It is the elites of society who play a prominent role within the historiography of early modern hospitality. The perspective commonly taken by historians is to consider these elites as the providers of hospitality within the great household, whether to their social equals, those lower down the social scale or both. Writing in the 1960s Lawrence Stone, in his *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, proposed a link between the practice of an intensely competitive, lavish hospitality and the financial ruin of many aristocratic families during the Elizabethan and Stuart periods.⁶ The influence of ideas about reputation, generosity and liberality during the period are pointed out. Following on from this Stone points out the changes that the structure of society underwent from 1570 to 1630, with the emergence of new families with claims to status.⁷ As Stone states 'long established families wished to defend their status and the newly risen wished to consolidate their claims'.⁸ Stone argues that driven by a desire to justify their rank and social status and informed by a warped conception of the ideal of generosity a competition of extravagance between these families ensued with hospitality being one of the ways in which this competition manifested itself.⁹ This was despite the fact that this was beyond the financial means of many such families. According to Stone it was the seventeenth century which saw a move away from an individual's status being determined by the extent of their hospitality towards an increased emphasis on privacy.¹⁰ Thus, Stone's argument presents us with an interpretation of early modern hospitality as equated with society's elite, and brings to the fore the themes of status and reputation.

Elite hospitality has also been given extensive attention in the work of one of the foremost historians on early modern hospitality, Felicity Heal. In her article written in the early 1980s on the idea of hospitality Heal outlines a typology of the Tudor and Stuart host put together from contemporary prescriptive literature. Heal states that during the early

⁶ Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641* (Oxford, 1966), p. 44, 583.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 583.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 584.

modern period 'when men thought of open entertainment they logically thought above all of those who could treat the household as a cornucopia of plenty, the rich and especially the landowning élite'.¹¹ This therefore suggests that the historiographical emphasis on elite society is something that is mirrored by certain contemporaries writing on the issue. In this same article Heal also broaches a number of further issues relating to hospitality during the period including attitudes towards the poor and stranger. Heal also outlines how the ideal of open hospitality enjoined by scriptural precept and natural law was sustained by cultural tradition and the belief in an honour code that shaped elite behaviour.¹²

However it is the question of whether or not the early modern period saw a decline in the provision of hospitality from the elite which is a major preoccupation of this particular article. In providing further answers as to what was happening to hospitality in practice, this can add further context to how the clergy were ~~practicing~~ practising hospitality. As Heal points out a number of contemporary authors deemed that the practice of hospitality had gone wrong, but 'the chorus of lamentation intensifies from the 1580s and then diminishes by the later 1630s'.¹³ It is how far this reflects the reality of hospitality during the decades concerned, and why these decades in particular should see such an intensification that Heal seeks to answer. Man's gluttony and pride, an increase in prodigy building, and the drift to London taking society's elites away from their country estates were all blamed by contemporary writers for this decline. Heal emphasises the role of the "civilising process" which involved the refinement of manners. As she states 'one of the principal arenas for the demonstration of refinement was, of course, the household and especially the communal meal which was so central to hospitality'.¹⁴ A shared dislike of slovenly behaviour, as Heal notes, gave hosts justification for only keeping men of civility as guests, therefore seeing in a neglect of traditional open hospitality.¹⁵ However, this view is qualified by Heal's acknowledgement of the partisan view of those contemporary writers and the complexity of the social reality of hospitality as opposed to the ideal, often being subject to personal taste,

¹¹ Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', p. 69.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

regional variations and differing community attitudes.¹⁶ Despite this Heal does assert that contemporary writers when writing about the gentry 'were surely correct to argue that, once influenced by the values of the metropolis and engaged in social emulation in building, clothing and habits of eating, there was little hope that they would undertake the generous feeding of the poor and all comers',¹⁷ showing some agreement with the idea of a decline in hospitality.

Indeed, it is this question of whether the early modern period saw a decline in the provision of hospitality which remains a recurring point of discussion throughout Heal's extensive body of work on hospitality. In a subsequent article focusing upon hospitality in relation to honour, Heal argues that there was a shift away from the open household as the arena in which honour was accrued by the elite, towards the Court as the place where honour and reputation could be sought.¹⁸ The evidence of household ordinances is demonstrated by Heal to show the meticulous way in which guests at the great establishments of the elite were to be treated and hierarchy maintained, with the aim of 'upholding the individual honor of the lord and the collective honor of the household'.¹⁹ However, Heal reiterates that an increasing concern with refinement saw a change in the practice of traditional hospitality with the great household at its centre, in that it created a social distance between the gentry and the poor and with this 'made it less easy to comprehend the poor neighbour or stranger within the bounds of household commensality'.²⁰ The Court, according to Heal, with its increasingly dominant role often acted as the source of changing attitudes and was now the place where honour and reputation was to be sought. To succeed at Court 'a combination of lavish personal display and considerable cultural polish was necessary',²¹ thus leaving the great household neglected for a large part of the year. The overall result of this was, according to Heal, the fragmentation of hospitality,²² as entertainment became an increasingly private and selective affair as opposed to the old ideal of open hospitality.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 90-92.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

¹⁸ Heal, 'Hospitality and Honor in Early Modern England', pp. 321-350.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 328.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 342.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 343.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 346.

Heal's *Hospitality in Early Modern England* brings together many of these ideas and arguments on the subject, further considering the ways in which hospitality was affected by developments during the early modern period and pointing towards some agreement with those lamentations of contemporary writers. Heal points towards the effects of the centralisation of politics, which lessened the political power held by the great household, and the effect that the requirement for a national response to the problem of poverty had upon the focus of charity at the local level as being important in changing behaviour.²³ But of greater significance was the response of society's elites to these changes, which were to the detriment of the household where hospitality traditionally was provided. As Heal describes these responses were 'the pursuit of influence in London, and the world of civility and fashion that emanated from that pursuit'.²⁴ Heal's overall assessment of the practice of hospitality in early modern England is 'that it was a form of behaviour men *wished* to practise, but often found themselves impeded by other objectives...the problems of the society, and by the rational calculation that early modern England was not a particularly sensible environment in which to...harbour all comers'.²⁵

The attention given to the provision of hospitality by the elite has continued in the more recent work of Felicity Heal, in particular regarding the monarch and a consideration of the ideas of giving and receiving during royal progress. Heal points out how such hospitality, with its welcoming and entertainment of guests, offered the chance of visibility and accessibility in a setting aside from that of the court.²⁶ As Heal states 'these could occasionally be parlayed into material reward'.²⁷ The issue of honour and hospitality is also revisited in relation to Elizabeth I by explaining how 'in her dealings with individual hosts, she relied upon an exchange offering honour in return for mandatory hospitality'.²⁸ Thus the significance of the idea of honour amongst early modern elites is something which has been sustained in the work of Heal over several years.

²³ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 402.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 403.

²⁶ Felicity Heal, 'Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress', in J. E. Archer, E. Goldring and S. Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford, 2007), p. 52.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

The provision of hospitality by the elite of society has also featured in the more recent historiography of early modern hospitality courtesy of other historians. Kimberley Skelton has looked at the evidence of English country houses, including architectural writing, country-house poems and the houses of architect John Webb, and identifies the 1650s as point of change.²⁹ Skelton argues that ‘the mid-seventeenth century English country house was rethought to provide more exclusive hospitality and emphasize a visual pleasure that evoked leisure’.³⁰ Such changes were, according to Skelton, a response to conditions post-Civil War and saw a move away from a welcome afforded to those of all social ranks and filtering of guests according to their place in the social hierarchy, towards this exclusive form of hospitality for elite social circles.³¹ Further to this Linda A. Pollock has also argued in favour of the importance of kindness as a social concept amongst early modern elite society.³² Pollock sees the practice of hospitality as an aspect of kindness, alongside other features of elite social life such as courtesy and civility.³³ Pollock’s view suggests that hospitality was more than just a meaningless act but as something which involved emotion, in this instance showing good will to others. Overall, that such issues have continued to be discussed over several decades does illustrate the long standing concern with elite hospitality. Although this prominence of the elite within the historiography is something perhaps dictated by the greater availability of sources relating to the great household.

However, all of this is not to say that other groups and members of society aside from lay elites have not figured in the historiography of early modern hospitality. Felicity Heal herself has written on how hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised by Archbishops of Canterbury during the early modern period, recognizing how the practice was something especially required of the clergy and the Bishops, being descended from figures who held

²⁹ Kimberley Skelton, ‘Redefining Hospitality: The Leisured World of the 1650s English Country House’, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 68, 4 (2009), p. 496.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 496.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 496-497.

³² Linda A. Pollock, ‘The Practice of Kindness in Early Modern Elite Society’, *Past and Present*, 211 (2001), pp. 122-123.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

responsibility for community care in the early Church.³⁴ That the ideas of status, reputation and honour had some consequence for certain clerical households appears to be the case. Through an examination of the evidence of expenditure accounts and household ordinances Heal has argued that 'most of the archbishops between the Reformation and the Civil War were anxious to justify their social position and to entertain according to the expectations of their social equals'.³⁵ The importance of receiving the monarch for the Archbishops is also pointed out by Heal, explaining how during these occasions 'their behaviour and generosity on such occasions was closely observed and became an element in the judgement which the crown made of the ecclesiastical hierarchy'.³⁶ Heal's *Hospitality in Early Modern England* also dedicates two chapters to the subject of the clergy and hospitality both before and after the Reformation. It is in these chapters where alongside those high up in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the parish clergy are also considered. Heal points out that on the eve of the Reformation the parish clergy were not the subject of any great expectations as regards hospitality, but does acknowledge how it continued to be asked about at visitations across the early modern period.³⁷ Such evidence shows that there were complaints made about issues relating to and inhibiting hospitality at parish level such as non-residence and ruined parsonages.³⁸ Although it must be noted that this is qualified by Heal's acknowledgement of those members of the parish clergy against whom no complaints were made.³⁹

Nonetheless aside from such work by Heal where hospitality as provided by the clergy during the early modern period is discussed, the focus is often placed upon the impact which the dissolution of the monasteries and subsequent loss of monastic hospitality had upon the nation. For example, John Pound in his study of poverty and vagrancy during the Tudor period looks at the decay of hospitality directly following the dissolution. He sees it as undeniable that all were affected by the loss of monastic hospitality considering how well hospitality was maintained by these establishments, but also argues that it is questionable as to how far such provision could have continued regardless of the

³⁴ Heal, 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', p. 545.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 562.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 560.

³⁷ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 286.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 287.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

dissolution.⁴⁰ Pound takes consideration of the inflation which hit during the period, causing all 'people of substance' to be selective in their provision of hospitality. In light of this he argues that 'the decay of hospitality was a general phenomenon and the fact that that it seemed to stem from the dissolution is no more than coincidence'.⁴¹ A. L. Beier in his study of Warwick also notes the significant loss which arose from the dissolution there.⁴² Beier states that in Warwick 'more foundations were lost than were maintained, despite the fact that purchasers of church lands were supposed to assume responsibility for hospitality and alms-giving'.⁴³ However, the all levels of the clergy did have an essential role to play in the continuing importance of hospitality beyond the dissolution of the monasteries and into the Elizabethan period and beyond. As the evidence shows, during the Elizabethan period in particular hospitality continued to be a subject that was discussed by early modern preachers, inquired about at visitation and conversed about with those in power by members of the clergy. This also included an awareness by the clergy of their own requirements to ~~practice~~ practise hospitality, as determined by scripture. Such points demonstrate the continued relevance hospitality had further into the early modern period. This allied with a lack of attention that hospitality amongst the clergy beyond the dissolution has received, aside from in the work of Felicity Heal, suggests that this is an area ripe for further study and research.

Just as hospitality was an issue for all levels of the clergy, hospitality was also an issue for all sections of society. The way in which hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised in locations other than the great household by those outside of society's elite has received attention. Peter Clark, in his study of the role of the alehouse in English society, points out the important role that such establishments had to play in taking care of the needs of various members of society, including the travelling poor.⁴⁴ Clark attributes this to the fact that whereas travellers had previously been able to call upon the clergy, landowners or poorer members of society for hospitality, this had become 'a declining commodity in pre-

⁴⁰ Pound, *Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England*, p. 21.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Beier, 'The Social Problems of an Elizabethan Country Town: Warwick, 1580-90', p.67.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁴⁴ Peter Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830* (London, 1983), pp. 133-136.

revolutionary England'.⁴⁵ Pin pointing the decline of hospitality further back into the period, Clark states that the alehouse became a prime stopping place for those travelling 'not least because traditional upper-class hospitality was almost certainly in decline after the Reformation'.⁴⁶ In addition to this Beier, in his research into early modern vagrancy, has noted how evidence shows that vagrants received hospitality not only from gentlemen but also from members of the non-gentry and alehouses and inns.⁴⁷ These non-gentry providers of hospitality, as Beier shows, were often widows who were likely to be poor themselves.⁴⁸

The use of hospitality within communities during the early modern period in order to provide each other with relief when their neighbours slipped into poverty has also received attention in the form of a debate between Judith M. Bennett and Maria Moisà on the practice of help-ales. Bennett argues that what she terms as 'ordinary people', many of whom were likely to experience hard poverty at some point in their lives, provided each other with assistance through the social institution of help-ales.⁴⁹ As Bennett explains these 'raised charitable money through festivals whose proceeds benefited a designated person, group of people or cause'.⁵⁰ Such events subscribed to contemporary understandings of charity, including where 'hosts offered goodwill and hospitality'.⁵¹ That these help-ales constituted charity has been disputed by Moisà, who has characterised such help-ales as rather being about the exchange of gifts and loans between neighbours.⁵² Moisà has further questioned the extent to which the poor were helped by these events, arguing how they disappeared during times of general impoverishment and that the price charged for ale prevented many from participating.⁵³ Nonetheless Bennett reasserts in replying to Moisà that 'they were charity in the sense that the word was understood at the time, for they entailed goodwill, hospitality, reciprocity, neighbourliness, *and* the raising of money for a

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 133-134.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁴⁷ A. L. Beier, 'Vagrants and the Social Order in Elizabethan England', *Past and Present*, 64 (1974), pp. 16-17.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Judith M. Bennett, 'Conviviality and Charity in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 134 (1992), p. 20

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

⁵² Maria Moisà, 'Conviviality and Charity in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 154 (1997), p. 223.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

variety of social needs'.⁵⁴ Thus early modern hospitality may be seen as being wider in scope than a concentration on the elite experience in setting of the great household would suggest. Instead it was conducted in various settings and was ~~practiced~~ practised by those lower down the social scale as well as the elite.

How early modern hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised as a response to the needs of society at specific points in the whole period, or points in the calendar year has also been looked at. For example, Steve Hindle has focused upon the 1596 campaign for general hospitality in response to food shortages and local responses to this campaign.⁵⁵ In also considering the campaign's relationship to the 1598 poor relief statute, Hindle argues that 'general hospitality...has important implications...for the longer-term development of welfare policy'.⁵⁶ One of these implications, as Hindle explains, was that '*in practice*, the notion of undifferentiated charity only very gradually gave way to the principle of discretionary relief'.⁵⁷ Ronald Hutton has also examined the practice of hospitality at Christmas during the early modern period. Addressing the issue of how much of the food, drink and entertainment seen at Christmas was directed towards the provision of hospitality, Hutton broaches the wider question of whether the period saw a decline in hospitality as described by certain contemporaries. Hutton argues that 'it seems clear that if there was a decline it was only relative, and it is even possible that there was little or none absolutely'.⁵⁸ Hutton points towards growing levels of poverty during the period as increasing the need for hospitality and making generosity appear crucial.⁵⁹ Such impressions are seen as being behind the chorus of complaint about the neglect of hospitality, rather than there being any actual decline.⁶⁰ In coming to this conclusion Hutton's work can be seen as overlapping with that on elite hospitality, in addressing the argument of Felicity Heal and formulating his own argument based on examples of Christmas hospitality including amongst the gentry.

⁵⁴ Judith M. Bennett, 'Conviviality and Charity in Medieval and Early Modern England: Reply', *Past and Present*, 154 (1997), p. 241.

⁵⁵ Hindle, 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms: The Campaign for General Hospitality in Late Elizabethan England', p. 48.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Hutton, *The Stations of the Sun*, p. 19.

⁵⁹ Hutton, *The Stations of the Sun*, p. 19; Ronald Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1994), p. 178.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

Religious change during the early modern period saw the development of religious pluralism, and it is within this context that hospitality has also been considered. Alexandra Walsham in looking at the experience of religious minorities in relation to tolerance and intolerance in early modern England points out how in several areas of society, including hospitality, 'Catholics could find ways of rubbing along legitimately with the heretics who lived all around them'.⁶¹ Issues concerning Catholic recusants and hospitality have also been looked at more recently by Walsham, as part of an exploration into 'the connection between the English Reformation and changing conceptions, experiences, and manifestations of 'community''.⁶² Drawing upon evidence from the early 1580s, consisting of two model sets of cases of conscience used in the English seminaries in the training of student missionaries, Walsham considers how Catholics approached the inherent quandaries of fulfilling the expectation of hospitality in an officially Protestant country.⁶³ One positive point appears to have been that "good hospitality' might serve to deflect attacks on the faithful and gifts too could induce them to be more benevolent to recusants and church papists'.⁶⁴ Although as Walsham states this had to be squared against the risks of becoming close to their Protestant guests. Further to this, the use of hospitality as an opportunity to infiltrate households and convert those of other faiths is also touched upon. Walsham points towards a memorandum concerning Jesuit approaches to the conversion of heretics and schismatics written in 1583 recommending such action.⁶⁵ From this she states that 'missionaries could insinuate themselves into the affections of these Protestants by engaging in country pursuits...and by making pleasant conversation with their hosts and guests at mealtimes'.⁶⁶ Here more insight is gained into the various motivations behind the practice of hospitality in early modern society.

Hospitality represented a form of charity in the early modern era and therefore the historiography of early modern hospitality is closely connected to the historiography of early

⁶¹ Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England*, p. 208.

⁶² Alexandra Walsham, 'Supping with Satan's Disciples: Spiritual and Secular Sociability in Post-Reformation England', in N. Lewycky and A. Morton (eds), *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W. J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012), p. 30.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

modern charity. The ways in which charity has been thought about by historians has implications for how the understanding of hospitality has developed over the past few decades. Therefore hospitality either lay or clerical cannot be fully assessed without examining charity and theories on how it worked in practice. Much of the writing on early modern charity has looked to compare different forms of charitable practice. An early example of this can be seen in the work of W. K. Jordan and the distinction he makes between Catholic and Protestant charity. Writing in the late 1950s Jordan argued in favour of the emergence of the Protestant ethic, arising out of the Protestant Reformation which was strongly secular in nature.⁶⁷ He argues that the reformation saw a rejection of the Catholic system of alms giving, and a move towards charity directed through institutions controlled by the laity, and with the aim of relieving poverty in a systematic manner.⁶⁸ This also constituted a move away from indiscriminate giving to discriminate charity. Such changes in giving saw a rise in the amount of charitable giving carried out by the end of the sixteenth century, with Jordan describing 'a golden stream of wealth that spread its way through the many channels of need opened during this remarkable period'.⁶⁹ When applied to hospitality such an argument may suggest that the early modern period saw a lessening of the provision of indiscriminate hospitality within the household setting, in place of increased charity within the institutional setting.

In contrast, Beier has subsequently demonstrated the flaws in the view that poor relief during the early modern period was subject to the influence of any Protestant ethic. These include the lack of evidence for a distinct Protestant or Puritan position on charity.⁷⁰ Instead it is argued by Beier that continuities and overlapping between the Catholic and Protestant or Puritan position existed. Beier also points out how it would be erroneous to see charitable acts carried out by Protestants as being driven by secularism.⁷¹ Overall this suggests that hospitality continued in its role as part of charitable practice during the early modern period, although the evidence of sermons and prescriptive literature shows that a selective approach was seen as the ideal way in which hospitality should be carried out.

⁶⁷ W. K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England 1480-1660: A Study of the Changing Pattern of English Social Aspirations* (London, 1959), p. 151.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 151-152.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁷⁰ A. L. Beier, *The Problem of the Poor in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (London, 1983), pp. 14-15.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

The effect that the formalisation of poor relief had upon the development of charitable giving, including hospitality, across the early modern period has also received attention. Keith Thomas, originally writing in the early 1970s, has commented upon the effect of the national Poor Law, seeing it as something which 'did undoubtedly sap the old tradition of mutual charity' and led to the moral duties of the householder becoming ambiguous.⁷² Such a point suggests that the legislation had a negative effect on the provision of hospitality, causing an insecurity to be felt and providing a lack of incentive to ~~practice~~ practise older forms of charity. More recently Steve Hindle has also commented on the effects of the formalisation of poor relief, in his study looking at how welfare was spoken about in early modern England and the negotiation of inequality involved in provision of welfare. Hindle describes how the propertied felt that it 'had not only released them from the duties of hospitality, but also empowered them to govern the conduct of the poor'.⁷³ Again this suggests that changing approaches to charity during the early modern period had the potential to negatively affect the extent to which hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised by the English people.

Paul Slack has also looked at charity and how it developed across the early modern period. This includes the changes and continuities between differing concepts of charity and forms of charitable practice. Whilst acknowledging that there should be no over exaggeration of the extent to which old charitable ideals declined,⁷⁴ Slack does recognize the fact that there was a modification of the concept of charity. Slack views it as becoming a more exclusive and calculating concept over time, and this is seen as a result of the need to define private charity in the face of discrimination and public relief.⁷⁵ In terms of actual practice Slack also argues that 'the continuation of philanthropic activities of all kinds shows that the advent of the statutory poor law and of outdoor relief paid for by the parish rates

⁷² Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1991; first edition 1971), p. 672.

⁷³ Steve Hindle, 'Exhortation and Entitlement: Negotiating Inequality in English Rural Communities, 1550-1650', in M. J. Braddick and J. Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 122.

⁷⁴ Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1988), p. 21.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

did not bring any rapid switch from private charity to public welfare'.⁷⁶ The continuities in the ways in which poor relief was carried out are acknowledged by Slack, and the fact that change was gradual is stressed. However, Slack argues that 'although change was gradual, it was real'.⁷⁷ It is pointed out how across the early modern period as a whole certain types of poor relief declined, with Slack citing large-scale hospitality as an example of a practice which 'withered away' during the seventeenth century.⁷⁸ Overall, in terms of hospitality Slack's arguments suggest that, whilst the scale and speed of change should not be overstated, increased discrimination and calculation and an element of decline did become features of hospitality over the course of the early modern period. These notions of discrimination and calculation certainly reflect what the evidence of sermons and prescriptive literature show about how hospitality was conceived in Elizabethan England, with hosts being increasingly advised to make calculations about prospective guests before providing them with hospitality.

Further to this, much of the historiography of early modern charity centres on the issue of quantification of monastic and secular charity, and attempts to answer questions on the scale of giving in pre and post-Reformation England. However, the problems in measuring such charity and therefore the importance of unrecorded charity, of which hospitality played a key part, has been recognized. Beier points out how the use of evidence such as probate records pose problems to the measurement of secular charity, in how 'a great deal of charity remained unrecorded, handed out to passers-by despite statutory restrictions on casual giving'.⁷⁹ This thesis will offer a departure from this pattern of quantitative analysis, instead using a qualitative approach to determine how attitudes towards hospitality developed across the Elizabethan period and how important an issue it continued to be.

More recently, Ian W. Archer in his work on early modern London has also considered charity from the voluntary sector, and the problem of quantification due to 'the

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Beier, 'The Social Problems of an Elizabethan Country Town: Warwick, 1580-90', p. 65.

'dark figure' of face-to-face charity'.⁸⁰ Archer recognizes the varied nature of such face-to-face giving, including acts such as distributing left-over food to poor members of the neighbourhood,⁸¹ and that not all such acts could be identified as indiscriminate charity.⁸² He also recognizes that practices constituting face-to-face charity such as hospitality carried on into the early seventeenth century.⁸³ Archer also points out how whilst private charity was directed towards public institutions during the early modern period, there was still room within these charitable arenas for those donating to be involved in decisions concerning who should receive money. As a result of this 'the distinction between 'face-to-face' giving and the new rational philanthropy is somewhat blurred'.⁸⁴ Such points suggest that charitable practices such as hospitality, despite their evasiveness in terms of quantification, continued to be in the mix across the early modern period. They also show that the opportunities for personal interaction and discretion in giving continued to exist, but within different settings outside of the household.

Beyond this the role of the individual in the practice of charity and informal support has been emphasised, also recognizing the vital part personal motivation to play. Writing in the early 1990s Sandra Cavallo criticised the tendency for historians to view charity as a response to the poor's needs or the perceived threat they posed, or to think about charity in terms of demand.⁸⁵ As Cavallo states 'this inhibits exploration of other kinds of explanations, relatively independent of the needs of the poor, but linked rather to the multiple meanings which charity held for benefactors'.⁸⁶ Instead Cavallo emphasises the value of looking at the motivations of individuals in the provision of charity, and why these individuals were driven to practice practise a certain type or types of charity at any particular time. To look at these motivations, argues Cavallo, 'could provide an important explanatory element in the analysis of charitable trends'.⁸⁷

⁸⁰ Ian W. Archer, 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), p. 242.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

⁸² Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 179.

⁸³ Archer, 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', p. 243.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

⁸⁵ Sandra Cavallo, 'The Motivations of Benefactors: An Overview of Approaches to the Study of Charity', in J. Barry and C. Jones (eds), *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State* (London, 1991), pp. 50-51.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

More recently, these ideas have been picked up by Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos in her work on the various types of informal support which existed during the early modern period, including hospitality. She points out that much research sees informal support as a 'unilateral transfer – a response to the material needs of the poor or to the social threat that poverty caused'.⁸⁸ Ben-Amos argues that instead of focusing on those in receipt of help, informal support should be thought of in terms of human exchange between the recipient of support and the giver, with help being transferred between the two parties.⁸⁹ She also argues that other types of help beyond the material were crucial to this human exchange, such as emotional support, the supply of information and protection.⁹⁰ It is through a consideration of such points that, according to Ben-Amos, a full understanding of the impulses behind informal support, the benefits for those who gave as well as received and why it continued to be ~~practiced~~ practised throughout the early modern period can be gained.⁹¹

In the particular context of hospitality, Ben-Amos points out the forms of human exchange involved in its various settings. These include within the great houses of the elite, with entertainment given in exchange for the prestige and enhancement to their reputation that their guests' presence brought.⁹² In the case of strangers, exchanges occurred where the provision of hospitality was returned in forms such as music, news or prayers.⁹³ There was also prestige and personal honour attached to the provision of hospitality to vagrants, and as Ben-Amos describes 'a sense of dignity that enhanced the identity of the host performing as a household head'.⁹⁴ That there was a decline in some aspects of hospitality during the early modern period is acknowledged by Ben-Amos,⁹⁵ as is the fact that there were limiting factors which affected informal support as a whole.⁹⁶ However, it is asserted

⁸⁸ Ben-Amos, 'Gifts and Favours: Informal Support in Early Modern England', p. 297.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 298.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 315.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 317.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 331 - 336.

that 'customs of hospitality remained entrenched',⁹⁷ and that overall 'as long as informal support continued to offer a rich reservoir of benefits and to respond to a range of social and human needs...informal support proliferated'.⁹⁸ In all, the arguments of Ben-Amos highlight the greater understanding of forms of support such as hospitality which can be gained from a closer consideration of the individual providing help and their own personal motivations as well as those receiving help, and the mutual benefits which kept the practice going during the early modern period.

In all, it is the subject of the clergy and hospitality which emerges as a part of the historiography of early modern hospitality in need of further attention. The clergy had a crucial role to play in its practice, and as evidenced by such sources as sermons and prescriptive literature hospitality remained an ever present concern across the early modern period. Despite this, much of the historiography relating to the clergy's role in hospitality is confined to the loss of monastic hospitality following the dissolution. It is important to note the vital contribution made by Felicity Heal to our understanding of the clergy's role in hospitality across the entire early modern period. However much of this historiography written about the clergy and hospitality also dates from before the millennium. It is therefore apparent that an examination of the role the clergy had to play in hospitality during periods such as the Elizabethan age presents an opportunity to add to the understanding of a neglected topic and the understanding of early modern hospitality as a whole. In doing this the ideas of Ben-Amos and the notions of personal interest will be picked up on, emphasising how personalities and personal interest could play a part in the form which exhortations to hospitality took and how hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised by the Elizabethan clergy. For instance, hosts could use an element of choice in who they wanted to provide with hospitality and preachers could maintain a Protestant outlook yet one which also reflected their own personal interests or experiences.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 338.

Exhortations to Charity and Hospitality

In Elizabethan England hospitality was afforded importance in the sermons and pieces of prescriptive literature of various preachers and authors working in the period. One stand out feature of these sermons and prescriptive literature were the exhortations to charity and hospitality. These exhortations were heavily influenced by the religious changes brought about by Elizabeth I's accession to the throne, with a Protestant based form of hospitality being advocated. With the Protestant emphasis on salvation being achieved through faith alone, preachers and authors sought to cast hospitality as being rooted in Christianity. By describing it as a 'fruit of the faith' and drawing upon the range of scriptural evidence to prove its basis in the word of God, Protestant preachers and writers were able to assure the status of hospitality as an essential part of the reformed religion and something to be done as part of following God's word. These exhortations also betray a wider anxiety about Protestantism and its place within Elizabethan society. Ian W. Archer has highlighted the concern that Protestants had over their own levels of charitable giving, and their worry about receiving criticism from their Catholic opponents.¹ Various preachers and writers made reference to the Catholic past and the large scale of their charity and hospitality. However it is also clear that Catholics were not being painted as being superior at charity, but as being driven to give by an incorrect belief in the power of good works to be able to achieve salvation. England had already been through much religious change by the Elizabethan period, and that this would not change again was not certain. Through exhortations Protestant preachers and writers could take ownership of hospitality and attempt to stave off any criticism from religious opponents through building a Protestant based view of hospitality, asserting its basis in God's word and encouraging people to ~~practice~~ practise hospitality in this fashion.

A revised view of hospitality was one of the consequences of the religious changes experienced in Elizabethan England. Part of this revised view was theological in nature, stemming from the changing position on the doctrine of good works in a now Protestant England under Elizabeth I. With salvation being achieved through faith alone, hospitality was

¹ Ian W. Archer, 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), p. 225.

conceived as a fruit of the faith as opposed to the Catholic position of hospitality as a good work which could aid in the quest for salvation. Preachers and authors sought to confirm acts including hospitality as fruits of the faith, and as an activity which arose out of following God's word. For instance Henry Bedel in a sermon preached in November 1571 and first published the following year, explicitly stated that society's duty towards the poor was 'a pleasant thing to the Lord, and a fruit of our faith, and a token of Christianity'.² A few years later in a sermon delivered in 1578 Laurence Chaderton declared that works were necessary for reasons including 'not onely for doing of the fathers will: but also for the declaration of our faith'.³ Henry Smith, renowned for his preaching before his death in 1591 and known during his lifetime as the Silver-Tongued Preacher or Silver-Tongued Smith,⁴ advocated that actions such as feeding the hungry should be done in faith, quoting Matthew 3:10 in stating 'for euerie tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewen downe and cast into the fire'.⁵ All such statements aimed to compel people to carry out works including hospitality during the period, and illustrate how it was an essential part of the reformed faith.

In addition, a wide range of scriptural precept and evidence was employed by preachers and religious writers throughout the Elizabethan period to demonstrate how hospitality was based in God's word, and therefore emphasise its necessity. Hebrews 13:2, which reminds Christians to 'be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares', was one of the most important pieces of scripture used. As Felicity Heal notes this was extremely popular 'in part perhaps because it supported a very broad definition of the desirable guest'.⁶ This piece of scripture related to the figures Abraham and Lot who had received angels in the likeness of men, the example of whom was employed by many writing and preaching about hospitality during the period. For instance, Henry Smith, Philip Stubbes, the *Three Sermons*, Henry Arthington and William Vaughan all cited Abraham and Lot as role models to be followed in the provision of hospitality.⁷

² Henry Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore* (London, 1572), sig. B1v.

³ Laurence Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon* (London, 1578?), sig. C7r.

⁴ Gary W. Jenkins, 'Smith, Henry (c.1560–1591)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25811>>, [Accessed 5 July 2015].

⁵ Henry Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares Opened in a Sermon* (London, 1592), p. 5.

⁶ Felicity Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102, 1 (1984), p. 72.

⁷ Henry Smith, *Four Sermons Preached by Master Henry Smith. And Published by a More Perfect Copie then Heretofore* (London, 1599), sig. E3r; Philip Stubbes, *A Motiue to Good Workes* (London, 1593), pp. 129-130; *Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poore and Needie in these times* (London,

Another important piece of scripture used was Matthew 25:35 and 36, which referenced receiving the harbourless as being one of the works of mercy.⁸ This can be seen in the sermon of Henry Bedel, partially quoted as ‘I was hungry, & ye gaue me meate, thirsty, and ye gaue me drinke’.⁹ In particular, Henry Arthington in his *Prouision for the Poor, Now in Penurie* provided a list of twelve pieces of scripture relating to the relief of the poor. This list includes the text from Luke 14:13 and 14 illustrating the importance of hospitality, with Arthington quoting ‘call the poore, the lame and the blind to they table, so shalt thou be blessed of the Lord, and recompenced for the same at the last day’.¹⁰ This was complimented by another list of examples of exceptional figures including those who kept good hospitality, drawn from the canonical scriptures. These include the aforementioned Abraham and Lot, but also Nehemiah who kept 150 at his table on a daily basis, and also Iob a wealthy man who was described as ‘neuer denying the needies requiest, nor being once wearie in supplying their wants’.¹¹ All of these uses of scripture combined to create a powerful argument in favour of the practice of hospitality, and increase the impact of the exhortations to hospitality.

A further way in which religious change brought about a revised view of hospitality in Elizabethan England was how it opened up an opportunity for comparisons to be made between Protestants and their Catholic predecessors. Ian W. Archer has identified what he describes as ‘the acute sensitivity of protestants to the criticisms of the ‘carping popelings’’.¹² Archer explains how the catholic hierarchy had received criticism from the evangelicals for their waste of resources which could have been used in charitable pursuits. However as the Reformation progressed the failure of the resources from the monasteries to be instead put towards social welfare as had been hoped by the early reformers ‘left them vulnerable to the charges of their adversaries that they had simply lined their own pockets from the spoliation of the church’.¹³ In terms of hospitality, that there was anxiety about the ability of the reformers to measure up to the standards set by Catholics in their

1596), [sig. B3r](#); Henry Arthington, *Prouision for the Poore, now in Penurie* (London, 1597), [sig. D4r](#); William Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue Moralized in Three Bookes* (London, 1600), [book 2, chapter 24, sig. P6r](#).

⁸ Heal, ‘The Idea of Hospitality’, p. 72.

⁹ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, [sig. E3r](#).

¹⁰ Arthington, *Prouision for the Poore*, [sig. D1v](#).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, [sig. D4r](#).

¹² Archer, ‘The Charity of Early Modern Londoners’, p. 225.

¹³ *Ibid.*

hospitality, and therefore avoid any accusations of greed, is apparent within the work of Elizabethan preachers and authors. For example, Laurence Chaderton preached that ‘the Papists, they always cast in our teeth the great and famous hospitality of their nobility and clergy, the building of Abbeys, Monastries and Nunneries, Cathedral churches, colleges, with many other outward works: which indeed are such as do stop our mouthes and put us Protestants to silence’.¹⁴ That the new regime would last was by no means certain, and this coupled with the opportunity their Catholic opponents had to potentially undermine the Protestant regime could only increase anxiety.

Others also acknowledged the strength of Catholic giving. Henry Bedel criticised the purpose and direction of Catholic charity, whilst advocating that the same levels of charity should be ~~practiced~~ practised by Protestant society. He preached about the gold that decorated churches and what had been bestowed upon ‘shameles friers that neuer were full, and fat bellyed Moonkes whose bellyes were their gods’.¹⁵ However, Bedel questioned where this level of giving had disappeared to. Although Catholics had put this to an ‘euyl purpose’ in seeking their salvation, Bedel believed that the same level of giving should ‘now be bestowed to a better vse, that is, to foster and fede the poore members of christ’.¹⁶ Along very similar lines Henry Smith preached about the high level of liberality, although set to evil purposes, which had maintained friars, monks, nuns and masses and which should now be put to better use and ‘foster and feed the pore members of Christ’.¹⁷ Such concern about the level of giving compared to that of Catholics was still apparent by 1600, as seen in William Vaughan’s *The Golden-Groue Moralized in Three Bookes*. Here Vaughan outlined his worry that, although steeped in superstition, the level of alms giving by Catholics in their attempts to be saved may count against Protestants at the day of judgement.¹⁸ Vaughan stated that ‘I feare me, it will be easier for them, then for vs, to enter into the kingdome of heauen, if speedily we amend not, & be bountiful vnto the poore’.¹⁹ Such a series of points suggests a strong desire to ensure that Protestants show their charity.

¹⁴ Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon*, [sig. C5r](#).

¹⁵ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, [sig. B3v](#).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, [p. 26](#).

¹⁸ Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue*, [book 2, chapter 27, sig. Q1r](#).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

It is also clear that preachers were not necessarily saying that Catholics were better at hospitality and charity than Protestants, but that they were driven to give large amounts due to misguided reasons. Indeed, some other individuals did choose to directly criticise the hospitality of Catholics. James Pilkington, the at one time Bishop of Durham, claimed that most of the hospitality given out by the abbeys had gone to those that were already rich or those that were attempting to avoid work, rather than to the poor.²⁰ According to Pilkington this state of affairs was so rife that the term 'abbey lubber' came into common use, in reference to those that frequented the abbeys for hospitality without proper need and instead were 'idle, well fed, a long lewd lither loiterer, that might work and would not'.²¹ Henry Arthington also seemed keen to rebuke the idea of giving credit to Catholics, instead directly countering their charge that Protestants were happy to deny and neglect good works. As Arthington wrote, 'neither let the Papists vntruly reproach vs, that we deny good works, or deeds of charitie, for...we vrge them to all Christians...because they cannot without them approue themselues to be true beleeuers'.²² Nonetheless, if Protestants in Elizabethan England could match the levels of giving of their Catholic predecessors whilst directing their efforts towards the right targets and backed up by strong theological arguments, then they could discredit any accusations of a lack of charity by Catholic opponents. It is here where Protestant preachers and writers were able to begin taking ownership of hospitality, using exhortations to encourage society to practice practise hospitality themselves, explain how hospitality should be practiced practised and develop a view of the practice influenced by Protestantism.

One way in which hospitality was encouraged was through a reminder of the rewards waiting for those who kept hospitality, and warnings of the consequences for those that did not fulfil their duty. From the early 1570s to the late 1590s the promise of heaven for those that took in the poor was employed in the sermons and writings of various clergymen concerned with hospitality. An early example of this was in a sermon delivered by Thomas Drant in 1572, where he outlined that 'the possessions of the kingdome of heauen remaineth to those that harbor strangers, and cloth the naked, and do the like works of

²⁰ James Scholefield (ed.), *The Works of James Pilkington, B. D., Lord Bishop of Durham*, The Parker Society (1842), p. 610.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Arthington, *Prouision for the Poore*, sig. E3r.

compassion'.²³ Similar lines can be seen in the 1578 sermon of Chaderton with his promise that those who give help including meat, drink and lodging 'shalbe pronounced righteous, and goe into life eternall'.²⁴ Henry Smith also reiterated the point concerning the kingdom of heaven.²⁵ By 1596 the *Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poor and Needie* preached during the campaign for 'general hospitality' exhorted patience to those that gave hospitality for 'the exceeding greatnes of the reward shall recompense abundantly the length of time that thou forbearst it'.²⁶ This same set of sermons in particular also posed a juxtaposition between these promises of rewards and the alarming consequences of a lack of hospitality. The *Three Sermons* urged that 'at the least, let the feare of Gods punishing judgement, and the dreadful terrour of his heauy indignation moue thee hereunto',²⁷ along with the use of warnings that 'the one shall haue their portion in the lake that burneth with fire' for those who neglected their duty.²⁸ By informing people of what was to be gained and what could be lost these figures were able to increase the impact of their exhortations to charity and hospitality.

Criticism of those who neglected hospitality was also used in exhortations as a method of encouragement, attempting to spur listeners and readers to change their apparent ways and fulfil their duty. It was those with the most means of providing hospitality and helping the poor that were often the target of criticism. Henry Bedel made reference to the 'hard harted ritch' who lacked respect for the poor.²⁹ Drant in his sermon also noted how 'diuers richmen...pile great heapes of plate upon their tables', meaning that the excess of some meant that others would die of want.³⁰ Henry Smith targeted country gentlemen in his sermon *The Sinners Confession*, claiming that they were prepared to see the stranger, fatherless and widowed starve and die in the streets rather than receive them in their houses and provide them with relief.³¹ In another sermon, *The Poore Mans Teares*, Smith reminded rich men who neglected to help the poor that their riches would be no

²³ Thomas Drant, *A fruitfull and necessary sermon, specially concerning almes geuing* (1572), [sig. A6v](#).

²⁴ Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon*, [sig. C2r](#).

²⁵ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, [p. 5](#).

²⁶ *Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poore*, [sig. l2r](#).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, [sig. K1r](#).

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, [sig. B2v](#).

³⁰ Drant, *A fruitfull and necessary sermon*, [sig. E5r](#).

³¹ Smith, *Foure Sermons Preached by Master Henry Smith*, [sig. L1v](#).

good to them after death, and instead 'will melt and consume away like butter in the Sunne'.³² In the 1590s Philip Stubbes continued this criticism of the rich, outlining how their 'great store of riches, and large possessions in this lyfe' had been given to them to help those in need. It had not been given to them to 'misspend in ryot and excesse...nor in anie other such kind of vanitie'.³³ It was these ideas of misspending, waste and excess which ran through more of the criticism of the neglect of hospitality.

Where the neglect of hospitality was discussed and criticised this was often done in relation to the idea of thrift, or lack thereof. Various figures during the Elizabethan period castigated the public for a lack of care taken in managing their resources, wasting that which should be used to help the poor and instead keeping themselves in excess.³⁴ The Archbishop of York Edwin Sandys, in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, most clearly summed up this position, and how some 'waste that unthriftilly, wherewith they should relieve the poor and comfort strangers'.³⁵ Some were preoccupied 'with three H. H. H. horses, hawks, and harlots; some with vain apparel...some with building, some with banqueting; some by one mean, and some by another'.³⁶ As a result of this Sandys argued that hospitality itself had been shut out of people's homes.

One particular subject of criticism for some figures was the increasing sophistication of food; food being a crucial component of hospitality. Henry Smith compared the simplicity of the past to the contemporary array of dishes being designed with taste in mind. These, claimed Smith, cost much more money than necessary and that when eating such expensive food people should 'let the teares of the poore admonishe you to releeeue them'.³⁷ William Vaughan writing in 1600 also outlined how 'they are greatly deceyued, who thinke, that hospitality doth consist in slibber-sauces, in spiced meates, or in diuersities'.³⁸ Instead such

³² Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, p. 22.

³³ Stubbes, *A Motiue to Good Workes*, p. 133.

³⁴ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, sig. E1v, sig. E2r.; Arthington, *Prouision for the Poore*, sig. C2v; Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue*, book 2, chapter 27, sig. P8v.

³⁵ J. Ayre (ed.), *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D. D., successively Bishop of Worcester and London, and Archbishop of York: to which are added some miscellaneous pieces by the same author*, The Parker Society (1841), p. 401.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, p. 15.

³⁸ Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue*, book 2, chapter 25, sig. P6v.

foods were a waste of goods, with Vaughan even going as far as to claim that such delicacies would cause a situation 'whereby the flesh is prouoked to lechery, & becommeth altogether inflamed, massy, and diseased'.³⁹ In contrast to this, Vaughan equated plain food with good health. Good hospitality was also equated with one kind of meat, which could go further than 'dainty delicacies'.⁴⁰ Adam Fox has explained how 'in early modern England the food and drink that people ingested provided resonant markers in the expression of worth and the articulation of status'.⁴¹ According to Fox the 'better sort' were able for example to 'seek out ever more rare and expensive dainties in order to reposition their consumption and distinguish themselves in more conspicuous ways from those beneath'.⁴² The words of Smith and Vaughan suggest a desire see such people forgo foods that symbolised personal status in favour of foods that were viewed as conducive to good hospitality.

It is also apparent that preachers and writers on hospitality during the Elizabethan period also foresaw a general reluctance amongst the population to help the poor, suggesting that this would also mean a reluctance to provide hospitality. This can be seen from the early 1570s through to the mid 1590s. For instance, Thomas Drant in his sermon delivered in 1572 addressed the excuses that may be used in order to avoid helping the poor. One of these was that by helping the poor one would become overwhelmed by the number of people they would receive and that 'man by geuing to so many beggers, hymselfe in tyme shalbe a begger'.⁴³ Another excuse addressed by Drant was that 'a man partyng now from his money to a poore man, it is as a man should cast a thyng into the water, it will be lost, and it wil not be remembred'.⁴⁴ Drant attempted to answer this doubt about the worth of providing for the poor by saying 'God is not unjust that hee will forget the worke, and loue which you haue shewed in his name'.⁴⁵ The perception of the sheer difficulty of getting people to help the poor was clearly demonstrated in a sermon by Henry Smith. He preached that 'I know in these daies...it is as hard a thing to perswade men to part

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, [book 2, chapter 26, sig. P8r.](#)

⁴¹ Adam Fox, 'Food, Drink and Social Distinction in Early Modern England', in S. Hindle, A. Shepard and J. Walter (eds), *Remaking English Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2013), p. 165.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁴³ Drant, *A fruitfull and necessary sermon*, [sig. B6r.](#)

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, [sig. B5v.](#)

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, [sig. B6r.](#)

with money, as to pull out their eies and cast them away, or to cut of their hands and giue them away, or to cut off their legges and throw them awaie'.⁴⁶ This suggests that men such as Smith saw a continuing need to keep encouraging people to help the poor in light of such reluctance.

By 1596 the reluctance to give hospitality in particular was still being addressed, as can be seen in the *Three Sermons*. Here the reaction of the host upon the reception of the poor guest was anticipated to be 'thou wilt say...this poore man is loathsome and fowle'.⁴⁷ This thereby suggests that there was a concern within sections of society about the types of people they were prepared to share their table with. The *Three Sermons* did attempt to allay these concerns, instructing people to wash and make clean such guests, and let them sit at the table to eat with them. However, realising that this may not happen a compromise was suggested. It was preached that 'at the least, if thou wilt not haue him sit with thee at thy table, then send him some reliefe and repart from thy table'.⁴⁸ Despite this there was a lamentation of the fact that such a compromise may have to be made, questioning 'why shoulde wee thinke scorne to receiue them into our houses' before asserting that 'the more vile and base the person is, the greater charitie it is to succour him'.⁴⁹ Overall, this acknowledgment of the potential reluctance to help the poor and provide hospitality and the attempts to then answer concerns acted as a further important feature of exhortations to charity and hospitality. The fact that these concerns continued to be addressed into the 1590s also suggests that preachers continued to sense a reluctance amongst their listeners and society to help the poor and practice practise hospitality across almost the whole Elizabethan period.

Whilst encouraging people to practice practise charity and hospitality, care was also taken to outline how hospitality should be carried out in practice. One of the ways in which this was done was to explain to people how hosts should conduct themselves in terms of emotions and motivations. Henry Bedel asserted that people should not give begrudgingly,

⁴⁶ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, pp. 1-2.

⁴⁷ *Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poore*, sig. F2v.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

stating that otherwise 'bread that I geuen wyth a grudgiug hart, is called stony bread'.⁵⁰ Laurence Chaderton further advocated that Christians 'take greater paynes and care to frame their heartes and woorkes according to the will of God, then onely to to haue an outward shewe and appearaunce of godlinesse'.⁵¹ Such points suggest a desire to ensure that people be driven by a genuine religious belief in such practices as hospitality rather than be motivated by the potential for worldly adulation from other people. This desire can be seen as a constant throughout the period, being apparent in other writings concerning hospitality from the 1590s. One of the main ones of these was the warning against the seeking of 'vain glory' and the avoidance of boasting or seeking of merit for good works such as hospitality as can be seen in the work of Henry Arthington in the late 1590s.⁵² Such thoughts are also echoed in William Vaughan's *The Golden-Groue* where he advocated that men give 'not for a brauery, and vainglory, to be prayed and extolled of the world, but rather of pure zeale & deuotion, not expecting any recompence againe'.⁵³ It is important to note that neither Arthington nor Vaughan were clergymen themselves, but their texts do show that such concerns as put forward by figures such as Bedel and Chaderton extended to the minds of laymen, that they were present throughout the period and indicate that the concerns of the clergy reflect something of a wider concern that existed amongst contemporaries.

Who it was that hospitality should primarily be provided by was another subject dealt with by certain clergymen preaching on the issue. Bedel and Smith both emphasised the role that all members of society had to play in providing hospitality. Bedel outlined that concerning the poor 'euery man according to his ability helpe them'.⁵⁴ Bedel further reinforced this describing 'that neyther the ritch in defiyng the poore say, away with this begger...neither on the other syde none say I am so poore I cannot help'.⁵⁵ Using very similar language Smith explained how concerning the poor, people should 'do asmuch as in vs lieth to prouide for them, euery one according to his abilitie'.⁵⁶ Matthew 10:42 was, as Felicity

⁵⁰ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, [sig. B4v](#).

⁵¹ Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon*, [sig. A8v](#).

⁵² Arthington, *Prouision for the Poore*, [sig. E2r](#).

⁵³ Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue*, [book 2, chapter 28, sig. Q2r, sig. Q2v](#).

⁵⁴ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, [sig. D1v](#).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, [p. 7](#).

Heal points out, often invoked and used to illustrate that a cup of water could be termed as hospitality and therefore that the host could come from any level of society.⁵⁷ For instance Henry Smith in particular began his sermon *The Poore Mans Teares Opened in a Sermon* by quoting 'he that shal giue to one of the least of these a cup of colde water in my name: hee shall not loose his reward'.⁵⁸ However alongside such calls for all to give what they were able, the wealthier members of society were identified as a particular group who could be expected to help the poor and provide hospitality. Thomas Drant characterised a large amount of riches as a burden, bringing disease during one's lifetime and trouble upon death, preaching that 'as the cloudes poure out their rayne let us bee free and dispence them'.⁵⁹

Who hospitality should be given to was a further key feature of the exhortations of the Elizabethan period. Some were keen to point out that it was not friends or equals that should be fed, but other targets such as strangers and the poor. For example, Henry Bedel told his listeners to 'feed not your equals, no the like his like, franke not yourselves to fat to feed the worms'.⁶⁰ William Vaughan commented that 'hospitality is the chiefest point of humanity, which an housholder can shew, not vnto his friends, but also vnto straungers & wayfaring men'.⁶¹ Luke 14:13 and 14 also featured in the *Three Sermons* of 1596, emphasising the needs of the poor, lame and blind.⁶² Throughout his sermons, Henry Smith made similar arguments. Smith warned 'doe not continually feede your equals for that is offensiue'.⁶³ Using the example of Abraham who had received angels in the likeness of men, Smith also advocated that people be particularly mindful to entertain strangers. In developing this point Smith reminded his listeners that Christ himself 'comes to vs in the likenes of a poore man, of a lame man, & of a blind man', reiterating that 'happy are they that feede, or cloath, or harbour, or visite him, when he commeth thus afflicted'.⁶⁴ In using the prospect of receiving Christ in the guise of various forms of stranger, Smith provided a compelling reason and source of motivation for his listeners to carry out the provision of

⁵⁷ Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality', p. 69.

⁵⁸ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, [p. 1](#).

⁵⁹ Drant, *A fruitfull and necessary sermon*, [sig. E2v](#).

⁶⁰ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, [sig. C4v](#).

⁶¹ Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue*, [book 2, chapter 24, sig. P6r](#).

⁶² *Three Sermons or Homelies to Moooue Compassion towards the Poore*, [sig. D2r](#).

⁶³ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, [pp. 32-33](#).

⁶⁴ Smith, *Foure Sermons Preached by Master Henry Smith*, [sig. L1r](#).

hospitality. Such explanations of who should be in receipt of hospitality were useful in providing specific guidance to hosts and reminding the public who their duty was towards.

In addition to this, in discussions on who the recipients of hospitality in Elizabethan England should be, ideas about the suitability of these recipients in terms of their religion began to be put forward. As part of the revised view of hospitality being put forward, preachers and authors sought to exhort people to provide for fellow Protestants by emphasising the importance of the household of faith. For example in 1578 Chaderton preached that whilst good works were necessary for the relief of all, they should be directed towards the needs 'especially of those which are of the housholde of fayth'.⁶⁵ This view was based upon scriptural evidence in the form of Galatians 6:10 and the instruction to be especially good to those who were of the household of faith. It should be acknowledged that what constituted the household of faith could depend on the individual speaking or writing about it. As Patrick Collinson has observed, this could mean the ministry or 'the ordinary distinction between worthy and unworthy'.⁶⁶ In the case of puritans, arguments about the household of faith could also refer to those who were visibly godly.⁶⁷ That there was a concern to provide for those who held Protestant views can be seen in the work of certain authors who by the 1590s were making calls for guests to be questioned so as to ascertain the suitability of their religious beliefs before any hospitality was given. Writing in 1593 Philip Stubbes outlined his position that nobody should provide anyone with relief without exception and instead should use discretion in their giving.⁶⁸ The first thing that Stubbes advocated should be undertaken by hosts as part of the process of providing hospitality to guests was 'to conferre with them (before we geue them any thing) of the word of God, of religion, to the ende, wee may knowe, whether they bee true Christians indeede, or no'.⁶⁹ Along similar lines, although writing about alms giving rather than hospitality in particular, William Vaughan in 1600, argued that they should not be given by hosts without exception.⁷⁰ Instead he advocated 'that they argue with them touching their

⁶⁵ Chaderton, *An Excellent and Godly Sermon*, sig. C7r.

⁶⁶ Patrick Collinson, 'Puritanism and the Poor' in Rosemary Horrox and Sarah Rees Jones (eds), *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities, 1200-1630* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 246.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Stubbes, *A Motiue to Good Workes*, p. 135.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136.

⁷⁰ Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue*, book 2, chapter 28, sig. Q2r.

religion, before they give them any thing, to the end, they may understand, whether they be true Protestants, or forward Papists, or Atheists'.⁷¹ Such words demonstrate how these Protestant writers were keen for only those deemed to be suitable in a religious sense to be accepted as guests.

In an extension to the idea that those of the household of faith should be prioritised it was emphasised by some that Protestant exiles should be especially afforded hospitality. The requirement to provide for exiles was interpreted from Romans 12:13 with its instruction that Christians must distribute according to the needs of the Saints. As Felicity Heal has noted the way in which this text was employed represented 'a more specifically Protestant contribution to some amendment of the notion of hospitality'.⁷² Protestant preachers and authors took the text to mean that Protestants exiled to the continent should be provided for first in the context of hospitality.⁷³ It was this idea of providing hospitality to exiles which, as Felicity Heal notes, also proved attractive amongst the first generation of prominent Elizabethan Protestants who had spent time in exile themselves.⁷⁴ The correspondence of some prominent Protestant exiles with their former hosts on the continent demonstrates how many of those who had been exiled still held those who had given them hospitality in kind regard. Figures such as John Jewel, Laurence Humphrey, Thomas Lever and Edmund Grindal all made a point of thanking their hosts for the kindness and hospitality they had received in exile.⁷⁵ Writing to Henry Bullinger from Coventry in July 1560, Thomas Lever took it upon himself to thank the people of Zurich on behalf of all those who had resided there for 'much needed hospitality there afforded to us exiles for cause of Christ'.⁷⁶ Such words suggest that their reception of hospitality from places like Zurich, left a positive impression of the practice on the minds of those who had experienced it. One example of the importance of Protestant exiles being discussed by those seeking to give advice on hospitality can be seen in the preaching of one of the most high profile ecclesiastical figures to address the subject, the at one point Bishop of London and

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality', p. 84.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Hastings Robinson (ed.), *The Zurich Letters or the Correspondence of several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth: chiefly from the archives of Zurich*, second edition, The Parker Society (Cambridge, 1846), p. 41, 49, 115.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

Archbishop of York Edwin Sandys. In a sermon preached by him at Paul's Cross he stated that 'hospitality hath respect unto all men, but chiefly to strangers, namely such as are of the household of faith, and are driven out of their country for the profession of Christ's gospel'.⁷⁷ Robert Allen was another figure to later advocate the importance of the Saints in his writing and outlined how it was 'best of all doe they, which dipose and giue themselues to pursue hospitalitie, and to distribute to the Saints most readily'.⁷⁸ This shows how certain figures were keen to prioritise those who it was felt had made some personal sacrifice for the good of the Protestant faith.

In conclusion, exhortations to hospitality produced during the Elizabethan period put forward a revised view of hospitality influenced by religious change and Protestantism. Preachers and writers used scriptural evidence to demonstrate hospitality's credentials as part of God's word and how it was a fruit of the Protestant faith, and separate it from the Catholic doctrine of salvation through good works. Religious change also opened up the possibility for comparison between regimes, and it is clear that some preachers and writers were anxious about being seen in unfavourable terms compared to their Catholic predecessors on issues such as hospitality. This is not to say that these preachers and writers were saying that Catholics were superior in their hospitality, but that they were doing so with the wrong intentions. It is here where it is clear that Protestant preachers and authors sought to take ownership of hospitality, and exhort people to follow their revised view of hospitality backed up by scriptural evidence. This extended to ideas concerning the suitability of recipients of hospitality. Levels of dedication to the Protestant faith were used to determine who should take precedence in the provision of hospitality, suggesting a degree of selectiveness had begun to gain traction in the revised view of hospitality. Through this hospitality could be disassociated with Catholic doctrine and practice, and an attempt to implement their reshaped ideas of a Protestant based form of hospitality into English society could be made. Whilst exhortations aimed to put forward an ideal view of hospitality for a Protestant society, that those at the forefront of implementing religious change into Elizabethan England were able to reinforce these messages through their own

⁷⁷ Ayre (ed.), *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D. D., successively Bishop of Worcester and London, and Archbishop of York*, p. 400.

⁷⁸ Robert Allen, *A Treatise of Christian Beneficence* (London, 1600), [p. 40](#).

~~practice~~ practise of hospitality is up for debate. As such it is to the practice of hospitality amongst the Elizabethan clergy to which we now turn.

Hospitality in Practice

Whilst hospitality was enjoined of all of the Christian faith, it was recognized as a particular requirement of the clergy. Members of the clergy were expected to ~~practice practise~~ hospitality on an individual basis and act as good examples to others in doing so.¹ It was the Bishops who faced the most expectation to conduct themselves in a hospitable manner. As Felicity Heal points out this related to their position 'as the descendants of those who, in the early Church, were responsible for the care of the community'.² The requirement of the Bishops to be hospitable was recognized in the work of Protestant writers and preachers during Elizabeth I's reign. Thomas Becon writing in 1569 outlined the three areas of duty incumbent upon Bishops and Ministers. These included spreading the gospel to their flocks and following doctrine so they may teach by good example in their own lives.³ It was the third of these areas which related directly to hospitality, with Becon explaining how they were ~~'to relieue y^e [...] poore & nedie with such goods as they receaue of y^e [...] Church, either by maintaining hospitalitie, or els by some other godly meanes'~~ 'to relieue y^e poore & nedie with such goods as they receaue of y^e Church, either by maintaining hospitalitie, or els by some other godly meanes'.⁴ Scriptural precept outlining the role of the Bishop was also employed by Becon as further evidence to back up his point. Citing 1 Timothy 3:2-4, he affirmed that 'a Bishop must be a maintayner of hospitalitie'.⁵ It should be reiterated that these expectations were not solely confined to the Bishops but the clergy in a wider sense. As Heal explains, 'care of the poor, and material support of the community became part of the threefold sustenance that was expected of all those chosen to follow in the steps of the Apostles'.⁶ Meeting these expectations in practice involved the whole of the clergy assuming the role of host and providing for guests.

It is apparent that during the Elizabethan period some preachers harboured the suspicion that hospitality was not being properly ~~practiced practised~~ by their fellow clergy.

¹ Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), p. 223.

² Felicity Heal, 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33, 4 (1982), p. 545.

³ Thomas Becon, *The principles of Christian Religion necessary to be knowen of all the faythful: set forth to the great profite in trayning vp of all youth* (London, 1569), [sig. K3v](#), [sig. K4r](#).

⁴ *Ibid.*, [sig. K4r](#).

⁵ *Ibid.*, [sig. K6r](#).

⁶ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 223.

In 1574 Edward Hake criticised the self-interest of the clergy.⁷ Addressing pastors, preachers and pillars of the Church, he accused them of being more concerned with building up their own personal wealth rather than sustaining the Church. Referencing the neglect of hospitality Hake stated 'a great number of you...wyl counterfaitelye séeme to bée carefull in feeding of soules...and forget altogether the reléeuing of bodyes'.⁸ Hake also made the suggestion that some were providing small amounts of hospitality but with the aim of diverting attention away from their lack of diligence in other areas of their duty. He outlined how some were 'so vaigneglorious in a litle reléeuing of the bodyes of the needy, that they thinke the same they counterfeit hospitality to be a sufficient discharge of themselues, and defence of their flock'.⁹ This reinforces the importance that was attached to approaching the practice of hospitality with honest intentions. Towards the end of the Elizabethan period criticism of the clergy and their hospitality was still being put forward, as can be seen in a sermon preached by John Howson in 1597. The focus of his criticism was simony, described as 'the vtter vndooing of the state of the Clergy'.¹⁰ Howson claimed that 'this buying and selling in the Church of God, this *Simony*, doth remoue all hospitality, and all meanes of hospitality from the state of the Clergie'.¹¹ If a clergyman was engaged in the buying and selling of church offices they would have no settled household from which to provide for guests. The lack of hospitality was perceived as problem because in Howson's eyes it hindered the effectiveness of preaching as 'the word of instruction dooth not pearce the minde of the needie, vnlesse the hand of mercie doo further commend it vnto him'.¹² With the importance placed upon God's word within Protestant thought, such conduct could do nothing to further the faith's cause.

One can also see that high profile secular figures had reservations about the standard of hospitality kept by some members the clergy. Writing to Matthew Parker in

⁷ Edward Hake, *A touchestone for this time present expresly declaring such ruines, enormities, and abuses as trouble the Church of God and our Christian common wealth at this daye. VVherevnto is annexed a perfect rule to be obserued of all parents and scholemaisters, in the trayning vp of their schollers and children in learning* (London, 1574), [p. 12](#).

⁸ *Ibid.*, [pp. 12-13](#).

⁹ *Ibid.*, [p. 13](#).

¹⁰ John Howson, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 4 of December, 1597 wherein is discoursed that all buying and selling of spirituall promotion is vnlawfull / by Iohn Howson ...* (London, 1597), [p. 33](#).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, [p. 32](#).

¹² *Ibid.*

November 1569 the Lords of the Council outlined concerns over the standards being set by the Bishops. Their letter stated that 'we know that some of the bishops of the realm are to be more commended than some other for preaching, teaching, and visiting of their dioceses, yea and for good hospitality'.¹³ Whilst not as harsh in their criticisms of the clergy's approach to hospitality as Hake and Howson, this shows that there was a feeling that the level to which hospitality was being ~~practiced~~ practised amongst those in the highest ecclesiastical offices was suffering from a lack of consistency.

It is the notion of a lack of consistency which characterises the realities of how hospitality was actually ~~practiced~~ practised by the entirety of the clergy in Elizabethan England. There were various circumstances in which hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised by members of the clergy such as within their own peer group and within the parish. There are examples of good hospitable practice, with John Jewel in particular standing out as an example of someone dedicated to the provision of hospitality. Whilst preachers such as Howson and Hake may have been overzealous in their condemnation of the clergy's approach to hospitality, it is evident that there were instances of neglect. Visitation articles and injunctions show how issues such as non-residence were of concern to Bishops who were looking for hospitality to be properly carried out by those working throughout their dioceses. Although it must also be acknowledged that records such as those produced at visitation necessarily highlight negative cases, with good examples of hospitality often going unreported. Overall, it is clear that personal motivation played a significant part in the extent to which members of the clergy ~~practiced~~ practised hospitality and the form which this took.

One circumstance in which hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised by members of the clergy during the Elizabethan period was amongst their peers, including fellow members of the clergy. One instance of this can be seen in a set of statutes produced in 1562 for Salisbury Cathedral following a visitation by Bishop John Jewel. The basis for the giving of hospitality in this case was a long standing precedent. The 'statute concerning the Feasts

¹³ John Bruce and Thomas T. Perowne (eds), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D. D. Archbishop of Canterbury Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A.D. 1535, to his Death, A.D. 1575*, The Parker Society (Cambridge, 1853), p. 356.

provided by the Four Dignitaries', described how 'the Dean, Precentor, Chancellor and Treasurer...are bound in accordance with old custom, if they be at home, thrice a year on certain statutory days to give a repast, and have open house for all the Church's Ministers'.¹⁴ This suggests that in the case of Salisbury Cathedral and hospitality old Catholic customs were maintained in place. It is also apparent that in this case of clergy to clergy hospitality, there was a failure to fulfil the requirements. The statute described that those who were away or did not want to be present and incur the expense of providing hospitality on the three days outlined, left behind only six shillings to cover the costs of the reception of other ministers to this Cathedral, something described as an act of 'unfairness'.¹⁵ In order to remedy this the statute decreed that 'if any of those Dignitaries from this day shall by chance be absent from the College at the time at which this feast is to be prepared, he shall hire some other of the Canons-residentiary to perform service in God's house and make feast as usual in the house in place of him, and shall contribute towards his charges not less than forty shillings'.¹⁶ The putting in place of measures ensuring that visiting clergy members would be sufficiently provided for illustrates how there was a desire to ensure that a deficiency in hospitality would be rectified.

Whilst John Jewel may have been concerned with the lax nature of other members of the clergy's hospitality, as an individual he represents an example of a member of the clergy whose own personal hospitality was carried out to a high standard. Jewel also acts as another example of how the clergy gave hospitality to their peers, in this case towards his former friend from time spent in exile the Swiss protestant Herman Folkerzheimer. In a letter sent by Folkerzheimer in August 1562 to Josiah Simler, himself a friend of Jewel from their time spent together in Zurich,¹⁷ Folkerzheimer heaped praise upon the reception he received from Jewel during a visit to Salisbury.¹⁸ He describes the exceptionally warm welcome he received from Jewel and his impressive palace and elaborate gardens within

¹⁴ Christopher Wordsworth and Douglas Maclean (eds), *Statutes and Customs of the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Salisbury* (London, 1915), p. 407.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ John Craig, 'Jewel, John (1522–1571)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edition, Jan 2008 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14810>>, [Accessed 15 Oct 2014].

¹⁸ Hastings Robinson (ed.), *The Zurich Letters or the Correspondence of several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth: chiefly from the archives of Zurich*, second edition, The Parker Society (Cambridge, 1846), pp. 149-154.

which he entertained.¹⁹ Folkerzheimer was taken hunting by some of Jewel's attendants and also to see Stonehenge by Jewel himself.²⁰ The magnificent food provision was also hinted at, with Folkerzheimer writing 'how can I describe to you the abundance or magnificence of the silver plate?'²¹ Folkerzheimer viewed this provision by Jewel in a selfless light, describing how 'yet great as it is, it does not seem to afford much pleasure to its possessor, and appears to have been provided rather for his guests' sake than his own'.²² Letters written from Jewel to both Peter Martyr and Josiah Simler also in August 1562 suggest that such hospitality was in part motivated by an enjoyment gained from the keeping of the company of friends and reminiscing about the past. Writing to Simler, Jewel described the conversations he and Folkerzheimer had about topics such as Zurich and how 'I have now the entire benefit of those delightful conversations, which, to say the truth, I rather envied you the enjoyment of'.²³ He similarly told Martyr 'as often as we talk together about yourself, and Bullinger, your wife, your whole family, and all Zurich, how sweetly and with what pleasure do we converse!'.²⁴ Such statements demonstrate how hospitality could be a mutually beneficial act. This also ties into the arguments of Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos and the role that human exchange had to play in informal support such as hospitality, with the host and the guest transferring help between one another.²⁵ In this example, Folkerzheimer enjoyed the reception he received from Jewel and in return Jewel was able to enjoy the company and conversation of his friend whilst also demonstrating his credentials as an excellent host.

The evidence of visitation articles and injunctions from the Elizabethan period also provide insight into how hospitality was being ~~practiced~~ practised in the parishes, highlighting the concerns amongst those at the highest level of the church hierarchy regarding the standards which the parish clergy were setting as regards hospitality. Where hospitality was enquired about it was most often done so within the context of non-residence, and Bishops often wanted to know what provision was being made for the poor

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 150-153.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

²⁵ Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, 'Gifts and Favours: Informal Support in Early Modern England', *Journal of Modern History*, 72, 2 (2000), p. 297.

by the parish clergy in the event of their absence. Archbishop Matthew Parker in his articles for the Province of Canterbury in 1560, although not mentioning hospitality directly, did enquire as to 'whether your parsons and vicars be resident continually upon their benefices', and also 'relieve the poor charitably to their ability'.²⁶ In 1575, Parker's articles for Winchester diocese did explicitly ask 'whether they keep competent hospitality according to their living, and if they be not resident whether they bestow the fortieth part of their living yearly amongst the poor, if their living be above twenty pounds a year'.²⁷ Bishop John Parkhurst in articles to be inquired of in his diocese of Norwich in 1569, similarly wanted to know if their vicar or parson kept residence and hospitality and how many other benefices they had.²⁸ Continuing to be aware of the threat that non-residence posed to the practice of hospitality amongst the parish clergy, Parkhurst also enquired as to 'whether ye know any parson or vicar that sell their benefice to mere laymen, absenting themselves from the same, to the...decay of hospitality'.²⁹

Edwin Sandys' articles for Worcester diocese in 1569 included an enquiry into the standards of the local ministers including whether they 'diligently waiteth upon his office and keep hospitality'.³⁰ In 1571, this time in articles for London diocese, the issue of non-residence cropped again with Sandys' wanting to know if ministers continually resided upon their benefices and kept hospitality.³¹ In the event of a minister's non-residence it was enquired as to what measures were put in place to ensure continued good service and care of the parish poor. The articles asked 'whether, being not resident, they leave their cures to an unlearned or lewd person or do not distribute yearly among their poor parishioners the fortieth part of the fruits of their benefices, the same being of the yearly value of twenty pounds or above'.³² This indicates that Sandys was concerned that the right type of people be in place to serve the parishes, reflecting his concerns shown in exhortations to provide hospitality for the right type of people, namely former exiles. Similarly, Edmund Grindal in both York Province in 1571 and Canterbury Province in 1576 asked about the residency of

²⁶ W. H. Frere and W. M. Kennedy (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, Vol. III (London, 1910), p. 82.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 378-379.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 309.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 309-310.

their ministers and whether hospitality was kept.³³ If residency was not kept, Grindal also wanted to know what they did in order to provide for and relieve the poor in their parish.³⁴ Other Bishops to enquire into the keeping of hospitality within their dioceses included Bishop Freke in Rochester in 1572-74 who asked 'what hospitality he keepeth according to the portion or ability of his living'.³⁵ Bishop Cooper in Lincoln, although not specifically mentioning hospitality, shared the same concern as other Bishops for the relief of the poor in the event of non-residence by the minister in asking 'whether parsons or vicars not resident give the forty part of their benefice (being above twenty pounds by year) to the relief of the poor or no'.³⁶ Overall, the evidence of visitation articles and injunctions infer that there was a suspicion amongst Elizabethan Bishops that not all of the parish clergy were providing hospitality within their parishes, with non-residence viewed as the main barrier to this. The repeated need to enquire about this by various Bishops based in different areas suggests that such a problem may well have existed throughout England, although the fact that such sources were designed to root out problems must also be acknowledged and the extent to which hospitality may have been neglected not overstated.

It is also clear that the Elizabethan clergy faced significant challenges to their ability to provide hospitality, one of these being financial constraints. Preachers made complaints to the effect that the clergy lacked the necessary means with which they could live up to the standards of hospitality expected of them. Henry Smith preached upon the lack of resources available to the clergy in making reference to the Levites and the cities of refuge, arguing that 'the true Ministers of our dayes haue no cities of refuge for others, for they haue none for themselues: they haue not where with to relieue the wants of others, for they haue not to relieue their owne'.³⁷ Thomas White preaching at Paul's Cross in 1589 focused upon the Bishops. He acknowledged the requirement of the Bishops to be providers of hospitality but also alluded to the difficulties of realising this requirement, stating his belief that they must

³³ Frere and Kennedy (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, Vol. III, p. 262; William Nicholson (ed.), *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D. D. successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, The Parker Society (1843), pp. 165-166.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Frere and Kennedy (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, Vol. III, p. 340.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

³⁷ Henry Smith, *Four sermons preached by Master Henry Smith. And published by a more perfect copie then heretofore* (London, 1599), [sig. E3r](#).

have the means to be able to provide this support. He said 'it is true that a *Bishop* should be giuen to *Hospitality*...and I thinke he must haue wherewithal too'.³⁸ William Harrison in his *A Description of England* also outlined the financial problems faced by the Bishops, including 'the curtailing of their livings, or excessive prices whereunto things are grown'.³⁹

James Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, in commenting upon the lack of resources available to the Bishops wrote 'if ye demand, why some bishops have so little lands, few houses and parks, the reasons also be sundry: but surely, few or none have so much as to keep them out of debt, or to maintain that hospitality which is looked for at their hands'.⁴⁰ Carrying on from his criticism of the way in which Catholics had ~~practiced~~ practised hospitality, Pilkington laid the bulk of the blame at the feet of their Catholic predecessors, who upon realising they faced being replaced by those of the gospel gave away their assets to figures including 'women, children, horsekeepers'.⁴¹ Pilkington asked those who unfavourably compared the Protestants housekeeping with that of their Catholic forbears to consider 'how barely they came to their livings...what charges they bear for first-fruits, subsidies and tenths...how they lack all household stuff and furniture at their entering; so that for three years' space they be not able to live out of debt, and get them necessaries'.⁴² All of these observations suggest a frustration at the financial barriers that were perceived to be standing in the way of the ability of the clergy, and especially the Bishops, to fulfil their duties and provide hospitality to the standards they would wish.

Felicity Heal has discussed the economic problems facing the clergy, arguing that 'the greatest significance of financial problems was that they distracted clergy, at all levels of the churches, from their primary spiritual duties'.⁴³ In the case of the Bishops, the 1559 Act of Exchange allowed the crown to take episcopal lands into its own hands and lease episcopal property back to itself on a long term basis, thus depriving the Bishops of valuable

³⁸ Thomas White, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 17. of Nouember An. 1589* (London, 1589), [p. 37](#).

³⁹ Lothrop Withington (ed.), *Elizabethan England: From "A Description of England," by William Harrison (In "Holinshed's Chronicles")*, (London, 1890), p. 79.

⁴⁰ James Scholefield (ed.), *The Works of James Pilkington, B. D., Lord Bishop of Durham*, The Parker Society (1842), p. 594.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2003), p. 411.

assets.⁴⁴ As Heal explains ‘thereafter the story of episcopal possessions was one of constant struggle to protect them against the predatory interests of courtiers and members of the elite who turned to the crown for material rewards’.⁴⁵ Taxation and the requirement to collect taxes in their own dioceses was another source of financial pain for the Elizabethan Bishops. That this resulted in debts is pointed out, although that some coped with this better than others is also noted by Heal.⁴⁶

That certain Bishops were anxious about issues such as the Act of Exchange, taxation and payments and increasing debts, and that this was impacting upon their ability to provide hospitality is apparent. One figure to display such anxieties was Matthew Parker. In a letter to Sir Nicholas Bacon outlining his reluctance to being appointed as Archbishop of Canterbury, Parker discussed his inability to furnish his household having only ‘thirty pounds in my purse, not ten shillings more, whereof I have wasted a good part’.⁴⁷ Another letter sent from Parker and four other Bishops elect to Queen Elizabeth in October 1559, concerning the 1559 Act of Exchange and seeking a deal to do with matters concerning this act, also set out a list of petitions to the Queen should the deal not be acceptable. The Queen was asked to consider the substantial expenses the Bishops had to bear, and therefore ‘to suffer us to enjoy the half-year’s rent last past at Michaelmas, and that our first-fruits may be abated and distributed into more years, for the better maintenance of hospitality’.⁴⁸ Other Bishops also showed similar concerns. The Bishop of Winchester in May 1595 outlined his financial struggles including the various payments he was required to make, the fact that his revenues came in at £180 less than the valuation he was given, and the need to spend £300 a year on repairs.⁴⁹ The effect of this was ‘I have little left for hospitality, finding of servants, furniture, the solemnities of St. George’s day’.⁵⁰ The fact that such complaints were still being made by 1595 suggests that the Bishops were expected to

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 405.

⁴⁷ Bruce and Perowne (eds), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 58.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁴⁹ M. A. E. Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth 1595-1596* (London, 1867), Vol. CCLII, p. 47.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

manage the situation themselves. As Heal states, 'while the queen lived there was little relief, despite the conspicuous favour she could on occasion display to individuals'.⁵¹

That members of the clergy other than the Bishops also faced financial constraints to their ability to provide hospitality can be seen. In a letter to William Cecil dated between 1563 and 1564, Matthew Parker displayed concern that the rest of the clergy would struggle to measure up to public expectations of hospitality and feel pressure to spend beyond their means. He outlined his feelings in stating 'honest ministers need not to be abashed within themselves to expend no more than they may, yet the world looketh for port agreeable'.⁵² As Heal points out 'litigation about tithe; tensions with patrons, or with farmers and lessees; the need to pursue other sources of profit: all these could burden a cleric'.⁵³ Some areas of the church struggled to attract clerics due to poor levels of pay, and the clergy working in urban areas were particularly likely to struggle due to their reliance on personal tithes and offerings.⁵⁴ As explained by Heal, cities like York saw the clergy regularly turn to pluralism and non-residence in order to be able to cope financially.⁵⁵ When facing such issues regarding finance, the task of placating a public looking for 'port agreeable' would be fraught with difficulties.

Despite this it must be acknowledged that not all members of the clergy were affected by financial struggles. The aforementioned Bishop of Salisbury John Jewel was able to leave behind £600 upon his death such was his conscientious approach to household management.⁵⁶ Jewel's monetary ability, alongside his desire, to provide hospitality can also be seen in his being able to send money to others to help them in the provision of hospitality. In August 1562 he sent ten French crowns to Peter Martyr 'which I desire may be expended, at the discretion of yourself and Bullinger, upon a public supper in your common-hall, to which may be invited, as usual, the ministers of the churches, and young students, and any others who you may think fit'.⁵⁷ Others appear to have been commended

⁵¹ Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, p. 404.

⁵² Bruce and Perowne (eds), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 208.

⁵³ Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, p. 411.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 406-407.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

⁵⁶ Craig, 'Jewel, John (1522-1571)'.

⁵⁷ Robinson (ed.), *The Zurich Letters*, pp. 157-159.

for their hospitality in spite of their lowly revenues. In a letter dated 1563 from Thomas Becon to the Bishop of Norwich John Parkhurst, Becon showed his admiration for Parkhurst's 'such and so notable' hospitality in spite of his yearly revenue being 'much inferioure to others'.⁵⁸ It was Parkhurst's reception of the poor, or 'poore Christ in his members' which received praise. Rather than feeding the poor at the gates with scraps of food described as 'many times to vile for dogges', they were 'brought into your house, set at the table, hauing ministred vnto him, all goode thinges necessary for the reliefe of his carefull state'.⁵⁹

In the case of the parish clergy during the Elizabethan period, the fact that they faced financial struggles was also not necessarily anything new. As Heal points out the pre-Reformation parish clergy had very limited resources and lacked the required number of assistants needed in order to provide good hospitality.⁶⁰ The financial situation of the parish clergy in Elizabethan England was also not universally negative. According to Heal taxation did not become an acute problem until the 1590s with the war crisis, and inflation made the livings of some increase in value across the period.⁶¹ William Harrison claimed that the Elizabethan clergy saw 'the poor oftener fed generally than heretofore they have been', compared to the pre-Reformation where financial constrains meant 'only a few bishops and double or treble beneficed men did make good cheer at Christmas only'.⁶² Although one may expect a figure such as Harrison to make an unfavourable assessment of Catholic hospitality. However, overall it is clear that there were members of the Elizabethan clergy at all levels facing financial challenges to their ability to provide hospitality, thus reinforcing how circumstances of the individual could affect hospitality as well as the individual's own personal motivation for providing.

⁵⁸ Thomas Becon, *The reliques of Rome contayning all such matters of religion, as haue intimes past bene brought into the Church by the Pope and his adherentes: faithfully gathered out of the moste faithful writers of chronicles and histories, and nowe newly both diligently corrected & greatly augmented, to the singular profit of the readers* (London, 1563), sig. B2v, sig. B3r.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. B3r.

⁶⁰ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 252.

⁶¹ Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, p. 406.

⁶² Withington (ed.), *Elizabethan England*, p. 79.

Another issue which impacted the practice of hospitality amongst the clergy was clerical marriage. One way in which permission for the clergy to marry in Elizabethan England affected hospitality was to add provision for the family to the duties of the clergy. As Heal explains 'provision for the family now became a matter of necessity, and the natural predilection of prelates for their children made them reluctant to invest their accumulated wealth in traditional ways'.⁶³ The notion of greed amongst the clergy is also relevant here, associated with the clergy wanting to preserve their resources for their own families. As further described by Heal 'in the case of the bishops...avarice was often seen as the major explanation for a decline in open entertainment, and avarice was regularly connected to the desire of prelates to protect their families'.⁶⁴ It is apparent that at an official level the wives and children of the clergy were seen as an obstacle to the practice of hospitality amongst the clergy, in terms of the effect they had on clergy's willingness to spend. William Cecil bemoaned the tendency of the clergy to store up money with their families in mind commenting that 'the bishops and clergy that shuld by ther teaching and devotion and specialye by hospittalyte and releyvng of the poore men wyn credit amyngst the people, ar rather despised than reverenced and beloved'.⁶⁵ In 1575 an 'Act concerning good hospitality among the clergy' also stated that 'ample revenues were granted the clergy that they might show hospitality, but many, being now married, neglect it, keep fewer servants, and reserve their incomes for their children'.⁶⁶

However, it must be acknowledged that it is certainly not the case that clerical marriage was universally thought of as having a negative effect on the practice of hospitality amongst the clergy. Indeed some saw the clergy's wives as a positive benefit to hospitality. William Harrison, in reference to the clergy, claimed that 'touching hospitality, there was never any greater used in England, sith by reason that marriage is permitted to him that will choose that kind of life'.⁶⁷ According to Harrison within the households of those clergy who had their wives living with them 'their meat and drink is more orderly and frugally dressed,

⁶³ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 257.

⁶⁴ Heal, 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', p. 548.

⁶⁵ Quoted in Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 257.

⁶⁶ M. A. E. Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566-1579* (London, 1871), Vol. XXIV, p. 478.

⁶⁷ Withington (ed.), *Elizabethan England*, p. 79.

their furniture of household more convenient and better looked unto'.⁶⁸ Matthew Parker in writing upon the subject of priest's marriages, also made the connection between families of the clergy, the keeping of residence and a good standard of hospitality. He asked 'when was hospitalitie and residentie better kept, then when the Pastor had his familie in a place certain to moue hym homeward?'⁶⁹ Eric Josef Carlson has argued that the clergy themselves approached the issue of clerical marriage with a lack of enthusiasm, and that they 'bear far more responsibility for the grudging and glacially slow recession of the ideal of a celibate clergy in the English church than has previously been acknowledged'.⁷⁰ This has been disputed by Nancy Basler Bjorklund, who has seen the example of Matthew Parker as something which 'undercuts the generalization that sixteenth-century English clergymen failed to received marriage enthusiastically'.⁷¹ The words of Parker in particular, in highlighting the benefits that came with having a wife, certainly back up Bjorklund's point and suggest that married members of the clergy saw having a wife as improving their own standards of hospitality.

Some did, therefore, see positives to clerical marriage as opposed to seeing the resultant families as diverting resources away from hospitality. However, for those who did see clerical marriage as problematic for hospitality the negative perception they held led to instances of interference with the living arrangements of some of those who had wives, which in itself compromised the ability of the clergy to provide hospitality. Bishop Cox of Ely wrote to Mathew Parker in August 1561 on the subject of an edict from the Queen ordering 'priests' wives not to remain in colleges or cathedral churches'.⁷² Cox sympathised with the need for quietness where students resided, but in the case of cathedrals such orders by the Queen requiring wives and families to move out were expected to lead to increased levels of

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ Matthew Parker, *A defence of priestes mariages stablysshed by the imperiall lawes of the realme of Englande, agaynst a ciuilian, namyng hym selfe Thomas Martin doctour of the ciuile lawes, goyng about to disproue the saide mariages,lawfull by the eternall worde of God, [and] by the hygh court of parliament, only forbydden by forayne lawes and canons of the Pope, coloured with the visour of the Churche. Whiche lawes [and] canons, were extynguyshed by the sayde parliament ...* (London, 1567), [p. 30](#).

⁷⁰ Eric Josef Carlson, 'Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 31, 1 (1992), p. 2.

⁷¹ Nancy Basler Bjorklund, "'A Godly Wyfe Is an Helper": Matthew Parker and the Defense of Clerical Marriage', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 34, 2 (2003), p. 348.

⁷² Bruce and Perowne (eds), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 151.

non-residence as clergy members moved with their families. Describing the situation in Ely church, Cox outlined how it was home to one prebendary who continually lived in Ely church along with his family. Suggesting that any attempts to turn out such families would leave no one in place to keep up hospitality, Cox stated 'turn him out, doves and owls may dwell there for any continual housekeeping'.⁷³ Parker himself in another letter addressed to William Cecil questioned Elizabeth I's attitude towards marriage amongst the clergy,⁷⁴ and saw the effect of excluding the clergy's wives and families as being 'to drive out hospitality in cathedral churches'.⁷⁵ Parker saw it as unfair that lay people working in cathedrals could keep their families residing with them, but the clergy could not despite them being the ones to keep hospitality. He stated 'horsekeepers' wives, porters', pantlers', and butlers' wives, may have their cradles going, and honest learned men expelled with open note, who only keep the hospitality'.⁷⁶ Overall, one can see how the issue of marriage amongst the clergy acted as another circumstance which for some clergy members affected their ability to provide hospitality at points of the Elizabethan period, in terms of financing their own families but also due to negative reactions to clerical marriage and resultant orders passed down.

In conclusion, it is apparent that in their practice practise of hospitality the clergy did not totally measure up to the expectations placed upon them. Instead the realities of life in Elizabethan England and the state of the Elizabethan church affected some of the clergy's ability to practice practise hospitality at all, let alone to measure up to any ideal standard. There were various scenarios in which hospitality did take place, with figures such as John Jewel standing out as a particularly positive example of someone who took the expectation of being hospitable seriously. However, whilst many did make efforts to practice practise hospitality it is clear that figures such as Jewel were not necessarily the norm. Instead the extent to which hospitality was practiced practised was largely dependent on how interested the individual clergy member was in hospitality and the circumstances which they found themselves in. The most significant of these circumstances were the financial constraints faced by the Elizabethan clergy which had a strong impact on their ability to

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-158.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

provide hospitality, leaving many of them with a lack of necessary resources. Whilst many clergy members in the position of host seemingly struggled with their own poverty, how the issue of the poverty levels of guests should be tackled was a matter which received great amounts of attention in sermons and prescriptive literature on hospitality. It is this matter which we now focus upon.

Poverty and Hospitality

Another key feature of the sermons and prescriptive literature produced about hospitality during the Elizabethan period was the attention paid to the issue of how the poor should be provided with hospitality. This is a subject worthy of attention in its own right because it yields evidence of the move towards the favouring of a selective form of hospitality by the end of Elizabeth I's reign. Where arguments about the household of faith advocated that guests be provided for on the basis of their commitment to the Protestant faith, arguments on poverty advocated that it was the deserving poor who should be taken in and given hospitality. Religious change was again an important factor in this changing position on the poor. The rejection of the idea of salvation being achieved through good works meant that the source of motivation for individuals to provide charity in an indiscriminate manner in pursuit of this salvation was undermined. That this led to a quick shift towards the favouring of a more selective way of providing hospitality to the poor is by no means the case. In the early 1570s preachers Henry Bedel and Thomas Drant urged people to provide for the poor, largely without discrimination. As the Elizabethan period went on the idea that hosts should provide to those deemed as the deserving poor began to come through in the work of Protestant preachers and writers such as Henry Smith and Philip Stubbes. That these ideas of selectivity were beginning to gain traction also reflects the context of how poverty was approached in Elizabethan England, which included the development of notions of the deserving and undeserving poor, increased hostility towards vagabonds in rogue literature and poor law legislation culminating in the Poor Law of 1601.

It is during the mid to late 1590s where a surge in interest in the issue of poverty and hospitality can be detected. A number sermons and literature that addressed the subject were published around the time, coinciding with a period of serious economic hardship and harvest failures. One can see that at this point preachers and writers were strongly advocating that when faced with a poor person in need of assistance hosts make it a priority to give to the deserving, suggesting that the need to give to those of the correct status was afforded more importance than the immediate needs of the poor. That this should be the case indicates that selectiveness had become the dominant mode of thinking about hospitality by this point. It is also vital to acknowledge the fact that the precise definition of

who it was that constituted the deserving poor depended on the individual doing the categorizing. The personal preferences of preachers and writers had a role to play in the exact shaping of the arguments put forward. As such the precise message gained by Elizabethans on how they should approach the issue of providing hospitality to the poor depended on who they read or listened to and when they were receiving this message. Overall, it is clear that hospitality and poverty acts as a further indication of how hospitality can be thought about in selective terms, where hosts were expected to favour those that matched the construct of the ideal guest.

The historiography of early modern poverty covers various themes such as vagrancy, the development of Poor Law legislation, changing attitudes to charity and the actual practice of different forms of charity both formal and informal. It is the extent to which long established informal forms of poor relief such as hospitality continued to be ~~practiced~~ practised versus the more formal systems of relief emerging in the sixteenth century which has received much attention from historians. Keith Thomas has argued that the development of the national Poor Law during the sixteenth century 'did undoubtedly sap the old tradition of mutual charity', and made the householder's moral duties vague.¹ Steve Hindle has also made reference to the way in which the formalisation of poor relief led to a belief amongst the propertied that they had been relieved from their duty to provide hospitality to the poor.² Paul Slack has argued that there was no quick rejection of private forms of charity in favour of public methods of providing welfare, and instead acknowledges the continuities in charitable practice across the early modern period.³ However, Slack has also pointed out that whilst change was gradual, it was a reality that some older forms of charity experienced decline.⁴ That there was a change in how the concept of charity was understood is also recognized, with Slack describing how private charity in particular 'became exclusive, calculating and deliberate'.⁵ Felicity Heal has also argued in favour of a change in how charitable giving was conceived during the early modern period. She states

¹ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1991; first edition 1971), p. 672.

² Steve Hindle, 'Exhortation and Entitlement: Negotiating Inequality in English Rural Communities, 1550-1650', in M. J. Braddick and J. Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 122.

³ Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1988), p. 168.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

that 'the experience of economic and demographic crisis in the sixteenth century led to a reconceptualization of forms of beneficence, both of the worthiness of the recipient and of the best apportionment of resources'.⁶ In practice Heal also explains how household relief such as hospitality was supplanted by organized poor relief systems as the dominant method of helping the poor.⁷ The overall trend in much of the historiography points towards a decline in hospitality as more formal systems of poor relief became more commonplace. More recently, important work on the role that human exchange played in the practice of informal types of charity such as hospitality and how this sustained the continuation of such informal charity throughout the entire early modern period has also been undertaken by Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos.⁸ During the Elizabethan period, it can be argued that hospitality continued to be thought of as a useful means of providing poor relief, particularly during times of crisis such as the 1590s. However it is also clear that, in line with some elements of the arguments of Slack and Heal, hospitality was subject to changing attitudes. Hospitality acts as an example of an informal form of charity which came to be thought of through the prism of discriminatory thinking on the poor, being modified so as to be selective in nature rather than being quickly replaced by formal systems of poor relief.

The theme of poverty in relation to hospitality is one that can be seen in sermons delivered in the earlier decades of Elizabeth's reign, or more precisely the early 1570s. Here the poor were identified as an important focus of hospitality, and as a group who should be provided for without discrimination. The sermons examined here were delivered in the capital where poverty was a concern given the rapidly growing population. Henry Bedel's *A Sermon Exhorting to Pitie the Poore* was delivered in November 1571 at Christ's Church in London. This made repeated reference to the hospitality which he felt should be afforded to the poor. The sermon also lamented that despite the fact that the duty to provide for the poor was outlined in scripture, it was often neglected, especially by the rich.⁹ In 1572 and along similar lines Thomas Drant urged his listeners in a sermon given at St. Mary's Spital to

⁶ Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), p. 392.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 393.

⁸ Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, 'Gifts and Favours: Informal Support in Early Modern England', *Journal of Modern History*, 72, 2 (2000), p. 336.

⁹ Henry Bedel, *A Sermon Exhorting to Pitie the Poore* (London, 1572), [sig. C1v](#).

'be plentyfull unto the poore'.¹⁰ Notions of the importance of the commonwealth in relation to helping the poor and the role to be played by particular groups within this other than just a general address to 'the rich' are also apparent with Bedel's comment to 'let the artificer syt fast by his calling, then shall hee profit the common wealth by his trauel, and he shall haue some what to spare to helpe the poore'.¹¹ It is important to note that the term 'commonwealth' or 'commonweal' was not static in meaning but had undergone shifts in meaning by this point in time. As Phil Withington has explained it was a term which could invoke various meanings, including 'the common good and communal resources...types of polity and their constitutions...a person's country and nation...even a republican 'free state''.¹² Nonetheless Bedel's words suggest that the poor were viewed as one distinct group by certain figures, with their own place in the described commonwealth, and to be provided with hospitality in their totality.

It was during the final decade of the Elizabethan period, and particularly during the mid 1590s onwards, where an increase in volume in the production of sermons and literature discussing the poor and hospitality occurred. Figures including Henry Arthington and William Vaughan aimed to set out how hosts should approach the task of providing the poor with hospitality. That it should be this decade in particular which experienced an increase in interest in the subject of the poor and hospitality can be explained by the experience of a particularly harsh dearth and harvest failure. Paul Slack has described how 'it is impossible to ignore the hardship caused by dearth and scarcity all over the country, especially when it was followed by disease as in the...1590s'.¹³ Slack comments how contemporaries perceived increases in vagrancy, petty theft and the number of beggars which took to the street in a state of hunger.¹⁴ J. A. Sharpe has also highlighted the problems which arose from harvest failure stating that 'the late 1590s also experienced a serious run of bad harvests which caused severe problems at the base of society: vagrancy, poverty, popular unrest and rising crime rates'.¹⁵ It was these circumstances which inspired

¹⁰ Thomas Drant, *A fruitfull and necessary sermon, specially concerning almes geuing* (1572), sig. E4r.

¹¹ Bedel, *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore*, sig. C4r.

¹² Phil Withington, *Society in Early Modern England: The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 152.

¹³ Paul Slack, 'Dearth and Social Policy in Early Modern England', *Social History of Medicine*, 5 (1992), p. 9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ J. A. Sharpe, *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760*, second edition (London, 1997), p. 14.

a government response in the form of the 1596 campaign for general hospitality, which in turn opened up new interest in hospitality and influenced others such as Arthington and Vaughan to contribute to the discussion on the subject.¹⁶ This all suggests that it was during times of serious hardship, that the impulse to help the poor via hospitality and too encourage others to do the same through sermons and prescriptive literature most came to the fore.

This leads us onto the ways in which Elizabethan society approached the issue of the poor. It was during this period that there was an increasing concern to divide the poor into categories according to the circumstances of their poverty. For instance William Harrison in his *Description of England* set out how 'the poor is commonly divided into three sorts, so that some are poor by impotence...the second are poor by casualty...the third consisteth of thriftless poor'.¹⁷ Increased hostility towards vagabonds was also apparent. Rogue literature such as John Awdely's *The fraternitie of vacabondes* and Thomas Harman's *A caveat for commen cursetors vulgarely called vagabones* provided a sensationalised account of the activities of vagabonds and the ways in which they organized themselves.¹⁸ Such literature sought to play upon the anxieties felt about the perceived threat that vagabonds posed to society. A series of pieces of poor law legislation culminating in the Poor Law of 1601 also reinforced the idea of dividing the poor into categories, and labelling them as either deserving or undeserving. As Sharpe explains, this was based upon the idea of the poor being divided into three groups.¹⁹ Reflecting the explanation of William Harrison, these were the impotent poor who were thought as the most deserving, those who were struggling to find work or could not fully support themselves through their own wages and whose need was recognised, and those who refused to work despite being able and represented the undeserving.²⁰ Such points are worthy of note because of how they show that approaches to relieving the poor were becoming more selective, something which had

¹⁶ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 129.

¹⁷ Lothrop Withington (ed.), *Elizabethan England: From "A Description of England," by William Harrison (In "Holinshed's Chronicles")*, (London, 1890), p. 122.

¹⁸ John Awdely, *The fraternitie of vacabondes* (London, 1565); Thomas Harman, *A caveat for commen cursetors vulgarely called vagabones* (London, 1567).

¹⁹ Sharpe, *Early Modern England: A Social History*, p. 225.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

implications for how preachers and writers expressed their thoughts on the issue of poverty and hospitality by the mid 1590s dearth.

That a selective approach to poor relief was beginning to influence those writing and preaching on the subject of poverty and hospitality can be seen work produced prior to the dearth of the mid 1590s. Henry Smith's sermon *The Poore Mans Teares* contains a strong message of duty towards the poor, making several calls for his listeners to provide them with hospitality and help.²¹ Smith, the Church of England clergyman famed for his preaching abilities and nicknamed Silver-Tongued Smith before his death in 1591, was described by contemporaries as being 'moderate and sober in opinions and affections'.²² However, in amongst his calls to provide for the poor was a nod towards the idea of certain types of people being undeserving of help. Smith was aware of the reservations that some held about their guests, mainly appertaining to their character and conduct. He described how 'o saith some I suspect he is an idle person, dishonest, or perhaps an vnthrift and therefore refuseth to giue anie reliefe at all'.²³ Smith's reaction to such refusals to give relief to those perceived as idle and unthrift was to state that 'to giue vnto suche as wee knowe of lewd behaiour, thereby to continue them in their wickednesse, were verie offensiue'.²⁴ By marking out those who were perceived to be 'lewd' as a group to be cautious about and painting providing help to such people in a negative light, Smith's advice alluded to a stance which was selective in nature, where only those deserving of help should be provided for.

Such sentiments can be seen as having gained in strength just prior to the period of dearth in 1596-8, with Philip Stubbes' instructions in his *A Motiue to Good Workes* advising hosts on what they should do before they provided any hospitality. Stubbes, a pamphleteer with a record of defending the established church and a disapproval of separatists, collected the material for this work during a three month tour of England.²⁵ Published in 1593, this

²¹ Henry Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares Opened in a Sermon* (London, 1592), pp. 6-7.

²² Gary W. Jenkins, 'Smith, Henry (c.1560–1591)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25811>>, [Accessed 5 July 2015].

²³ Smith, *The Poore Mans Teares*, p.13.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Alexandra Walsham, 'Stubbes, Philip (b. c.1555, d. in or after 1610)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26737>>, [Accessed 3 July 2015].

was a work which made complaints about the lack of charity and hospitality compared to the past. Despite this, Stubbes made clear that he was 'not of that foolish pity, that I would haue a man to geue to euery one without exception'.²⁶ Instead discretion was to be used and various circumstances were to be observed. One of these was 'to consider whether they be old, blind, lame, or otherwise diseased and infirmed'.²⁷ Such people were to be given hospitality, being identified as deserving. Another point to be discerned was the cause of the poverty suffered by the guest, and whether this be the result of 'the hande of God, as by fire, shipwracke, death of cattel, or anie other the like iudgment and visitation of God'.²⁸ Stubbes also addressed the issue of those who should be excluded from receiving hospitality. He described how 'those that be...able to worke, and yet will not, I am not to giue any thing, for in releeuing of such, besides that, I maintain them in their idleness still, I also offend both God and brethren'.²⁹ Drawing upon 2 Thessalonians 3:10, Stubbes summed up his position on such people by stating 'they who will not labour, should not eate'.³⁰ By outlining the actions which should be taken when faced with a prospective guest, hosts would be equipped to filter out those who were undeserving.

It is these same views which are expressed in the sermons and prescriptive literature produced in the wake of the dearth of the mid 1590s and subsequent government campaign for general hospitality. Whilst the increased activity and interest in addressing the subject of poverty and hospitality at this point during the reign suggests that a greater imperative to help the poor was felt at a time of hardship, the move towards discrimination in these texts also highlights the conflict between the immediate need to alleviate the effects of dearth and the influential ideas about the deserving and undeserving poor. Felicity Heal has argued that 'at the end of the century there are still echoes of this idea of catholicity in giving in the writings of Vaughan, Curteys...indeed, in the 1590s it enjoyed a revival under the pressure of economic crisis and government concern for the poor'.³¹ In using the term catholicity, Heal is referring to 'broad, and hence largely indiscriminate, Christian charity', linked to the seven works of mercy and with the household as the ideal location in which to provide such

²⁶ Philip Stubbes, *A Motiue to Good Workes* (London, 1593), [p. 135](#).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, [p. 136](#).

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, [pp. 136-137](#).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, [p. 137](#).

³¹ Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 127.

charity.³² However, rather than seeing calls to provide indiscriminate charity within these texts, instead one can see instances where discrimination was advocated towards guests. It is important to also note that the group who was emphasised as being most deserving could depend on the individual undertaking the categorizing. Preachers and authors had their own opinions on how the provision of hospitality to the poor should be conducted. Their own lived experience of contact with the poor could also affect where they drew the line as regards discrimination. By the mid 1590s, preachers and writers were balancing the impulse to encourage their listeners and readers to provide for the poor, the influence of ideas about the deserving poor and their own personal ideas and experiences within their work. The advice received by hosts on providing hospitality to the poor could depend on the sermon they heard or literature they read. When taken together the advice given out in sermons and prescriptive literature provided a set of varying messages, which hosts would have to work around if they were to follow all the advice given out. It is to these sermons and pieces of literature to which we now turn.

Concern to provide for the poor at the official level can be seen in the *Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poor and Needie* of 1596. These sermons were 'set fourth by Authoritie' and were to be read out by preachers as part of the government response to the dearth of the mid 1590s in the form of the campaign for 'general hospitality' of 1596. People were called on to give hospitality to those poor people physically unable to work including the maimed, the lame and the blind. However, it was those that 'cannot live by their labour' who were to be prioritised and were identified as those most in need.³³ The sermons outlined how although such people did put much effort into their trade or vocation 'by reason of the extremitie of the world, for that their rents are so great, the prices of necessaries so deare, and the hearts of men so hardened, they cannot liue by their labour...but suffer want and are poore'.³⁴ It was these kinds of poor people that listeners were instructed to 'call them first of all'.³⁵ The merit of helping such as could not get their living by their labour was emphasised by the casting of this as 'a double good

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poore and Needie in these times* (London, 1596), sig. E4r.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

worke'.³⁶ The reasoning given for this within these sermons was that such people were usually too ashamed to ask for charity despite often being more in need than other poor people, and therefore by providing them with hospitality one would be fulfilling their need and 'preuentest their bashfulness'.³⁷ This example shows how alongside calls to help the poor, were calls to prioritise certain sections of the poor who were deemed as being most deserving. These sermons also highlight how who was deemed as most deserving could vary. As Steve Hindle has pointed out in his article on the campaign for general hospitality, the argument put forward in the *Three Sermons* 'inverted the usual moral order of priority by subordinating the needs of the 'poore by casualtie' to those that cannot get their living by their labour''.³⁸ This reinforces the role of producer of the material in where priorities lie in terms of providing for the poor.

In addition to this, Richard Curteys' *The Care of a Christian Conscience* also represents further efforts at an official level to aid the poor at a time of dearth. This work was in the form of a set of ten sermons, with the fourth sermon being the one to have a specific focus upon the topic of hospitality. Curteys' sermon was preached directly in relation to the government's campaign for 'general hospitality', being one of only two surviving contemporary printed sermons along with the *Three Sermons* to have been used in such a capacity.³⁹ In the sermon, Curteys made a strong reminder to those listening of the scriptural basis for the requirement to provide hospitality, citing Matthew 25:35-36 and Christ's outlining of 'a catalogue of good workes...to feede the hungrie, to giue drinke to the thirstie, to cloth the naked...to entertaine straungers and waifaring men'.⁴⁰ This was allied with a critique of those who continued to fail in the provision of hospitality, and instead 'shut vp their gates, euen in this great time of scarcitie'.⁴¹ Curteys argued that many people were more preoccupied with pursuits such as spending their money on luxurious clothing, extensive house building projects and banqueting. Others took up residence in towns and cities where they would neglect housekeeping and avoid hospitality. Curteys' advice to such

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Steve Hindle, 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms: The Campaign for General Hospitality in Late Elizabethan England', *Past and Present*, 172 (2001), p. 55.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁴⁰ Richard Curteys, *The Care of a Christian Conscience* (London, 1600), [sig. F5v](#).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, [sig. F6r](#).

people was to 'bee more carefull in relieuing the poore distressed members of Iesus Christ, euery one, according to that portion which the Lord hath bestowed vpon you'.⁴² It is at this point where a difference in how the poor were thought about as a group in *The Care of a Christian Conscience* and in the *Three Sermons* can be discerned. The *Three Sermons* made a point of prioritising the needs of a particular section of the poor. In contrast by emphasising the need to relieve every one of Christ's poor members Curteys spoke in terms of the poor as one group to be provided for in their entirety. In terms of a religious basis for these arguments, that these two pieces of text differ suggests that a different interpretation of scripture such as Matthew 25:35-36 could be made, with who it was that qualified as the hungry or thirsty depending on how the author interpreted this and what point they wanted to make. This approach to viewing the poor is also in line with Heal's argument that the end of the sixteenth century saw the idea of catholicity in giving come through in the work of such writers as Curteys.

However, it must be taken into account that Curteys died in 1582,⁴³ meaning that the sermon must have originally been written some time before then, putting *The Care of a Christian Conscience* closer in terms of time to the work of preachers such as the aforementioned Bedel and Drant with their promotion of a type of hospitality that did not seek to categorise the poor and discriminate between groups. Curteys' sermon was not written in the same context as the *Three Sermons*, which whilst showing concern to provide for the poor in the wake of dearth also contains hallmarks of the influence ideas about the deserving and undeserving poor. The fact that Curteys' sermon contains useful and relevant messages for those looking to encourage help for the poor at a time of dearth goes some way to explaining why it would have been used as part of the 1596 campaign. For example, the sermon makes a robust case for providing hospitality for the poor and also makes direct reference to a 'want of foode' and the displeasure of God for reasons including 'our contempt of the holy religion...vncharitablenes'.⁴⁴ Given the stance taken by Curteys in seeing the poor as one group *The Care of a Christian Conscience* stands out as an exception

⁴² *Ibid.*, sig. F8r.

⁴³ Roger B. Manning, 'Curteys, Richard (1532?-1582)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edition, Jan 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6957>>, [Accessed 21 Sept 2015].

⁴⁴ Curteys, *The Care of a Christian Conscience*, sig. F6r, sig. F6v.

amongst literature advocating discrimination used in the wake of the mid 1590s dearth, and displays catholicity in giving because whilst it was employed during the late Elizabethan period it was not originally produced in the precise context of the late sixteenth century. The status of Curteys' *The Care of a Christian Conscience* as an exception also makes explicit the change in views of preachers and authors producing work in the 1590s, towards a more selective type of hospitality.

Other literature written in the wake of the mid 1590s dearth also sought to encourage hosts to provide for the poor. Although not used as part of the official direct response to the dearth themselves, these pieces of literature drew upon the revived interest in hospitality sparked by the 1596 campaign and added to the conversation about hospitality and the poor that was going on in the later 1590s. This concern for the poor can be seen in Henry Arthington's *Prouision for the Poore* dated 1597, which touched upon topics including the neglect of charity and overzealous consumption by those in a position to provide charity.⁴⁵ Although rather than demonstrating catholicity in giving Arthington, who had links to presbyterian groups at points in his life,⁴⁶ went to great lengths to outline the different types of poor according to how deserving they were. Arthington began his discussion of the topic by outlining how the poor could be split into the impotent poor and the poor who were able to work. However, rather than stopping at this simple split these two categories were further broken down in sub-categories. These included those who should be helped entirely, those partially and those who should not be helped at all. Arthington broke the impotent poor down into four sorts, including 'aged persons past their worke...lamed persons vnable to worke...little infants without parents...poore sicke persons during their weaknesse'.⁴⁷ Those who were old or ill and therefore physically unable to work were deserving and 'must be maintained in the whole'.⁴⁸ The poor that were able to work were also tackled. This included those that were able to live by their labour, comprising of such people as 'are yong and lustie, yet vnwilling to labour'.⁴⁹ This suggests that such people were undeserving of help, and that hosts should be unwilling to help those that were

⁴⁵ Austen Saunders, 'Arthington, Henry (fl. 1569–1609)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2013), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/104920>>, [Accessed 5 July 2015].

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Henry Arthington, *Prouision for the Poore, now in Penurie* (London, 1597), [sig. B2v](#).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, [sig. B3r](#).

avoiding work. In commonality with the *Three Sermons* the plight of those who could not live by their labour was also touched upon, by further breaking down the category of the poor who were able to work. This included those 'such as bee ouercharged with children, hauing nothing to maintaine them but their hand labour'.⁵⁰ Arthington advocated that such people 'ought to be relieued in part, as their necessitie shal require',⁵¹ and thus were deserving. However, unlike the *Three Sermons* Arthington did not explicitly place those who cannot live by their labour as the first priority in the provision of hospitality. Nonetheless, this does further demonstrate how the notion of discrimination influenced works produced on hospitality from the mid 1590s, and also how where the emphasis lie in the application of discrimination could vary by author.

By 1600, interest in hospitality and poverty arising out of experience of the dearth of the mid 1590s continued to spur on authors to produce work on the same subject. William Vaughan in his *The Golden-Groue*, like others before him, portrayed a desire to see the poor helped. Vaughan made a clear statement in favour of catholicity in giving, stating 'we must tender hospitality without discretion, lest that the person, whom we exclude and shut out of doores, be God himselfe'.⁵² Vaughan further outlined his view that 'good hospitality therefore consisteth...in one kind of meat, in clothing the naked, and in giuing almes vnto the poore'.⁵³ However, despite this declaration of alms giving to poor as a part of good hospitality in a later section of the text Vaughan states his position that 'I am not so indulgent and fond, that I would haue men distribute almes without exception'.⁵⁴ Instead Vaughan outlined a series of steps to be taken by those in the position of providing for the poor, stating that hosts should give 'to them that be old, blind, lame, or crazed and sicke of body'.⁵⁵ This infers that it was the impotent poor who should be prioritised. This also highlights an inconsistency in Vaughan's argument in how he suggests that discrimination should be applied to those outside of this group in the giving of alms, despite his earlier assertion that discrimination should not be used in hospitality which according to his own description included alms giving. That authors such as Vaughan were balancing the impulse

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² William Vaughan, *The Golden-Groue Moralized in Three Bookes* (London, 1600), [book 2, chapter 24, sig. P6r.](#)

⁵³ *Ibid.*, [book 2, chapter 25, sig. P7r.](#)

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, [book 2, chapter 28, sig. Q2r.](#)

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

to encourage people to help the poor, but also the influence of notions of the deserving and undeserving poor is clear from *The Golden-Groue*. Added to this, it also reinforces the role of the individual in the prioritising of certain sections of the poor, with Vaughan mentioning the impotent poor as opposed to other works prioritising those who cannot get their living by their labour.

Further to this, a significant proportion of the literature about poverty and hospitality produced in the wake of the mid 1590s dearth was produced by figures based in rural areas, particularly East Anglia. These works by Samuel Gardiner, Samuel Bird and Robert Allen followed the same example as other sermons and literature on the subject of poverty and hospitality in displaying a concern to see the poor provided for at a time of hardship. Samuel Gardiner's *The Cognizance of a True Christian*, published in 1597, began by criticising the excess of food amongst certain people. Gardiner, a Church of England clergyman, spoke of those who were 'not ashamed to eate til they vomit, and they drink by measures, without measure'.⁵⁶ Instead people should help the poor via hospitality in tandem with fasting. Direct reference was made to the 1596 campaign for 'general hospitaly' and 'that fast which our gracious Queene in a tender compassion which shee hath of her poore distressed people...almost consumed with this long continued dearth...hath commended'.⁵⁷ Outlining how people should give any meal they forgo to the poor as a means of providing them with relief, Gardiner considered the scale of the amount of poor people who could potentially be helped in this way asking 'how many poore people may be feede by one dinner that is forborne this day?',⁵⁸ suggesting that he felt that people were not making enough of an effort to fast and give their meal to the poor instead. Samuel Bird, also a clergyman, in his *Lectures* of 1598 emphasised the need to provide hospitality for the poor, stating that 'the poore are the men that we should giue vnto: for howsoever rich friends may feast one another sometimes, yet our vsuall feasting should be for the poore'.⁵⁹ In his quest to encourage hospitality Bird also reinforced the benefits for those who did provide for the

⁵⁶ Samuel Gardiner, *The Cognizance of a True Christian or the Outward Markes whereby He May be the Better Knowne: Consisting Especially in these Two Duties: Fasting and Giuing of Almes: Verie Needfull for these Difficult Times* (London, 1597), [p. 8](#).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, [p. 10](#).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, [p. 11](#).

⁵⁹ Samuel Bird, *The Lectures of Samuel Bird of Ipswidge vpon the 8. and 9. Chapters of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Cambridge, 1598), [p. 78](#).

poor and have the poor dine with them at their own table, stating that 'Christ will set them downe at his table, he good himselfe and in his own person attend vpon them'.⁶⁰ A few years later in 1600, Robert Allen in his *A Treatise of Christian Beneficence* outlined his belief that 'better is it...that almes should be cast away, then any creature should perish for want of reliefe',⁶¹ echoing other preachers and authors, in initially suggesting that a wide range of people be helped if required.

Nevertheless whilst these texts display a desire to see the poor provided with hospitality in the wake of the mid 1590s dearth, a situation which acted as the initial stimulus to the production of the bulk of literature concerning poverty and hospitality, the impulse to discriminate between the deserving and undeserving poor is also apparent. Gardiner made moves towards prioritising certain sections of the poor, breaking down the particular groups in order of how they should be provided for. The first was kindred, followed by 'brethen according to the flesh', then neighbours.⁶² After this other groups such as both the aged and infants and young children, by virtue of being physically unable to work and therefore help themselves, were to be helped. Those who had suffered because of poor parentage or had experienced 'losse by casualtie' were also earmarked as deserving.⁶³ Other sections of the poor were also designated as being undeserving. It was 'those who get not their liuing by labour' who were subject to particular hostility, being labelled as 'nothing but theeues, and therefore they are to bee punished as theeues'.⁶⁴ This theme of punishment for those perceived as idle continued as Gardiner advocated that the authorities should 'punish all such, who make a gaine and occupation of begging, and vnder the cloacke and pretence of pouertie, like Rogues and vagabonds, do liue in all idle and vn-sufferable libertie'.⁶⁵

Bird also echoed Gardiner in the identification of certain groups as being unsuitable for help with the statement that 'if releife be bestowed vpon rogues and vagabonds, god

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

⁶¹ Robert Allen, *A Treatise of Christian Beneficence* (London, 1600), p. 41.

⁶² Gardiner, *The Cognizance of a True Christian*, pp. 146-147.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

can have no such honour by it'.⁶⁶ The issue of whether providing for the poor via more formal systems of charity should absolve one from the provision of hospitality was also addressed by Bird. His position was that hospitality should not be affected, stating that 'we must bid the poore to our house notwithstanding our collection money'.⁶⁷ Whilst on the subject of collection money, Bird's favouring of collectors for the poor who 'will inquire who be sicke, or who haue more special neede',⁶⁸ still displays a desire to identify the deserving in the practice of poor relief in Bird's mindset.

The Church of England clergyman Allen also qualified his position on providing for the poor by advocating that discretion be used against certain undeserving people who could be seen as causing their own poverty. Allen outlined how:

'Yet wisdom and discretion is to be used this way, for their sakes, who are wont to pretend neede without cause, or in a measure about their neede, while they make themselves more poore and friendlesse, or more diseased and lame, or more weake and feeble then they are indeed, in that they lay the blame vpon other for their vndoing and decay: when as in truth they haue had no other riflers and oppressors then their owne slouth and vnthriftinesse'.⁶⁹

To give to such undeserving people represented a waste of resources, confirming them in their sinful behaviour and was fraudulent towards those who were worthy of that same help. It was vagabonds that were particularly singled out for criticism, reminiscent of the hostility of Gardiner towards people in this position. Allen argued that aiding 'roguish, vagabond and idle persons' hindered obedience both to the laws of God and the land in which they lived.⁷⁰ Allen's hostility towards these people was such for him to state that 'vagabond and roguish beggers...ought not to be suffered among Christians'.⁷¹ It is at this point that the public poor relief system was suggested as a way of avoiding having to provide for those unknown to the host. Whereas Samuel Bird suggested the poor should still

⁶⁶ Bird, *The Lectures of Samuel Bird of Ipswidge*, p. 85.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁶⁹ Allen, *A Treatise of Christian Beneficence*, p. 41.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

be brought to the table and provided with food, Allen described the relief that hosts would feel in stating that 'yet it must needs be a great ease vnto euery one, touching persons vnknowne to them, in that they may with good conscience leaue them to those who haue the charge of the publike distribution'.⁷² This suggests that the more formal forms of charity, as opposed to more informal hospitality dispensed in the household, were considered as a way to absolve oneself from having to provide for certain people in one's own house but still provide peace of mind that the poor would not be left with no help at all.

It is here where the importance of the lived experience of the individual in the production of material concerning poverty and hospitality is apparent. Gardiner, Bird and Allen all, although perhaps Bird less so, displayed hostility to vagabonds and those who were perceived as choosing to pursue an idle lifestyle in advocating punishment and ways of avoiding having contact with such members of the poor. All three of these men were Church of England clergymen based in more rural areas in East Anglia at the time of writing their works and during the mid 1590s dearth. Samuel Gardiner composed *The Cognizance of a True Christian* whilst fulfilling the role of vicar in Ormesby in Norfolk.⁷³ Samuel Bird held the position as minister of St Peter's in Ipswich at the time of writing his *Lectures*.⁷⁴ Allen, who graduated in 1585-6, spent much of his career working in small villages by ministering to churches.⁷⁵ This included Culford in Suffolk, and it was here that he completed his *Treatise of Christian Beneficence* in May of 1600.⁷⁶ Being located in parishes in rural areas such as Suffolk and Norfolk during a time of dearth, it seems likely that these men would have experienced the day to day consequences of dearth upon the population in areas at the frontline of the crisis and also have had experience of dealing with the poor at parish level. The immediate need to help certain sections of the poor during this rural crisis can be seen in some parts of the concerned texts. At the same time, particularly in the case of Gardiner, it seems that amongst those with probable first hand experience of the scale of the crisis and seeking to alleviate the suffering of the poor at a time of scarce resources, attitudes

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ J. R. Lowerson, 'Gardiner, Samuel (1564–1632?)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10363>>, [Accessed 21 Sept 2015].

⁷⁴ John Craig, 'Bird, Samuel (d. 1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edition, Jan 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2451>>, [Accessed 21 Sept 2015].

⁷⁵ Richard L. Greaves, 'Allen, Robert (fl. 1582–1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68266>>, [Accessed 3 July 2015].

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

towards those felt to be the cause of their own poverty appear to have hardened and a lack of patience engendered towards people that it was felt had no genuine need. A personal dislike of direct contact with poor people or the processes involved in providing them with hospitality may also be factored in. Allen's mention of the 'great ease' which would be felt at leaving the public distribution system to deal with poor certainly suggests that reservations were held towards poor strangers. Overall this context, when combined with the general trend towards discrimination in thinking on poor relief in Elizabethan England, appears to have produced a more uncompromising and selective argument about the issue of hospitality and poverty in such authors as Gardiner and Allen. When the impulse to provide hospitality for the poor is factored in that there was a triple bind faced by preachers and authors between this, the influence of ideas about discrimination and selectivity, and the influence of their own lived experience is apparent.

In conclusion, it was the dearth crisis of the 1590s and the subsequent campaign for 'general hospitality' which made the need to help the poor urgent and thus inspired the majority of sermons and literature produced on the subject of poverty and hospitality during the Elizabethan period. However, it is also clear that by this point thinking on hospitality was becoming increasingly discriminating and selective. This reflected Elizabethan thinking on poverty, with its move towards distinguishing between the deserving and undeserving and increased hostility to particular groups such as vagabonds. Preachers and authors picked out particular types of poor people who it was felt should be prioritised in the provision of hospitality, although which groups were deemed as most deserving could depend on the individual. A balance was being made between the urgency to see the poor provided for in a time of crisis, and the general trend towards discrimination. It is also clear that the lived experience of the individual preaching or writing about hospitality also had an important role to play in the production of material concerning poverty and hospitality. The works of Gardiner, Bird and Allen all show how the lived experience of dearth in a rural setting could lead to a hostile position, particularly towards vagabonds. Overall, with the bulk of material being produced in the wake of the mid 1590s dearth, preachers and authors were balancing the triple considerations of a desire to see the poor provided for, a desire to see that those who they deemed as deserving were

prioritised and the influence of their own lived experience upon their own conception of providing hospitality for the poor. Where the balance lay depended on the preacher or author, meaning the exact message prospective hosts gained depended on who they listened to or read. As a whole, preachers and authors put forward a complicated framework which would have to be negotiated by hosts if they were to follow all the advice given.

Conclusion

The preceding chapters have explored how hospitality in Elizabethan England was conceived and ~~practiced~~ practised within the context of Protestantism. These chapters have also examined the ways in which arguments contained within the work of those addressing the subject of hospitality were affected by religious change and further how they developed across the period. Key themes including how people were exhorted to hospitality, how notions of a more selective type of hospitality began to emerge and how far the ideal of hospitality matched the reality have been put forward arguing that whilst there may have been a difference between the ideal and reality, preachers and writers were reshaping ideas and did put forward a more selective conception of hospitality. In consideration of the issues discussed, some conclusions may be drawn.

Through an assessment of sermons and prescriptive literature addressing the issue of hospitality produced during the period, it is clear that Elizabethan England saw the development of a revised view of hospitality due to religious change. The move from a belief in salvation through good works in Mary I's England to salvation through faith alone under Elizabeth I meant hospitality could no longer be thought of as a good work. This, combined with the Protestant emphasis on the importance of God's word, saw hospitality framed as a fruit of the faith and an action which occurred from a close following of scripture. Simultaneously, this religious change also meant that a comparison could be made between the new religious regime and the previous. It is apparent that the preachers and authors concerned were worried about the perception that Catholics were responsible for great levels of giving. England had already experienced much religious change prior to Elizabeth I's reign, and no one could be sure that the religious changes brought about by Elizabeth's accession would be a success or that a return to Catholicism was beyond the realms of possibility. Hospitality therefore had the potential to be a point of comparative weakness for those arguing in favour of the reformed faith. However, it is also clear that the preachers and writers concerned were not conceding defeat to Catholics on the issue of hospitality but instead sought to tackle this point of weakness by taking ownership of the idea of hospitality, advising people of what form the practice should take and backing themselves up through scriptural evidence. This attempt to take ownership of hospitality and the use of

scripture also had the effect of developing an understanding of hospitality which was more selective in nature. This can be seen in the use of Galatians 6:10 and the call to provide for the household of faith, which inspired arguments about the suitability of recipients of hospitality based on the strength of their faith.

It is the notion of being selective when providing hospitality which can most strongly be seen in discussions by preachers and writers on poverty and hospitality. It was the 1590s which saw the production of the majority of sermons and literature addressing the specific issue of hospitality and the poor. The main stimulus to this increase in interest in how the poor should be treated in the practice of hospitality was the dearth crisis of the 1590s, which made the need to find ways to provide for the poor during a food shortage urgent. The way in which this urgent need was approached was to advocate a selective approach where the deserving and undeserving poor were distinguished from one another. This selective approach reflects the tone which had been set by ideas such as the household of faith, and suggests that by the 1590s a context had been successfully created by which preachers and writers felt they could justify why not everyone should receive hospitality.

In terms of how hospitality was ~~practiced~~ practised by the Elizabethan clergy, it is clear that they were unable to match their own ~~practice~~ practise of hospitality with the standards expected of them, or any ideal set forth by preachers and writers. There was certainly a will to ~~practice~~ practise hospitality by many. However, the stark realities of finance hindered the ability of some clerics at all levels to provide hospitality in the way they would wish. Others appear not to have seen hospitality as a priority in the first place. Elizabethan preachers and writers were putting forward a revised Protestant view of hospitality with the aim of altering the mind sets of the English people, but what the English people heard and read would not necessarily concord with the example they saw being set in practice by the clergy. This highlights the fact that exhortations to hospitality represented an ideal, and did not stop the realities of life getting in the way of the provision of food and drink for guests or those in need.

The extent to which preachers and writers were actually successful in changing the mind sets of the Elizabethan people regarding hospitality can also be questioned. Did they

manage to create an environment where the English people subscribed to the revised view of hospitality, or had their efforts been wasted? Arnold Hunt has recognized the importance of sermons as one of the primary ways in which the clergy could spread religious ideas amongst the laity,¹ but also that the Elizabethan clergy ‘faced a daunting task in planting and establishing the key doctrines of the Protestant faith in a population deeply imbued with Catholic beliefs and stubbornly resistant to change’.² In considering the delivery of the sermon in its spoken format the extent to which people would have troubled to attend the preaching of such sermons addressing the issue of hospitality is unclear; once there did they pay attention to the message being given? How far did they then understand these messages and apply them to their own life?³

Although we do not know the answers to these questions regarding the sermon as preached orally, the publication of such material did at least increase the chances of the message spreading. In the case of those sermons preached at Paul’s Cross, as Mary Morrissey points out there were various ways in which people could access them including ‘through the preacher’s notes, through oral delivery, from the notes taken by hearers, through a manuscript full-text copy made by the preacher and circulated to his acquaintances, and through the printed version on sale to the general public from bookshops’.⁴ Hunt also signals how the range of people who bought copies of sermons included the London mercantile and professional elite, members of the preacher’s congregation, the middling sort through to those lower down the social scale.⁵ Printed sermons also provided preachers with material that they could use when preaching to their own congregations.⁶ That people were able to access sermons in such a variety of ways suggests that it was possible for preachers to transmit their ideas to a wider audience. In the case of prescriptive literature, this was also able to be sold and distributed amongst the public, creating the possibility of spreading the ideas expressed within to a wider audience.

¹ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴ Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul’s Cross Sermons, 1558-1642* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 66-67.

⁵ Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, pp. 164-170.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

It must be acknowledged that there were limitations to how far the ideas expressed in printed sermons and literature could impress upon the minds of the English people. As Ian Green reminds us 'early modern England was neither a completely oral nor a fully literature society'.⁷ How the clergy intended for their printed sermons to be interpreted and how the laity themselves interpreted and used sermons could differ, and this needs to be acknowledged. As Hunt explains, preachers believed that readers would follow the text from beginning to end, mirroring the experience of listening to a sermon being delivered in its oral form. Instead, according to Hunt, printed sermons were often read in 'non-linear ways', with the laity taking sections or quotes out of context.⁸ Nonetheless, whilst the intent and actual impact of the sermons and prescriptive concerned may have differed, this does not undermine the fact that by the final decade of Elizabeth I's reign selectiveness had become a central feature of the arguments about hospitality being put forward by preachers and writers. This thesis does not attempt to make a comprehensive assessment of how hearers put messages into practice but rather asserts that these preachers and writers were attempting to reshape ideas. It is clear that selectiveness became a key feature and the men discussed in this thesis did go some way to succeeding in reshaping the idea of hospitality as something arising out of a close following of God's word, and something involving selectiveness on the part of hosts.

⁷ Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2000), p. 24.

⁸ Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, p. 12.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Allen, R., *A Treatise of Christian Beneficence* (London, 1600).

Arthington, H., *Prouision for the Poore, now in Penurie* (London, 1597).

Awdely, J., *The fraternitye of vacabondes* (London, 1565).

Ayre, J. (ed.), *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, D. D., successively Bishop of Worcester and London, and Archbishop of York: to which are added some miscellaneous pieces by the same author*, The Parker Society (1841).

Becon, T., *The principles of Christian Religion necessary to be knowen of all the faythful: set forth to the great profite in trayning vp of all youth* (London, 1569).

Becon, T., *The reliques of Rome contayning all such matters of religion, as haue intimes past bene brought into the Church by the Pope and his adherentes: faithfully gathered out of the moste faithful writers of chronicles and histories, and nowe newly both diligently corrected & greatly augmented, to the singuler profit of the readers* (London, 1563).

Bedel, H., *A Sermon Exhortyng to Pitie the Poore* (London, 1572).

Bird, S., *The Lectures of Samuel Bird of Ipswidg vpon the 8. and 9. Chapters of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Cambridge, 1598).

Bruce, J. and Perowne, T. T. (eds), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D. D. Archbishop of Canterbury Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A.D. 1535, to his Death, A.D. 1575*, The Parker Society (Cambridge, 1853).

Chaderton, L., *An Excellent and Godly Sermon* (London, 1578?).

Curteys, R., *The Care of a Christian Conscience* (London, 1600).

Drant, T., *A fruitfull and necessary sermon, specially concerning almes geuing* (1572).

Frere, W. H. and Kennedy, W. M. (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, Vol. III (London, 1910).

Gardiner, S., *The Cognizance of a True Christian or the Outward Markes whereby He May be the Better Knowne: Consisting Especially in these Two Duties: Fasting and Giuing of Almes: Verie Needfull for these Difficult Times* (London, 1597).

Green, M. A. E. (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda 1566-1579* (London, 1871).

Green, M. A. E. (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth 1595-1596* (London, 1867).

Hake, E., *A touchestone for this time present expresly declaring such ruines, enormities, and abuses as trouble the Churche of God and our Christian common wealth at this daye. VVherevnto is annexed a perfect rule to be obserued of all parents and scholemaisters, in the trayning vp of their schollers and children in learning* (London, 1574).

Harman, T., *A caveat for commen cursetors vulgarely called vagabones* (London, 1567).

Howson, J., *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 4 of December, 1597 wherein is discoursed that all buying and selling of spirituall promotion is vnlawfull / by Iohn Howson ...* (London, 1597).

Nicholson, W. (ed.), *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D. D. successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, The Parker Society (1843).

Parker, M., *A defence of priestes mariages stablysshed by the imperiall lawes of the realme of Englande, agaynst a ciuilian, namyng hym selfe Thomas Martin doctour of the ciuile lawes, goyng about to disproue the saide mariages,lawfull by the eternall worde of God, [and] by the hygh court of parliament, only forbydden by forayne lawes and canons of the Pope, coloured with the visour of the Churche. Whiche lawes [and] canons, were extynguyshed by the sayde parliament ...* (London, 1567).

Robinson, H. (ed.), *The Zurich Letters or the Correspondence of several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth: chiefly from the archives of Zurich*, second edition, The Parker Society (Cambridge, 1846).

Scholefield, J. (ed.), *The Works of James Pilkington, B. D., Lord Bishop of Durham*, The Parker Society (1842).

Smith, H., *Foure Sermons Preached by Master Henry Smith. And Published by a More Perfect Copie then Heretofore* (London, 1599).

Smith, H., *The Poore Mans Teares Opened in a Sermon* (London, 1592).

Stubbes, P., *A Motiue to Good Workes* (London, 1593).

Three Sermons or Homelies to Mooue Compassion towards the Poore and Needie in these times (London, 1596).

Vaughan, W., *The Golden-Groue Moralized in Three Bookes* (London, 1600).

White, T., *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 17. of Nouember An. 1589* (London, 1589).

Withington, L. (ed.), *Elizabethan England: From "A Description of England," by William Harrison (In "Holinshed's Chronicles")*, (London, 1890).

Wordsworth, C. and Maclean, D. (eds), *Statutes and Customs of the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Salisbury* (London, 1915).

Secondary Sources

Archer, I. W., 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), pp. 223-244.

Archer, I. W., *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge, 2002).

Beier, A. L., *The Problem of the Poor in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (London, 1983).

Beier, A. L., 'The Social Problems of an Elizabethan Country Town: Warwick, 1580-90', in P. Clark (ed.), *Country Towns in Pre-Industrial England* (Leicester, 1981).

Beier, A. L., 'Vagrants and the Social Order in Elizabethan England', *Past and Present*, 64 (1974), pp. 3-29.

Ben-Amos, I. K., 'Gifts and Favours: Informal Support in Early Modern England', *Journal of Modern History*, 72, 2 (2000), pp. 295-338.

Bennett, J. M., 'Conviviality and Charity in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 134 (1992), pp. 19-41.

Bennett, J. M., 'Conviviality and Charity in Medieval and Early Modern England: Reply', *Past and Present*, 154 (1997), pp. 235-242.

Bjorklund, N. B., "'A Godly Wyfe Is an Helper": Matthew Parker and the Defense of Clerical Marriage', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 34, 2 (2003), pp. 347-365.

Carlson, E. J., 'Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 31, 1 (1992), pp. 1-31.

Cavallo, S., 'The Motivations of Benefactors: An Overview of Approaches to the Study of Charity', in J. Barry and C. Jones (eds), *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State* (London, 1991).

Clark, P., *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830* (London, 1983).

Collinson, P., 'Puritanism and the Poor', in Rosemary Horrox and Sarah Rees Jones (eds), *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities, 1200-1630* (Cambridge, 2004).

Craig, J., 'Bird, Samuel (d. 1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edition, Jan 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2451>>, [Accessed 21 Sept 2015].

Craig, J., 'Jewel, John (1522–1571)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edition, Jan 2008 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14810>>, [Accessed 15 Oct 2014].

Fox, A., 'Food, Drink and Social Distinction in Early Modern England', in S. Hindle, A. Shepard and J. Walter (eds), *Remaking English Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2013).

Greaves, R. L., 'Allen, Robert (fl. 1582–1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68266>>, [Accessed 3 July 2015].

Green, I., *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2000).

Heal, F., 'Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress', in J. E. Archer, E. Goldring and S. Knight (eds), *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford, 2007).

Heal, F., 'Hospitality and Honor in Early Modern England', *Food and Foodways*, 1, 4 (1987), pp. 321-350.

Heal, F., *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990).

Heal, F., *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2003).

Heal, F., 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33, 4 (1982), pp. 544-563.

Heal, F., 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102, 1 (1984), pp. 66-93.

Hindle, S., 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms: The Campaign for General Hospitality in Late Elizabethan England', *Past and Present*, 172 (2001), pp. 44-86.

Hindle, S., 'Exhortation and Entitlement: Negotiating Inequality in English Rural Communities, 1550-1650', in M. J. Braddick and J. Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001).

Hunt, A., *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge, 2010).

Hutton, R., *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1994).

Hutton, R., *The Stations of the Sun: A History of the Ritual Year in Britain* (Oxford, 1996).

Jenkins, G. W., 'Smith, Henry (c.1560–1591)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25811>>, [Accessed 5 July 2015].

Jordan, W. K., *Philanthropy in England 1480-1660: A Study of the Changing Pattern of English Social Aspirations* (London, 1959).

Lowerson, J. R., 'Gardiner, Samuel (1564–1632?)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10363>>, [Accessed 21 Sept 2015].

Manning, R. B., 'Curteys, Richard (1532?–1582)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edition, Jan 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6957>>, [Accessed 21 Sept 2015].

Moisà, M., 'Conviviality and Charity in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 154 (1997), pp. 223-234.

Morrissey, M., *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642* (Oxford, 2011).

Pollock, L. A., 'The Practice of Kindness in Early Modern Elite Society', *Past and Present*, 211 (2001), pp. 121-158.

Pound, J., *Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England* (London, 1971).

Saunders, A., 'Arthington, Henry (fl. 1569–1609)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2013), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/104920>>, [Accessed 5 July 2015].

Sharpe, J. A., *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760*, second edition (London, 1997).

Skelton, K., 'Redefining Hospitality: The Leisured World of the 1650s English Country House', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 68, 4 (2009), pp. 496-513.

Slack, P., 'Dearth and Social Policy in Early Modern England', *Social History of Medicine*, 5 (1992), pp. 1-17.

Slack, P., *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1988).

Stone, L., *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641* (Oxford, 1966).

Thomas, K., *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1991; first edition 1971).

Walsham, A., *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2006).

Walsham, A., 'Stubbes, Philip (b. c.1555, d. in or after 1610)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26737>>, [Accessed 3 July 2015].

Walsham, A., 'Supping with Satan's Disciples: Spiritual and Secular Sociability in Post-Reformation England', in N. Lewycky and A. Morton (eds), *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W. J. Sheils* (Farnham, 2012).

Withington, P., *Society in Early Modern England: The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Cambridge, 2010).

Copyright Statement

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of any patents, designs, trade marks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the “Intellectual Property Rights”) and any reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions.